

**CHARLES COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
2026 LOCAL LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS**

- 1. TOPIC: Heritage Commission** **PG. 1**  
Submitted by Office of the Clerk to the Commissioners
- 2. TOPIC: Board of Commissioners Attendance Requirements** **PG. 3**  
Submitted by Joseph Mank
- 3. TOPIC: Investigations of Commissioners** **PG. 5**  
Submitted by Debra Jones
- 4. TOPIC: Traffic Calming** **PG. 7**  
Submitted by Derrick Terry
- 5. TOPIC: Elimination of the Planning & Design Review Board (PDRB)** **PG. 13**  
Submitted by Eileen Britt
- 6. TOPIC: Vacant Commercial Property Registration and Maintenance** **PG. 16**  
Submitted by Eileen Britt
- 7. TOPIC: Warranty Period for Infrastructure Transferred to HOAs** **PG. 19**  
Submitted by Eileen Britt
- 8. TOPIC: Prioritizing Agriculture, Agritourism and Outdoor Recreation** **PG. 22**  
Submitted by Latina Wilson
- 9. TOPIC: Monotonous Streetscapes** **PG. 24**  
Submitted by Latina Wilson
- 10. TOPIC: Compliance by Commissioners with DEI Policies** **PG. 26**  
Submitted by Latina Wilson
- 11. TOPIC: Commissioners' Attendance and Performance Standards** **PG.28**  
Submitted by Latina Wilson
- 12. TOPIC: Mandatory Governance and Ethics Training for Elected Officials** **PG. 30**  
Submitted by Latina Wilson
- 13. TOPIC: Establishment of Office of the Independent Ethics Auditor** **PG. 32**  
Submitted by Latina Wilson

- 14. TOPIC: Entrepreneurs Grant Competition** **PG. 34**  
Submitted by Jolana Watson
- 15. TOPIC: Moratorium on Data Centers** **PG. 36**  
Submitted by: 1. Khaliq Greathouse; 2. Jessica Cassidy; 3. Brenda Lough; 4. Olivia Robinson; 5. Skylar Robinson; 6. Milton Guzman; 7. Jackie Wesley; 8. Yvonne Stanton; 9. Jasmine Tiamfook; 10. Tiffany Marte; 11. Frank Robinson; 12. Aliyah Malazarte; 13. David Lopez; 14. Danielle Dixon; 15. Jazmine Gordon; 16. Madeline Kaba; 17. Keith Quaine; 18. Major Robinson; 19. Faith Shelton; 20. Kendall Tucker; 21. Eleni Varlas; 22. Owen Whalen; 23. Patricia Williams; 24. Rachel Marino
- 16. TOPIC: Ban on Data Centers** **PG. 84**  
Submitted by: 1. Patrice Gutrick; 2. Lavon Harper; 3. Deborah Dwomoh; 4. Connor Sauers; 5. Michael Jenkins; 6. Patricia Ruiz
- 17. TOPIC: Quarterly Joint Accountability Meetings for Data Center Discussion** **PG. 96**  
Submitted by Micaiah Lloyd
- 18. TOPIC: Ban on Non-Disclosure Agreements for Technology or Data Centers** **PG. 98**  
Submitted by Micaiah Lloyd
- 19. TOPIC: Economic Development Task Force** **PG.100**  
Submitted by Micaiah Lloyd
- 20. TOPIC: Permanent Ban on Data Centers Above Tier 2** **PG.102**  
Submitted by Micaiah Lloyd
- 21. TOPIC: Planning for Long-term Maintenance in New Home Subdivisions** **PG. 104**  
Submitted by Eileen Britt

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal - Long Form**

---

From DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

Date Mon 3/30/2026 1:00 PM

To Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal - Long Form**

Submission #: 4729971

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission Date: 03/30/2026 1:00

Survey Time: 3 minutes, 4 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

John Adelodun

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

adeloduj@charlescountymd.gov

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

(240) 776-6709 ext. 2909

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

John Adelodun

,

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Remove the Heritage Commission from the County Code

**CODE REFERENCES**

§ 62 Establishment; purpose. [P.L.L., 1982, ch. 304; 1988, ch. 44] A. There is a Charles County Heritage Commission. B. The purpose of the Commission is to manage, procure, preserve and disseminate materials relating to the local history of Charles County.

**PROBLEM**

This Commission was established to prepare for the County's bicentennial celebration, it has not been active for over 20 years. Ronald Brown, former staff member of College of Southern Maryland, served as the Sole Curator for this Commission through his work at Southern Maryland Studies Center (SMSC).

**SOLUTION**

Store the archival materials of the Charles County Heritage Commission with the Southern Maryland Studies Center (SMSC), located at the College of Southern Maryland (CSM) in La Plata, Maryland. This collaboration will ensure the long-term preservation, accessibility, and professional care of historically valuable records, while supporting transparency and public

engagement. Transferring these documents to the Southern Maryland Studies Center (SMSC) for archiving since the SMSC has the appropriate infrastructure and experience in handling government related historical materials and is already stewards for various collections such as Charles County Bicentennial , Charles County Tercentenary , Charles County Cultural Community Center Committee , Charles County Cooperative Extension Service , Charles County Sheriff's Office , Charles County Board of Elections , Richard R. Clark Senior Center , Old La Plata Jail Charles County Court Records. This alignment would situate the Heritage Commission's collection among related local government archives, increasing its value to researchers and the public. The SMSC employs trained archivists and offers climate-controlled storage to preserve fragile and historic materials. Documents stored at the SMSC are available to the public by request, in alignment with state and local regulations. The SMSC has confirmed willingness to house these materials as part of their public service mission.

**COST**

none

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

The SMSC has confirmed willingness to house these materials as part of their public service mission.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

none

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Wed 3/25/2026 2:42 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4710078

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/25/2026 12:11

**Survey Time:** 11 minutes, 59 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Joseph Mank

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

[REDACTED]  
Waldorf, MD 20602

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

To establish a standard of minimum attendance guidelines for Charles County Commissioners.

**CODE REFERENCES**

N/A

**PROBLEM**

There is not a strict attendance legislation outlined in regards to attendance requirements for Charles County Commissioners. The lack of such legislation does not currently foster an environment where regular attendance is required and therefore the best interests of the populace is not being best served. Also there should be a requirement of in person attendance to avoid potential conflicts of interest

**SOLUTION**

There should be a legal requirement that all commissioners should attend no less than 85% of all scheduled meetings either in person or virtual. In addition to all meetings attended no more of those meetings shall be attended 15% virtually to satisfy this requirement

**COST**

n/a

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Community at large

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

N/A

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

A legal requirement that all Charles County Commissioners should be required to attend no less than 85% of all scheduled meetings either in person or virtual. In addition to all meetings attended no more than 15% of those meetings shall be attended virtually to satisfy this requirement. If a commissioner does not meet the attendance requirements they will be subject to prorated salary forfeiture based on the number of meetings not attended below the attendance requirement. In addition if a commissioner fails to attend 70% of all scheduled meetings then that particular commissioner shall have been deemed to have forfeited their office.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

From DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

Date Thu 3/26/2026 10:21 PM

To Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

Submission #: 4714404

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission Date: 03/26/2026 10:20

Survey Time: 24 minutes, 19 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Debra Jones

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

Port Tobacco, MD 20677

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Legislative Proposal: Investigations into commissioner actions Require disclosure of commissioner investigations, findings & disciplinary actions Proposal Summary: Enact legislation that would require the Board of County Commissioners to make public any investigations with findings whenever the investigation is related to Commissioner acts and those acts constitute grounds for disciplinary action, retroactive to 12/1/2018.

**CODE REFERENCES**

Unknown

**PROBLEM**

The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) is elected by and accountable to the people of Charles County. Currently, there is no means for the public to definitively know whether and when a commissioner has engaged in improper actions. Without such knowledge, the people of Charles County are effectively disenfranchised because they lack essential information about their representatives' conduct. This lack of transparency results in an erosion of trust and a lack of true accountability to the people of Charles County. EXAMPLE: On June 9, 2020, the BOCC received a briefing from Ms. Bernadette Sargeant regarding her investigation – paid for by the taxpayers of Charles County – that found Commissioner Thomasina Coates: 1. "Subjected (County Administrator) Mark Belton to an abusive, hostile work environment;" and 2. "Tarnished (Mr. Belton's) reputation and hindered

his ability to do his job"; and 3. "Was disparaging and disrespectful toward Mr. Belton;" and 4. "(Coates') actions were racially motivated," and 5. "That creating a hostile work environment is legally actionable;" As a result of Ms. Sargeant's findings, which were detailed in the 27-page "Sargeant Report," the BOCC censured Commissioner Coates. FIRST: None of this was known to the citizens of Charles County prior to the 2022 election. The people of Charles County were deprived of the right to knowledgeably vote for candidates based on these highly relevant findings that have since impacted the county via lawsuits. SECOND: Citizens later became aware that a "2nd Sargeant Report," also paid for by the citizens of Charles County, had been completed and contained "employee allegations of discrimination, bullying, and retaliation by a current Commissioner." On October 24, 2023, the BOCC voted 3 - 2 not to release any part of the 2nd Sargeant Report to the public. This independent investigation into commissioner actions, which was paid for by the citizens of Charles County, remains concealed to this day.

#### **SOLUTION**

Enact legislation requiring that if a county commissioner is found to have: A. Committed an act that would be grounds for disciplinary action if the same act were performed by a county employee, or B. Committed an act that would be eligible for disciplinary action / censure based on rules in effect for and applying to the Board of County Commissioners, or C. Committed an act that results in disciplinary action, however minor, including written admonishment by a professional organization or licensing agency, then the associated investigation and its outcomes must be made public within fifteen (15) days of the finding being completed/issued by the investigator. This will apply to any and all investigations into commissioner conduct including those performed by the Department of Human Resources or contracted to an independent investigator; any investigations and findings of an Inspector General of Charles County or the State of Maryland; or by any other agency or arm of government. This also applies to any findings of misconduct by any professional organization or licensing agency, and any findings that are discovered after their completion, even if the BOCC was unaware at the time of investigation. Upon determining of a finding: a. A member of the BOCC must read aloud a summary of the investigation and finding(s) at the BOCC's next open meeting; and b. A written copy of the investigation and findings shall be posted to a prominent and logical location on the county's website, such as on the Ethics Commission page or linking to the report directly from that page; and c. Redactions to the investigation and findings may only include those necessary to protect whistleblowers in the county and may not be used in any way to conceal the actions of elected officials from the public. This legislation is retroactive to findings dating back to December 1, 2018. Once this legislation is enacted, a member of the BOCC will read this legislation aloud at the next Legislative Day of

#### **COST**

Negligible. Furthermore, passing this legislation may ultimately yield savings to taxpayers in the future.

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

TBD

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

None anticipated

#### **PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

See language in "Solution" above.

#### **OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

N/A

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 8:44 AM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4714702

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 8:44

**Survey Time:** 27 minutes, 31 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

DERRICK TERRY

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

[REDACTED]

Waldorf, MD 20603

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Implement a traffic calming program enabling HOAs to fund speed cushions or humps through full or shared cost models on County or HOA roads. This approach empowers residents to address speeding concerns quickly while reducing reliance on slow public funding. The County maintains oversight through engineering standards, placement, and safety review by combining community initiative with professional guidance to improve safety, efficiency, and accountability on residential streets.

**CODE REFERENCES**

Charles County Road Ordinance (Chapter 276 – Traffic Calming)

**PROBLEM**

Many HOA neighborhoods face persistent and often escalating traffic safety issues that negatively impact residents' quality of life. One of the most pressing concerns is speeding. Residential streets are designed for low volume, low speed traffic where the absence of physical deterrents such as speed humps, stop signs, or speed cameras, excessive speeding continues unchecked. This creates dangerous conditions for pedestrians, particularly children, seniors, and families who rely on these streets for walking, biking, and everyday activities. The lack of traffic calming measures increases the risk of serious injury and undermines the sense of safety residential communities are meant to provide. Another major issue is cut through traffic. As congestion

worsens on main roads, drivers increasingly use neighborhood streets as shortcuts. Without effective traffic calming, these roads begin to function like extensions of larger thoroughfares, bringing higher traffic volumes and faster moving vehicles into areas never designed to handle them. This not only increases the likelihood of accidents but also erodes the sense of community and security. Relying solely on enforcement is not a sustainable solution. Law enforcement resources are limited and cannot provide continuous monitoring. As a result, speeding often resumes once enforcement presence is reduced, creating a cycle of complaints without long term resolution. Additionally, the absence of speed cushions or humps contributes to greater accident severity. Research consistently shows that higher speeds lead to more severe injuries and fatalities. On a personal note, my wife and I have witnessed and prevented at least five near misses serious injury or death of a child. Lastly, noise and overall quality of-life concerns are affected by speeding vehicles, sudden braking, and aggressive driving causing ongoing disruption, making outdoor spaces less enjoyable, and potentially reducing neighborhood appeal over time.

#### **SOLUTION**

A practical and effective solution is to establish a formal traffic calming program that allows HOA communities to install speed cushions and/or speed humps through either 100% HOA funded or a shared-cost partnership with Charles County. This approach empowers neighborhoods to directly address speeding and cut through traffic while creating a clear and consistent process where none currently exists. The program should begin with a simple, HOA-led application. Communities would submit requests outlining safety concerns, supported by resident feedback and documented issues such as speeding, near misses, or increased traffic volume. Research shows that speed is a critical factor in roadway safety. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the risk of a pedestrian fatality increases dramatically as vehicle speeds rise, with severe injury risk increasing significantly above 25 mph. Additionally, studies from the Federal Highway Administration indicate that speed humps can reduce average speeds by 15-20% and cut traffic volumes on residential streets by up to 13%. Clear engineering and placement standards must be established to ensure these measures effectively reduce speeds without impacting drainage, emergency access, or roadway integrity. The County would review and approve all designs to ensure safety and consistency, while HOAs would fully fund or share installation costs. The program should also define maintenance responsibilities. Under a fully HOA-funded model, the HOA manages upkeep and in a shared cost model, responsibilities can be divided or supported by the County, ensuring long-term accountability. Ultimately, this program offers a proactive, self-enforcing approach to traffic safety. Unlike enforcement alone, speed cushions and humps provide a constant physical reminder to slow down, leading to reduced speeds, fewer crashes, and improved quality of life.

#### **COST**

Typical installation costs in Maryland: Speed Cushions: \$2,500 – \$6,000 per unit Speed Humps: \$2,600 – \$7,000 per unit Costs vary based on materials, design specifications, and roadway conditions.

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Piney Grove Estates Homeowners Association Board of Directors

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

If there's going to be pushback, it'll probably come from emergency service organizations that are concerned about delays or difficulty navigating speed humps and cushions.

#### **PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

**LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL:** Establishment of a Residential Traffic Calming Partnership Program I. **PURPOSE** This proposal establishes a Residential Traffic Calming Partnership Program under Charles County Road Ordinance Chapter 276 to enable installation of speed cushions and humps through HOA funding with County oversight. II. **BACKGROUND & NEED** Although permitted, traffic calming measures are rarely implemented in Charles County despite rising demand. Communities face persistent speeding, increased cut-through traffic, pedestrian safety risks, and declining quality of life. Enforcement alone is insufficient due to limited resources and temporary impact. III. **PROBLEM STATEMENT** The lack of infrastructure has led to higher crash risk, frequent near misses, and residential roads functioning as arterial routes. Concerns about emergency response delays persist, though modern designs accommodate emergency vehicles. IV. **PROPOSED SOLUTION** Create a partnership program with: A. HOA application process with documented support B. Funding options: full HOA or shared-cost C. County oversight for design, safety, and compliance D. Defined maintenance responsibilities based on funding model V. **SUPPORTING DATA** NHTSA data shows pedestrian fatality risk rises above 25 mph. FHWA reports speed humps reduce speeds by 15-20% and traffic volume by up to 13%, providing consistent, self-enforcing control. VI. **COST ESTIMATES** Speed cushions: \$2,500-\$6,000 Speed humps: \$2,600-\$7,000 VII. **REGIONAL COMPARISON** Peer jurisdictions widely implement these measures, demonstrating effectiveness. VIII. **OPPOSITION** Emergency concerns are mitigated through design and engineering review, with minimal impact shown elsewhere. IX. **BENEFITS** Improved safety, reduced speeding, enhanced livability, and cost-efficient solutions. X. **RECOMMENDATION** Establish the program, standardize guidelines, pilot in select communities, and expand Countywide.

#### **OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Speed cushions/humps are a proven traffic calming measure that slow vehicles to safe residential speeds while maintaining designs that allow emergency and first responder vehicles to pass safely. Properly engineered speed cushions/humps minimize delays for fire trucks, ambulances, and police without compromising neighborhood safety. In Maryland, speed cushions, humps and/or bumps are common in Montgomery, Howard, Baltimore, and Frederick Counties on residential streets to reduce speeding. In Northern Virginia, counties like Fairfax and Arlington use them in neighborhoods and school zones as part of traffic calming programs. They are typically installed on local streets with high speeds or cut-through traffic to improve safety.

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

**This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.**

## **LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL**

Establishment of a Residential Traffic Calming Partnership Program with Homeowners Associations and Charles County Government

### **I. PURPOSE**

This proposal seeks to establish a formal Residential Traffic Calming Partnership Program under Charles County Road Ordinance Chapter 276 - Traffic Calming to facilitate the installation of speed cushions and speed humps in residential communities through Homeowners Association (HOA)-driven funding and County oversight.

### **II. BACKGROUND & NEED**

Although Chapter 276 permits the use of traffic calming measures, implementation across Charles County remains virtually nonexistent despite increasing resident demand.

Residential communities throughout the County are experiencing and without physical deterrents, unsafe driving behaviors quickly return:

1. Persistent and excessive speeding
2. Increased cut-through traffic due to regional congestion
3. Elevated safety risks for pedestrians, including children and seniors
4. Noise pollution and declining quality of life
5. Enforcement alone has proven insufficient due to limited law enforcement resources and the temporary nature of traffic stops.

### **III. PROBLEM STATEMENT**

The absence of effective traffic calming infrastructure has resulted in:

1. Increased likelihood and severity of vehicle collisions
2. Frequent near-miss incidents not captured in official data
3. Residential streets functioning as unintended arterial roadways
4. Reduced pedestrian safety and community livability
5. Additionally, concerns regarding emergency response delays have been cited as a barrier to implementation.

However, modern speed cushions and humps are engineered to accommodate emergency vehicles, particularly those with wider axle widths.

### **IV. PROPOSED SOLUTION**

Establish a Residential Traffic Calming Partnership Program with the following components:

1. HOA-Initiated Application Process
2. HOAs may submit formal requests identifying traffic safety concerns
3. Applications must include resident support and supporting documentation (e.g., speed data, complaints, near-misses)
4. Funding Structure
5. Option 1: 100% HOA-funded installation
6. Option 2: Shared-cost model between HOA and Charles County
7. County Oversight
8. Charles County will review, approve, and oversee all designs
9. Ensure compliance with engineering, safety, and placement standards
10. Evaluate impacts on drainage, roadway integrity, and emergency access
11. Maintenance Responsibilities
  - a. HOA assumes maintenance under fully funded model
  - b. Shared-cost agreements define maintenance responsibilities collaboratively

## **V. SUPPORTING DATA**

According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, pedestrian fatality risk increases significantly as vehicle speeds exceed 25 mph.

The Federal Highway Administration reports:

1. Speed humps reduce average vehicle speeds by 15–20%
2. Traffic volumes decrease by up to 13% on residential streets
3. These measures provide continuous, self-enforcing traffic control, unlike intermittent enforcement.

## **VI. COST ESTIMATES**

Typical installation costs in Maryland:

1. Speed Cushions: \$2,500 – \$6,000 per unit
2. Speed Humps: \$2,600 – \$7,000 per unit
3. Costs vary based on materials, design specifications, and roadway conditions.

## **VII. REGIONAL COMPARISON**

Comparable jurisdictions actively utilize these measures, including:

1. Montgomery County, Maryland

2. Howard County, Maryland
3. Baltimore County, Maryland
4. Frederick County, Maryland
5. Fairfax County, Virginia
6. Arlington County, Virginia

These jurisdictions successfully incorporate traffic calming into residential safety strategies.

#### **VIII. ANTICIPATED OPPOSITION**

Potential concerns may arise from emergency service providers regarding response times and damage to vehicles

#### **IX. BENEFITS**

1. Reduced vehicle speeds and safer neighborhoods
2. Decreased cut-through traffic
3. Improved pedestrian and cyclist safety
4. Enhanced quality of life for residents
5. Cost-efficient, community-driven infrastructure improvements

#### **X. IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Charles County Government:

1. Formally establish the Residential Traffic Calming Partnership Program
2. Develop standardized application procedures and engineering guidelines
3. Pilot the program in select HOA communities
4. Evaluate outcomes and expand Countywide

#### **XI. CONCLUSION**

This proposal provides a balanced, data-driven, and community-centered solution to a growing public safety concern. By combining HOA initiative with County oversight, Charles County can modernize its approach to residential traffic safety while maintaining accountability and efficiency.

Respectfully submitted,

**Derrick Terry**

Waldorf Resident

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

From DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

Date Fri 3/27/2026 2:20 PM

To Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

Submission #: 4715554

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission Date: 03/27/2026 2:20

Survey Time: 47 minutes, 55 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Eileen Britt

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

,

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal eliminates the Planning & Design Review Board (PDRB) as a duplicative layer of approval while preserving HOA and Master Association authority. Once approved at the community level, applicants may proceed directly to County permitting. This streamlines the process, reduces delays and costs, and improves transparency and efficiency.

**CODE REFERENCES**

Charles County Code, Chapter 297 – Zoning Ordinance (Including PUD provisions §297-212–§297-231 and Site Plan Review §297-285 et seq.) Charles County Code, Chapter 278 Subdivision Regulations Charles County Code, Chapter 250 Building Code (Permitting) Charles County Code, Chapter 98 – Board of Appeals Docket 90 – Revised and Restated Order (September 9, 2014)

**PROBLEM**

Under the current framework established by Docket 90, Revised and Restated Order (September 9, 2014) , architectural review within Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) includes an additional layer of approval through Planning & Design Review Boards (PDRBs). While HOAs and Master Associations already review and approve applications in accordance with their governing documents, applicants are often required to seek further approval from a PDRB before proceeding to County permitting. This structure creates unnecessary duplication, delays, and added costs. PDRBs frequently face challenges establishing quorum or meeting consistently, resulting in stalled residential and commercial projects. Businesses are particularly impacted, as they must

often pay additional fees for PDRB review while still being required to obtain County permits. This redundant process increases expenses, slows economic activity, and creates uncertainty for property owners. Additionally, PDRBs operate with limited transparency and oversight. In many cases, there is no publicly available list of members, no defined selection process, no recorded charter, and no consistent meeting minutes or reporting. This lack of structure creates confusion among homeowners, businesses, HOAs, and Master Associations regarding roles, authority, and expectations. Architectural review is already effectively addressed at the HOA or Master Association level and through County permitting requirements. The additional PDRB layer does not provide meaningful regulatory value and instead introduces inefficiency and administrative burden. This bill addresses these issues by removing the PDRB as a duplicative approval authority while preserving HOA and Master Association review and allowing applicants to proceed directly to County permitting once community-level approval is obtained.

#### **SOLUTION**

This bill streamlines architectural review in Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) under Docket 90 by removing the Planning & Design Review Board (PDRB) as a duplicative approval layer while preserving the authority of HOAs and Master Associations. HOAs and Master Associations will continue to review and approve applications in accordance with their governing documents. For improvements requiring a County issued permit, once community approval is obtained, applicants may proceed directly to County permitting without additional PDRB approval. The bill eliminates redundant reviews and associated private fees, reducing costs for homeowners and businesses, and improves efficiency by aligning architectural review with existing County permitting processes. It includes amendments to Chapter 297 (Zoning Ordinance), supersedes conflicting provisions in Docket 90, and recommends supporting updates to Chapters 278, 250, and 98 to ensure consistency. HOAs and Master Associations retain authority over non-permitted improvements, while the County maintains oversight through permitting. This approach reduces delays, eliminates unnecessary red tape, and creates a clearer, more efficient process for all stakeholders.

#### **COST**

Minimal fiscal impact. Minor staff time and updates, absorbed into existing processes. Eliminates redundant reviews and fees, reducing costs. Improves revenue by reducing business delays and enabling

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Organizations that may support this bill locally include HOAs and Master Associations impacted by the Docket 90 Ordinance, business and economic groups such as the Charles County Chamber of Commerce and Charles County Economic Development Department, due to reduced delays, lower costs, and improved efficiency that supports both homeowners and local businesses

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Organizations that may oppose this bill include developer-aligned organizations and property management firms currently involved in administering PDRB reviews, as they may experience a loss of revenue from application processing fees and reduced administrative control.

#### **PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Section \_\_. Architectural Review Authority and Process A. Recognition of HOA and Master Association Authority Nothing in this Act shall diminish the authority of duly established Homeowners Associations (HOAs) or Master Associations to review and approve architectural applications in accordance with their governing documents. B. Elimination of PDRB Authority Notwithstanding any provision of Docket 90, Revised and Restated Order (September 9, 2014), or any related governing document, the Planning & Design Review Board (PDRB) shall have no authority to approve, deny, or condition architectural applications. Any such role is hereby eliminated. C. Streamlined Review Process Upon approval by the applicable HOA or Master Association, applicants for improvements requiring a County-issued permit may proceed directly to Charles County for permitting and review. No additional approval by a PDRB or similar entity shall be required. D. Prohibition on Redundant Review and Fees Architectural review shall not be duplicative. Applicants shall not be required to obtain multiple approvals for the same scope of work or pay fees to any private or non-County entity beyond HOA or Master Association requirements and County established fees. E. Coordination with County Permitting County review shall be integrated with permitting processes to ensure efficiency, with HOA or Master Association approval recognized as satisfying applicable private governance requirements. F. Non-Permitted Improvements For improvements not requiring a County-issued permit, HOAs or Master Associations shall retain full authority to review and approve applications. G. Conflicting Provisions Any conflicting provision of Docket 90 or related governing documents establishing PDRB authority is hereby superseded and shall be of no force or effect.

#### **OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Over the past two years, residents across multiple communities within the Docket 90 framework have repeatedly come before the Board of Commissioners to raise serious concerns about the Planning & Design Review Board (PDRB). These are not isolated complaints—they reflect a consistent pattern of issues impacting both homeowners and businesses. During the March 17, 2026, Commissioner Comments segment, a local business owner courageously spoke about the real impacts of this process, including delays that affect their ability to operate and generate revenue. This is a critical point contention, our local businesses are economic partners, and unnecessary delays directly impact on our County's economic health. The concerns are clear: lack of transparency, no publicly available information on board members or how they are selected, no consistent or open meetings, and little to no accessible records, such as meeting minutes. This is not the level of accountability our residents or business community should expect from a process that directly affects property use and investment. This is also not the first time the community has asked the County to resume oversight. At what point do we acknowledge that the current structure is not working? If we are serious about supporting smart, sustainable growth and strengthening County revenue, we need efficiency, transparency, and accountability. Removing unnecessary layers like the PDRB is not just a governance "fix it" is an economic one.

This proposal is about restoring clarity, reducing delays, and supporting both our homeowners and the businesses that help sustain our community.

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

**This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.**

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 4:11 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715892

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 4:11

**Survey Time:** 36 minutes, 17 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Eileen Britt

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

,

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Charles County has experienced instances of prolonged vacant commercial properties that: • Remain unmaintained or under-secured • Generate recurring code enforcement complaints • Contribute to stormwater neglect and infrastructure strain • Attract vandalism, illegal dumping, and public safety concerns • Depress surrounding property values • Reduce commercial corridor vitality and economic activity This proposal is specifically focused on commercial properties, where prolonged vacancy has a more

**CODE REFERENCES**

Maryland law provides clear authority for counties, including those operating under a Commissioner form of government, to regulate vacant and blighted commercial properties to protect public health, safety, and welfare. Under the 2024 amendments to the Maryland Tax-Property Article (HB 2), counties and municipalities may establish a subclass of real property for vacant or abandoned properties and apply a special property tax rate under defined conditions. This authority enables jurisdictions such as Charles County to adopt registration programs, impose accountability measures, and incentivize reinvestment in underutilized commercial properties. Additionally, Maryland counties are authorized under State delegated police powers to enforce property maintenance standards, abate nuisances, and recover costs associated with unsafe or neglected properties. These authorities extend to commercial structures that pose risks to public safety, infrastructure, and economic stability. Commissioner counties, including Calvert County, St. Mary's County, Caroline County, Dorchester County, and Worcester County, routinely exercise this

authority to address nuisance conditions and enforce compliance. This proposal aligns with established Maryland statutory authority and existing local enforcement practices, providing a proactive framework to monitor, regulate, and support the reinvestment of vacant commercial properties while protecting surrounding communities and the County's economic base

#### **PROBLEM**

Charles County is experiencing prolonged vacancy across commercial properties, particularly along corridors such as Smallwood Village Shopping Center, Bryans Road, Old Washington Road, Old Leonardtown Road, and near St. Charles Towne Center. Many of these properties remain underutilized, unmaintained, or unsecured for extended periods. These vacant properties contribute to code enforcement complaints, illegal dumping, vandalism, and increased public safety concerns, often requiring repeated responses from police, fire, and emergency services. Poor maintenance can also lead to stormwater and drainage issues, placing additional strain on infrastructure. Economically, prolonged vacancy weakens commercial corridors, discourages investment, and limits business growth. Vacant storefronts create a visible perception of decline, negatively impacting surrounding areas and making it harder to attract new businesses. Currently, enforcement is largely reactive, and the County lacks a centralized system to track and manage vacant commercial properties. This limits accountability and leads to inefficient use of resources. Without a proactive approach, these challenges will continue to impact public safety, infrastructure, and economic development across the County.

#### **SOLUTION**

Adopt a Vacant Commercial Property Registration and Maintenance Ordinance to establish a proactive, enforceable framework for identifying, monitoring, and maintaining vacant commercial properties across Charles County. The proposed legislation would require owners of vacant commercial properties to register their properties within a defined timeframe and renew annually until occupancy is restored. Owners must designate a responsible local agent and submit a basic maintenance and security plan. The ordinance would establish minimum standards, including securing structures, maintaining the property free of debris and overgrowth, preventing illegal dumping, and ensuring compliance with stormwater and drainage requirements. To ensure accountability, the County would be authorized to conduct inspections, issue notices of violation, and enforce compliance through civil penalties. Where necessary, the County may perform abatement actions and recover costs through liens. The program would include reasonable fees to offset administrative costs, with the option to implement escalating fees for properties that remain vacant over multiple years, encouraging timely reinvestment. To ensure fairness, the ordinance would include defined exemptions (e.g., active redevelopment, permitted construction, or temporary vacancy) and provide a formal appeals process. This legislative approach shifts enforcement from reactive to proactive, reduces strain on County resources, protects infrastructure, and supports economic revitalization by encouraging productive use of commercial properties.

#### **COST**

Estimated annual cost \$110K–\$160K, offset by \$75K–\$130K revenue. Near-neutral within 12–24 months, with added savings from reduced public safety, cleanup, and infrastructure costs.

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Several organizations and stakeholder groups are likely to benefit from this legislation due to its focus on public safety, economic revitalization, and infrastructure protection. Community Associations – Local community associations across Charles County benefit from reduced blight, improved neighborhood conditions, and protection of property values. Property Management Companies – Firms responsible for maintaining commercial properties benefit from clear standards and accountability, helping ensure consistent upkeep and reducing impacts from neighboring neglected properties. Chambers of Commerce & Business Organizations – Local chambers and business groups benefit from stronger commercial corridors, improved business environments, and increased ability to attract and retain businesses. Economic Development Organizations – Agencies focused on business attraction and retention benefit from reduced vacancy and improved marketability of commercial areas. Public Safety Agencies – Organizations such as the Charles County Sheriff's Office and fire/EMS services benefit from reduced calls related to trespassing, vandalism, and unsafe structures. Overall, these groups benefit from safer communities, protected infrastructure, stronger economic conditions, and a more accountable and sustainable approach to managing vacant commercial properties.

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Some stakeholders, including commercial property owners, investors, financial institutions, and business groups, may have concerns about costs, administrative requirements, and impacts on redevelopment. However, this legislation is designed to be flexible and fair. Cost Concerns: Fees can be modest and structured to focus on long-term vacant properties, not those in active transition. Properties being marketed, leased, or redeveloped may be exempt or have reduced requirements. Administrative Burden: Depending on the County's system, registration can be simple and streamlined. Many responsible owners already meet these standards, so additional effort is minimal. Redevelopment Flexibility: Exemptions may be included for active construction and properties in transition to ensure redevelopment is not delayed. Financial Institutions: Reasonable timelines and exemptions can be provided for foreclosure or property transfers. Approach: This is not a punitive measure. It creates a consistent, proactive system to address prolonged neglect. Overall, the ordinance focuses on long-term vacant properties, protects responsible owners, reduces taxpayer costs, improves public safety, and supports economic growth.

#### **PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Establish a Vacant Commercial Property Registration and Maintenance Program requiring owners of vacant commercial properties to register such properties with Charles County within thirty (30) days of vacancy or receipt of County notice. Require property owners to designate a responsible local agent located within the State of Maryland, available for 24-hour contact to receive notices and coordinate compliance. Require submission of basic owner information and a maintenance and security plan

to ensure properties are secured, free of debris, and maintained in compliance with applicable County codes, including stormwater requirements. Require annual renewal of registration until the property is lawfully occupied or redeveloped. Authorize the County to conduct inspections and enforce compliance through civil penalties for failure to register or maintain the property. The County may perform necessary abatement actions and recover costs through liens as permitted by law. Authorize the establishment of reasonable registration and renewal fees by resolution, with the option for graduated fees for properties that remain vacant over extended periods. Provide exemptions for properties in active construction, permitted redevelopment, or temporary transition, as defined by the County. Provide a formal administrative appeals process for property owners. Effective Date & Grace Period: This Ordinance shall take effect ninety (90) days following adoption. A one time ninety (90) day grace period following the effective date shall allow for initial registration and compliance prior to enforcement, except in cases of immediate public safety risk. Require annual reporting to the Board of Commissioners on program activity, costs, and outcomes.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

**Implementation Approach:** The program can be phased, starting with distressed or nuisance commercial properties before expanding Countywide. This limits initial costs and allows refinement based on real data. **Data & Tracking Benefits:** A centralized registry provides the County with accurate data on vacancy trends, ownership, and property conditions—supporting better planning, code enforcement, and economic development strategies. **Coordination Across Departments:** The program can leverage existing County functions, including Planning & Growth Management, Code Enforcement, Public Works, and public safety agencies, improving coordination and efficiency without creating new departments. **Focus on Compliance First:** The program should prioritize voluntary compliance through notice and education, using enforcement as a secondary step. This reduces conflict while improving outcomes. **Protection of Property Rights:** The ordinance is designed to regulate property conditions, not ownership, ensuring due process, clear standards, and fair enforcement. **Alignment with Economic Goals:** Reducing prolonged vacancy supports corridor revitalization, strengthens the County's ability to attract businesses, and improves overall community perception. **Scalability & Adjustments:** The County can adjust fees, exemptions, and enforcement levels over time based on program performance and stakeholder feedback.

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 4:45 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715973

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 4:45

**Survey Time:** 32 minutes, 41 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Eileen Britt

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Charles County already requires a one-year maintenance warranty when infrastructure is transferred to the County under the Charles County Subdivision Ordinance. This proposal extends that same protection to HOAs, ensuring developers remain responsible after transition and preventing homeowners from inheriting costly defects.

**CODE REFERENCES**

The Charles County Subdivision Ordinance establishes the County's authority to require bonding, inspection, and post-construction accountability for infrastructure improvements. §297 33 Performance Guarantees Requires developers to post financial security to ensure all infrastructure is constructed in accordance with approved plans and County standards. §297-34 – Maintenance Guarantees Requires developers to provide a maintenance bond, typically for one (1) year, after construction is completed. This ensures that infrastructure remains in proper condition and allows time for defects to appear and be corrected before final release. §297 35 Inspection and Acceptance of Improvements Authorizes the County to inspect infrastructure and verify compliance prior to acceptance and bond release. Together, these provisions demonstrate that Charles County already uses a one year post construction warranty approach to protect public infrastructure before it is fully accepted by the County. However, these protections primarily apply to infrastructure transferred to County ownership. There is currently no equivalent requirement ensuring the same level of protection when infrastructure and common areas are transferred to homeowners' associations (HOAs), creating a gap in accountability that this proposal seeks to address.

## **PROBLEM**

The Charles County Subdivision Ordinance requires developers to provide bonding, inspections, and a one-year maintenance period to protect infrastructure before it is accepted by the County. This ensures defects can be identified and corrected before the County assumes responsibility. However, this same protection does not exist when infrastructure and common areas are transferred to a homeowners' association (HOA). Turnover inspections are often conducted without meaningful involvement from homeowners. During early development, the developer typically controls the HOA board and may rely on a property management company they hire to participate in or sign off on inspections. This creates a conflict where the party responsible for construction is also approving the condition of the assets on behalf of the HOA. Once the transition occurs and the bonds are released, there is no required warranty safeguard. In recent years, many HOAs have reported having no recourse because parcels and assets were signed off on, and the County had already released the bond. Defects, particularly in stormwater systems, drainage, and site construction, often appear months later after exposure to real world conditions. At that point, responsibility shifts to the HOA and homeowners, who had limited visibility during the inspection process. This creates an uneven system where the County is protected by a one year warranty period, but homeowners are not. Without a post transition warranty requirement, financial risk is shifted to residents, leading to unexpected costs and long-term maintenance challenges.

## **SOLUTION**

To address this issue, Charles County should require a one-year warranty period after transition for all infrastructure and common areas transferred from a developer to a homeowners' association (HOA). This can be done by updating the Charles County Subdivision Ordinance to tie the final bond release to the warranty period. In simple terms, the developer remains responsible for repairs for one year after the HOA takes over, and bonds are not fully released until that period is complete or all issues are fixed. The warranty should cover stormwater systems, drainage, roads, open space, and community amenities. To improve transparency during transition: Require HOA involvement in turnover inspections Use a simple County checklist for inspections and transfer - Require a written warranty from the developer before bond release During the warranty period, the HOA can report issues, and the developer must fix them within a set timeframe. If repairs are not made, the County can use existing tools, such as holding or drawing on bonds. This would apply to new developments and any community that has not yet had its bonds fully released. This solution is simple, uses existing County authority, and ensures developers remain responsible when problems are most likely to appear, while protecting homeowners from unexpected repair costs

## **COST**

Minimal cost using existing staff and processes within Charles County Government. Minor updates to procedures with potential savings from fewer complaints and infrastructure issues.

## **ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Local homeowners' associations (HOAs) across Charles County are the primary beneficiaries, as this proposal reduces unexpected repair costs and protects homeowners from financial risk tied to construction defects. Charles County Government, including Planning & Growth Management and Inspections, benefits from fewer post transition disputes, stronger compliance, and improved long-term infrastructure performance. Community Associations Institute supports this approach as it aligns with best practices in HOA governance and developer accountability. Environmental stakeholders, including the Maryland Department of the Environment and local environmentally focused groups, benefit from improved performance and reliability of stormwater systems. Property management companies also benefit from smoother transitions, clearer expectations, and fewer conflicts between homeowners and developers.

## **ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Developers, builders, and related industry groups aligned with developers may oppose this proposal due to concerns about extended responsibility, potential costs, and impacts to project timelines. Some property management companies aligned with developers may also raise concerns about added oversight during transition. However, the proposal does not create new obligations; it ensures developers remain accountable for their work during the period when issues are most likely to appear. It uses existing County processes, encourages better construction upfront, and reduces future disputes. This policy proposal creates fairness by holding developers responsible for their work during the most critical period, while protecting homeowners and reducing long-term issues for the County.

## **PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

All developers of residential subdivisions in Charles County shall provide a minimum one (1) year warranty on all infrastructure, common areas, and related improvements conveyed to a homeowners' association (HOA), beginning on the date of transition of maintenance responsibility. No performance bond, maintenance bond, or other financial security required under the Charles County Subdivision Ordinance shall be fully released until: 1. The HOA has formally accepted the transfer; 2. The developer has provided written warranty documentation; and 3. The one-year warranty period has expired, or all identified defects have been corrected. The warranty shall cover stormwater systems, drainage, roads, open space, grading, and community amenities. The HOA shall have the right to report defects during the warranty period, and the developer shall complete repairs within a reasonable timeframe. Implementation Timeline & Applicability: This requirement shall take effect xxx, 2026, with a 90 day grace period for projects in active review or nearing transition. This requirement shall apply to: - All new subdivisions approved after the effective date; and - All existing subdivisions where common area assets have not yet been transferred to the HOA or where final bond release has not occurred as of the effective date. Failure to comply may result in the County withholding or drawing upon financial security or taking corrective action to ensure compliance.

## **OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Applying this requirement to developments that have not yet completed transition or received final bond release is both fair and necessary. Many communities currently have parcels and infrastructure that remain incomplete or not fully performing at the time of transition. Because developers are still actively responsible for these communities, this proposal does not create new obligations; it ensures completion is done properly before responsibility shifts to homeowners. It also reinforces the County's existing authority to condition bond release on compliance. This approach will help focus developer efforts on completing communities fully and to a higher standard, rather than transferring responsibility prematurely. It ensures consistency, improves overall quality, and protects homeowners from inheriting unfinished work or costly defects.

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

**This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.**

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 2:01 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715493

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 2:01

**Survey Time:** 5 minutes, 18 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Latina Wilson

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

[REDACTED]

Port Tobacco, MD 20677 3145

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

The purpose of this Act is to strengthen the economic viability of Charles County's rural heritage by: Reducing regulatory barriers for Value-Added Agriculture (processing). Standardizing and encouraging Agritourism as a secondary farm income. Formalizing a "Right to Fish" policy to protect the commercial seafood industry from residential encroachment.

**CODE REFERENCES**

Amendment to Chapter 235, Chapter 297, and Chapter 75

**PROBLEM**

Agriculture, Agritourism and outdoor recreation given the landscape of Charles County is not a priority.

**SOLUTION**

Adding stronger language to the county code reinforces the commitment to these areas and enhances economic development

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Citizens of Charles County, Farmers, Commercial Fishermen and watermen

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Anyone against eating.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

II. Article I: Value-Added & Agritourism (Zoning Amendments) A. Definition: Expansion (§ 297-49): Value-Added Agriculture: Activities that change the physical state or form of a farm product (e.g., milling grain, fermenting grapes/hops, curing meats, or making artisanal cheeses) to increase market value. Agritourism: Activities conducted on a working farm offered to the public for recreation or education, including farm stays, tasting rooms, and seasonal festivals. B. "Safe Harbor" for Farm Buildings (§ 12-508 Compliance): In accordance with Maryland Public Safety Code § 12-508, existing agricultural buildings in Charles County used for Agritourism shall not be considered a "change of occupancy" requiring a full commercial building permit, provided: The occupancy does not exceed 200 persons at any one time. The building is structurally sound and meets minimum egress standards. III. Article II: Commercial Seafood Industry Protections A. Right to Fish Policy (New § 75-2): To preserve the working waterfronts established in Chapter 75-1, the County hereby establishes a Right-to-Fish ordinance. Nuisance Protection: No commercial seafood operation (including harvesting, packing, or processing) shall be deemed a public or private nuisance due to traditional noise, odors, or hours of operation, provided it follows generally accepted industry practices. Plat Disclosure: All new subdivision plats within 1,000 feet of a Public Landing or zoned "Waterfront" must include a disclosure statement notifying buyers of the proximity to active commercial fishing operations. B. Infrastructure Support: The County shall prioritize the maintenance of wharves and parking at public landings specifically for commercial vehicles engaged in the seafood trade, as authorized under § 75-1(B). IV. Article III: Economic Incentives & Support Ag-Business Fast-Track: The Department of Planning and Growth Management shall create a "Rural Business Navigator" position to assist farmers and wat

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 1:54 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715472

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 1:54

**Survey Time:** 6 minutes, 2 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Latina Wilson

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

[REDACTED]

port tobacco, MD 20664

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

The purpose of this article is to promote high quality residential design and prevent monotonous "cookie cutter" streetscapes. By requiring variations in building massing, exterior materials, and architectural styles, the County aims to protect property values, enhance the aesthetic character of neighborhoods, and foster a sense of place for residents

**CODE REFERENCES**

Building code

**PROBLEM**

**Monotonous Streetscapes** The primary hallmark is a lack of visual interest. When every house on a block (and directly across the street) shares the same roofline, entryway, and color palette, it creates a visual "wall" of identical structures. This uniformity can lead to: **Loss of "Sense of Place":** Neighborhoods feel mass produced rather than unique or organic. **Navigation Difficulty:** Uniformity can actually make it harder for visitors (or emergency services) to distinguish between properties at a glance. **Impact on Property Values** While standardized building reduces costs for developers, it can negatively impact long term value: **Aesthetic Depreciation:** Over time, highly repetitive neighborhoods may be viewed as less desirable than "custom" or architecturally diverse areas. **Market Saturation:** Having 30% or more of a subdivision sharing the exact same floor plan can lead to price

stagnation, as multiple identical homes may compete for buyers simultaneously. **Reduced Builder Diversity:** Heavily standardized codes often favor large scale developers who use a few "master plans" to maximize profit, sometimes making it harder for small, local builders to compete.

#### **SOLUTION**

**Scalability:** it scales based on the size of the project, so small local builders aren't over-burdened while large developers are held to higher variety standards. **Visual Interest:** By targeting the "adjacent and across" lots, it breaks up the visual "wall" of identical houses common in modern suburbs. **Integration:** It supplements the safety and backfilling requirements already found in the Building Projects code.

#### **COST**

TBD

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Citizens of Charles County

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Developers

#### **PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

**Proposed Amendment: § 17-2 Architectural Diversity Standards A. Applicability** These standards shall apply to all new residential subdivisions and planned unit developments (PUDs) consisting of five (5) or more single-family detached or attached dwellings. **B. Anti Monotony "Similarity" Rule** No two single family dwellings located on adjacent lots, or directly across the street from one another, shall be of the same "Architectural House Type." To be considered a different house type, at least three of the following five criteria must be substantially different: **Roof Line:** Significant change in roof orientation (e.g., gable vs. hip) or the addition of dormers/intersecting gables. **Entryway:** Distinct variations in porch design, porticos, or recessed entries. **Facade Materials:** A change in primary cladding (e.g., transitioning from horizontal siding to brick, stone, or board and batten). **Fenestration:** Variation in the size, shape, or arrangement of windows on the primary facade. **Color Palette:** Use of a distinct color scheme for the body and trim that is not repeated on immediate neighboring lots. **C. Building Massing and Footprints** For developments exceeding twenty (20) units, no single floor plan may comprise more than 30% of the total units in any single phase of construction. Developers must provide a minimum of four (4) distinct floor plans with varying footprints. **D. Completion of Amenities** To ensure "complete development" as referenced in Chapter 17-1, no more than 50% of residential occupancy permits shall be issued until all planned neighborhood amenities (e.g., parks, sidewalks, community centers) are at least 75% complete. **III. Enforcement and Penalties** **Plan Review:** All building permit applications must include a "Streetscape Diversity Map" identifying the house type and color palette of neighboring lots. **Violations:** Failure to comply with the anti monotony standards will result in a stay on building permits for the subject lots. **Fines for non-compliance**

#### **OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 2:08 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715519

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 2:08

**Survey Time:** 6 minutes, 8 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Latina Wilson

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

[REDACTED]

Port Tobacco, MD 20677 3145

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establishing Accountability for Elected Officials as it relates DEI

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

I. Closing the "Employee Status" Loophole A conflict has arisen regarding whether elected officials must follow DEI policies. Opponents argue that because Commissioners are not "employees" under the Personnel Handbook, they are exempt. This ordinance closes that loophole by placing these requirements within the Code of Ethics, which governs all "Public Officials" by law. II. The "Public Trust" Argument Elected officials set the culture for the entire County government. It is inconsistent to require 1,000+ County employees to follow DEI standards while the five individuals at the top remain exempt. This Bill ensures that the Board "leads by example." III. Meaningful Consequences Vague policies without consequences are merely suggestions. By providing the Ethics Commission with the power to publicly censure or restrict travel funds, this ordinance creates a "standard of conduct" that carries weight without infringing on the constitutional rights of an elected officer. We are here to stop the semantic games. Whether you call them an employee or an official, a Commissioner's job is to serve the whole community. If they refuse to follow equity policies, there must be consequences. This ordinance ensures no one is above the standard of respect and inclusion.

**SOLUTION**

Establishes the standard and expectation of any county commissioner.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Citizens of Charles County

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Anyone against standards and accountability

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Chapter 170: Ethics, Code of § 170-5. Prohibited conduct and interests. J. Mandatory DEI Compliance for Elected Officials. (1) Applicability: Notwithstanding any argument regarding the employment status of elected officials, every County Commissioner, as a "Public Official" under this Chapter, shall comply with all Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) policies adopted by Resolution or Ordinance of the Board of County Commissioners. (2) Mandatory Requirements: (a) Training: Each Commissioner shall complete an approved DEI and Anti-Bias training program within sixty (60) days of taking the oath of office, and annually thereafter. (b) Equity Impact Assessments: Commissioners shall participate in the preparation and review of Equity Impact Assessments for all major legislative and budgetary decisions as required by Resolution 2021-24. (3) Consequences for Non-Compliance: Upon a finding by the Ethics Commission that a Commissioner has willfully failed to comply with the requirements of this subsection, the Commission may: (a) Public Censure: Issue a formal, public letter of reprimand to be read into the record during a televised Commissioner meeting. (b) Removal from Boards: Recommend the immediate removal of the Commissioner from any inter-jurisdictional boards, committees, or commissions where they represent Charles County. (c) Budgetary Restrictions: Restrict the non-compliant Commissioner's access to discretionary office funds for travel, town halls, or community recognition items until compliance is met. (d) Referral for Misfeasance: In cases of repeated or egregious non-compliance, refer the matter to the Office of the Attorney General for investigation of misfeasance in office.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 2:15 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715541

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 2:15

**Survey Time:** 4 minutes, 48 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Latina Wilson

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

[REDACTED]

Port Tobacco, MD 20677 3145

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Forces Transparency: By requiring a statement "for the record" for every missed meeting, it prevents Commissioners from quietly skipping sessions without public scrutiny. Community Presence: By including "Public Comment Sessions" and "Forums," the law acknowledges that a Commissioner's job isn't just voting in the building, but listening to the people outside of it. Legal "Teeth": Linking the attendance record to the County Attorney's review for "neglect of duty" provides a clear path for remo

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

Too many missed meetings/forums

**SOLUTION**

establishes expectation.

**COST**

0

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Citizens of Charles County

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

none.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

1. Amendment to § 27-2: Attendance and Performance Standards New Subsection G: Commissioner Attendance Accountability 1. Duty of Attendance and Scope: To maintain the "transaction of business" and ensure representative governance as described in § 27-2(A), attendance by all County Commissioners is expected at all officially scheduled proceedings. This expectation of attendance shall encompass: Regular and Special Legislative Sessions; Executive Sessions; Public Hearings and Public Comment Sessions; County-sponsored Community Forums and Town Halls. 2. Annual Threshold: Each Commissioner shall attend no less than 80% of the total combined scheduled proceedings listed in Subsection G(1) annually. 3. Public Record of Absence: In the event a Commissioner is absent from any scheduled proceeding, a written public statement shall be entered into the official meeting minutes. This statement shall explain, for the record, the specific reason for the absence. Note: This ensures transparency beyond the simple "excused/unexcused" binary currently found in § 27-2(A)(3). 4. Violation and Reporting: Failure to meet the 80% attendance threshold, excluding absences verified for illness or emergencies as defined in § 27-2(A)(3), shall require a formal "Statement of Attendance Accountability" to be filed by the Commissioner. This statement must be included in the County's next Annual Report and posted prominently on the official County website. 5. Recall Trigger for Neglect of Duty: Consistent failure to meet these attendance standards over two consecutive calendar years shall constitute prima facie evidence of "neglect of duty." Such cases shall be referred automatically to the County Attorney for a formal review and a recommendation to the Board regarding potential removal or recall proceedings.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 2:26 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715576

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 2:26

**Survey Time:** 5 minutes, 21 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Latina Wilson

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

[REDACTED]

port tobacco, MD 20664

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Public service in a rapidly growing county like Charles County requires more than just winning an election; it requires a deep understanding of the legal and social responsibilities of the office. By making this training mandatory for officials—not just employees—we ensure that those at the top are held to the highest standard of the "Prestige of Office. Integrating DEI into the Law While Resolution 2021-24 expressed a "commitment" to DEI, this ordinance gives that commitment "teeth" by making

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

Ensuring an established definition of responsibilities

**SOLUTION**

Legislation shows the level of commitment from the Board of Commissioners

**COST**

none

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

citizens of Charles county

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

none

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

**MANDATORY GOVERNANCE AND ETHICS TRAINING FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS** FOR the purpose of: Establishing a mandatory, comprehensive training curriculum for all County Elected Officials; requiring biennial certification in Conflict of Interest, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI), and the Prestige of Office; and providing for public disclosure of compliance. BY adding: § 170-4.1: Mandatory Professional Development and Ethics Training. Code of Charles County, Maryland SECTION 1: BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CHARLES COUNTY, MARYLAND, that the Laws of Charles County read as follows: Chapter 170: Ethics, Code of § 170 4.1. Mandatory Professional Development and Ethics Training, A. Requirement: Every local elected official shall successfully complete a "Governance Excellence Training Program" (the "Program") as developed by the Ethics Commission in consultation with the Department of Human Resources. B. Timeline. Initial Training: New officials must complete the Program within ninety (90) days of being sworn into office. Refresher Training: All officials must complete a refresher Program biennially (every two years) thereafter. C. Curriculum Components. The Program shall consist of no less than six (6) hours of instruction covering the following mandatory modules: Conflicts of Interest and Financial Disclosure: Detailed instruction on the requirements of § 170 5 and § 170 6, including identifying indirect financial interests in entities doing business with the County and the process for recusal. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI): Training in accordance with Resolution 2021-24, focusing on the application of Equity Impact Assessments in legislative decision making, implicit bias, and fostering an inclusive public forum. Prestige of Office and Public Trust: Instruction on the prohibitions against using the influence of office, County resources, or the title of Commissioner for personal gain or the gain of another, as defined in MD Code,

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 2:19 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715553

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 2:19

**Survey Time:** 3 minutes, 7 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Latina Wilson

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

[REDACTED]

port tobacco, MD 20664

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Restoring Public Trust through Independent Verification I. The Need for Verification Currently, the Ethics Commission receives forms but lacks the staff and technical expertise to "fact-check" them. This creates a "honor system" that is easily exploited. By hiring an independent consultant (the Auditor), the County moves from passive receipt to active oversight. II. Deterrence through Accountability The Tiered System of Consequences provides the Ethics Commission with a "ladder" of enforcement

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

Elected Officials Ethics/Financial submissions are not validated.

**SOLUTION**

Review and validation ensures accountability

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

citizens of the county

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

none

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

AN ORDINANCE concerning: ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ETHICS AUDITOR AND ENFORCEMENT TIER SYSTEM FOR the purpose of: Creating the Office of the Independent Ethics Auditor to validate the accuracy of financial disclosure and ethics filings; establishing a formal investigative process for inaccuracies; and implementing a tiered system of consequences for non compliance and material misrepresentation. BY adding: Chapter 170, §§ 170.13 through 170.15 Code of Charles County, Maryland (Ethics Code) SECTION 1: BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CHARLES COUNTY, MARYLAND, that the Laws of Charles County read as follows: Article IV: Oversight and Validation § 170.13. Office of the Independent Ethics Auditor. A. Establishment: There is hereby established the Office of the Independent Ethics Auditor (the "Auditor"). B. Appointment: The Auditor shall be a third party consultant or firm specializing in forensic accounting or government ethics, hired by the Ethics Commission via a competitive RFP process. To ensure independence, the Auditor shall not be an employee of Charles County and shall report directly to the Ethics Commission. C. Duties: The Auditor shall: Conduct a mandatory "Accuracy Audit" of at least 25% of all filed financial disclosure statements annually, selected at random. Perform a "Validation Review" of all disclosure statements filed by County Commissioners and Department Heads within 30 days of filing. Verify interests in real property, business entities, and sources of income against public records and third-party data. § 170-14. Investigation of Inaccuracies: A. If the Auditor identifies a material discrepancy or omission, they shall issue a Notice of Preliminary Finding to the filer. B. The filer shall have ten (10) business days to provide a written explanation or corrected filing. C. If the discrepancy remains unresolved or appears willful, the Auditor shall refer the matter to the Ethics Commission for a formal investiga

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 2:52 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715645  
**IP Address:** [REDACTED]  
**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 2:52  
**Survey Time:** 37 minutes, 44 seconds

You have a new online form submission.  
Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Jolana Watson

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20695

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

I would like for Charles County to develop a grant competition that gives local entrepreneurs the chance to win a cash grant and in kind services to open up a local business based on votes casted by county residents. This community centered economic development grant would allow for county residents to vote on business that they feel are needed in the community while supporting local entrepreneurs to start such businesses. It would ensure that the county is investing in local economies.

**CODE REFERENCES**

Giving county residents a role in the Charles County's economic development.

**PROBLEM**

Charles County Commissioner Ralph Patterson asked for residents to present ideas for economic development in the county. This program would ensure that every year, county residents not only present ideas but that the county seed funding for those ideas to manifest. Most of the economic development ideas rely on outside businesses to invest in the county but the issue is that the money they generate is not guaranteed to stay in the county. The cost is democratized but the profits are not. Too many residents spend their money outside of the county through online sites, services, and products. How can we ensure that more county residents spend money here? Additionally, many county residents are employed by companies that are not based in Charles County, for example the federal government, DC political organizations, VA tech companies, international enterprises,

etc. Lastly, how can we ensure that new businesses will have a sustainable customer base and a viable business plan if we do not have a mechanism for collecting the opinions of what county residents actually need and local business don't have government support.

**SOLUTION**

For 15 years, Detroit Hatch by TechTown has hosted a competition to give community members a say in which brick-and-mortar businesses they feel are most needed in the city and ensuring funding for those businesses. Bookstores, tech repair shops, restaurants, wellness centers and other alumni businesses contributed more than \$13 million back to Detroit's economy and provided over 500 jobs. CHARLES COUNTY CAN USE DETROIT HATCH AS A MODEL FOR SUCCESS! Each year, the county will accept applications from \*independent\* and local entrepreneurs who want to develop \*store-front\* businesses in Charles County. The county residents then have an opportunity to vote on which business plan and initiative they feel is most in demand and needed in the county. The winner would receive a cash grant and in-kind services including but not limited to retail space, marketing support, and business mentorship.

**COST**

100,000

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Sankofah Solutions

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

N/A

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:11 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715697

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:11

**Survey Time:** 12 minutes, 5 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Khaliq Greathouse

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 21224

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a moratorium on the establishment of any new data centers to engage residents in a meaningful and rigorous dialog and process with county officials and appropriate to fully consider the long term impacts of data centers before considering allowing them into our county.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns or the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities in which such facilities are being or already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees, 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are

required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum time of 8-10 years to allow for longitudinal studies and data to be established for impacts in communities where large AI data centers have already been built and operating. Should include a task force comprised of citizens from each district, environmental and health experts, racial justice advocates, and no government employees or anyone associated with any business with a potential financial interest in the establishment of data centers. Should include a process to communicate all findings to the community and allow for the community to vote on the final outcome, including the ability for residents to vote to ban data centers permanently or establish rigorous regulations and guardrails for any data centers prior to development to protect the community from harm.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 1:47 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715452

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 1:47

**Survey Time:** 10 minutes, 29 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Jessica Cassidy

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

,

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a Data Center Moratorium

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns or the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities which such facilities being or already established.

**SOLUTION**

Establish a moratorium prohibiting any data center development in Charles County for a minimum of 8 years so effects of data centers on communities within which they currently exist can be seen, studied, and analyzed. Preserve the rural and agricultural character of our county until and unless such time arrives that the state of the industry for data centers evolves to a place where environmental, health, property value, and water supply impacts are negligible and their inclusion legitimately offers a net benefit to our community.

**COST**

\$0

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of county residents and farmers, the Sierra Club, Strong Towns, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

The County Attorney has stated that there is no current zoning which would allow data center development in Charles County, but the TeraWulf acquisition of the Morgantown property indicates either a) a legal loophole they will be able to exploit currently exists, or b) they have received a level of assurance worthy of such investment from county officials that they will be able to develop a massive data center facility within our county

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

From DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

Date Fri 3/27/2026 3:25 PM

To Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

Submission #: 4715749

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission Date: 03/27/2026 3:25

Survey Time: 5 minutes, 11 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Brenda Lough

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20640

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a moratorium on the establishment of any new data centers and to engage residents in a meaningful and rigorous dialogue and process with county officials and appropriate experts to fully consider the long term impacts of data centers before considering allowing them into our county.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Establish a moratorium that gives the county time to study the long-term impacts and engage productively with county residents. Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees, 8 year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance

and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:26 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715754

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:26

**Survey Time:** 14 minutes, 3 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Olivia Robinson

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20601

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers/ Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees, 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

From DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

Date Fri 3/27/2026 3:28 PM

To Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

Submission #: 4715757

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission Date: 03/27/2026 3:27

Survey Time: 1 minute, 51 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Skylar Robinson

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20603

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a moratorium on the establishment of any new data centers and to engage residents in a meaningful and rigorous dialogue and process with county officials and appropriate experts to fully consider the long term impacts of data centers before considering allowing them into our county.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Establish a moratorium that gives the county time to study the long-term impacts and engage productively with county residents. 8 year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

"Official language TBD, but should include a minimum time of 8-10 years to allow for longitudinal studies and data to be established for impacts in communities where large AI data centers have already been built and operating. It should include a task force comprised of citizens from each Commissioner district, environmental and public health experts, racial justice advocates, and no government employees or anyone associated with any business with a potential financial interest in the establishment of data centers. It should also include a process to communicate all findings to other community and allow for the community to vote on the final outcome, including the ability for residents to vote to ban data centers permanently or establish rigorous regulations and guardrails for any data centers prior to development to protect the community from harm."

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:28 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715758

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:28

**Survey Time:** 1 minute, 21 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Milton Guzman

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 29646

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers/ Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees, 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:30 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715760

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:30

**Survey Time:** 1 minute, 17 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Jackie Wesley

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20601

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers/ Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees, 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:31 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715766

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:31

**Survey Time:** 3 minutes, 8 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Yvonne Stanton

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20646

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a moratorium on the establishment of any new data centers and to engage residents in a meaningful and rigorous dialogue and process with county officials and appropriate experts to fully consider the long term impacts of data centers before considering allowing them into our county.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Establish a moratorium that gives the county time to study the long-term impacts and engage productively with county residents. 8 year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

"Official language TBD, but should include a minimum time of 8-10 years to allow for longitudinal studies and data to be established for impacts in communities where large AI data centers have already been built and operating. It should include a task force comprised of citizens from each Commissioner district, environmental and public health experts, racial justice advocates, and no government employees or anyone associated with any business with a potential financial interest in the establishment of data centers. It should also include a process to communicate all findings to other community and allow for the community to vote on the final outcome, including the ability for residents to vote to ban data centers permanently or establish rigorous regulations and guardrails for any data centers prior to development to protect the community from harm."

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:33 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715770

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:33

**Survey Time:** 4 minutes, 27 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Jasmine Tiamfook

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 21042

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers/ Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees, 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
**Charles County, MD**

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

From DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

Date Fri 3/27/2026 3:33 PM

To Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

Submission #: 4715773

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission Date: 03/27/2026 3:33

Survey Time: 2 minutes, 53 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Tiffany Marte

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20603

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a moratorium on the establishment of any new data centers and to engage residents in a meaningful and rigorous dialogue and process with county officials and appropriate experts to fully consider the long term impacts of data centers before considering allowing them into our county.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees, 8-year 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

"Official language TBD, but should include a minimum time of 8-10 years to allow for longitudinal studies and data to be established for impacts in communities where large AI data centers have already been built and operating. It should include a task force comprised of citizens from each Commissioner district, environmental and public health experts, racial justice advocates, and no government employees or anyone associated with any business with a potential financial interest in the establishment of data centers. It should also include a process to communicate all findings to other community and allow for the community to vote on the final outcome, including the ability for residents to vote to ban data centers permanently or establish rigorous regulations and guardrails for any data centers prior to development to protect the community from harm."

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD.

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

From DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

Date Fri 3/27/2026 3:40 PM

To Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

Submission #: 4715794

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission Date: 03/27/2026 3:40

Survey Time: 2 minutes, 4 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Frank Robinson

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20601

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a moratorium on the establishment of any new data centers and to engage residents in a meaningful and rigorous dialogue and process with county officials and appropriate experts to fully consider the long term impacts of data centers before considering allowing them into our county.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Establish a moratorium that gives the county time to study the long-term impacts and engage productively with county residents. A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum time of 8-10 years to allow for longitudinal studies and data to be established for impacts in communities where large AI data centers have already been built and operating. It should include a task force comprised of citizens from each Commissioner district, environmental and public health experts, racial justice advocates, and no government employees or anyone associated with any business with a potential financial interest in the establishment of data centers. It should also include a process to communicate all findings to other community and allow for the community to vote on the final outcome, including the ability for residents to vote to ban data centers permanently or establish rigorous regulations and guardrails for any data centers prior to development to protect the community from harm.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

From DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

Date Fri 3/27/2026 3:41 PM

To Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

Submission #: 4715796

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission Date: 03/27/2026 3:41

Survey Time: 2 minutes, 38 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Aliyah Malazarte

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20603

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers/ Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees. 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years. Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
**Charles County, MD**

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:42 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715799

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:42

**Survey Time:** 1 minute, 44 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

David Lopez

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20603

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a moratorium on the establishment of any new data centers and to engage residents in a meaningful and rigorous dialogue and process with county officials and appropriate experts to fully consider the long term impacts of data centers before considering allowing them into our county.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Establish a moratorium that gives the county time to study the long-term impacts and engage productively with county residents. A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum time of 8-10 years to allow for longitudinal studies and data to be established for impacts in communities where large AI data centers have already been built and operating. It should include a task force comprised of citizens from each Commissioner district, environmental and public health experts, racial justice advocates, and no government employees or anyone associated with any business with a potential financial interest in the establishment of data centers. It should also include a process to communicate all findings to other community and allow for the community to vote on the final outcome, including the ability for residents to vote to ban data centers permanently or establish rigorous regulations and guardrails for any data centers prior to development to protect the community from harm.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:51 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715832

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:50

**Survey Time:** 1 minute, 6 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Danielle Dixon

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20695

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees. 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum time of 8-10 years to allow for longitudinal studies and data to be established for impacts in communities where large AI data centers have already been built and operating. It should include a task force comprised of citizens from each Commissioner district, environmental and public health experts, racial justice advocates, and no government employees or anyone associated with any business with a potential financial interest in the establishment of data centers. It should also include a process to communicate all findings to other community and allow for the community to vote on the final outcome, including the ability for residents to vote to ban data centers permanently or establish rigorous regulations and guardrails for any data centers prior to development to protect the community from harm.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:49 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715827

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:49

**Survey Time:** 56 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Jazmine Gordon

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20695

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers/ Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees. 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years. Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:48 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715817

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:48

**Survey Time:** 53 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Madeline Kaba

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20601

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers/ Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

"Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees. 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years. Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals."

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

**This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.**

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:54 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715842

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:54

**Survey Time:** 2 minutes, 17 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Keith Quaine

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20637

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers/ Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees. 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years. Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:49 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715825

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:49

**Survey Time:** 2 minutes, 20 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Major Robinson

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20601

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers/ Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees. 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years. Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
**Charles County, MD**

---

**This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.**

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:45 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715807

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:45

**Survey Time:** 3 minutes, 57 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Faith Shelton

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20613

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers/

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

"Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees. 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:47 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715812

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:46

**Survey Time:** 2 minutes, 28 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Kendall Tucker

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20603

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a moratorium on the establishment of any new data centers and to engage residents in a meaningful and rigorous dialogue and process with county officials and appropriate experts to fully consider the long term impacts of data centers before considering allowing them into our county.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Establish a moratorium that gives the county time to study the long-term impacts and engage productively with county residents. A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum time of 8-10 years to allow for longitudinal studies and data to be established for impacts in communities where large AI data centers have already been built and operating. It should include a task force comprised of citizens from each Commissioner district, environmental and public health experts, racial justice advocates, and no government employees or anyone associated with any business with a potential financial interest in the establishment of data centers. It should also include a process to communicate all findings to other community and allow for the community to vote on the final outcome, including the ability for residents to vote to ban data centers permanently or establish rigorous regulations and guardrails for any data centers prior to development to protect the community from harm.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.



**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:50 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715831

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:50

**Survey Time:** 1 minute, 39 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Owen Whalen

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20646

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a moratorium on the establishment of any new data centers and to engage residents in a meaningful and rigorous dialogue and process with county officials and appropriate experts to fully consider the long term impacts of data centers before considering allowing them into our county.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Establish a moratorium that gives the county time to study the long-term impacts and engage productively with county residents. A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum time of 8-10 years to allow for longitudinal studies and data to be established for impacts in communities where large AI data centers have already been built and operating. It should include a task force comprised of citizens from each Commissioner district, environmental and public health experts, racial justice advocates, and no government employees or anyone associated with any business with a potential financial interest in the establishment of data centers. It should also include a process to communicate all findings to other community and allow for the community to vote on the final outcome, including the ability for residents to vote to ban data centers permanently or establish rigorous regulations and guardrails for any data centers prior to development to protect the community from harm.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:48 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715821

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:48

**Survey Time:** 1 minute, 35 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Patricia L Williams

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20603

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a moratorium on the establishment of any new data centers and to engage residents in a meaningful and rigorous dialogue and process with county officials and appropriate experts to fully consider the long term impacts of data centers before considering allowing them into our county.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Establish a moratorium that gives the county time to study the long-term impacts and engage productively with county residents. A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years, Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum time of 8-10 years to allow for longitudinal studies and data to be established for impacts in communities where large AI data centers have already been built and operating. It should include a task force comprised of citizens from each Commissioner district, environmental and public health experts, racial justice advocates, and no government employees or anyone associated with any business with a potential financial interest in the establishment of data centers. It should also include a process to communicate all findings to other community and allow for the community to vote on the final outcome, including the ability for residents to vote to ban data centers permanently or establish rigorous regulations and guardrails for any data centers prior to development to protect the community from harm.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

From DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

Date Fri 3/27/2026 3:43 PM

To Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

Submission #: 4715801

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission Date: 03/27/2026 3:43

Survey Time: 1 minute, 4 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Rachel Marino

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20695

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Establish a moratorium on new data centers/Ban on Data Centers/ Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

Data Center Research Task Force: The group should be made up of a coalition member, zoning expert, environmental expert, racial justice advocate, no more than 1 tech industry participant, public health expert, a community member from each Commissioner district but no local government employees. 8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years. Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

From DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

Date Fri 3/27/2026 3:23 PM

To Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

Submission #: 4715743

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Submission Date: 03/27/2026 3:23

Survey Time: 39 minutes, 43 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Patrice Gutrick

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20695

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a ban on data centers in Charles County.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

In alignment with testimonies from County residents, ban all formal legislative actions that would allow the County to entertain data center proposals and construction.

**COST**

\$0

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum of 8-10 years to begin to have a comprehensive picture of the risks and harms associated with hyperscale data centers prior to reconsidering allowing them into Charles County.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:26 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715751

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:26

**Survey Time:** 1 minute, 15 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Lavon Harper

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20603

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a ban on data centers in Charles County.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

In alignment with testimonies from County residents, ban all formal legislative actions that would allow the County to entertain data center proposals and construction.

**COST**

\$0

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum of 8-10 years to begin to have a comprehensive picture of the risks and harms associated with hyperscale data centers prior to reconsidering allowing them into Charles County.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:42 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715798

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:42

**Survey Time:** 1 minute, 22 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Deborah Dwomoh

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20708

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a ban on data centers in Charles County.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

In alignment with testimonies from County residents, ban all formal legislative actions that would allow the County to entertain data center proposals and construction.

**COST**

\$0

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum of 8-10 years to begin to have a comprehensive picture of the risks and harms associated with hyperscale data centers prior to reconsidering allowing them into Charles County.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:45 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715806

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:45

**Survey Time:** 57 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Connor Sauers

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20601

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a ban on data centers in Charles County.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

In alignment with testimonies from County residents, ban all formal legislative actions that would allow the County to entertain data center proposals and construction.

**COST**

\$0

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum of 8-10 years to begin to have a comprehensive picture of the risks and harms associated with hyperscale data centers prior to reconsidering allowing them into Charles County.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:46 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715811

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:46

**Survey Time:** 51 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Michael Jenkins

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20695

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposal is to establish a ban on data centers in Charles County.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

In alignment with testimonies from County residents, ban all formal legislative actions that would allow the County to entertain data center proposals and construction.

**COST**

\$0

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

Official language TBD, but should include a minimum of 8-10 years to begin to have a comprehensive picture of the risks and harms associated with hyperscale data centers prior to reconsidering allowing them into Charles County.

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:54 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715839

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:53

**Survey Time:** 4 minutes, 11 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Patricia Ruiz

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20602

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Ban on Data Centers/ Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

8-year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years. County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established.

**SOLUTION**

8 year Ban on Data Centers: A ban on all and any plans, ZTAs, or proposals regarding the creation of a data center of any size in Charles County for 8 years. Commissioner Mandatory Attendance and Transparency: A change to the legislative code that mandates that all county commissioners and planning commissioners are required to attend all town hall meetings, and they must provide full transparency on their meetings with tech industry professionals.

**COST**

\$0

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:23 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715738

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:23

**Survey Time:** 17 minutes, 44 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Micaiah Lloyd

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

,

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

A quarterly joint accountability meeting with district, planning, and economic development members. The community has a lot of questions and a public forum should be had that facilitates a dialogue between local officials and the people they represent.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns or the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities which such facilities being or already established.

**SOLUTION**

Create an opportunity for all decision making committees to hear the concerns of the people regularly, together, specifically as it relates to the economic development of the county.

**COST**

None

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of county residents

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations and corrupt government officials.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 4:49 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715987

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 4:49

**Survey Time:** 6 minutes, 55 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Micaiah Lloyd

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20603

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Ban County Official From Entering into Non Disclosure Agreements (NDAs) With Any Tech or Data Center Organizations or Affiliated Organizations

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County officials are increasingly entering into NDAs with companies wishing to establish data centers in communities across the nation and state. This obscures transparency and accountability of officials to county residents and should be prohibited with penalties for violations.

**SOLUTION**

Prohibit county officials from entering into NDAs with business entities associated with data centers, artificial intelligence tech, police/military tech, etc.and impose financial and other sanctions for violations

**COST**

\$0

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 4:48 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715984

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 4:47

**Survey Time:** 7 minutes, 20 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Micaiah Lloyd

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20603

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

The County should establish an Economic Development Task force to provide accountability and transparency for the public about the Economic Development Department.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

Based on recent behaviors observed with relation to Data Centers, it is clear that our County's Economic Development Department is prone to state corruption and influence. They are not concerned with the wider issue of how economic development decisions have an impact on public health and community wellbeing, or at least believe that economic gains, especially in the short term, are more important than the quality of life of the County residents. They are not acting in the best interest of the community and need to be held more accountable to the will of the residents.

**SOLUTION**

Create a Public Economic Development Task Force: a permanent body that will provide checks and balances to the Economic Development Department and any outside corruption or attempt at manipulation or influence. This task force will provide transparency for the public and release feedback reports quarterly for residents to stay up to date on economic development matters.

**COST**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

TBD

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations that want to syphon the wealth and resources in the county at the expense of the wellbeing of the residents and the environment.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

**This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.**

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 4:40 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715963

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 4:40

**Survey Time:** 3 minutes, 50 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Micaiah Lloyd

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

, 20603

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

Proposal to establish a permanent ban on any data centers above tier 2.

**CODE REFERENCES**

**PROBLEM**

County residents are increasingly concerned about the harms of hyperscale data centers and do not trust that county officials are sufficiently hearing or considering their concerns and the increasingly mounting body of evidence of harm to other communities where these facilities are already established

**SOLUTION**

Ban all data centers above tier 2

**COST**

\$0

**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Majority of residents, Southern Maryland Sierra Club, Strong Towns Charles County, Schools Not Jails, Port Tobacco River Conservancy, other environmental organizations.

**ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Tech corporations with executives not residing in Charles County, County officials receiving incentives from such corporations.

**PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

TBD

**OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

Thank you,  
Charles County, MD

---

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

---

**\*NEW SUBMISSION\* Legislation Proposal**

---

**From** DO NOT REPLY UNMONITORED ACCOUNT <no\_reply@charlescountymd.gov>

**Date** Fri 3/27/2026 3:35 PM

**To** Danielle E. Mitchell <MitchelD@charlescountymd.gov>; County Attorney <coattorney@charlescountymd.gov>

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

**Legislation Proposal**

**Submission #:** 4715776

**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

**Submission Date:** 03/27/2026 3:35

**Survey Time:** 35 minutes, 21 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "\*\*\*\*\*" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

**Read-Only Content**

**CONTACT PERSON NAME**

Eileen Lynch Britt

**CONTACT PERSON EMAIL**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON PHONE**

[REDACTED]

**CONTACT PERSON ADDRESS**

,

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

This proposed legislation requires developers in Charles County to plan for long-term maintenance in the development of new home subdivisions, including HOAs and condominium communities, before the first home is built. Developers must complete a reserve study, create a maintenance plan, and establish and fund a reserve account prior to key development milestones. This ensures communities are financially prepared from the start and helps prevent sudden fee increases, special assessments, and fin

**CODE REFERENCES**

This proposal is consistent with Charles County's authority under its Subdivision Regulations (Chapter 278, Ord. No. 96-68), which govern subdivision approvals, plat recordation, bonding, and infrastructure responsibilities. The County has the authority to place conditions on development approvals, including requirements related to long-term maintenance and financial readiness. It also aligns with related County processes, including stormwater management, grading, and infrastructure requirements overseen by Planning & Growth Management. These frameworks already require HOAs to maintain critical systems such as stormwater facilities, making long term planning essential. At the state and federal level, this proposal supports environmental requirements under the Clean Water Act and regulations enforced by the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE). Many HOAs in Charles County are responsible for maintaining stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs), which directly impact compliance and system performance. The proposal is modeled after proven approaches such as

Oregon law (ORS 94.595 and ORS 100.175), which require developers to complete reserve studies, maintenance plans, and establish reserve accounts at the time a community is created. By applying similar requirements during development, this proposal strengthens long-term planning, protects homeowners, and supports sustainable infrastructure within the County's existing authority.

## **PROBLEM**

In Charles County, HOAs and condominium associations are responsible for maintaining critical infrastructure such as stormwater systems, roads, sidewalks, lighting, and community amenities. Too often, these communities are transitioned from developer control to homeowners without proper financial preparation. HOA fees are frequently kept low early on to attract buyers, while the true long-term costs of maintaining infrastructure are underestimated or deferred. When homeowners take control, associations often discover that reserves are insufficient. They are then forced to raise fees or impose special assessments just to meet basic maintenance needs. These sudden increases create financial stress and, in some cases, make homeownership unaffordable or a serious hardship. This issue is further compounded by updated Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) stormwater requirements, which add ongoing maintenance and compliance responsibilities. Many HOAs are unaware of these obligations until problems arise, increasing costs even further. Over time, this leads to deferred maintenance, deteriorating infrastructure, and higher long-term expenses. It can also create inequities, where early homeowners end up subsidizing costs tied to future development phases. Without proper planning and funding from the start, communities begin in a financially unstable position, putting both homeowners and the County at risk.

## **SOLUTION**

This proposal solves the problem by requiring developers to plan for long-term maintenance before communities are turned over to homeowners and before the first home is built. Developers must:

- Complete a reserve study to identify infrastructure, lifespan, and costs
- Create a maintenance plan for ongoing upkeep
- Set up and fund a reserve account for the association

These steps are tied to existing development stages like plan approval, final plat, and certificate of occupancy, so no new process is created. By doing this upfront, communities start with a clear plan and the funds needed to maintain infrastructure. This helps prevent sudden fee increases, special assessments, and delayed repairs. The proposal also improves transparency for homebuyers and ensures communities are set up for long-term success, protecting homeowners and supporting stable, well-maintained neighborhoods across Charles County.

## **COST**

Minimal cost to County. Managed within existing Planning & Growth Management processes with minor review time and one time staff training. No new staff or ongoing oversight required.

## **ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

This proposed legislation is expected to be supported by homeowners, HOA boards, and organizations that are directly impacted by underfunded infrastructure and rising costs after developer turnover. HOA leaders and community groups often struggle to maintain infrastructure without adequate reserves. This proposal helps ensure communities are better prepared and able to manage maintenance responsibly. It also aligns with the interests of County agencies, including Planning & Growth Management and environmental stakeholders, by supporting responsible growth, sustainable infrastructure, and compliance with stormwater requirements that protect public health and safety.

## **ORGANIZATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Developers and builders may say this proposal adds costs, requirements, and could impact timelines or affordability. However, it uses existing approval processes and does not create new fees or agencies. Costs are predictable and small compared to overall development costs. More importantly, it helps prevent much higher costs for homeowners later, like special assessments and steep fee increases. It also ensures developer-controlled associations collect HOA fees on time and properly fund reserves. This supports responsible development, stable communities, and long term housing affordability in Charles County.

## **PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE**

All new developments in Charles County that create a homeowners association (HOA), condominium, or other common ownership community responsible for maintaining shared infrastructure shall meet the following requirements. This legislation also applies to developments currently in process, including phased developments, before the transfer of common areas and the release of any bonds.

1. Developer Requirements: Before final plat approval, the developer shall:
  - Submit a reserve study identifying all common infrastructure, its expected lifespan, and replacement costs
  - Provide a maintenance plan outlining required upkeep and inspections, including stormwater systems
  - Establish a reserve account in the name of the association and fund it with at least one year of recommended contributions
2. Phased and Ongoing Developments: For developments in progress or built in phases, these requirements must be met before the release, reduction, or acceptance of any performance or maintenance bonds, and before the transfer of common areas to the association.
3. Approval Conditions: The County may withhold final plat approval, certificates of occupancy, or bond release until all requirements are satisfied.
4. Buyer Transparency: Developers shall provide purchasers with a summary of the reserve study, maintenance responsibilities, and expected HOA costs.

## **OTHER INFORMATION TO NOTE**

This proposal presents a practical, preventive approach to challenges already being observed in Charles County. It ensures communities are financially prepared before homeowners take over, helping to prevent special assessments, rising HOA fees, and infrastructure failures. It works within the County's existing development process and does not create new boards, fees, or ongoing oversight. Instead, it adds a simple planning step at key approval stages, making it a low impact change for both staff

and developers. The proposal also supports long-term housing affordability by reducing the risk of sudden fee increases that can create financial hardship. More predictable costs help families remain in their homes. In addition, it protects the County by helping ensure that infrastructure such as stormwater systems, roads, and drainage are properly maintained. When these systems fail, the County often faces complaints and pressure to intervene. This proposal helps reduce that risk. It also promotes fairness by setting consistent expectations for all developers while supporting those who already follow best practices.

Thank you,  
**Charles County, MD**

---

**This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.**