Customer Relations
2662 Riva Rd, MS-7400
Annapolis, MD 21401
410-222-7582
pwcust00@aacounty.org
www.dpwandyou.com

# COMMENTS

## VALENTINE CREEK PARK WATER ACCESS – Project# P567418

1. Ashley Avrett: I am against this. My concerns are safety, the added traffic it will bring to the area, the destruction/disruption to wildlife and the water way. I think it will encourage more cyclists to the area where we already struggle with them riding recklessly in the area on winding roads with blind corners and no shoulders.
2. Rosana Gilmore: I'm a resident of Arden and I oppose the project. My question is why the county is spending critical resources on a project that will benefit a very small number of county residents, is opposed by all the homeowners associations that surround the area (representing several thousand households), have grave environmental and traffic safety issues and it is not even funded. With today's economic issues impacting county residents, I'm sure there are better projects were the money being wasted in this ridiculous project can be better spent.
3. Brenda Vitello: I am totally against the current plan for this project for the negative environmental impact it will have. I have submitted my reasons with less destructive alternatives. This critical wildlife habitat serves the community as a green space as is, there are other water access points nearby. I vote NO!
4. Anne Knowles: I am against this project in any form.
5. Michael Stefanelli: Stop overdeveloping this area!!! You are ruining this area. I have lived here all my life. As a young person growing up in the 60's the water was clean and the sea grass was so thick you could hardly row a boat thru it. Grass shrimp were abundant for using as fish bait. Now that is all gone, because you have let greedy developers come here and build in areas that should never have been developed. Anne Arundel county supports eight rivers and three creeks. There have been Three major sewage spills in AA county since 2023. Aug14 2025 Anne Arundel County health officials have issued a public health advisory for Boyds Creek off the South River due to a sewage spill. May 30th 2025 Anne Arundel County Department of Health has issued a water contact advisory for the northern part of the county following a major sewage overflow from the Patapsco Wastewater Treatment Plant in Baltimore City. More than 21 million gallons of partially treated sewage have been discharged, prompting public health concerns along local waterways. Aug29th 2023 The Anne Arundel County Department of Health has closed a section of Spa Creek to direct contact after a sewage spill was found in the area of Heritage Court near Merryman Road in Annapolis until Saturday, September 2, 2023. The spill was caused by a broken sewer pipe that leaked approximately 300,000 gallons of sewage. Not to mention all the run off from storms that wash pollution from developments into the rivers and creeks. The county is NOT doing it's job to protect the rivers,creeks and the bay. Shame on

You!! The area you want to develop in valentine creek is a few of the remaining watershed areas that should remain undeveloped.

6. Stephen Y: I have walked the Valentine Creek woods for 23 years. These pristine woods are a blessing, well cared for and well used by the 3 communities bordering this area. I have encountered all manner of wild life including wild turkey, fox, owls, eagles and the famous Maryland Terrapin. I know that cutting many of these beautiful mature hardwoods and grading for parking will have a significant negative impact on the wildlife. I also know the area that is planned for kayak launch and good luck at low tide because it's a mud flat . The terrain from the Valentine Creek community is steeply slopped with a steep cliff on the east side. At the proposed launch point for kayaks is another steep slop down to the very shallow waters. I would assume there are numerous other areas to plan a new kayak launch site. **Comment** Jeanine Lissauer: Valentine Creek Woods are the last wooded area with natural paths and wildlife like owls, fox, hawks, turtles etc. It can be accessed for hiking either from Valley Drive in Arden or by Valentine Creek homes off Old Herald Harbor Road. That already is a valuable pastime there, that Arden residents enjoy & cherish. Water access within these woods would destroy them because of the need for parking & rest rooms/port-o-potty's. Pump out trucks would have to have access the port-o-potty's to pump them out. Trucks & roads would further destroy the delicate woods & wetlands. There are already established launch sites at Jonas Green Park in Annapolis & Truxton Park in Annapolis. Both of these have plenty of parking, picnic tables & clean rest rooms. You can use the Valentine funds towards upgrading them. Why spoil what little wilderness we have left? Once it's gone, it's gone forever. Another idea is to change the funding you have earmarked for this idea over to the proposed Crownsville Hospital Park. That is land that desperately needs to be made more beautiful as it's been an eyesore for years. Better to do that than to spoil untouched woodlands with roads, parking lots, & port-potty's.
7. My name is Gary Hurban. I live in Arden near the entrance to a walking path into the Valentine Creek Park. My wife and I have walked most of the existing trails in that area, and we agree with the comment made by the biologist who said that this area is a special pristine wooded forest. When we walk these trails, we see many other people walking their dogs, jogging, biking, or just walking. Every day we also see many other people entering the park from the path near our house to enjoy these activities, and this is only one of several access points from which people access those trails. It would be a shame to ruin this existing natural, wooded, pristine area that many people are enjoying by constructing metal rails, to slide kayaks down to the water, an access road down to the water, etc. This is an impractical site to consider for launching kayaks when you have to drag them about a half a mile up and down a hill. The proposal to slide them down a rail would make it easier to slide them down the hill, but then you would have to drag them back up that rail. There are proposals to use porta potties on this site. If they are placed down by the proposed pier, you will need to construct a road for vehicles to service the proposed pier and the porta potties. Would you then pave the road in this critical area and remove more trees to build it? If the port potties are left up at the proposed parking area, then people down at the pier would have to walk for a half a mile up a hill to use them. That wouldn't make sense. In conclusion, I think that it would be a crime to destroy this beautiful pristine forested area in order to create an area to launch kayaks, when it is such an impractical site. I also think that it would be a waste of our tax payer money to proceed with designs and permits for building facilities to launch kayaks on this site.

8. Amanda Foreman: As an Arden resident, my family & I are adamantly against this proposal. It is intrusive & completely unnecessary. The beauty, serenity & privacy for Arden residents & wildlife that this will disrupt is monumental. Not to mention the damage to the watershed being so close to the waters edge. The removal of mature trees that are currently holding the shoreline in place would be devastating. To move forward with this plan without the support of the community that lives here would be a massive overstep on the county's part.
9. Rebecca Cagle: This plan does not seem to be well researched or informed. Everyone in the communities surrounding the site seem to be against it, and it seems to be cost prohibitive... not only in monetary cost to the county, but in ecological and social cost as well.
10. Dawn Wallis: I request you discontinue planning for development at this site. It's already actively used for recreation- hiking, observation, mountain biking, and exploration- and it's pristine habitat for nature. All kinds of wildlife including fox, deer, turtles, bats, big trees and so much more live undisturbed here. Also, in addition to destroying habitat, it will also increase traffic danger for pedestrians and children that play along the roads near the proposed site entrance. Old Herald Harbor Rd has a tragic past and near misses at that intersection regularly. Also that road is a back-up road when the pathways in Herald Harbor get blocked due to trees falling or accidents, so sometimes Old Herald Harbor Rd sees increased traffic patterns, that could be affected even further by the development. The expense to change this site into a usable launch for kayakers would be quite expensive for tax payers also and it will be difficult to make this area accessible for all, given the natural layout of the land. There are really steep slopes and very marshy land at the small "beach". The area is very secluded for a pier and could be potentially dangerous "at your own risk" especially for kids/teens going out there unsupervised after dark, despite closing at dark. There are other, likely better, locations for this project. Have you considered Bargagni beach in Herald Harbor? It is already mostly paved and easily accessible, yet few folks know about it or use it. I also heard Brewer Pond might be a good alternative as well. I'm sure there are better sites to consider, ones I don't even know exist. Traffic, safety, accessibility, the natural eco system, wildlife habitat, land conservation, expense, critical area zoning, and reduction in litter/waste are all great reasons to reconsider the proposed location for this project. Thanks for considering my comments.
11. Francis Sullivan: Below are my questions:
    a. The trail from the proposed parking lot to the kayak launch area apparently is to be a pervious surface. What specifically is the type of surface?
    b. This trail will traverse very rough terrain and passes over several gullies. How much grading do you anticipate? Any cost estimates?
    c. Does the County have any estimates of the cost per linear foot for the Valentine Creek Drive extension, the cost of the parking lot and storm water management associated with the extension and parking lot?
    d. You stated that the concerns about the safety of the intersection at Old Herald Harbor Road, and management of increased traffic and speed limits must be addressed by someone at DPW. Do you have that contact information?
12. Frank Sullivan and Suzan Giraldi: We have focused in our comments on the social cost and quality of life disruptions rather than the facts of why this proposal is so destructive to our neighborhood and the environment, as so many others, including VCCA, have rationally and eloquently stated. We suppose we were naive in thinking that our County Officials and employees actually cared equally about ALL the people who choose to live here in peace. We

have lived at 1115 Valentine Creek Drive in Crownsville for 28 years. This is a dead-end street with 28 homes. Behind our houses and at the end of the street are over 75 acres of Conservation Lands platted to Valentine Creek Community Association or VCCA. In 2013 approximately 25 acres of lots and right of way were bought by the County as conservation land. This 25 acre parcel that abuts the VCCA conservation area is now the focus of a Water Access Park for Kayakers. Ironically there is already water access by hiking/biking trails. At the time of the County purchase our community association (VCCA) was supportive of the land acquisition in the belief that this pristine and heavily forested land would be preserved as a wildlife and hiking/biking preserve. Residents expected the woods to remain as natural as possible, with access from multiple sites around the County owned land and from VCCA Conservation Lands. Individuals have been able to access the Woods and the water for a significantly longer period than my residency here, and this continues to be the case. The AA Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) began developing park designs without first consulting directly affected residents. The latest reiteration seems to focus on “water access” verses enjoyment of a basically wild area for nature lovers. In our opinion, this obsession with “water access” would result in environmental harm by clearing and grading a pristine, protected forest, increasing risks of invasive species and destroying wildlife habitat. As I listened to the people at the October 23 meeting and read the comments on this project, it has become clear that this proposal and the DRP planning process ignores the feedback collected, dismisses inputs for better use of this land, and ignores more cost-effective alternatives for water access elsewhere. For us personally, we see the pleasantness of our neighborhood being destroyed, our faith in our County processes evaporating, and our taxes squandered on somebody’s pet project. In conclusion we are in opposition to the “Concept D2” and hope for the opportunity to have meaningful input in any future process that will so strongly affect our daily lives.

13. Raymona Stickell: If the county ensures environmental protection measures are followed/maintained, then the public should be given access to easily launch kayaks or similar vessels. So many waterfront communities, mine included, prohibit public access to the waterways making it difficult for many to enjoy the benefits of being out in nature. Also, there needs to be corresponding speed limits in place 365 days beginning at Severn Narrows all the way inland to Severn Run. Shore line erosion has dramatically increased with the current speed limit settings and continually rising tides. DNR representatives patrolling the area once said “it’s called Severn Narrows for a reason” but no speed limit adjustments have been made.
14. Jessica Angle:
    a. Comment#1: This project is going to be very harmful to the 4 communities that surround this land. Moreover this area is environmentally sensitive and you will be ruining a fragile ecosystem. I am strongly against this project and i suspect that there is more to it than is being said. Someone stands to gain millions of dollars by creeping in on a piece of land that touches water. And that’s the bottom line. This is a waste of our tax payers dollars. Use the Brewer Pond location instead and stop trying to ruin another wetland. This is not a viable option after access point unless pavement goes all the way to the water and the wetland is dredged. I know that will be what is part B of this SHADY plan. Me and my community members will fight you every step of the way. **Response:** Noted
    b. Comment #2: I have heard the Valentine Creek project which is on the 28 acres that the county bought from the Campbell's was purchased with open space money from the DNR. I have heard that since the purchase was used with this money, the DNR requires

that this land has to include public access or the money has to be given back-it's a clause in the agreement. I have some questions about this- First of all is this true? If so how can an access the documentation for this? If this is true, what qualifications does this land have to meet to fit the public access requirements? Can it arguably be accessible as is? I look forward to hearing back from you and getting some clarity on this particular point.

15. Steve Yaniga: As a long time resident of AA County I have seen to many examples of bad growth. Old Hearld Harbor Rd. is narrow and loaded with curves and hills and school bus stops. With the advent of Wayz and similar apps traffic has increased to a dangerous level already. People are using that a a cut through to avoid Route 97 and 178 grid lock. Adding any more traffic to the road is a recipe for disaster. I urge you do the right thing and pass on this Valentine Creek Project.
16. Rose Irving & Jeff Pincus: Environmental Responsibility: Valentine Creek D2 would permanently fragment a pristine forest. Brewer Pond requires no clearing or grading. Safety: Old Herald Harbor Road has a tragic accident history, and Valentine Creek Drive is unsafe for overflow traffic. Brewer Pond avoids these risks entirely. Equity: Brewer Pond has been effectively reserved for 12 private homes for years. Improving it would restore true public access, rather than burden one small neighborhood. Fiscal Prudence: Brewer Pond can be enhanced for ~$30,000. Valentine Creek D2 would cost taxpayers hundreds of thousands, if not millions.
17. Christen Bartels: I am against the development of Valentine Creek Water access, adding a Tax burden to county residents, in development and maintenance. The burden would outweigh the benefits, I'm concerned the development would disturb wildlife patterns and increase accidents with wildlife. Additionally adding a volume of traffic coming in and out of Valentine Creek road which is in the center of the the elbow of Old Herald Harbor Road lacking sufficient visibility of Traffic approaching in both directions. Increasing the volume of traffic will increase the number of accidents on our road. Old Herald Harbor RD is a major access road to the area's neighborhoods and often becomes a detour road when 97 and Generals Highway experience closures and back ups. if there are accidents on our road it forces the local traffic back up to Generals Hwy to access there residence, as we know in times like when river rd was being paved, or when trees are down traffic on Generals could add 30-60 mins to residents home commute not to mention other county residents trying to get through Generals HWY. Please, Consider these as some of the issues and how they will affect the larger community in Anne Arundel County.
18. Judith Krantz: Please do not interfere with the natural beauty and disturb nature.
19. Maria Johnson: Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional input following the October 23rd public meeting on the Valentine Creek Water Access Project. As residents of this community (our house is directly across Valentine Creek) for over 22 years, we would like to share my observations and concerns for your consideration:
    a. Lack of Community Input: At the meeting it was stated that a survey had been distributed to residents to gather ideas for the site's use. To our knowledge, and after speaking with many neighbors, most in the Valentine Creek community, never received such a survey. If accurate, this represents a serious shortcoming in community outreach.
    b. Representation of Non-Local Interests: Comments in favor of kayak access appeared to come from individuals outside our community. It raises concerns that input from non-

local groups—potentially with political or financial influence—is being weighed more heavily than those of adjacent residents who will bear the direct impact.

c. Wildlife and Environmental Concerns: It was suggested that DNR found no issues with wildlife. However, this contradicts local knowledge and observations. Valentine Creek is home to box turtle breeding grounds (photo attached) (box turtles are classified as “vulnerable”) and terrapin turtles (considered “threatened”). Their presence deserves serious biological study before any construction. I have personally helped countless turtles that were on Valentine Creek get safely across the street. I have sadly seen some of these turtles killed on Valentine Creek by delivery trucks and even the garbage trucks.
d. Additionally, the introduction of invasive species—such as Japanese knotweed, already present nearby from prior roadside work—poses a substantial risk. This plant is destructive to ecosystems, infrastructure, and property values, and spreads easily via construction equipment. Bringing in heavy machinery and cutting back vegetation will almost certainly accelerate its spread. The system allows for only one file and I will have to send additional entries indicating the Japanese knotweed already growing in on Old Herald Harbor.
e. Safety and Security: County representatives suggested park rangers would patrol the site. In our 22 years here, I have never seen rangers in this area. It is unrealistic to assume weekly patrols will mitigate crime, loitering, or misuse of the facilities.
f. Infrastructure Failures and Traffic Hazards: Valentine Creek Road was recently resurfaced and already shows cracks and potholes. Additional traffic will only accelerate deterioration.
g. Traffic safety is also a major concern. While accident data presented at the meeting only covered seven years, residents know the reality spans decades: we have witnessed multiple fatalities and serious accidents on Old Herald Harbor Road and Herald Harbor. These roads are narrow, winding, and unsafe for additional high-volume traffic. The app WAZE reroutes traffic through Old Herald Harbor whenever there is a backup on Interstate 97, Generals Hwy, and surrounding roads. We have experienced times when we couldn't easily leave our driveway due to the amount of traffic.
h. Quality of Life Impacts: Residents moved to Valentine Creek for its quiet, safe, and natural setting. Increasing traffic, introducing porta-potties, and creating a park entrance at the end of our residential street undermines the character of the neighborhood and the safety of children who walk, bike, and play here. We walk our dogs on Valentine Creek and I use the road to train for races. Crossing the road is already very dangerous and many of those who do not live on Valentine Creek do not adhere to the speed limit on the street and are sometimes very rude, especially since the street is very narrow.
i. Requested Action. Given these concerns, we respectfully ask the County to: Reassess whether the existing natural uses of the property (hiking, birdwatching, biking) already satisfy Program Open Space obligations without adding costly infrastructure. If not, please help us understand exactly why that is, conduct a comprehensive biological survey with a focus on vulnerable species such as box turtles and terrapins and provide the results to Valentine Creek residents, evaluate the long-term risks of invasive species introduction from construction activity, revisit the traffic impact study to include historical accident data and consider infrastructure deterioration, provide clarity on how ongoing safety patrols would be realistically implemented, thank you for your consideration of

these concerns. We believe these issues are essential to address before moving forward with any development.

j. The system only allows for one file and I wanted to show where the Japanese Knotweed is already destroying the ecosystem in our community along Old Herald Harbor Rd. We were told it cannot be touched besides mowing because it will not die and if you try to pull it out, it grows exponentially because of it's deep roots. The only chemical that will destroy is Agent Orange. My husband is a Vietnam Veteran

20. Joseph Davis: I support adding water access at Valentine Creek. I am thankful for the county's push for cartop access in the past 10 years, especially at Spriggs Farm Park. Access at Valentine Creek will open up the scenic and lesser trafficed upper Severn River. The residents currently have a monopoly on water access and will certainly fight hard to keep the public out. They will have to sacrifice very little (maybe a few more cars and a few more paddlers), but the public has orders of magnitude more to gain. Everyone benefits when the public becomes a shareholder in the natural resources of our county.
21. Violeta Streidel: I am writing as a longtime resident of Valentine Creek Drive to express my strong opposition to Concept D2 and to urge Anne Arundel County to prioritize Brewer Pond Natural Area as the more appropriate and responsible site for expanded water access. Our neighborhood’s narrow, shoulderless roads — particularly Old Herald Harbor Road and Valentine Creek Drive — were not designed for high-volume traffic or trailers. Increased use would create serious safety risks for pedestrians, children, and dog walkers who use these roads daily. Sadly, this area already has a record of traffic accidents, and adding more vehicles and boat trailers would only make conditions more dangerous. Equally concerning is the environmental impact. The Valentine Creek Woods represent one of the last remaining intact forests in our community — a thriving habitat that would be permanently fragmented by the proposed D2 development. This plan contradicts the County’s stated goals of sustainability, environmental stewardship, and preservation of natural buffers along our waterways. By contrast, Brewer Pond offers a far better solution. It is larger (over 40 acres vs. 28 acres at Valentine Creek), safer to access, and can be improved for a fraction of the cost — approximately $30,000 compared to hundreds of thousands or even millions for Concept D2. Brewer Pond has already been identified in the County’s July 2025 Park Water Access Study as a superior site, making it the fiscally and environmentally prudent choice. For these reasons, I respectfully ask the County to redirect its focus and funding toward Brewer Pond, a location that would expand public access without displacing residents, endangering local families, or destroying protected woodland. Thank you for considering the perspective of those who live here and care deeply about preserving the safety, natural beauty, and balance of our community.
22. Kurt Riefner: A a resident living on Valentine Creek Drive, I would like to express my concerns about the VC water access proposed project D2.
    a. The projected area for this project is one , if not, the last pristine wildlife habitats left on the west side of the Severn River. The amount of construction needed to implement this project will cause irreparable harm to the area.
    b. Valentine Creek Drive is a narrow, dead end street (23 feet wide), has no shoulders, no sidewalks and a very small turnaround at the entrance to the existing trail. Our road has a blind curve, is used by many of the residents to safely walk their dogs, exercise, ride bicycles rollerblade and skateboard. The speed limit on this road is 30mph and in my

opinion, too fast even for our local traffic, let alone visitors The proposed 10 car parking space will cause visitors to park as close as they can to the entrance to the road leading down to the parking lot. As I stated, our street has no shoulders and no curbing. This will lead to cars being partially parked on our front lawns, which causes damage to the grass and ruts in the soil when the ground is wet.

c. My concern about this project is that it is a politician's "feel good" project that will only serve their future careers in County and State politics and cause more harm than good. There is already a public access for water access at Brewers Pond. It has parking, a level access to the water that meets the ADA requirements. The VC water access project will require massive grading, removal of probably a hundred trees or more and nobody can even offer a cost estimate for this project. Having been a resident for almost my entire life, I can guarantee you that what ever the projected cost estimate will be, you can probably double it. Valentine Creek Drive has a substandard road base construction that has hundreds and hundreds of cracks in it from normal vehicle traffic and trash removal trucks. The County has already "resurfaced" the road twice in the last 5-6 years to seal the cracks, but that does not address the real problem with the subhead structure. Removal of trees, grading and paving for this project will require large trucks to transport the equipment, materials and removed trees in and out. The damage to our street from this traffic will require major repairs to the entire length of Valentine Creek Drive. Do not leave this cost out of the projects cost.
d. The project shows an approximate 2200 feet of trail access to the "beach" down about 120 feet of elevation. This trail will also need to be graded, paved in some areas and filled with a permeable material the rest of the trail. The trail will also require shoring up and a framework to retain that material to prevent erosion and loss of the material. All of this, so a very small group of kayakers and maybe paddle boarders can use the headwaters of Valentine Creek. The pier will be located in an area that experiences very shallow water levels during low tides, is not conducive to swimming and suffers algae blooms that remove oxygen from the water in the summer. Fish don't like that.
e. In conclusion, the taxpayer money required to complete this project could be better put to use improving Brewer Pond and maybe subsidizing the parking fee at Smith's Marina with a County contract for fixed amount to cover kayak and maybe paddle board access.

23. Jeffrey Sanders: I oppose the Valentine Creek D2 for the reason that it disturbs a pristine forest that exists along the shoreline within the critical area. Plenty of water access sites are already established. Further destroying what little forest we have left would not help us maintain the health of the Chesapeake Bay. The site could be made available to the county for recreation without creating a line of destruction and scarring the beach.
24. Susan Campana: I am 100% opposed against the Valentine creek project. Why can’t anyone leave these communities alone? It’s not broke so don’t fix it! Tell Pittman to make himself useful and find another project
25. Amy Levitt: I’m strongly OPPOSED to developing Valentine Creek Park, due to environmental upAset to land and water ecosystems. Tree loss, noise, trash, erosion, and stormwater runoff would permanently degrade the peaceful quality of the Critical Area, causing animals to flee their habitat and changing the landscape of this natural resource. Furthermore, the difficult elevation is impractical for transporting kayaks, let alone financial cost to the county and taxpayers. The park is already available to the general public for hiking and solitude, due to its

richness of wildlife and plant species. The quiet wooded trails are full of wonderful native and migratory birds. The waters are a frequent shallow breeding ground for great and little blue herons. Horned and sago pondweed, redhead grass, and Eurasian milfoil found in the cove waters at the proposed fishing pier site would very likely be destroyed. These grasses contribute to the health of our area waters, and are vital to crabs, fish, and other species. Whether on land or water, I ask Anne Arundel County leadership to block any environmental disruption of the Valentine Creek area. As a point of education, the meeting organizers did not take into account the non-contiguous geography of the Arden on the Severn community when they presented the sole survey statistic. FYI, Arden comprises 5 distinct neighborhoods, including a large section of residences located between the Indian Creek and Cypress Branches of the Severn River; these homes are miles from Valentine Creek Park. Merely citing a percentage of respondents is not only misleading, it's not a practical measure of community interest. Nor is it a surprising statistic, given Arden's "spread out" nature. One might wrongly conclude that Arden residents are apathetic, which is quite to the contrary. I suspect those who review the content of those survey responses, would draw a very different, less-biased conclusion. Last, there are other options for public water access available on Bargagni Road and Wilson Road in Herald Harbor--less than a mile from Valentine Creek Park, which is *already* public open space. No one denies the desire for more water access--the issue is whether this particular location is both a good idea and good use of county funds. Thank you for your time.

26. Thomas Heinz: This development is a detriment to every aspect of the local society, and a hindrance to the joy of external county members wanting to enjoy the water access. There is absolutely no need for additional development, when maintenance of current site can fulfill the current need. This development will cause havoc for local residents, while existing sites will deteriorate. Please focus on existing sites and do not create additional sites where there is no need, and neglect will amount to disrepair and mischievousness.
27. Debra Clark: I would like to urge the County to reconsider any type of development to this property. This property should remain as is due to its critical environmental impact to Valentine Creek. I understand that it was purchased using POS funding and as such, the County stipulates that it must be developed in some format for public use. Is it possible to purchase it with other County funds and reimburse the POS funding? In general, I support public access to water in our County for all the same reasons the County does, but not at this cost. Not the fiscal cost, not the environmental impact cost, not the potential cost of decreased life satisfaction for the residents of Valentine's Creek, not at the cost of the safety to those that must travel the nearby roads.
28. David Larsen: Please when you consider the environmental, safety and cost between Valentine Creek and Brewers Pond the clear choice is Brewers Pond! Please Do Not destroy the Valentines Creek area for these and too many more reasons I have room here for you to consider!!!!
29. Stacey Gonzalez: As a resident of Herald Harbor, I do not support the proposed plan to develop public access at Valentine Creek. When considering the environmental responsibility, safety, equity, and fiscal prudence of developing Valentine Creek compared to developing Brewer Pond, I think it is obvious that Brewer Pond is the better choice. Please listen to the residents who this decision will impact. We have an extensive trail system that will be destroyed.
30. Dawn Propst: Our very narrow street, with no shoulder or sidewalk is not conducive to traffic or boats.

31. Jordan Cipolla: Keep Valentine Creek trail a pristine nature trail. I appreciate the fact the county wants to expand water accessibility, but I cannot understand the want to waste so much taxpayer money on developing a nature rich environment. I would also like to bring up an alternative plan to Valentine Creek. My first suggestion being the end of Bargagni rd in Herald Harbor. This seems to have once been a usable boat ramp/ water access point. Many have stated that the homeowners nearby have built a structure that blocks this point. Is this not county land how could this not be used as an already developed ramp in which the funds could be used to improve an existing site and make it amenable for all? My second suggestion would be Sherwood forest area. This location has a better traffic calming options, a much larger area, and the funds can be used much more effectively.
32. Susan Reinhart: I urge you to choose the Brewers Pond site for this project. Simply, it is much more cost effective, safer for patrons and community members, gives easier access for all wanting water access, and has a lesser affect on the environment. The decision is an easy one. Thank you.
33. Eleanor Kelliher: A commercial landfill company wants the contract to dump demolition and construction waste - profitable destruction of a large delicate watershed natural environment. Many trees would have to be destroyed and the ecology ... launching speedboats and kayaks and paddleboards together is dangerous. Brewer Pond is a much more suitable area to handle both types of use, including access and parking.
34. Maxine Mead: I strongly urge the completion, as soon as possible, of the public park that will provide for a kayak/canoe soft launch into Valentine Creek. Considering the amount of shoreline it contains, Anne Arundel County has far too few points that allow the public to access the county waterways. A public official's or candidate's support for increased public water access (constructed in an environmentally-responsible fashion) is a significant factor in my evaluation of whether that official/candidate receives my political and voting support. Thank you.
35. Guy Merritt: This is a bad project that the County Executive had previously said was off the table. We should be looking at the Brewer's Pond site, which would be easier to develop and has much better road access.
36. Annie Medford: - I am against the original proposal which included dredging the creek channel and allowing for motorized watercrafts.  I do not want to see motorized watercraft which will impact the shoreline with erosion issues due to waves/wake generated by faster moving boats. I am FOR the new proposal limiting the access to non-motorized kayaks or canoes. I appreciate the new design plan lowering the environmental impacts in our critical area buffer zone. I agree with the smaller parking lot accommodating 10 vehicles with monitored/gated access. - I want to see the existing hiking trails remain.
37. Kathe Flynn: As a local resident, I want to express my deep concern about the proposed Valentine Creek Park project. While I appreciate the County’s goal of expanding public water access, this plan appears to come at an unacceptable environmental and community cost. The number of trees marked for removal is truly disheartening. Beyond their beauty, these trees are vital to the health of the surrounding ecosystem—providing critical animal habitats, stabilizing the shoreline, and filtering runoff before it reaches the water. The proposed construction would permanently alter this delicate environment, contributing to erosion and water pollution. There are also legitimate worries about increased traffic and safety risks along narrow neighborhood roads, as well as the likelihood that the site’s terrain will limit actual public use. With an existing public water-access point less than a mile away on Bargagni Road, this particular location does

not seem to justify the financial or environmental cost. Notably, Valentine Creek supports important wildlife—birds such as bald eagles, and fish and other animals that benefit from the relatively undisturbed shoreline and forested buffer. Any substantial disturbance could degrade the habitat for these species and reduce the ecological value of the site. I strongly urge the County to reconsider this plan and explore alternatives that enhance access without destroying habitats or jeopardizing community safety.

38. Pam Hudgins: I am against developing the valentines creek area for water access. Disruption to the eco system is inevitable if the shore line is disturbed. The Chesapeake bay and its tributaries help with clean water, air, healthy living environment for animals and people. There is public access in herald harbor already established. No more disruption to the tress, shoreline and animal habitats please
39. Gerald Etzold: I live in Arden on the Severn and enjoy walking over to this area for exercise and enjoying nature. I am not sure that folks understand how shallow the water is in this area. The access area being planned involves a pretty steep hill that people wanting to kayak would have to negotiate with their equipment - not bad going down, but a good workout hauling gear back uphill. The access to this area would involve traveling through a small neighborhood. This will clearly interfere with those residents daily activity and the plan to add a parking lot and road extension will cause a major disruption of the environment here. It is currently a mecca for wildlife and I would hate to see it destroyed. A fishing pier??? It would be located in what is frequently a mud flat. Not much fishing to do there. It seems to me that this would not serve to increase access to the water that folks would want and a significant waste of taxpayer money.
40. Ron Perpall: I understand someone brought up the water "Access" on Bargagni rd. for kayaks etc... Bargagni road is at best 20' wide and less than 15' at the waters edge. There is absolutely no parking available on the road without blocking it from the two residents who live there and there is no turn around without using the private owners property. This is a completely unviable solution. I'm not sure what these people are thinking... or not.
41. Laura Zlatos: This is a pristine area for animal habitats. The disturbing of the area, when there is already an access so close by, would cause so many issues: neighborhood access would bring too much traffic to a small road area and the safety of the residents; loss of wildlife; pollution in that area that has none. Just to name a few. The long hike to the water with a kayak or a paddleboard?? How many would actually make that trek? I have kayaked for years off beach 4 (I am an Arden resident) to that area and so love the quiet and sighting of animals. It's disturbing to even think of that being gone.
42. Michael Brown: I am in favor of this plan to increase pubic access to the Severn river.
43. Sarah Milam: I STRONGLY oppose use of this location for public water access in any capacity due to concerns about physical impacts to the environment (destruction of trees, erosion, and water pollution; disturbed/shrinking animal habitats; traffic and safety issues; potential low usage by kayakers due to difficult terrain/ elevation; and financial costs. public water access is already available on Bargagni Rd. in Herald Harbor, less than a mile from Valentine Creek Park, which is *already* public open space. Do not develop more here
44. Cody Cole: Opening public access to this waterway will pose immediate challenges for Herald Harbor & Arden on the Severn. Aside from environmental concerns attributed to construction, Arden Beach Association will be forced to enlist additional resources to monitor security of their private beach in section 4. Kayak/Canoe/Paddle Board traffic will naturally be inclined to access the private beach from the water front. Also, being that the park is public there is no way to vet

the people who are accessing the park. Has there been any consideration to assess a daily or annual fee to enter the park? This may deter anyone and everyone from accessing the park. All of the residents from the surrounding community have paid peak real estate prices and property taxes in order to live in the respective communities, not to mention, the annual fees to maintain the community amenities. Allowing unfettered public access to the water way redefines the meaning of “water privilege” by allowing anyone to access it. In my experience, people tend to have a deeper appreciation and level of respect for resources that they pay for rather than public spaces that they feel entitled to the use.

45. Kara Richmond: I oppose the proposed plan to create water access at Valentine Creek. The terrain of the sight is not ideal for accessing water with kayaks while the destruction of habitat, erosion impact, and potential loss of wildlife would be significant. There is also nearby public access for kayakers, making this new plan unnecessary.
46. Maria Stanley: I just don’t think this particular spot is the right place for public River access. With the project down to just 10 parking spots, is it worth the bang for the buck for use of county money?
47. Robert Arias: Thank you very much for hosting the public meeting held on October 23, 2025. Your presentation was informative and enlightening, as were the audience comments. The presentation suggested that Spriggs Farm Park and Homeport Farm Park as good models for the proposed boat launch at Valentine Creek. In both of these parks, the distance from the parking area to the launch is about 150 yards (450 feet), as documented on the AA county web site. For Valentine Creek, it’s about 2/3 of a mile, or 3000 feet. That makes the kayak or canoe portage quite difficult for most people. As well documented in the attached letter from the Valentine Creek Community Association, there are significant safety hazards, security concerns, and environmental impacts associated with this project. As evidenced at this and other public meetings, community opposition is very strong. Currently Valentine Creek is well used for hiking and cycling. The creek itself is well used by community kayakers. Jefferson Holland, in his recent book “Walk Around Arundel” describes the Park as “one of AA County’s marvelous pocket wildernesses.” Considering the project’s many downsides and community opposition, I suggest the project be abandoned and the park remain in its natural state. Your time and effort, and our tax money, would be better spent elsewhere.
48. Sophie Troy: I don't understand why access to the Severn River is limited to a few privileged land owners. Other rivers (mostly is other counties, not AA county) have public access for those who can't afford living by the water but still enjoy being on the water. Letting these people access the upper Severn River would not be detrimental to those who live by the river. All we need is a road to unload kayaks, canoes, or light crafts, a parking lot, and a portable toilet. It's time to share the water Anne Arundel County!!
49. Evan Humphries: There is a plethora of boat ramps in the crownsville area. Open some to the public but do not tear down the forest and scenery that makes this land beautiful and unique for more boats when water access is in abundance already. Renie Sotiropoulos: I attended the community meeting on October 23, where—as you can imagine—most voices were strongly opposed to the expansion of the Valentine Creek Trail. I shared my thoughts, emphasizing that the proposed parking lot is approximately 0.55 miles from the trail and involves a steep grade with a 132-foot elevation change, making it unsuitable for most users. I also pointed out that disturbing rare, pristine forest land in Crownsville to accommodate a handful of kayakers each month is not worth the negative environmental impact. Furthermore, kayakers already have

access to the creek via existing trails, with parking available in both Arden and Herald Harbor. Smith's Marina can also serve kayakers and boaters. There are also several county-owned access points for kayaks, though nearby landowners have intentionally camouflaged these areas to make them appear private. One example is the access point at the end of Bargagni Trail, behind the firehouse in Herald Harbor. This access point can easily support all kayakers and would also support parking. However, it has been deliberately made to look like private property between two homes. It remains unclear what happens next. The representative from Parks and Recreation indicated that the project has already been funded by the county and is expected to come to a vote in 2026, with construction beginning in 2027. Please let me know the next steps the county will take and when constituents will have another opportunity to have input.

50. Rich Stevens: Will the comments from the meeting on 10/22 be posted? Where and what is the timeline for posting comments regarding the Valentine Creek project? Will there be future well-advertised public meetings regarding this project and not just another meeting for stakeholders? It appears that the stakeholders have been apprised for years regarding this project, but little notice has been given to the general public. I would hope any future meetings would be better moderated. While I can sympathize with local residents being upset that their private free neighborhood park is becoming a public park, it should be kept in mind that this is a county park financed by taxes paid for by all county residents. If they wanted a private community park, of which there are many in the county, they could have purchased the land themselves. The constant interrupting, ridiculing, and loud booing of anyone who expressed the slightest support for this project was childish and embarrassing.
51. Jeff Knaub: I am against this access point. The environmental impacts and cost are excessive for the minimal benefit. The access would impact forested areas in the critical area which are better served as a buffer. The access would to a very shallow waterbody that is not able to be fished. There is no ability to provide access for kayaks, canoes, etc. The environmental impacts do not justify building this in my opinion.
52. Andrew Smith: With Anne Arundel county bordering 6 major rivers of the Chesapeake Bay and providing public boat ramps to only 2 of those rivers (Patapsco and West), I strongly support any action to improve public water access by any means in Anne Arundel County. One of the reasons we moved to AACo was to be closer to the water, only to find that accessing the water is disappointingly difficult in this area. A water access point on Valentine Creek would increase public participation with our most important local resource.
53. Cynthia Elliot: Please do not proceed with the Valentine Creek Water Access Trail. Preserving the pristine forest area should be the highest priority as we see more and more projects disturbing our area around Old Herald Harbor Road. We travel Old Herald Harbor Road for access to River Road and are concerned that this project would dramatically increase the existing hazards at the intersection with Valentine Creek Road. We understand that decision makers have not personally viewed this site and urge them to see how increased traffic turning onto Old Herald Harbor would present huge safety risks. We are also opposed to the costs of this project, which greatly outweigh its benefits and are being proposed at a time when there are much greater needs. We must avoid devoting resources to projects that are going to burden us all with escalating costs. Please help us preserve the Valentine Creek area and avoid the destruction and risks of the Valentine Creek project—which once undertaken cannot be undone.

54. Ben Mayock: I'm a kayaker who would like to see the proposed projects completed especially a new parking area and driveway, a new trail, a porta potty, kayak/canoe soft launch, and landscaping. Thank you
55. Yvonne Scoggins: I walk in the woods at Valentine Creek every morning and have for approximately 6 years. It is currently available to the public and can be found on the AllTrails website and app. People are riding the trails on mountain bikes, running, and walking their dogs. The public currently uses it. I understand that people would like access to water. According to the Maryland Public Water Access website, there are already 34 soft access locations in Anne Arundel County. Isn't it possible that the people requesting water access are not aware of what is already available to them? A kayaker who would like the woods developed into a park for a Kayak launch attended the public meeting and said it wasn't enough to have a 10-car parking lot; she wants the original plans for a 40-car parking lot. This indicates that she won't be happy with the current plans. The communities near the woods, who currently use them, won't be happy either.  This area of woods is lovely. It is the home of deer, wild turkey, owls, turtles, and muskrats. To change it would be sad. It would not be progress. Paving paradise to put up a parking lot. I will follow the local elections. I will not vote for anyone who supports this change. I will talk with my neighbors so they can be informed voters also.
56. Patrick Ellis: Another public water access point at Valentine Creek for kayaks and canoes would be a wonderful addition to Anne Arundel County's access to nature for all of it's residents. The county has installed similar parks around the county and it seems whenever residents were concerned the county did a great job at mitigating traffic and other potential issues. It also seems that many resident concerns end up being unfounded and they end up being the greatest beneficiaries of these types of parks. Furthermore, the land is already a park. Not making these improvements *would* likely lead to parking issues, unfamiliar patrons getting lost in their neighborhood, etc.
57. Robert Moore: Parking should be 30 to 40 spaces to avoid conflict with surrounding property owners. Car top kayak and canoe launch needs a narrow beach. Waterfront access should include public accessibility beyond the immediate property owners.
58. Tim Hang: Access to boat ramp is needed for recreational uses: Need parking at least 40 spaces; need port-a-potty; no gate; vehicle access to ramp.
59. Marilyn Cooper: Water access is important for everyone and teaches respect for the water.
60. Ralph Heimlich: PLEASE INCLUDE WATER ACCESS AT Valentine Park, with 40 parking spots (to avoid illegal parking damaging grass), a porta potty ( to avoid people peeing on the bushes), road passes nearer to the launch point, and avoid a locked gate, if possible. I kayak all over the Bay and this would only be the second public launch on the Severn River.
61. Julie Cain: Paddlers need 40 parking spots as per the original design. Dedicated parking will aliviate overflow parking in neighborhoods. We need ADA level accessibility via a vehicle access lane to the water with a drop off instead of only a footpath. Most local kayakers are seniors. We need a portapotty. There is no need for a gate - we are not a nuisance! Open the Severn River to the public! Only public water access point on the mid and upper Severn. Jonas Green Park is 6.5 miles downstream. The Tucker Street / Weems Creek boat ramp is 7.5 miles away7. Kayakers will set shuttle at Jonas Green or Tucker Street and paddle one way from Valentine Creek to those take-outs.The county bought Valentine Creek with Maryland Department of Natural Resources Program Open Space (POS) funds. Program Open Space

mandates public access.The public paid for Valentine Creek Park, the public must be able to use Valentine Creek Park.

62. Ricardo Stewart: As a local kayaker I would like to request the following : Can we have more parking spaces (40), a port-a-potty, access road to the water and provide a non-gate access?
63. Renee Riley-Adams: As a kayaker, I appreciate having access to the water so I can enjoy paddling on the Chesapeake Bay. At Valentine Creek, I would ask for having 40 parking spaces, a porta party, an ADA access point, and no gate. All kayakers I know are highly responsible.
64. Thomas Haas: Please stop this impending disaster and waste of precious funds.
65. Jeanne Pollard: As a senior citizen of Anne Arundel County, I'm appalled that our Politicians, and Dept. Of Rec & Parks Directors, would deny people with disabilities or the elderly access to all public parks. To ask for waivers or thinking that they could disregard the rights of these people without consequences regarding the ADA laws is unheard of and will not look good for any politician or County departmental Director. The dollars spent nowadays could be used in far better ways. For the County to waste the residents tax dollars on an area when there are other county water accessible parks (Spriggs farm park and Brewer Ponds) available within the area that would suit the needs of all county residents, young, elderly or disabled residents, the county could make them known to the general public at little expense The dollars the county saves, could be well spent on hiring more park rangers that could check on these parks more often and make sure that the Parks and surrounding areas are kept in good standing for all visitors and neighboring communities.
66. Nanette Steinle: I support public access to local rivers
67. Julie Smith: As a resident of Valentine Creek Drive, I am opposed to the development of the Valentine Creek Water Access Trail. When we purchased our home in 2018, we were captivated by the seclusion and natural landscape provided by VCD and Crownsville. It seemed almost impossible that undeveloped land still existed in central Anne Arundel County--and yet, we found it here! My children have spent their lives riding bikes, walking, and exploring the land around our home. Without sidewalks, much of our play and adventures happen in the street as we walk to the bus stop or ride bikes toward the trails. I am concerned with an increase in road traffic and safety, especially near the entrance at Old Herald Harbor Road. Our school bus stop is at the end of the road. Twice a day, we wait on the bus pad along Old Herald Harbor, watching residents of Valentine Creek and commercial traffic leave the community. With low visibility and vehicles on Old Herald Harbor driving above the recommended speed, drivers are forced to pull out quickly in an effort to minimize a crash. We have seen (and been in proximity) to near collisions. Increasing traffic into Valentine Creek before fixing this intersection will only increase this risk. My greatest concern lies in the increased development of the land. As I said before, we chose Crownsville because it felt like a wooded haven. We are now facing the development of two parks along Generals Highway and the construction of a small commercial center at the corner of Herald Harbor Road and Generals Highway. Many in the community don't see these as amenities, but as the destruction of green space and animal habitats. Continuing with the development of Valentine Creek Access Trail, while on a smaller scope than these other projects, is just another way we are taking from the land and creating a bigger impact that we can't take back.
68. Virginia Lamprecht: I am a kayaker and I'm requesting that full public access to Valentine Creek and the Severn River Including 40 parking spaces, access lanes that allow both boats and kayakers to unload, and an ungated entrance. As a long-term Maryland taxpayer and kayaker I

believe that we need more free public access to our waterways. I enjoy kayaking with a safety-conscious group of paddlers, and we would love to explore this wonderful area of Maryland more in depth in the future.

69. Lynne Rockenbauch: I support this proposed project. Access at Valentine Creek will open up the scenic and lesser trafficed upper Severn River. The residents currently have a monopoly on water access and will certainly fight hard to keep the public out. They will have to sacrifice very little (maybe a few more cars and a few more paddlers), but the public has orders of magnitude more to gain. Everyone benefits when the public becomes a shareholder in the natural resources of our county.
70. John Vitello: As a resident of Ann Arundel County, specifically Arden-on-the-Severn Community, for over 24 years, I strongly oppose the development of the Valentine Creek Water Access Trail, while I'm in favor of enhancing Brewer Pond for water access, for several reasons that I will now elaborate on. Environmentally, the Valentine Creek project would require clearing, grading, invasive species management, and road expansion, all of which would permanently fragment a pristine forest valued and used by the local community. Brewer Pond improvements to provide water access would require no tree clearing, grading, or disruptive construction, preserving habitat and minimizing ecological risk. Socially, Valentine Creek is adjacent to a long-established, family-oriented neighborhood where safety and quality of life would be permanently compromised. In addition, the Arden Community regularly uses Valentine Creek for bird watching, hiking, wild foraging, and communing with nature in a pristine environment; all of which would be severely damaged with the proposed project. In contrast, Brewer Pond is designated as part of the Severn River Water Trail, making it an ideal site for small-scale, non-vessel access. Improving it would restore true public access, rather than burden one small neighborhood, as would happen with the Valentine Creek project. Regarding safety, Old Herald Harbor Road has a tragic accident history, and Valentine Creek Drive is unsafe for overflow traffic. Introducing additional park traffic onto this corridor would exacerbate risks along an already fragile and hazardous roadway. In contrast, Brewer Pond provides flat, short access, 0.21 miles from parking to kayak landing, and offers a defined right-of-way entrance and space for small, contained parking, removing substantial risk involved with developing Valentine Creek. Fiscally, Brewer Pond can be enhanced for around $30,000, according to July 2025 estimates. In contrast, estimates to develop Valentine Creek were in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, all tax payer money. In conclusion, it just makes good sense when viewing all of these criteria, to develop Brewer Pond rather than Valentine Creek for water access.
71. Gabriela Wikar: Public water access at Valentine Creek should include 1) 40 parking spots as originally planned 2) a vehicle access lane to the water with an unloading area so kayak anglers can use Valentine Creek and for ADA access 3) a portapotty 4) No gate - the expensive electronic gate proposed by Rec & Parks discourages public use and builds in a flawed permanent undercount of actual park use.
72. Randi Krugar: Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the planning phase of the new public water access point at Valentine Creek on the Severn. I am the Maryland State Director for the American Canoe Association. The ACA has pursued a 145 year mission of advocacy for people using human powered craft. Many kinds of craft fall into this category, from paddle boards to wide sit-on-top kayaks that can be pedaled. The ACA actively works in the areas of policy and stewardship, as well as education and competition. Water access for ALL people is the heart of our mission. Simple steps can allow anyone to get on the water; effective planning

must be a primary goal. Every year I ask my constituents, the people of Maryland, what their largest issue is; what would they like me to work on? Invariably they come back with “water access. ” Our state is a water wonderland and yet we have relatively few access points for the public. Valentine Creek would be an amazing asset. Its location on the Severn River opens the mid and upper Severn to the paddling public. The nearest public water access point on the Severn is 6.5 miles downstream at Jonas Green Park. Paddlers who launch at Valentine Creek will be able to explore the sheltered upper Severn and the other creeks around Valentine Creek. A vehicle access lane to the water with a waterfront unloading area is necessary for any well-planned car-top launch. For example, fishing craft are heavy; the long carry from the parking area would create a genuine barrier. A long carry would also present difficulties for the less-able, the elderly, and those who need a bit of accommodation. A vehicle access lane is necessary for this to be an effective car-top launch. Careful consideration must also be given to parking and sanitation. The original plan called for forty spots. This is an adequate number. Cutting the number of spaces down to ten will prevent usage to the point of “barely an option.” Additionally, any area that is meant to serve the public needs some form of sanitation. A simple Porta-Potty will do the trick. Updated parking and sanitation must be a part of this plan. I understand that a gate is being considered for this project. Having dealt with gated parks here in Maryland I have often observed that they provide no meaningful security while creating a significant barrier to entry for the less-able. They are an expense and hassle no one needs. Human powered craft serve a wide variety of people. Every form of human powered craft and the people who use them will benefit from Valentine Creek. If the Pandemic taught us anything, it is that people need to get outdoors to enjoy the freedom that has brought so many people joy and health. Please, let us put this park into use, and allow the people of Maryland access to their waters.

73. Chris Wright: Voicing strong advocacy for Option C boat ramp, soft ramp at Valentine Creek. Public water access that includes turnaround and vehicle access to water edge is desperately needed on the Severn River in this area. We vote no to gates and gate code access as this is not public access friendly. We vote IN FAVOR of option C that includes trailer and regular parking for a total of 40 cars with turnaround. This is the bare minimum of public water access elements for ADA to use the public access, adults age 50+ and those with Anne Arundel county residents with small children to enjoy the public access. The Severn River is unique in that it is a large protected water way that can be enjoyed despite adverse wind or weather by crafts of all sizes. It is also unique in that it offers a year round draw for water enthusiasts, wildlife viewing and is the only legitimate all winter long catch and release angling opportunity due to the uber robust population of chain pickerel that are best targeted during the winter months. The boat ramp access is needed in this location to the severn as it is often too windy for small craft to safely travel to the protected severn River waters. It is also too far from other public water access for many to paddle to this protected area from far away access points. All of the residents of Anne Arundel county bare added costs, taxes to pretty much everything done around here as there is always extra care needed to minimize negative impacts on the SHARED natural resources such as the severn river and Chesapeake bay. The lack of robust public access to the Severn River like Option C is an appalling social injustice that needs to be rectified immediately. Thank you for your consideration to our commentary on this project.

74. James Billings: Require a county paid permit to use. The county taxes waterfront owners heavily. Water users should have to pay. Also would stop non county residents from using. More use is more pollution and first responder utilization.
75. Rebekah Mcwain: The logistics of this plan present significant challenges. If there's any uncertainty about the feasibility, I'd be happy to guide you on a hike to demonstrate the practical considerations.
76. Richard MacDonald: I support adding water access at Valentine Creek.Access at Valentine Creek will open up the scenic and the lesser trafficked upper Severn River. The residents currently have a monopoly on water access and will certainly fight hard to keep the public out. They will have to sacrifice very little (maybe a few more cars and a few more paddlers), but the public has orders of magnitude more to gain. Everyone benefits when the public becomes a shareholder in the natural resources of our county. Thank You.
77. Daniel Einhaus: I respectfully urge the County to establish a public water access point to the upper Severn River. At present, this portion of the river is largely inaccessible to the general public, effectively limiting use to those who own waterfront property. Creating a public launch would ensure that all taxpaying residents have equitable access to the recreational and environmental benefits of our Chesapeake Bay tributaries. The Severn River is a shared public resource, and its enjoyment should not be restricted to the relatively few waterside homeowners. I respect their privacy as homeowners, but the water is a public resource that are present is not publicly accessible. I encourage the County to provide a facility with sufficient capacity—ample parking and broad operating hours—to meaningfully serve other county residents and promote responsible outdoor recreation.
78. Hil Yeskey: This site is one of the most ill suited for water access the County could have found. An investigation into who purchased and who suggested this project should be conducted. This project would create an environmental disaster and cost millions. ed
79. Brenda Decker: Please open access to the Severn River, with 40 parking areas. The area is so beautiful and should be accessible to everyone!!
80. Nat Wood: I'm writing in support of water access & a portapotty at Valentine Creek. AA County needs more access for paddlers, who, as a group, are quiet & respectful of others. Water access is part of what makes AA County special and we need more of it.
81. Palmer Salisbury: As an avid kayaker, I am disappointed that there are so few public access places from which to launch a kayak onto AA County waters. I understand AA County has approximately 530 miles of waterfront. Unfortunately the County has only a mere handful of public access points affording county residents the opportunity to get out on the water and appreciate the beauty of our river waters and the Bay. A public water access point on Valentine Creek would allow water enthusiasts (paddlers) access to the middle and northern portions of the Severn River. As a longtime County Resident I have been paying to preserve the heritage of our waters and the Bay. What better way to instill a lifetime appreciation of our water heritage than to encourage and allow residents the opportunity to enjoy the waters firsthand. Please establish a public cartop kayak/canoe/paddleboard launch site on Valentine Creek, with adequate vehicle parking and close water access. Thank you for your consideration.
82. Kim Kjerulf: Please provide the 40 parking spots as originally planned; a vehicle access lane to the water with an unloading area so kayak anglers can use Valentine Creek and for ADA access; a portapotty; and NO GATE - the expensive electronic gate proposed by Rec & Parks discourages public use and builds in a flawed permanent undercount of actual park use. We

need more public access to water. This area is so much closer than any other area for public access to our waterways. Such a shame we have to fight so much for water access.

83. Jan h Hejl: This is a bad idea for many reasons. Negative impacts on the environment and wildlife. a SMALL community where access would stem from would be does not have roadway to support additional traffic Impacts on private community beaches on the creek where kayakers would naturally beach equipment for a break Sediment from steep slopes that the county executive visit and provided assurances to the communities would not be impacted. There are other locations that are free or relatively nominal fees with better infrastructure
84. Gary Habicht: As a kayaker, I have found that unless you know someone in the community, it is almost impossible to find a place to launch a kayak in the quieter part of the Severn. We pay a lot in county taxes and should be able to get better access to launching facilities. A kayak launch is not going to bring in undesirable elements to the community.
85. James Houck: Fully opposed to the concept of developing the parcel into any means of public facility/access. Yes, I do hike the woods of this parcel. Yes, I do kayak this backwater often (I bought into a community—Herald Harbor— with access nearly 20 yrs ago). The mean low water in the proposed area is maybe 18 inches, which completely eliminates a launch facility for motorized vessels. A soft launch for kayaks would also disturb the natural habitat of this pristine area. I have seen yellow perch spawn in these grounds firsthand, most notably during the past five winters. This is akin to the protected Severn Run grounds upriver. I will let others within the Valentine Creek neighborhood, through which this proposal would directly disturb, comment on how the public traffic and development would negatively affect their neighborhood.
86. Dean Hovell: The road down the middle of that neighborhood is very narrow. It is a quiet, off the beaten path community with NO access to Valentine Creek. The cliff at the end of the road that leads to Valentine Creek is very steep and difficult. This has to be one of the stupidest ideas ever from the county. Of all the places to access the water, why not pick something easier, like in the Downs? Or Arlington Echo Outdoor Educational Center or anyplace in Section 5 of the Arden neighborhood off of Echo Cove Drive. Valentine Creek Drive will require a huge infrastructure build out through a neighborhood that is just minding its own business. This is just a silly idea.
87. Matthew Nudell: I'm commenting in strong support of public water access at Valentine Creek. The scenic upper Severn is essentially closed to public access to paddlers, as the next public access point is miles downriver. I strongly advocate for a robust access option at Valentine Creek, with a multitude of parking (to alleviate any conflicts with neighborhood parking), easy access for cartop load/unload and ADA access, good infrastructure to keep the access point clean (trash, port-a-potty), and 24-hour open access so kayak/canoe anglers can utilize before dawn or after twilight. The Severn River is a public waterway, and access to it shouldn't be controlled solely by wealthy homeowners with waterfront property!
88. Valerie Wampler: My name is Valerie Wampler, and I have lived on Valentine Creek Drive for 26 years, raising two children here. I love our neighborhood. It's quiet, close-knit, and full of families who look out for one another. I also appreciate the value that parks bring to a community. However, I'm deeply concerned about the proposed park entrance at the end of Valentine Creek Drive. Our street is narrow, with no sidewalks and very limited room for cars to pass safely. Many children still live and play here riding bikes, walking dogs, and spending time outside. Adding a park access point at the end of the street would bring a constant flow of vehicles driven by people unfamiliar with our neighborhood's tight layout and active pedestrian activity,

creating a real safety risk for the children who live here. The intersection where Valentine Creek Drive meets the main road is also problematic. Visibility is poor, and traffic often moves quickly. Introducing park traffic, especially on weekends, would only increase the danger. There have already been accidents and several close calls, and many residents take extra precautions just to exit safely. Using existing infrastructure, such as the parking lot at Arden, seems like a much safer and more practical alternative. After more than two decades here, I've seen firsthand how much effort our neighbors put into keeping this street safe. A park entrance at the end of Valentine Creek Drive would undo much of that progress. I respectfully ask that the committee reconsider this location or at least evaluate safer access points and parking options before moving forward. We all want to see our community grow but we also want to ensure our children can continue to play safely where they live. If this plan moves forward, I would like to understand how the county plans to ensure our children's safety. I would like to know how this project will continue to insure the safety of our community and after attending the listening session I have concerns about the turn about and if EMS will have access to the turn around point when the park gate is closed. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

89. Terry Carnahan: I have similar concerns expressed by Mr. Pollard. Additionally, I am shocked and appalled that neither the county representatives nor the consultants had viewed or walked around the area for the project. As representatives, I would expect at a minimum that the site would be visited to gain a perspective on accessibility and the amount of work as well as the environmental disturbance involved. Further, the consultants should have considered the issues surfaced by Mr. Pollard regarding safety, accessibility, environmental impact, and traffic. These risks should be heavily weighed with other option's considered, in addition to the increased cost, in formulating recommendations.
90. Emily Shaw: I am a paddleboard who lives nearby and I strongly support having public water access at Valentine Creek. There is so little public access for a car, top kayaks and paddle boards in Arundel County. And most places we have to contend with power boats, so a project like this would be so very valuable, and paddle boards and kayaks have very little impact on nature or the surrounding area and would not hurt the community.
91. Graham Scarbro: I am writing to express my opposition to the plan to develop the Valentine Creek Park site. This site represents an inequitable, environmentally damaging, and economically irresponsible plan for public water access and better sites, such as Brewer's Pond or Arlington Echo are available. The site is steep and difficult terrain and represents a significant open space uninterrupted by development. This natural habitat, once gone, will be gone forever, replaced by an non-ADA compliant park in a single-lane neighborhood available only to dedicated kayakers. Other residents have ably highlighted the specific problems with the county's current plan to develop the site. I would like to add that, as a member of the Council-confirmed Stakeholder Advisory Committee, responsible for outlining a vision for Region 6 in accordance with the county's Plan 2040, Valentine Creek flies in the face of the plan's stated goals: Green, Smart, and Equitable. Additionally, the Region 6 SAC declared its goal of seeing the natural beauty and resources of the region preserved and its character maintained. Our vision statement was that our region "protects, enjoys and enhances its natural areas, trail network, and historic crossroads community." Protecting our natural areas was listed first by design: we must first preserve for future generations the environment of our county, while seeking out smart ways to provide resources for county residents. The current Valentine Creek fails at both of these tasks. Our draft region plan also lists measures to protect the environment,

including steep slopes, specimen trees, and the critical area, which would limit the use and development of the site. During our SAC process, we found that "Residents strongly support environmental and wetland conservation efforts in the Region, from preserving land within the Green Infrastructure network to promoting restoration initiatives. A number of residents discussed the value of passive recreation opportunities in the Region..." These findings by OPZ and printed in our draft region plan describe the current situation at Valentine Creek, and would be undercut by developing the site. During meetings with Parks and Rec as part of the SAC process, I, along with other representatives, expressed our opposition to Valentine Creek Park. As representatives of our community, we felt that developing Valentine Creek would be a tremendous waste of the County's natural and financial resources. Pursuing the current plan to develop Valentine Creek is a mistake. A fraction of the resources deployed at Brewer Pond or Arlington Echo would provide the water access so many county residents desire at a fraction of the cost and environmental destruction that the Valentine Creek project would require. Valentine Creek is the quintessential example of not needing to do something simply because it can be done. The project would quickly cost the County more than it bargained for in time, money, and damage to our environment, without the benefits to county residents that County leadership seeks to provide.

92. Irene Sotiropoulos: I spoke at the public meeting on October 23rd in opposition to the proposed improvements to the Valentine Creek Trail, and I would like to reiterate and expand upon my comments for the record. The proposed project— including a new parking lot, switchback trails, and a kayak “slide”—would have a severe environmental impact on what remains one of the few underdeveloped natural areas in Crownsville. I am back there running/walking those trails almost every day since 1999. This area is a gem, and one of the wonderful things about living in Crownsville. The existing trails are already easily accessible to anyone who wishes to use them, and people do use them. The area is beautiful, quiet, and full of native flora and fauna. When it became clear through the orange/pink tape everywhere and the marking stakes that the county was moving forward with a plan to significantly "improve" the area, I became alarmed. According to my mapping application, the distance from the proposed parking lot to the “beach” area is approximately 0.55 miles as the crow flies. This does not include the switchbacks, which would necessarily increase the walking distance and the overall environmental footprint. Obviously, switchbacks take up more square area than straight-line trails. Furthermore, the elevation difference between the proposed parking lot and the beach is 133 feet—representing a steep and uneven grade, rather than a gradual slope. This is why the firm tasked with planning the site has proposed those switchbacks, which would further expand the area of tree, brush, and foliage removal. Additionally, the firm has also proposed a kayak "shute" or "luge" near the soft launch site. (This was mentioned at the meeting on October 23, though it was the first I heard of it) Again, the need for all of this additional infrastructure highlights the challenging terrain, and I can imagine the number of trees that would have to be removed to accommodate this kayak chute. I remain unconvinced of the purpose or need for this development. Only a few hardy kayakers would likely use such a launch—and, in fact, they already can. The current trails allow for access, though the steepness and distance understandably discourage regular use. Moreover, there are multiple existing and far more practical public access points for kayaks nearby, including Smith’s Marina, several sites in Herald Harbor, and most notably, the soft launch at the end of Bargagni Road behind the Herald Harbor Firehouse. Unfortunately, the two adjacent homeowners have gone to great lengths to make that area appear private, which is

inappropriate given its public status.For all of these reasons, I strongly urge the County not to proceed with the proposed Valentine Creek Trail expansion. It would bring unnecessary disruption to a rare and valuable undeveloped landscape without delivering meaningful community benefit.

93. Giovanni Busacca: Please provide paddlers with public access to the upper Severn River
94. Brian Cleary: Please consider allowing for stand up paddle boards to launch at Valentine Creek. There are zero launch sites available in this part of the Severn River.
    Thanks
95. Please consider allowing for stand up paddle boards to launch at Valentine Creek. There are zero launch sites available in this part of the Severn River.
    Thanks
96. Kathryn Handy: I am a lifelong resident of Anne Arundel County who has spent decades enjoying and respecting the Chesapeake Bay and its many waterways. I am also a current resident of the Valentine Creek community, where my family and I have chosen to live because of its quiet character, natural beauty, and safe environment. As someone deeply connected to this area both as a boater and a community member, I feel compelled to share my serious concerns about the proposed development project and its long-term impact on our neighborhood and the surrounding environment. The proposed Valentine Creek Water Access Project presents substantial and unresolved concerns regarding safety, traffic, environmental preservation, and feasibility. Based on stakeholder meeting information, community input, and firsthand neighborhood realities, I remain firmly opposed to the project. It is evident that there is a severe lack of concern for the residents of the Valentine Creek community in both the design and communication of this project. The county has repeatedly downplayed or dismissed legitimate safety, parking, and environmental concerns raised by neighbors, prioritizing the concept of “public access” over the lived realities of those who actually call this area home. By moving forward without meaningful solutions to address traffic hazards, parking overflow, and the disruption of a family-oriented neighborhood, the proposal demonstrates a disregard for the safety, security, and well-being of the very community most directly impacted.
    a. Parking Overflow and Traffic Safety: Overflow Parking is Inevitable: Even with a reduction to 10 designated spaces and electronic gate controls, there is no enforceable plan to prevent excess visitors from parking along Valentine Creek Drive. The County’s suggestion that this is simply a “public road” ignores the street’s narrowness, lack of sidewalks, and soft shoulders. Regardless if there is a reservation system, this will not prevent others from simply showing up and parking along the roadside and walking in.
    b. Roadway Hazards: Roadside parking would block emergency vehicles, trash trucks, and residents attempting to tow boats or trailers. Residents already experience this during events and estate sales, where yards are damaged and roads are impassable. Parking along the roadside, which will inevitably happen, limits vehicle passage causing safety concerns for drivers and pedestrians alike. Currently the width of Valentine Creek Drive is 18-20’. The proposed roadway for the project is stated to be 24’. If that is the standard, then how can Valentine Creek Drive, which is only 18–20 feet wide, be considered safe, especially with the expected increase in traffic.
    c. Children at Risk: Valentine Creek Drive is heavily used by children walking, biking, and playing. Additional cars increase the likelihood of accidents. Parents chose this secluded neighborhood specifically for safety, which the project directly undermines.

d. Dangerous Roads Already Exist: The intersection of Old Herald Harbor Road and Valentine Creek Drive is already a very dangerous intersection due to limited visibility. Adding more traffic from visitors unfamiliar with the road will make an already hazardous situation far worse.
e. Traffic Safety: Traffic safety in our neighborhood is already a serious issue. The current speed limit of 30 miles per hour is far too high for such a narrow, residential road, and there are no speed bumps or other calming measures to slow drivers down. We already deal with frequent speeding problems, which endanger children, pedestrians, and wildlife. Adding more traffic from this project would only make the situation worse. Furthermore, there are no sidewalks anywhere along Valentine Creek Road, forcing residents, including children, to walk directly in the roadway, which significantly increases the risk of accidents and injuries.
f. The County has failed to:
    i. Provide an enforceable solution to overflow parking, relying instead on unenforceable assumptions about electronic gates and reservations.
    ii. Address the roadway hazard created by roadside parking, which would obstruct emergency vehicles, trash trucks, and residents towing boats.
    iii. Resolve contradictions between roadway standards: if 24 feet is required for safe passage, Valentine Creek Drive's current 18–20 feet is already unsafe, yet no corrective plan has been provided.
    iv. Consider the risks to children and pedestrians who use the road daily in a neighborhood with no sidewalks or speed calming measures.
    v. Mitigate hazards at the dangerous intersection of Old Herald Harbor Road and Valentine Creek Drive, which will only worsen with added traffic.
g. Safety and Security Concerns
    i. Strangers in a Family-Oriented Area: Increased traffic will bring an influx of visitors unfamiliar to the neighborhood, raising concerns about theft, trespassing, and safety for all.
    ii. Crime Potential: The county has not provided any data or assurances regarding potential crime increases. There is no clarity on how risks will be mitigated before moving forward with such a disruptive plan.
    iii. Porta-Potties: Another major concern is the proposed placement of porta-potties. Their presence also raises safety concerns, as unattended facilities may invite loitering or inappropriate use. We have already observed individuals who appear to be living in the woods near Valentine Creek, and the installation of porta-potties will likely exacerbate this situation by encouraging further encampments. This proposal again reflects a lack of consideration for the residents of Valentine Creek, who did not choose to live next to what could effectively become a public rest stop.
h. The County has failed to:
    i. Provide a credible plan to mitigate the increased risk of crime, trespassing, and theft from unfamiliar visitors in a family-oriented neighborhood.
    ii. Offer data, assessments, or a strategy to monitor crime potential linked to the project.

iii. Address the risks posed by porta-potties—from sanitation and odors to misuse, loitering, or encampments—despite community objections.

i. Impracticality of Water Access
    i. 2,200-Foot Path to Pier: Asking users to carry kayaks, paddleboards, or fishing equipment over a half-mile round trip, much of it uphill on the return, is simply unrealistic.
    ii. Kayak Slide Feasibility: The “kayak slide” concept has not been explained in detail. The notion of a slide is simply not user friendly nor will it be helpful. Additionally, the concept of a dedicated kayak rack or “self-service” kayak usage/rentals is unrealistic. Who will manage this? If there is a rental, where do these proceeds go?
    iii. Who Are “Dedicated Kayakers”? At the meeting, planners suggested the project would serve “dedicated kayakers.”
j. This is troubling for several reasons:
    i. The county does not define what qualifies someone as a “dedicated kayaker,” nor do I believe they are capable.
    ii. Serious kayakers typically seek direct water access, adequate parking, and safe launch points, not a 2,200-foot uphill trek.
    iii. By targeting only a niche group, the county essentially admits the project will not serve the broader public as promised.
    iv. No Real Improvement in Water Access: Practical, accessible launches already exist at nearby marinas (e.g., Smith’s Marina), which provide far safer and more functional facilities. This project does not expand meaningful access, but rather creates a symbolic pier that will see minimal real use. The identification of the land near the water a “beach” is absurd, there is no usable space here for meaningful usage.
k. A Boater’s Perspective: As a lifelong boater and kayaker, I strongly believe this project does not represent a viable or effective solution to Maryland’s water access challenges. I fully recognize that access to waterways is limited across the state, and I support thoughtful efforts to expand it. However, this proposal does not address the real needs of those who actually use Maryland’s waterways for recreation. Dragging a kayak or paddleboard more than 2,000 feet through uneven terrain is impractical, unsafe, and entirely inconsistent with how responsible boating and paddling activities occur. There are far better ways to provide safe, appropriate, and meaningful water access, such as through improved launch facilities, partnerships with existing marinas, or smaller, better-situated access points. This project, in its current form, is not the solution but promotes a “solution” that fails the very people it claims to serve.
l. Environmental and Wildlife Concerns
m. Impact to Waterways: The addition of a park at Valentine Creek poses significant environmental risks that extend beyond the immediate area. Increased human activity will introduce runoff containing trash, fertilizers, and other pollutants directly into Valentine Creek. Even small increases in stormwater contaminants or soil disruption can alter the fragile balance of this tidal tributary.
n. Because Valentine Creek feeds into the Severn River and ultimately the Chesapeake Bay, any contamination here will not remain localized. Nutrient loading, sedimentation,

and bacterial contamination can contribute to algae blooms, fish kills, and declining water quality downstream. Increased erosion from foot traffic, parking areas, and potential restroom facilities will only accelerate these problems.

o. Protecting Valentine Creek means protecting the Severn River and the Chesapeake Bay. Introducing a high-traffic recreational site in this sensitive watershed risks degrading the natural ecosystem, threatening aquatic life, and diminishing the long-term health of one of our region's most vital waterways.
p. Threats to Wildlife: Increased traffic will lead to more turtle fatalities, as already documented by residents, and disrupt habitats for blue herons and bald eagles.
q. Irreversible Loss: Once the woods are cleared, stormwater redirected, and traffic increased, the environmental and community character will be permanently altered.
r. Porta-Potties: The addition of portable restrooms in this secluded residential neighborhood poses serious health, sanitation, and quality-of-life issues. Without constant monitoring and upkeep, porta-potties quickly become unsanitary, attract pests, and create odors that will negatively impact nearby homes. Placing one at the parking area or near the water, as the county as proposed, would introduce unnecessary health risks and diminish the natural character of the neighborhood and waterfront, not to mention attract individuals who make the woods their home and individuals looking to cause destruction of property.
s. The County has failed to:
    i. Provide adequate environmental studies or solutions to prevent runoff, pollution, and erosion that will flow from Valentine Creek into the Severn River and Chesapeake Bay.
    ii. Consider the cumulative impact of stormwater, sedimentation, and nutrient loading on fragile aquatic ecosystems.
    iii. Protect critical habitats, ignoring resident reports of turtle fatalities, bald eagle activity, and blue heron populations.
    iv. Recognize that the environmental loss will be irreversible once land is cleared and traffic introduced.
    v. Mitigate the environmental and public health concerns linked to porta-potties, which risk contamination and degradation of neighborhood quality of life.
t. Cost–Benefit Reality
    i. High Costs, Low Returns: Without strong evidence of usage demand, it is unlikely that the benefits of this project justify its costs in construction, enforcement, and maintenance.
    ii. Better Alternatives Ignored: Smaller-scale, dispersed access points or easements through existing associations could expand access with far less disruption. These options deserve formal study before any single, high-impact project proceeds.
u. The County has failed to:
    i. Demonstrate that the project's costs (construction, enforcement, long-term maintenance) are justified by any proven benefit or demand.
    ii. Explore or present lower-impact alternatives such as small-scale access points, marina partnerships, or dispersed sites.

iii. Justify why less disruptive, more practical options have not been studied before pursuing this single high-impact plan.

v. In closing, I urge Anne Arundel County Recreation & Parks to reconsider this project in its current form. While I understand and respect the County's desire to expand water access, this proposal does not meaningfully achieve that goal and instead places unnecessary burdens and risks on the Valentine Creek and surrounding communities. It is unsafe, invites dangerous overflow parking, undermines neighborhood security, and does not realistically improve public water access. Instead, it targets an undefined demographic while ignoring the needs of the broader community and the safety of residents. I hope you will give serious consideration to the safety, environmental, and quality-of-life concerns raised by myself and other key stakeholders. Thank you for your time and for the opportunity to provide input on this important issue.

97. William Moulden: The following comments and attachment are in reference to the recent meeting held on October 23, 2025 regarding the Valentine Creek Water Access Trail. At this meeting alternative sites were discussed, reference comments made at the meeting and current comments being made at this website. It is being proposed that the Brewer Pond Natural Area be used as an alternate site to Valentine Creek. This is not feasible and would be illegal. The Brewer Pond Natural Area is a wildlife sanctuary. It is protected via multiple conservation easements held by the Maryland Environmental Trust and the Scenic Rivers Land Trust. This property was specifically purchased through Program Open Space to preserve the last remaining pristine riparian forest on the Severn River with a complete ecosystem. The area is listed in dozens of Chesapeake & Anne Arundel County listings as a high priority area of conservation. At present, near countless forest interior dwelling species inhabit this last remaining pristine forest on the Severn, more than a dozen listed as either endangered, threatened, or in need of conservation. Converting the Brewer Pond Natural area from a wildlife sanctuary to an active public park would destroy this wildlife sensitive area and would break several conservation easements that specifically bar the use of the area as a public park. Additionally, there is no road access to this wildlife sanctuary. The 1.5 mile road leading to the park is a private road that is gated. Public access is not permitted. The comments made at this public hearing, along with the comments being submitted to you now on the Brewer Pond Natural Area being an alternate to the proposed Valentine Creek Water Access Park should be dismissed. This site is not an alternate to the Valentine Creek Water Access Park for the good merits shown here and verified through the current deeds, easements, and conservation records held by Anne Arundel County serving to protect this wildlife sanctuary- in perpetuity. Attached is a legal memorandum of this natural area and the protections that prevent its conversion to a public park. (Hyatt & Weber, 10.29.2025)
98. John Rentch: As an avid kayak fisherman, public access to Severn River creeks are slim. Please develop this area and make it available to county tax payers.
99. Kimberly Franklin: I oppose this project proposal primarily due to the FACT that the cost and environmental impact do not justify the proposed (limited) use by the public. This property, although purchased without due diligence by AACo with POS funding, is already open and accessible to the public and is ideal to remain as a nature/walking trail with access to Valentine Creek. The County has acknowledged that the use with the proposed Concept D plan would be limited to the most zealous and dedicated kayakers because of the distance proposed from the parking area to the water access point for transporting a vessel. It seems unreasonable to

propose such a project with that limited of use that would most definitely cause detrimental effects to the ecosystem of Valentine Creek and its woods, and added traffic causing safety concerns for the community of Valentine Creek. The County should reconsider waterway access through the County-owned road being Bargagni Road in Herald Harbor where the infrastructure exists for a more useful access point for the public with much less environmental and safety concerns. This actually makes much more sense and should not be dismissed or overlooked by the County as an alternate waterway access project. Some miner improvements could be made to the trails in the existing Valentine Creek Park, without disturbing the ecosystem or removing trees in the critical area in topography with steep slopes only to create more run-off and pollution into the tranquil Valentine Creek. A pier placement in the proposed plan is a terrible idea that would result in the need to dredge the creek for construction access.

100. Stephanie Wilding: I have several comments concerning developing Valentine Creek for public access area. I have lived in Arden for 40 years and I hike the trails on Valentine Creek frequently. I access the trails thru Arden and it is a beautiful area to explore. It is good for passive walking or biking -- I do not want to see specimen trees removed, a paved parking lot and creating trails on steep slopes to accommodate kayaks. The trails for Valentine Creek are on the AllTrails app and I have met people out of town who use these trails. This is a great app to use when you are not familiar with the trails and do not want to get lost. They have no problem obtaining a passive access to these trails. I agree with all the comments concerning the environmental impact this would have on this beautiful forest and will not elaborate further on them. I am concerned about the traffic to the neighborhood of Valentine Creek. It would be remiss of you to ignore these comments and then have a serious accident occur there. I feel the county has not fully investigating using other access points. I still feel Snodgrass Road or Bishop Trail should be looked at more closely. The cost of the county purchasing areas for a parking lot and/or extending Bishop Trail would be more feasible for Kayak Access. It may even be less expensive than the current plan. Also, Brewers Pond was also mentioned which would be a good match. We frequently have severe storms that cause these huge trees to come down. The maintenance of tree removal over the trails will need to be considered in the expense in maintaining these trails. For Hikers, we can always find ways around a downfallen tree, hauling a kayak would be impossible. The planned access is not at all comparable to Spriggs Farm that has no steep slope disturbance. BTW – I grew up in Bayberry-on-the-Magothy so I am very familiar with that neighborhood and the development of the property.

101. Christine DeAngelis: Concern for traffic safety

102. Glen Pollard: As a follow-up to our previous correspondence and the October 23 public meeting, we wanted to share several serious concerns about how the Valentine Creek Concept D2 project has been handled to date. From our perspective as long-time residents of Valentine Creek Drive, the County's process appears to have overlooked critical safety, environmental, and procedural safeguards while excluding meaningful input from the community most directly affected. These issues, taken together, illustrate why residents like us have been asking for genuine, ongoing involvement in the planning process—not as an obstacle, but to ensure that projects are developed responsibly and with transparency.

    a. Lack of Site Familiarity and Procedural Oversight: During the October 23 public meeting, when residents asked whether County representatives had visited the Valentine Creek site before the meeting, only one hand was raised among the five County representatives and project consultants present. Those listed on page 3 of the County's

presentation include Ms. Harlinski, Ms. Mathews, Mr. Bruchey, Ms. Megan Batniea (Senior Project Manager - Bayland Consultants), Ms. Alison Woodfield (Chief, Natural & Cultural Resources), and Ms. Jessica Hardy (Superintendent, Resource Conservation and Protection)—although Ms. Hardy was not in attendance that evening. Given that the property contains 15–40 % slopes, tidal wetlands, and extensive forested buffers, it's difficult to understand how the County could present Concept D2 as a viable plan without firsthand familiarity with these on-site challenges. We respectfully ask whether all representatives listed on page 3 have personally visited the site—either before or since the public meeting—to fully evaluate the terrain and environmental conditions being discussed. If that has not yet occurred, we would be more than happy to help coordinate a brief site visit with representatives from our community association to walk through the key environmental and access constraints together. We believe such a visit could be productive and help ensure all parties share the same understanding of the site's realities.

b. 2. Contradictions in the County's Own Statements: During the meeting (Slide 5, minute 3 of audio recording of the meeting posted online), Ms. Mathews stated that the property was purchased using Program Open Space funds and that "the property must be open for public access." She then immediately added that "right now it's being used by the local communities for passive recreation and nature exploration." If the property is already open and actively used for recreation, then it already meets the Program Open Space criteria for public access. Why, then, is additional disturbance needed? Further, Ms. Mathews referenced the County's 2022 Long Range Plan identifying increased demand for water access, beach swimming, and hard-top watercraft. Yet she also confirmed during the September 19 stakeholder meeting that Valentine Creek "is not a swimming beach." If this is not a swimming site and already provides passive recreation, then expanding into the woods appears inconsistent with both the data and the County's own descriptions.
c. Absence of a County-Led Traffic Study: At that same meeting, County staff confirmed that no traffic study has been conducted, explaining that "it would have to warrant 50 trips per day, and we don't think this project would reach that threshold." A County representative further stated: "Um, we also asked about speed humps because someone brought that up, and, um, speed humps, um, is not an option because it's a dead-end road. Um, Bureau of Highways also said that they are very happy to meet with the community to discuss a traffic study. Um, and he also said that 'We cannot do this. You guys have to initiate the traffic study.'" That exchange was troubling. It confirms that the County has not analyzed traffic safety, is not planning to, and has told residents they must initiate and fund a study themselves—for a County-led project.Meanwhile, residents have repeatedly raised concerns about the dangerous sightline on the south side of Old Herald Harbor Road, which also serves as a school bus stop. There have been fatalities on this corridor, and longtime residents recall County speed sensors clocking vehicles traveling as fast as 70 mph. Yet despite years of warnings, there has been no acknowledgment or plan from the County to address this hazard.
d. Cost Implications of Steep Slopes and ADA Compliance: The County's own 2022 feasibility study (4th written page in report but titled "Page 1") notes that "the site contains steep slopes with the majority of the land being 15–40 %." Constructing an

ADA-accessible trail within that terrain will require extensive grading, switchbacks, retaining structures, and railings. Based on prevailing construction costs in Anne Arundel County, such a 2,200-ft pathway could easily exceed $1.5–$3.5 million when accounting for environmental mitigation, stormwater design, and professional fees—an order of magnitude higher than the $30,000 improvement estimate in the 2025 Brewer Pond study. Even accepting the County's own estimate of only 20–30 daily visitors—its "high-end, worst-case scenario"—the cost per visitor would be extraordinarily high. Moreover, all of the planned recreational uses (fishing, hiking, bird watching, and mountain biking) already take place today under the current conditions, without the need to pave or disturb forested land. Given these conditions, we respectfully ask whether the County has prepared an updated engineering cost estimate and ADA feasibility analysis that accounts for slope profile, critical-area limitations, and Resource Conservation Area designation.

e. Comparison to Spriggs Farm Park: Spriggs Farm Park—repeatedly cited by County staff as a model—is not an appropriate analog:
    i. Roadway Width and Safety: The access road at Spriggs Farm measures approximately 28 ft wide and features multiple speed humps throughout the community. Valentine Creek Drive measures only 20 ft, has no sidewalks, and as Ms. Harlinski stated during the October 23 meeting, "speed humps are not an option because it's a dead-end road."
    ii. Topography: Spriggs Farm has no steep slopes between its entrance and shoreline; Valentine Creek's access corridor contains sustained grades of 15–40 %, presenting far greater erosion, stormwater, and accessibility challenges.
    iii. Infrastructure: Spriggs Farm has no paved or pervious-paver trails—only compacted soil and native grassland—while Valentine Creek would require extensive paved and pervious surfaces, exponentially increasing cost and disturbance.
    iv. Parking: Contrary to the "nine-space" figure cited at the meeting, Spriggs Farm offers ample parking capacity with room for expansion—none of which exists within Valentine Creek's constrained, steeply sloped footprint.In light of these disparities, we ask that the Department publish the full comparative cost and design data used to justify Spriggs Farm as a reference site.

f. Fiscal and Environmental Accountability: Brewer Pond Natural Area—flat, 40 acres, already County-owned, and identified in the July 2025 Water Access Study as "requiring no tree clearing or grading"—could be improved for roughly $30,000 for basic amenities. For full transparency, even if Brewer Pond improvements were expanded to include ADA-compliant surfacing along its 0.21-mile (≈ 1,100 ft) access path, total cost would still remain modest. Based on standard unit costs for permeable-paver or asphalt ADA trails ($75–$125 per linear foot), the ADA component would add approximately $80,000–$140,000, placing total Brewer Pond enhancement in the $110,000–$170,000 range—still less than 10 percent of the likely cost of making Valentine Creek's 2,200-ft steep trail

ADA compliant. Given this, we again question whether the County's limited funds for water access might be far better directed toward a site like Brewer Pond—where accessibility, equity, and environmental stewardship all align.

g. A Flawed Process and the Need for Genuine Community Partnership: Taken together—the lack of site visits, contradictions in public statements, missing traffic study, unaddressed safety hazards, steep terrain, and potential ADA and environmental violations—this process has felt reactive and incomplete.
h. We have lived on Valentine Creek for over 14 years, and Glenn was born and raised in Anne Arundel County, where he has lived for more than 30. We have seen firsthand how our county has grown, and we care deeply about ensuring that progress happens in a way that respects the character, safety, and natural integrity of the communities that make this area special. This is not a partisan issue. Many of us, regardless of political affiliation, voted for County Executive Pittman and our current Councilmember. This is about sound planning, fiscal responsibility, and environmental integrity for all Anne Arundel County residents and taxpayers. The County's handling of Concept D2 underscores why the community must be given a real seat at the table going forward. Residents are not asking to slow progress—we're asking to help shape it responsibly.
i. Requested Actions
    i. Confirm whether all County representatives listed on page 3 of the presentation have personally visited the site before or since October 23.
    ii. Commit to conducting an independent traffic study, particularly for Old Herald Harbor Road and the Valentine Creek Drive intersection.
    iii. Provide clarification on whether an ADA waiver or specimen tree removal is being considered.
    iv. Publish comparative cost and design data for Spriggs Farm and Valentine Creek.
    v. Extend the public comment period by one week, given the delay in posting materials and the lack of official minutes.
    vi. Ensure meaningful community representation in all future planning and feasibility discussions.
j. Thank you for your time and attention. We remain hopeful that, by engaging residents more directly, the County can achieve a plan that aligns with both its public access goals and its commitments to safety, fiscal responsibility, and environmental stewardship. We would also welcome the opportunity to arrange a site visit with your teams to ensure all parties share the same understanding of the site's unique terrain and community context.

103. Tracey Nosal: NO. To the Valentine Creek Water Access Trail.

104. Ray Scurr: Please support the new public water access at Valentine creek on the Severn. Valentine Creek opens up the mid and upper Severn River to the public. The nearest public water access point is 6.5 miles downstream at Jonas Greene Park. Stand-up paddleboarders, kayakers, canoeists, kayak anglers and shore anglers will use Valentine Creek, if this location is made public water access. Ideally there would be development support for :1) 40 parking spots as originally planned, 2) a vehicle access lane to the water with an unloading area so kayak anglers can use Valentine Creek and for ADA access, 3) a portapotty, 4 ) No

gate - the expensive electronic gate proposed by Rec & Parks discourages public use and builds in a flawed permanent undercount of actual park use.

105. Jeffrey Mitchell. Kenneth Van Hooijdonk: I am a resident of [street / neighborhood]. I oppose Concept D2 as currently designed due to safety risks on Valentine Creek Drive and the Old Herald Harbor Road intersection, steep/erosion-prone terrain that makes “water access” impractical, and environmental impacts (Critical Area, FIDS habitat, specimen trees, tidal buffers). I support safer, more cost-effective alternatives such as improvements at Brewer Pond Natural Area. I also request a County-led traffic study with enforceable mitigation, publication of the environmental package (NRI/FSD, FIDS, wetlands, specimen trees, stormwater), an ADA feasibility analysis for the full ~2,200-ft route, and a full capital + O&M estimate with a utilization model. Please include my comment in the record and notify the community about next steps.
106. Jayna Fenton: Please do not disturb this area. We have so few wild places left , why add anything here , I’ve lived here for 30 years , as a kid I saw box turtles , bats etc all the time in the summer, now it’s so few and far between. There is just no reason to take away or disturb more in these woods. It is unnecessary and not even a good place to add water access to the public and to make it easily accessible is not worth the environmental risk. There are already access points close by, this is a waste of county funds and would be a disappointment to the community here.
107. Andrew Newswanger: I strongly appose the development effort proposed at the Valentine Creek site. My main concerns are the following: 1. Environmental/Habitat: The valentine creek property represents a rare undisturbed piece of shoreline that are sadly disappearing in our county due to overdevelopment. The proposed plan would require grading, tree, remove, and installation of impervious surfaces. The end result of this destruction would be a park that would be difficult for kayakers to use (its intended purpose) due to the steep grade and distance to the water. The county would be disrupting this ecosystem in a major way for very little gain. 2. Cost: The ratio of benefit to the taxpayer vs cost to the taxpayers seems to be a non starter to me. Because substantial grading, tree, removal, and paving will need to take place, it seems that the cost would be well into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. However, the park would only be useable by a small number of taxpayers at a given time due to limitations of the site itself. As a county resident, I strongly appose such a large amount of resources being utilized for very little gain. Overall, I feel that this project is being forced forward even though there are many red flags being raised. I understand that there is a stated commitment, from the county, to increase water access. However, I believe that this commitment should be approached in a manner that is both fiscally responsible and best preserves our ecosystems.
108. Tom Rohrbaugh: I am strongly AGAINST this project. The county is trying to fit a square peg into a round hole. The site is difficult, remote, small, unsupervised, and very disruptive to an existing quiet dead end neighborhood. The water depth is quite shallow (1-2 ft) for a radius of 30-40 ft around the proposed pier which greatly limits fishing. However, the sight of a pier to unfamiliar boaters will encourage them to approach only to become grounded and create congestion. This is the wrong idea and the wrong place and it will fail.
109. Bailey Meyer: Please do not do this. It will harm our environment.
110. Clifton Cannon: I do not believe this project is beneficial to the community or local ecosystem.
111. Douglas Walcutt: am in favor of additional public access to our county waterways. This plan appears to create minimal watershed disruption and the purchase pulled potential

development that might have further contributed to water troubles. This trail and dock and perhaps a bulkhead should accommodate canoe and kayak use. It should be important to identify and put in corrections to previous rainwater runoff contamination issues to ensure this part remains usable.

112. Jessica Kennedy: There should be more public access for us non motorized paddlers to enjoy the water!

113. Ron Quarto: I vote no. Let’s protect what we have.

114. Christine Nefferdorf: Concerns include: environmental destruction of trees, plants, and submerged aquatic vegetation, disturbance of animal habitats; financial costs to taxpayers; possibly low kayaker usage due to difficult terrain; safety and vehicle traffic issues; stormwater runoff into the creek waters, damage from erosion; lack of accessibility or accommodation for ADA compliance. Incidentally, this spot isn't the only opportunity to use or create water access. Bargnani Road and Wilson Road in Herald Harbor are both public county roads nearby with existing water access to launch kayaks. Perhaps AA County will consider the Brewer Pond Natural Area for kayak access, also county-owned property on the Severn River. Unlike Valentine Creek, Brewer Pond requires no tree clearing, no steep slope disturbance, no ADA waiver, and no significant grading or stormwater construction.

115. Michael Brown: I am in favor of the project to provide public access to the Severn river via valentine creek.

116. Clifford Hutt: I am a Maryland resident and avid kayak fisherman that regularly fishes the lower Severn River. I am writing to express my strong support for the establishment of a public access site on the upper Severn River on Valentine Creek. I am not an Anne Arundal resident, by it as state and federal funds went into the purchase of this property, I strongly feel that my opinion should still count on this matter. If such a site was established, it would open up the upper river to my use, which would likely result in my making several trips to the area each year. When I fish the Severn, I regularly frequent local businesses including Anglers Sportsman Center and at least one local restaurant. In addition to supporting the establishment of a public access site, I feel strongly that it should not feature a gate, that it should have as sizeable a parking lot as the property can accommodate (preferable at least 20 parking spaces), and should have some kind of bathroom facility if only a portajohn.

117. Ryan Mezler: 1. The speed limit on Valentine Creek Dr is 30mph. At 20 mph, there is about 5% fatality risk if a pedestrian is struck by a car vs about 45% fatality risk at 30mph. With no sidewalks on Valentine Creek Drive and a community of walkers, Concept D proposing a "max of 20-30" parkgoers would insert 4-30 vehicles entering and exiting the street on a busy park day. The influx of traffic poses health and safety risks for the residents of Valentine Creek as a pedestrian hit at 30 mph is roughly 9 times more likely to die than one hit at 20 mph and the construction of Concept D perpetuates these odds occurring indefinitely. 2. Given the "max of 20-30" park-goers expected by AACo, the average is likely between 4-7. As survey results indicated a "need for more water access", the average volume will likely not meet the demand of the survey results. Thus, resulting in wasted time, labor, and resources all paid for by the AACo residents via tax dollars. 3. The state of Maryland is currently operating at a deficit and has squandered away roughly $8BB over the previous 2 years - largely in part due to irresponsible fiscal discipline. Continuing forward with Concept D furthers the narrative of government officials and entities mismanaging their constituents hard-earned money. 4. As an attendee of the in-person community meeting, I was appalled that transparency was not at the forefront as it

relates to County Executive Pittman's comments opposing Concept D. The comments by County Executive Pittman disaligning with the project is observed as convenient and reinforces my own, personal doubts of the projects true intentions.

118. Tim Robinson: Don't do it

119. Jana Trovato: We definitely do not think this is a good idea to develop this area for public water access/kayak launch. There are more suitable spots to provide this than this Valentine Creek spot.

120. Ken Trovato: For all the reasons given, Valentine Creek Access Trail is a bad idea. Brewer Creek would be a much better choice. Who are you making this for? If you have to haul a kayak a distance on a graded trail, it isn't useful.

121. Leeanne Dunsmore: This project is not necessary as kayak access to the Severn river already exists nearby at Wilson Road and Bargnani road? This project will unnecessarily destroy precious natural habitats when access already exists nearby. What about Brewer pond? No trees would need to be cleared, no stormwater protection required. Plum creek and valentine creek already receive a great deal of runoff and mud that is impacting the natural habitat. Finally, having more kayaks on valentine creek at sunset is very dangerous. Boats coming into the creek cannot see and kayakers have already been hit by boats. Incredibly dangerous to increase kayak traffic on valentine creek.

122. Chandler Metzler: I am a resident of Valentine Creek. I oppose Concept D2 as currently designed due to safety risks on Valentine Creek Drive and the Old Herald Harbor Road intersection, I have lived here only a short time and I have almost had multiple car accidents while pulling out of our neighborhood, coming from either/both sides of Old Herald Harbor. People speed way more than 35 and the sign that was put before our street to tell drivers that there is a hidden drive has done nothing to slow anyone down. There are multiple reasons as to why I do not want this project but this is one of the main ones that I think would be a big mistake if the county decided to continue. One of the statistics that was shown at the public meeting was referring to the fact that there is not a lot traffic coming in and out of Valentine Creek Drive and apparently, not much traffic on Old Herald Harbor Rd. However, this has to be false, I myself enter and exit Valentine Creek at least 4 times a day not including my husband and others in the neighborhood, all of us almost having accidents at our neightborhood entrance. I think that the increased traffic due to the park would incur way more traffic accidents. My other reasons for not wanting this park are as follows; steep/erosion-prone terrain that makes "water access" impractical, and environmental impacts (Critical Area, FIDS habitat, specimen trees, tidal buffers). I support SAFER, more cost-effective alternatives such as improvements at Brewer Pond Natural Area. I also request a County-led traffic study****with enforceable mitigation, publication of the environmental package (NRI/FSD, FIDS, wetlands, specimen trees, stormwater), an ADA feasibility analysis for the full ~2,200-ft route, and a full capital + O&M estimate with a utilization model. Please include my comment in the record and notify the community about next steps.

123. Brock Strom: Strongly against this proposal.

124. Jim Frazetti: I am against destroying the natural landscape of valentine creek. The dredging alone would destroy the local habitat. Also the population is already severely crowded in the area, adding a park and boat ramp would be problematic. Increased traffic would lead to issues. The road way isn't wide enough to support trailers. The public already has access to the

water at Jonas creek. It would make more sense to expand that park and add a boat ramp there.

125. Wendy Olenik: Please support public water access on Valentine Creek on the Severn River. Valentine Creek opens up the mid and upper Severn River to the public. I kayak and would take advantage of this. I am confident stand-up-paddleboarders, canoeists, and anglers would take advantage of the access as well. I love the idea of 40 parking spots and a vehicle access lane to the water. Having an unloading area and a port-o-potty would be perfect. The one thing I am against is an expensive electronic gate. I am confident that would discourage public use. But everything else would be magnificent and I'm excited for this project to be completed.

126. Delanie Stigile: Adding public access in Valentine Creek is a terrible idea. It will be devastating for wildlife by tearing down even more of their home, residents with the increased traffic, and the waterways with increased usage past private property. Not to mention that the water is muck and a generally awful place to kayak. I have almost sunk in a canoe in the area because it is just all mud. Truly an awful idea with no community support.

127. Sandra Dove: This project is not wanted by the surrounding communities. This project is not the answer.

128. Joan Shank: I attended last meeting. After researching proposed plan, I find this project both fiscally and environmentally not feasible. It is a very poor location and an exorbitant cost for the amount of projected users. A cheaper alternative would be to give vouchers to kayak users to cover entrance fees at nearby public facility.

129. Justyn Juarez-Robertson: I oppose the proposed Valentine Creek water access trail and associated parking area. This project would destroy part of a rare, intact forest along the Severn River watershed that currently protects water quality, prevents erosion, and supports wildlife. Adding a paved access road and parking lot will fragment habitat, introduce runoff, and degrade a sensitive shoreline that functions best when left undisturbed. Anne Arundel County already offers multiple nearby public water access points; this project duplicates existing amenities while sacrificing an irreplaceable conservation area. The environmental costs far outweigh any recreational benefit. Please preserve Valentine Creek as a natural forested buffer, not another parking lot.

130. Bradley Smith: First, I am disappointed that the link for comment was broken from the presentation slide and out of at least 5 of the twelve days given for comment there seemed to be no link anywhere at all, this feels like an attempt to suppress comments against the project. Second, I was also disappointed that County Exec Pittman was not in attendance given the "confusion" surrounding his comments about the feasibility of projects at the end of Valentine Creek Drive. Third, I am against this project or any other project at the end of Valentine Creek Drive. I believe the disruption to the community and wildlife to be too much for the limited benefit this project would provide. Don't do it.

131. Kelsey Abbott: I have concerns about the environmental impact of this park as well as whether there would be enough kayak use to justify the environmental impact.

132. Cindi Scilipoti: I’m totally against the proposed project . We walk these trails , and the wildlife that will be disrupted is terrible . We’re supposed to be for the environment in MD , and this project seems so far out there in terms of wildlife.

133. Rebecca Womick: This project would do harm to our environment. Wildlife already has a shrinking habitat due to development. This would further harm their homes. This project would

bring unwelcome traffic. This project could greatly impact the quiet nature of several neighborhoods. Residents do not want this project to go forward. There is already public access to water in herald harbor and also a boat ramp at smiths marina.

134. Comment Terrie Boucher: AGAINST the Valentine Creek concept. Reasons: Lack of site visits, contradictions in public statements, missing traffic study, unaddressed safety hazards, steep terrain and environmental impact and possible environmental violations. A better site for water access might be Brewer Pond - where accessibility, equity, and environmental stewardship all align. Thank you.
135. Kim Simpkins: I DO NOT agree with this project in this area and the environmental impact it would have on the fragile environment and the wildlife.
136. Marge McGugan: We do NOT need a county park/ water access near our community. Traffic would be horrible and our quiet neighborhood would be ruined.
137. James Gilmore: The plan is totally stupid and a waste. No one is going to walk a 1/2 mile and its closer to a mile walk to launch a kayak. The space is super shallow and adding a pier makes even less sense. This launch and pier would be underutilized due to the long walk for a kayak launch and fishing pier with 2 ft of water. It makes no sense and will be a huge waste of our money.
138. Christine Wojciechowski: I am opposed to any development on Valentine Creek.
139. Maureen Pawlikowski: This project will bring unneeded traffic to our community.
140. Comment Beth Greve: Do not support this proposal
141. Joel Weszkal: do NOT support the Valentine Creek Public Waterway Access project.
142. Michael Scanlon: Hello, I'm writing to express my concerns about the proposed development of Valentine Creek, which includes the construction of a trail and a parking lot. While I understand the need for improved access to the waterways, I'm worried that this development could negatively impact the natural beauty and ecological balance of the area. During my recent walk along the proposed trail, I was shocked by the number of trees that would be cut down. This is not only detrimental to the environment but also disrupts the natural habitat of various animals. It's important to preserve these habitats for the well-being of wildlife. As a homeowner in the area, I'm also concerned about the potential impact on my own property. If the animals are displaced from their natural habitat, they may end up moving into my backyard, which could cause problems for both me and the animals. I hope that these concerns will be taken into account when making decisions about the development of Valentine Creek. I believe that it's important to strike a balance between human needs and the preservation of the natural environment.
143. Maria Jacob: We have reviewed the proposed site plans and project description and feel that it's overkill for that area. It's expensive, environmentally questionable and would attract a very small group of users in relation to all of the tree demolition. costs and construction that would be necessary.
144. Susan Midas: I do not support the country's plan for Valentine Creek Public Waterway Access. I have concerns on the disturbance to the waterfront environment in terms of erosion, water pollution and run off, the disturbance to the hiking trials and the animal habitat. In addition to harming the environment, the public access also creates added safety concerns for the neighborhood to bring public access that can only support very limited traffic. There are better spots to focus on public access that will not bring increased danger to the people and environment.

145. Jenna Mondora: Public water access is important and essential, however, this space may not be the best use of funding. It is my understanding that there is access just a mile away at Bargagni Rd. in Herald Harbor. This may be a better site of development for the county, especially since the new county firehouse will be opening soon at the intersection of Sunrise Beach and Generals, leaving the old herald harbor fire department space more accessible. Perhaps that lot could be used for parking and water access at the end of Bargagni, as it is less than a quarter mile and already has access. We've seen erosion and runoff issues at community beaches in Arden, and with the continued development and construction in the area I could only imagine this would cause similar issues. I support public water access, however, this plan, with the walk it would entail, doesn't seem suitable.
146. Alex Thomson: In general I support the concept of public access to our shared waterways. In this instance, I challenge the return on the investment and ecological destruction for the proposed solution. Simply- the challenging terrain, long distance from the parking lot to the launch site, and likelihood that people will carry kayaks, paddle boards, etc. that distance suggests it would result in very low usage and low return on investment.
147. Lindsey King: Please do not allow the Public Access Warerway project for Valentine Creek to move forward. This would greatly harm the ecosystem and cause more pollution for this area. We really need to focus on keeping the environment safe instead of adding to the destruction.
148. Jeff Metzger: Such a waste of our money that could be put to better use. 1/2 mile to get a kayak or canoe or paddleboard to the water on flat land is hard enough. Hoping some common sense prevails. My heart does go out to those individuals who know they are working on a meaningless project. As well as those who live on the street where this is being proposed.
149. Rodney Daff: I don't think this was wisely spent money from the beginning, and any work is going to disturb the natural area that it has become since the former owner did not finish developing the plotted lots. “The serious Kayaker” can currently launch their Kayak in its current state. Just because the Dept of Rec & Parks and or AA County can buy a piece of property, without public input before doing so, doesn’t mean that they should. As an Anne Arundel County resident, we have already seen way too many properties in the Crownsville area being bought up by the County, weather to build new soccer fields, ball fields, fire station, etc., and now want to take a perfectly pristine area at the head waters of Valentine Creek and develop it for about 2% of county residents to use. If the Dept of Rec & Parks was really serious about having water access for county residents, you should have bought Smiths Marina a few years ago. For that matter, look for and buy an upcoming water front home/property that comes up for sale. Demo the house, put in a parking area, boat ramp and pier.
150. Richard Russell: I am concerned about the potential traffic through local neighborhoods by those trying to get to the Waterway Access. This access invites anyone to cruise the area, making it less safe for children and more suspicious because of outsiders.
151. John Veil: I fish more than 200 days a year, mostly from my kayak. Over the past five years, I fished 477 times in AA County waters (~95 times/year). The Severn River is my home waters. Without extensive public water access on the Severn, Magothy, South, or West rivers, I am limited to the few places where I can launch a kayak. My Severn range is from Saltworks Creek on the upstream end to Greenbury and Tolly Points at the downstream end. As an aging senior citizen, that range grows smaller each year. I strongly welcome any efforts by AACo to

establish additional kayak launch locations in the Severn River watershed farther upstream from Jonas Green park and the city's Tucker St launch. This would open up many more fishing spots.

152. Stephen Carl: I am against your proposed plan. FYI, just because someone doesn't respond for or against does not mean they are for it.

153. Lauren Craig: Super concerned about disturbing the fragile ecosystem of waterfront as well as to add more boat traffic to what is already an overcrowded and unhealthy river system. Also how will AAC provide security during hours the proposed park is closed?

154. Frank T. Morrison: Regretfully, I was unable to attend the Public Comment meeting on 10/23/25 due to a business commitment but appreciate the opportunity to submit my comments. I fully support the letters dated 09/26/25 and 11/3/25 from the Valentine Creek Community Association Board opposing the destruction of the nature area at the end of Valentine Creek and the exploration of alternative sites with less environmental and community disruption as well as better access to the water for residents. I would like to add that I have lived on the Arden side of the end of Valentine Creek since 1995 - over 30 years! The amount of wildlife at this end of the creek and the associated wetlands never ceases to amaze me. Ducks, geese, and yes, American Bald Eagles use this end of the Creek - what environmental impact studies have been performed to evaluate the negative impact on these habitats? The negative impact of the Valentine Creek project under consideration will result in significant environmental destruction and ongoing impact to this wildlife, which includes deer, racoons, and other creatures beside waterfowl and birds. The public needs to be made aware of this impact with a study provided by an independent, third-party environmental firm. Furthermore, the noise created by this proposed new area needs to be evaluated as this end of the creek is very quiet and peaceful - I have spent many hours relaxing and watching the wildlife prosper in this safe area for these creatures - to think of the disruption and destruction that this project will cause as detailed in the attached letters is criminal. Lastly, the politicians and county employees, starting with Mr. Pittman and our local county council person, should disclose any and all political contributions from the firms working on this project, contributions to their political campaigns from these firms, or business connections and relationships with any of these firms. Thank you for your consideration of my comments and I remain firmly opposed to this project.

155. Julia Thumel: We live in a small community where many people walk, run, kids bike. Adding this would encourage more cars to fly through our neighborhood. The baseball and soccer fields add so much traffic and congestions with cars flying well over the speedlimit into our neighborhood. Please don't allow more cars and traffic here! We need traffic modifications to Sunrise beach and the Arden roads to slow cars down enough as it is!

156. David Lissauer: Please do not spoil virgin forest when there are already public launch sites at Truxton & Jonas Green. There are very few places for wildlife anymore. That is why we only see them dead on our roads! If money is burning a hole in your pocket, use it towards the eyesore that is Crownsville Hospital! Pittman said he was against the launch site but where is he now?

157. Michael Hammer: As a former resident of the Valentine Creek Community I am deeply familiar with the wooded area that will be disturbed if this project is allowed to continue as proposed in concept D2. I will spare all my safety, environmental, accessibility and financial concerns with this proposal - it seems others have covered those pieces well enough. What I can speak to personally is how unrealistic the expectation is that people will carry kayaks down the proposed trail to the beach head. I was motivated to have water access for launching my

kayak from the very location proposed while living on Valentine Creek Drive. I purchased a commercial kayak cart but it wasn't capable of handling the steep slopes and rough terrain. Undeterred I proceeded to fabricate an off road version of that kayak cart that was able to handle the job. I made the half mile walk with my kayak to the water and paddled around for roughly an hour, enjoying the calm water and peaceful quiet of Valentine creek. Getting the kayak back to Valentine Creek Drive was the issue. I am a 30 year old male in excellent physical condition and it was a workout to get my kayak back home. I tried taking my wife and other friends who are not in the same physical condition as me and nobody was able to make it back without my help. The dream that this water access will provide equal accessibility to all for its intended purpose is unrealistic as proposed in concept D2. If public water access is a priority of the county, they should consider subsidizing the costs of launching small watercraft from a private marina (such as Smith's Marina on the Severn). This is about a mile from this proposed boat launch and would be a more prudent use of taxpayer dollars. The county's proposal "D2" should not proceed as currently presented.

158. Susan Fenton: Valentine Creek is not the place to offer public access It is an environmentally safe place for native plants and animals. The creek already has pollution issues at various times

159. Leanne Simm: Stop! Listen! A new park is not wanted nor needed. AA County does not need more. It needs less. AA is over built and over populated. Preserve this land. Put it in a trust or something so it can never be built on. Let people/ the community enjoy the land, the trails, the nature as it is. WE the people like this land the way it is. If there is money to be spent, put it towards fixing, cleaning, updating, upgrading AA County's existing parks AND waterways. Put the money towards helping clean our creeks and tributaries. Stop runoff from dated/ unregulated homes, roadways and parks (like the run off from Arden Park into Plum Creek). Adding an unwanted "park" will add unwanted consequences to our community, the land, the roads and Valentine Creek.

160. Jeremy May: Very concerned with the adverse effects of this project. Removing a large portion of forest could have irreversible effects on the local ecosystem. Besides maintaining the beauty of this land and water, this is counterintuitive of the county ordinance on local residents for tree removal (Bill No 20-21). My impression is this is to maintain the shoreline and keep development to a minimal for floodplain management/ sediment control/ erosion control. Lastly Valentine Creek is a shallow area.

161. Ted Sheils: I live in Herald Harbor. I support water access in this location. We need way more water access throughout the county. There is quite an extensive trail network in this area between Arden and Herald Harbor. Currently the trails are hard to access for those that do not live near an access point. This parking area could also serve as a trail access point for those who wish to access the trails.

162. M Hurt: I think this is a terrible waste of resources and time due to the grading that would be required. It would be an idea to remove all of the trees required changing the landscape completely. This destruction would also upset the wildlife in the area that already have limited habitat. The area in Harold Harbour would be a much easier area to get to for kayaking and would require much less work. Ie: grading and tree removal. I feel it's worth taking this into consideration.

163. John Bayley: I've been in Arden on the Severn since 1962. My grandfather bought land here in 1911. I've been running on the trails often on since 1959.

164. Glenn Whisman: I am a resident of Valentinen creek. I oppose Concept D2 as currently designed due to safety risks on Valentine Creek Drive and the Old Herald Harbor Road intersection, steep/erosion-prone terrain that makes “water access” impractical, and environmental impacts (Critical Area, FIDS habitat, specimen trees, tidal buffers). I support safer, more cost-effective alternatives such as improvements at Brewer Pond Natural Area. I also request a County-led traffic study with enforceable mitigation, publication of the environmental package (NRI/FSD, FIDS, wetlands, specimen trees, stormwater), an ADA feasibility analysis for the full ~2,200-ft route, and a full capital + O&M estimate with a utilization model. Please include my comment in the record and notify the community about next steps. Safety: ~20-ft shoulderless road, no sidewalks; hazardous school-bus corner. Access practicality: ~2,200-ft trek on steep slopes—impractical for families
165. Timothy Hoy: do not agree with the proposed access trail and I believe the county needs to further study the available site.
166. Robert Fraser: NO! We have destroyed enough of the environment already. I spent good money for water access and spend a lot in HOA dues. Don't spend my tax dollars to give away what I earned.
167. Kristen Patel: I am a 20+ year visitor to Timber Tree Place, and I oppose Concept D2 as currently designed due to serious safety and access concerns.
    a. Safety Concerns: Valentine Creek Drive and the Old Herald Harbor Road intersection are unsafe for additional traffic. The ~20-ft road has no shoulders or sidewalks, and the turn onto Old Herald Harbor and River Roads is dangerously blind—especially for school buses, pedestrians, and cyclists. Increasing use of this corridor would put residents and visitors at risk of accidents.
    b. Access Practicality: The proposed “water access” requires navigating roughly 2,200 feet of steep, erosion-prone terrain. This route is not practical for families, those with limited mobility, or anyone transporting kayaks or gear. An ADA-compliant design for such a grade would be costly and complex, and I request that the County conduct a full ADA feasibility analysis to assess this.
    c. Preferred Alternative: There is a safer and more cost-effective alternative at Brewer Pond Natural Area, which is flatter, already County-owned, and more suitable for improvement without the same safety and access limitations.
    d. Requests for the Record:
        i. A County-led traffic study with enforceable mitigation measures.
        ii. Publication of all project documentation (NRI/FSD, FIDS, wetlands, specimen trees, stormwater).
        iii. An ADA feasibility analysis for the full ~2,200-ft route.
        iv. A comprehensive cost estimate, including both capital and O&M expenses, supported by a realistic utilization model.
        v. That my comment be included in the official record, and that the County notify the community about next steps in the process. Thank you for your consideration and for prioritizing the safety and accessibility of the Valentine Creek area.
168. Brian Purkins: I am a resident of Herald Harbor. I oppose Concept D2 as currently designed due to safety risks on Valentine Creek Drive and the Old Herald Harbor Road intersection, steep/erosion-prone terrain that makes “water access” impractical, and environmental impacts (Critical Area, FIDS habitat, specimen trees, tidal buffers). I support

safer, more cost-effective alternatives such as improvements at Brewer Pond Natural Area. I also request a County-led traffic study with enforceable mitigation, publication of the environmental package (NRI/FSD, FIDS, wetlands, specimen trees, stormwater), an ADA feasibility analysis for the full ~2,200-ft route, and a full capital + O&M estimate with a utilization model. Please include my comment in the record and notify the community about next steps.

169. Michael Dawson: I think using Sprigg's Farm as a model is excellent. The community's concerns about the overuse, and amount of people are extremely overstated and underinformed. I live right near the Sprigg's Farm access and it's totally fine. Kayakers are not a rough and tumble bunch, and we're really good at finding where we need to go (case in point, the insane layout of Beachwood Park's launch....). We had similar issues in Ulmstead at Sprigg's Farm with community members being unreasonably opposed to the kayak launch, going so far as to block folk's access and put their own locks on the gates. It's comical to hear people's "concern" over the environmental impact of a Kayak soft launch. The little strip of land in question is surrounded by million dollar homes with docks and power boats. I do think it's good that this isn't going to be a 40 car parking lot with a boat ramp. Power boats can launch on Tucker and at Truxton, or support one of the many Marinas along the Severn. We really don't need to encourage MORE power boats out there. I think it's great that this is a soft launch for Kayaks. Jonas Green is the only other launch on the main stem of the Severn, and it puts kayakers out in extremely dangerous water near the mouth of the Severn and tons of boat traffic on the weekend. A few parking spots, a soft launch, and a porta john is all that's needed to open up a small piece of the upper Severn. Can't wait for this access point to open up!

170. Lisa Trovato:This site will not work as a launch area for kayaks. The grade to her to the water is too steep. Parking would be very challenging and dangerous. The water in that creek is incredibly shallow. The area is not great for anything but the beautiful walking trails that are already in the area.

171. Janet Holbrook: I am a Herald Harbor resident (25+ years) and write to comment on Valentine Creek Park proposal. First, I want to thank the County for being responsive to some local concerns. It is progress that the proposal for a 40 vehicle parking lot with spaces for 22-foot boat trailers has been down-sized to a 10 vehicle parking and water access for car top vessels. The Acquisition Application for Valentine Creek Park describes the property as 28.44 acres to be purchased by the county for $1.2M funds (2017) with the stated intention of: Water access for boating, fishing and crabbing; 20 acres of protected forest along Valentine Creek; Hiking trails; Picnic area; Avoid impact of 5 single family homes. Other relevant information from the Acquisition Application are descriptions of the property: “18 acres steep slope; 10 acres rolling”. Property lies within the Severn Run-Epping Forest Greenway, connects to State owned Severn Run Natural Area. Regardless, from the start a plan for a boat launch was trying to fit a square peg in a round hole. If it was practically feasible to have water access from the property it would have been developed into houses long ago. The hills are steep, and the water access is to a tidal wetland. The Acquisition Application also refers to another park – “This park will be one of two parks located on the Severn River and providing water access.” What is the other park? At the 10/23 meeting County staff described a “kayak” slide since the water access is via steep slopes. No mention of potential length or slope of the slide but it brings to mind an alpine ski ramp flinging teenagers out into the mud flats on cardboard sleighs with a high potential for injury. And how does one get a kayak back up the kayak slide? Regardless, after hiking in the nearby Severn Run State Park today, that park seems like a good model for Valentine Creek. A

small parking area, maintained trails with a few benches and some fishing spots. For years the parking lot at the Veterans Highway's entrance had a large pothole, but that is now paved. There is a bulletin border type sign and a trash can, but no restroom and hours are dawn to dusk. Typically, I run into a few people, families and dog walkers mostly. It also makes you wonder why the County doesn't explore other local public lands like Severn Run or Brewer's Park for water access points. The water access points at Severn Run are more accessible than the steep banks at Valentine Creek Park. It is also odd that Valentine Creek was not included in a study published in July 2025 on water access for non-vessels users. (/https://www.aacounty.org/sites/default/files/2025-07/current-park-water-access-report.pdf) That study also did not include cartop vessel use, which seems short-sighted if it is such a pressing concern. Both Valentine Creek Park and Arlington Echo are identified on Figure 4 in the report, which shows the 7 County Parks making up the Severn River Trail, but neither park is included in non-vessel use report? I believe County employees who say that the conditions of purchase require improvements to public access for stated purposes or refunding money to State. Hence, doing nothing is not a tenable option. However, rather than pursuing an infeasible, expensive project, we should take fresh eyes to see how best to use forested land along our coastline instead of shoe-horning a kayak slide into the coastal woodlands. It is hard to understand why the County is so focused on Valentine Creek Park and not the other parks included in the July 2025 report. Why is Arlington Echo so inaccessible to most of the public? Is Brewer's Pond the other park mentioned on the Acquisition Application? Is it impossible to consider allowing some communities to sell passes to County residents to use private facilities via a County program. A community or property owner could find an ongoing funding stream attractive and maybe there could be County assistance in maintaining all their shoreline. The current proposal is infeasible and expensive to create and maintain. There need to be more details about the kayak slide, maintenance and insurance costs. I urge the County to take a step back and consider the best use of this property and integration into existing public lands, e.g., Severn River Trail. Some type of water access at Valentine Creek seems like it could be a win for everyone since I think this would be the first and only direct access to Valentine Creek for Valentine Creek residents.

172. Paul Robbins: I can't picture anyone lugging a kayak down that trail to launch it. Let alone hauling it back up. You're probably looking at numerous ambulance runs for those attempting it. Not a fan of the probable trash nightmare either

173. Briana Henry: Please do not develope this area. Anne Arundel county is so over developed and it will further pollute our waterways as well as misplace precious wildlife that has no where to go! I vote not to develope this area

174. Barclay Collins: Utilizing the Brewer Pond Natural Area as an alternate site to Valentine Creek would violate several existing agreements and conservation easements that preserve this pristine forest and wildlife sanctuary on the Severn River. Specifically, the 1999 Brewer Pond Deed of Conservation Easement established the Brewer Pond conservation area in-perpetuity and specifically states in section IV.A. that the public is not allowed access to the Brewer Pond Conservation area. IV.A. further states that AAC may, in its discretion, allow access to the general public only in accordance with the Management Plan. This plan states that all access to the property will be controlled through a permit process managed by the Recreation and Parks Department. Further, it stipulates additional requirements including (1) only issuing one permit per day; (2) limiting the group size; (3) supervision by an authorized county employee or guide

and (4) providing an educational or environmental justification for a visit. Additionally, there is no public road access to the Brewer Pond wildlife sanctuary. The only road to access Brewer Pond is a private, gated road. Public access is not permitted on this private road. The July 2025 report by BayLand, “Current Park Water Access Study for Non-Vessel Uses,” that proposes developing the Brewer Pond Natural Area as a public park appears to ignore these legal restrictions and prior binding county management plans. The proposal to utilize Brewer Pond Natural Area as an alternate to the proposed Valentine Creek Water Access Park should be dismissed. Brewer Pond is not a legally viable alternative. Further, Bayland’s July 2025, “Current Park Water Access Study for Non-Vessel Uses,” should be revised to include the relevant legal issues that would prohibit the public access to Brewer Pond. Attached is a letter that was submitted to the county from my lawyer challenging the use of Brewer Pond as a public park or water access.

175. Alex Lopata: There is a practical public safety concern, which had been ignored by the county D2 proposal. ... The present plan would result in nice improved pathways into this remote and almost wilderness area. These would be close to at least two areas that are densely populated within easy walking distance: Herald Harbour and Arden on the Severn. .... The "water park" is planned to have easy walking access, no lights, and no access by ordinary police patrols. .... Unfortuately, the plan is to install "attractive nuisances" such as a "swimming" dock and other structures. ... I was a teenager once. Sounds like a perfect place to grab a few sixpacks, hike into the woods and have a party, isolated from parents, other observers and the police, with plenty places to run away to in the woods. What is the county plan to prevent these activities? The are real and very predicable. ... Please don't tell us that a ocassional or even nightly Park Ranger visit is going to stop this. I am sure that people of Valentine Creek and the two + other surrounding communities do not want to see this.

176. Alexander Lopata:The county proposal presentation was very misleading because all the maps showed the VCCA recreational land as "part" of the "water park". This ca. 25 acre parcel is to the right of the proposed entry. It belongs to the VCCA and NOT to the county. Why was this shown on all maps as part of the county land? For my part, I have no intension of allowing the county to use this land as their own. We (VCCA) have not make any issue over the light use and trespassing there up to this time. This will change once the increased traffic from the D2 plan might start. What actions are the county going to take to prevent the public nuisance of this trespassing? Is there going to be fencing, signage, patrolling to control this and vandelism on the VCCA land? Realize as well that any access road and paths will have to obey offsets from this property. Realize that any existing paths that trespass on the VCCA land must be barred from public access. I live on the first serious curve on V.C.Drive and have a concern about the maintenance of the road shoulder there. The curve is about 60 degrees over a short distance and has a very limited sight distance. The curve is a "complex" curve in that the radius of curvature changes, so that a driver has to keep adjusting for the change in how to steer. This is worse because the across street house has a limited driveway and often has cars parked on the street. ..... The result is that they drive off the road, onto the lawn and tear up the lawn. I've lived here 20+ years and this has gotten worse, because of more delivery trucks, do to online shopping and free delivers. ... I've probably shoved 100+ barrow loads of dirt to fix the ruts. ..... An additional 100 or so vehicle traffic of people not familiar with the road is going to make this even worse. ..... What is the county plan to fix the shoulders? I'm not going to do it anymore.

177. Hanbyeol Lee: Don't destroy Valentine Creek!

178. Melissa Moore: I understand neighbor concerns about this new water access point. However, unless they can provide or suggest an alternative cite this appears to be the best option. It has been changed numerous times in attempts to address concerns. Sadly the result is now limited parking and water access for fit kayakers and paddle boarders as those of us who are older (probably not able to carry equipment to water from parking) will not be able to use it. I hope the compromises that have been made do not succeed in making this water access so undesirable that use will be very limited. Maybe it really is time to consider using the education land rather than this space.

179. Aaron Paquette: This creek would be an ideal access point to the northern Severn river for kayaks/SUP/canoes where there are no public launch points available. The county purchased this land for this purpose lets see it follow through on making that access a reality! To properly serve the public and realize the full potential of this resource, we advocate for the immediate reinstatement of the following components:
    a. Adequate Parking Capacity: We request the original plan for 40 dedicated parking spots be implemented. A reduced capacity will inevitably lead to overflow parking on surrounding residential streets and create unnecessary friction between users and neighbors. Providing ample, planned parking is crucial for accommodating the expected community demand for this unique natural area.
    b. Vehicle Water Access: The plans must include a dedicated vehicle access lane to the water's edge with an unloading area. This facility is essential for several user groups: it allows kayak and canoe anglers to safely unload heavy gear, and most critically, it ensures access for those with mobility challenges who need to utilize the park and the creek.
    c. Essential Amenities: To support extended public enjoyment, we strongly advocate for the inclusion of a basic portapotty or similar restroom facility. Providing minimal sanitary amenities is a necessary part of responsible public park management.
    d. Eliminating the Electronic Gate: We request the County abandon the proposed installation of the expensive electronic access gate. This type of barrier is costly to install and maintain, actively discourages spontaneous public use, and will create a flawed, permanent undercount of actual park utilization. Valentine Creek should be welcoming and openly accessible to all citizens without unnecessary bureaucratic or physical impediments.
    e. We believe that implementing these four points—specifically adequate parking, safe vehicle unloading access, basic sanitation, and eliminating the restrictive gate—will result in a safer, more inclusive, and much better-utilized public resource. We urge your department to listen to the community and adjust the plans accordingly. We look forward to seeing Valentine Creek fully and correctly opened to the public.

180. Terri Morrison: This is a bad idea all the way around. It is bad for the people who live in the area, the animals who inhabit the woods and waters, and the taxpayer. Why the county would even propose to spend millions of taxpayers' dollars on disturbing a pristine watershed when the other options - such as Brewers Pond - are available is beyond me. County residents are enjoying the area now. The current trails are rustic and do not interfere with the environment - please keep it that way! We need to safeguard untouched areas like this for future generations to enjoy.

181. Steven Adraka: I have been utilizing and maintaining the trail system in the woods for the past 20 years and was very involved with saving the trail network and woods from development with my main point being connectivity of the trail network which is used by residents of Valentine creek, Herald harbor and Arden on the Severn. So, I was extremely happy when the county was able to purchase the property from Koch homes to maintain as a county park for the residents of Anne Arundel county. I then realized that the reason the funds were procured for the purchase of the property was the argument that this could be a public access to the water. When the county produced the options A-c, I was very opposed to the major impact that the proposed access was creating especially the options with the large parking lot for boat trailers which wiped out much of the trails and the associated dredging. We held a site walk with Stewart Pittman to show how devastating the proposed plans were to the woods and the trail network along with how impractical it would be to try to launch trailered boats. The county then presented a plan for a kayak launch with a large parking lot up near valentine creek subdivision. I felt that the parking lot was still excessive along with clearing a 50 foot swath all the way to the water for the kayak launch. I again expressed the need to maintain the trail network and keep as much of the woods intact. I feel that with the latest layout with the reduced clearing and the much smaller parking lot that the county and their consultant have prepared does a wonderful job minimizing the impact to the trails and the woods. In my opinion the latest layout is a very reasonable compromise between the existing recreational uses of the park while providing access to kayak or fish for the residents of the county. I like that the parking is limited size and that there is a proposed registration system to park there. I have provided the county with a mapping of the existing trail network such that hopefully as the plan progresses any trails that are impacted can be shifted to maintain connectivity of the natural surface trails or the layout can be tweaked to preserve existing trails. I would also emphasize minimizing any clearing to construct the pathway from the parking area to the launch in order to maintain the existing wooded feel. My Hats off to the folks who have been preparing the design to compromise between the existing recreational gem for the local residents and the county's desire to provide water access such that if the does proceed forward with developing a water access it won't destroy the existing use and experience.

182. LuAnn Davis: I am a 72 year old life-long resident of AACO. In fact, I live in my childhood home built by my father in Arden on the Severn in the 50s. My fondest memories are fishing on the Severn River with my dad. The waters were calm in those early morning hours and there were quiet coves aplenty to drop anchor and cast our lines. Now, the river is unrecognizable to me. There is virtually no undisturbed land along the river. Quiet coves are surrounded by development and the shorelines erroaded away by boat traffic. The once clear waters are often off limits due to runoff and high bacterial levels. I understand the public desire to have access to the Severn River. However, there are marinas and other public access points on BOTH sides of the Severn without disturbing Valentine Creek. Please, allow us to enjoy one of the last undisturbed areas of beauty along our treasured waterfront. Once you've claimed it for public access it can never be reclaimed for nature. Thank you.

183. Aaron Wade: As a resident of the Sahlin Farm community, I have been made aware that this Valentine Creek discussion mentions Brewers Pond as a possible alternative. Having lived in this neighborhood for seven years, I can tell you that access to Brewers Pond is virtually impossible from our Sahlin Farm community. I suspect that whomever thinks Brewers Pond is a good location for a proposed public park has never actually been back here to assess the

practicality of it. The terrain involves multiple steep slopes that are virtually impassible. Additionally, there are two very swampy areas that I assume flood out on a regular basis. I have attempted to walk from Sahlin Farm Road to Brewers Pond with my kids on multiple occasions, and the distance (almost 1/2 mile) combined with the geographic challenges made it a nearly impossible task.

184. Marianne Walker: I am opposed to public waterway access at Valentines Creek as proposed. The cost per person is enormous as well as the destruction of the environment especially considering there already is nearby access in Herald Harvor.

185. Art LIttle: I am a resident of Valentine Creek neighborhood. VCCA has met and collectively articulated our opposition. At the meeting, I heard many residents from adjacent neighborhoods that appreciate the woods state their opposition as well. This was definitely the majority opinion in the room. I would like to add my additional personal concerns. I would like to reiterate that safety warnings about the intersection are very real. Secondly my concern is the complete lack of any financial information on the projected cost of this project. It is very evident from the terrain that any type of roadwork will be extremely costly. It will also carry a high environmental cost. We know that the Bowers Pond project costs are estimated around $30,000. How can the County consider this project without a viable cost estimate? The public should not consider supporting any county project without this information. Please leave this Crownsville park intact as is.

186. Nancy Franklin: Development of this critical shore area would negatively impact the environment and critical ecosystem we are working to protect along the Severn River. I oppose the County's plans to develop this area for public use.

187. Christina Tymkiw: I was in attendance at the community meeting regarding Concept D2. I do not directly live in the neighborhood, but I know how beautiful the woods is. I frequently visit this area and work as a pet sitter in the neighborhood so I am familiar with the trails. I feel that I am in the majority of people who are NOT requesting the County provide them with water access. And as a taxpayer in the County, I do not support this project. It appears costly and poorly designed. When you come into the neighborhood, it does not look like a park entrance. The road is winding and you would have to go through the entire neighborhood to the end of the street to get to the entrance. When I pull out of Valentine Creek onto Old Herald Harbor Road to return home, I do it with a small prayer! because the intersection is hazardous. What really clinched it for me was that people who paddle and are familiar with the woods; thought this was an atrocity. My opinion is that the park should be preserved the way it is.

188. Joanna Labor: I strongly encourage and am pro a new access point on Valentine Creek! As a long time paddler and former Annapolis resident, I have always been disheartened that so much of the upper Severn is essentially inaccessible unless you are willing to make a 12 mile round trip paddle from Jonas Greene. Water monitoring with the SRA this year was the first time I was able to actually SEE any part of the Severn, and it made me so mad that so much of the water was so inaccessible to the vast majority of the area. I strongly encourage the following: 1. For there to be 40 parking spots as originally planned, 2. A vehicle access lane to the water for kayakers as well as ADA access, 3. A portapotty like at Solley's Cove- it's been a massive game changer to be able to use the ladies before going on a long kayak!, 4. No gate- it's public land! Why do we need a gate? Thank you so much for reading!

189. Carol Morrison: I am opposed to the Valentine Creek project due to the environmental impact of cutting down trees which help to curb the runoff into the Severn. The area is deemed

non swimmable and the distance of .4 mile path to carry a kayak makes me think this is not a place that will get much public use.

190. Sonia Sana: I am a resident of Herald Harbor and an avid hiker who also enjoys kayaking and paddleboarding. I frequently hike Valentine Creek, which has a steep grade (about a 2,200-foot climb). I am truly disheartened that the establishment of a kayak launch in this area is even being considered AGAIN. It seems impractical to expect anyone to carry a 70-pound kayak (which ours weighs) to the proposed launch area. There are many more accessible options nearby, such as Smiths Marina, just down the street, or Brewer Pond, which has flatter terrain (and is county-owned). A feasible kayak launch would be better suited to a location like Brewer Pond, where previous studies have estimated the cost at around $30,000, rather than the hundreds of thousands or even millions needed to implement changes at Valentine Creek. Additionally, the natural beauty of the untouched trails, the wildlife, and the habitat for various birds would be significantly damaged by this proposal. There are far better ways to utilize our taxpayer money, such as funding safer sidewalks or bike paths rather than altering our cherished trails. Anyone who has hiked these trails knows that there is very little usable "beach" space. I hope all voices are heard, and I urge those making the decision to consider alternatives, such as Brewer Pond or other locations, if there is indeed a need for a kayak launch. Personally, I don't have any issues using the many other locations near me. Let’s protect our environment and make better decisions!

191. Joseph Narbut: We need 40 parking spots instead of 10, a vehicle access lane to the water 3 highly important a kayak is very heavy and expensive to drag a portapotty and no gate.I will be using this to crab and fish the river

192. Buddy Niosia: I would love to see a launch go in there. Thank you

193. Kenneth Thompson: I am late to this process due to hospitalization. I have had a residence on the water at Valentine creek since 1996. I was shocked to learn of the disregard of environmental and safety issues that I had to contend with in the building of my home. I oppose Concept D2 as currently designed due to safety risks on Valentine Creek Drive and the Old Herald Harbor Road intersection, steep/erosion-prone terrain that makes “water access” impractical, and environmental impacts (Critical Area, FIDS habitat, specimen trees, tidal buffers). This terrain is not suitable for such a project ~2,200-ft trek on steep slopes—impractical for families/kayaks. Environmental risk: Critical Area, FIDS habitat; invasive species concerns (e.g., Japanese Knotweed). Equity/ADA: County indicated a possible waiver—site may be wrong if it can’t be accessible. I support safer, more cost-effective alternatives such as improvements at Brewer Pond Natural Area. I also request a County-led traffic study with enforceable mitigation, publication of the environmental package (NRI/FSD, FIDS, wetlands, specimen trees, stormwater), an ADA feasibility analysis for the full ~2,200-ft route, and a full capital + O&M estimate with a utilization model. Please include my comment in the record and notify the community about next steps.

194. Stacy Henderson: Proposed Comment on Concept D – Valentine Creek Public Access Park. This is not an appropriate location for the proposed Concept D plan. The amount of tree destruction, high development costs, and potential for runoff, shoreline disturbance, and water pollution make this site both environmentally harmful and fiscally irresponsible. Moving forward here would not be a wise use of taxpayer funds. This property is already open to the public and enjoyed daily in its natural state. The steep elevation makes it especially difficult—and costly—to develop responsibly. The inevitable consequence will be increased runoff and further

degradation of already stressed water quality in Valentine Creek and the Severn River. Our waters are already unsafe at times. We are advised not to enter for 72 hours after heavy rain or with any cut or scrape. A man on the Severn River recently had to have his foot amputated after a small wound became infected from bacteria in the water. My own granddaughter has twice developed a facial virus after playing in the River. I want nothing more than to enjoy the water safely with her, but the risks are too high. Why would we add more pollution and activity that will only worsen the problem? The State of MD and a home owner named Janet Clausen has already invested millions in successful shoreline restoration projects nearby—Kyle Point ($4 million) and a second example of restoration is the Jabez Branch Tributary ($9.1 million, nine years to complete). Both projects are within a few miles of this proposed site by water. Both sites are designed to reduce water run-off and remove Nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment. Why would the County think it would be ok to destroy when others are restoring? Brewer Pond, a larger and flatter site, would be far more suitable for a public access plan like this. We only need to look to Beverly Triton Beach Park in Edgewater as an example of what not to do. Please read the one-star reviews—do we really want to go through all this expense, environmental damage, and stress on our natural resources only to end up with a park full of disgruntled visitors? Valentine Creek is simply not the place for it. Without constant supervision, the area will become a magnet for unsupervised gatherings, boat traffic, fires, and litter. Protect what is.

195. Cathy Gallagher: I am a resident of Herald Harbor and would like to voice my concerns about the Valentine Creek Project. I am not going to list all of the concerns, as I am sure you are aware of the issues regarding the land designated for water access. Simply put, it is a terrible use of tax payers' money for a myriad of reasons. There are several alternative sites within a short distance of the current proposed site. All of which are better suited for water access for ALL residents, not just able bodied people who are able to traverse the steep incline at the Valentine Creek Site. Ideas: -give AA county residents vouchers to use at Smith's Marina for launching their vessels. - take back county property that is designated as water access that has been "stolen" by recent residents. One example is the county water access at the end of Bargagni Road in Herald Harbor that has been fenced off by two residents so they now have sole access to the water in a place we have enjoyed for years. Please consider all alternatives before disturbing the pristine forest at Valentine Creek Site. My hope is that common sense prevails. Jim and Cathy Gallagher PS. I also need some guidance as to how to begin reclaiming the county water access at the end of Bargagni Road. This is an absolute atrocity for two people to get away with stealing the right of way from fellow citizens.

196. Katherine Little: As a former Valentine Creek and current county resident, I am not in support of proposal D. The proposal fully ignores the safety concerns of the blind intersection at Valentine Creek and Old Herald Harbor Rd. I learned at at age 16 the safest way to make that particular turn was to roll my windows down and listen for traffic, something I still do today when visiting family. That is not a realistic suggestion for park goers. Furthermore, I fail to see how this project is a sensible investment for the county. Given the steep terrain, developing Valentine Creek will be inordinately expensive and even when complete will only be accessible and desirable to handful of county residents as a kayaking destination, meanwhile disrupting the much more extensive usage of the area for walking, running, and other passive recreation. It would be for the good of a few at the expense of many. I strongly urge the department to thoughtful stewards of our county funds and invest in water access that is less expensive, less

disruptive to communities and the natural environment, and can be enjoyed by a greater percentage of county residents. Brewers Pond present an excellent option in terms of improving county assets, as does a potential partnership with a local marina such as Smith's in order to leverage existing infrastructure.

197. Barbara Tymkiw: The community meeting at South Shore was robustly attended with a cafeteria full of concerned citizens. The turnout was very good considering that not many residents were notified and not all adjacent neighborhoods have HOA's. Also the venue may have been too small; several cars turned away because there was no available parking. I am a resident of Valentine Creek neighborhood and I looked around the room and saw mostly faces of people that I did not know. They lived in adjacent communities; but we shared a passion against the development of the Crownsville woods. The people that spoke ranged in age from high school to senior citizens, environmentalists, hikers, runners, and kayakers. I myself am a senior who hikes the park with my dog and who has felt a stewardship of this property for the 36 years that I have lived here. The Valentine Creek Community Association was actually founded to do just that. We hope that the County will realize that this project will deface a beautiful woods that functions as a "Green Cathedral" for the Severn River. The park is used by many people, the improvements would only benefit a select group of kayakers. I do not think that the environmental cost to the forest and the suspected financial cost are justified. There is a car top kayak launch site at Smith Marina which is available to the public for a $10 parking fee. Smith Marina has expressed an interest to be listed on the county web site with this information. It is a beautiful site to launch from and only a mile away. The County asked people what they wanted years ago when this project was designed. I hope the County is asking what do people want now? The answer was very clear at the meeting. The majority of people did not want paving, grading, and metallic chutes, but to preserve the park as it is.

198. Christina Tymkiw: I attended the community the community meeting regarding Concept D2. I do not directly live in the neighborhood, but I know how beautiful the woods is. I have hiked back there before. I am in the majority of people who are NOT requesting the County provide them with water access. As a taxpayer in the County, I do not support this project. It appears costly and poorly designed. When you come into the neighborhood, it does not look like a park entrance. The road is winding and you would have to go through the entire neighborhood to the end of the street to get to the entrance. What really clinched it for me was that people who paddle and are familiar with the woods; thought this was an atrocity.

199. Marjorie Winslow: I oppose any development of Valentine Creek's shore-lined woods. The wooded hills and fern filled valleys and fringe of wetlands are an undisturbed gem and I hope they will remain that way. They should not be subject to any major incursions of equipment or paving to carve out boat launches -soft or hard. It's our privilege as neighboring communities on either side of the creek to protect and preserve them, so they remain, as they are - a home and haven for wildlife, flora and fauna. In them we can find any number of things to enrich our days, among other things, they can be a lab for learning, a playground for amusement, and a sacred place to connect with all around us... But with the ever-shrinking natural habitat around us we need to do what we can to save these pristine woods and fragile coves so they remain as they are unharmed... for the wildlife, for us, our children, their children, and each other.

200. Kathleen Cooke: The OPZ's concept for developing a water access project at Valentine Creek is a poor idea. The existing park is entirely wooded with about 4 miles of well-maintained single-track trails used by walkers, joggers, and mountain bikers. It is a contiguous area of

woods and bogland for area wildlife. Putting in a 24-foot wide road (what is the length of this road, anyway?) seems rather excessive for a 10-car parking lot. Then, paving a half-mile path over steep slopes and the creek to get to the dock will irrevocably alter the character of the landscape. This concept would destroy 3 acres of trees and chop up one of the prettiest areas of the park. Furthermore, the concept does not align with this year's Region 6 community input to the 2040 Plan. In the October 23 presentation, the OPZ mentioned that 2017 and 2022 requests for water access was one of the highest requests in past polls. This is not the case in 2025. The 2025 Region 6 responses to the 2040 plan questionnaire about recreation and parks (see https://www.aacounty.org/load-file?folder=opz-region-plan-6&file=Region%206%20Draft%20Strategy%20Questionnaire%20Summary%20Natural%20Environment_Parks_and%20Recreation.pdf) to several questions shows community respondents strongly favor preservation of existing woodlands and boglands; there was much less interest in increasing water access. The Valentine Creek park is currently excellent for walking and biking and does not need improvement, but this location would be a poor choice for the water access project due to problems many others have cited. I would like to add that it would not serve the people who want increased water access if they have to park a half-mile away. The county needs to select a different location that is more suitable for a water access project.

201. Eric Thomas: We believe utilizing the Brewer Pond Natural Area as an alternate site to Valentine Creek would violate several existing agreements and conservation easements that preserve this pristine forest and wildlife sanctuary on the Severn River. Specifically, the 1999 Brewer Pond Deed of Conservation Easement established the Brewer Pond conservation area in-perpetuity and specifically states in section IV.A. that the public is not allowed access to the Brewer Pond Conservation area. IV.A. further states that AAC may, in its discretion, allow access to the general public only in accordance with the Management Plan. This plan states that all access to the property will be controlled through a permit process managed by the Recreation and Parks Department. Also, it states additional requirements including (1) only issuing one permit per day; (2) limiting the group size; (3) supervision by an authorized county employee or guide and (4) providing an educational or environmental justification for a visit. Additionally, there is no public road access to the Brewer Pond wildlife sanctuary. The only road to access Brewer Pond is a private, gated road. Public access is not permitted on this private road. The July 2025 report by BayLand, “Current Park Water Access Study for Non-Vessel Uses,” that proposes developing the Brewer Pond Natural Area as a public park appears to ignore these legal restrictions and prior binding county management plans. The proposal to utilize Brewer Pond Natural Area as an alternate to the proposed Valentine Creek Water Access Park should be dismissed. Brewer Pond is not a legally viable alternative. Further, Bayland’s July 2025, “Current Park Water Access Study for Non-Vessel Uses,” should be revised to include the relevant legal issues that would prohibit the public access to Brewer Pond. Robert Cloney: I am writing to express my strong opposition to any consideration of the Brewer Pond Natural Area (BPNA) as an alternative site for expanded public water access in place of the proposed Valentine Creek project. While I understand that the County is evaluating multiple options for recreational access along the Severn River, any representation that BPNA is a viable public water access location is legally inaccurate, factually incomplete, and inconsistent with the County’s own recorded instruments and obligations. BPNA is encumbered by a Conservation Easement that expressly prohibits public access, development, or disturbance of the property except under strictly limited and managed circumstances. Furthermore, BPNA is not served by

any County-owned, -controlled, or -maintained road. Sahlin Farm Road is a private, gated right-of-way traversing multiple privately owned parcels before reaching the BPNA boundary. The County has not been granted unrestricted access to this road for public purposes. The County's recently published report, "Current Park Water Access Study for Non-Vessel Uses" (BayLand, July 2025), identified BPNA as a potential public water access park. However, the Study contains no legal feasibility review of land title, easements, or access rights, elements that are essential when evaluating any County development proposal. Instead, the "Concept" section proposes installing picnic tables, signage, and blazed trails, all of which are expressly prohibited under the Conservation Easement, which forbids disturbance, vegetation removal, and construction of public infrastructure. The Study's errors, omissions, and misrepresentations have the effect of misleading stakeholders who are now advocating for Brewer Pond as an alternative to the proposed Valentine Creek access project. This, in turn, undermines informed public participation and responsible environmental planning. County planning and community discussions pertaining to the Brewer Pond Natural Area should not be based on the seriously flawed "Current Park Water Access Study for Non-Vessel Uses" report. Consequently, I urge the County to formally exclude BPNA from consideration as an alternative to the Valentine Creek project or any other public access initiative.

202. Jeffrey Toeneboehn: I strongly oppose any proposal to utilize the Brewer Pond Natural Area as an alternate site to Valentine Creek. Brewer Pond is protected under the 1999 Brewer Pond Deed of Conservation Easement, which explicitly prohibits general public access and establishes the property as a permanently conserved wildlife area. Public access would violate the easement terms and existing management plans that strictly limit entry through a controlled permit process for educational or environmental purposes only. Additionally, Brewer Pond has no public road access—the only access road is private and gated community. The establishment of this public access would violate existing agreements and also destroy the natural beauty of the area.

203. Matthew Gorman: This is not an appropriate location for the proposed Concept D plan. The amount of tree destruction, high development costs, and potential for runoff, shoreline disturbance, and water pollution make this site both environmentally harmful and fiscally irresponsible. Moving forward here would not be a wise use of taxpayer funds. This property is already open to the public and enjoyed daily in its natural state. The steep elevation makes it especially difficult—and costly—to develop responsibly. The inevitable consequence will be increased runoff and further degradation of already stressed water quality in Valentine Creek and the Severn River. Our waters are already unsafe at times. We are advised not to enter for 72 hours after heavy rain or with any cut or scrape. A man on the Severn River recently had to have his foot amputated after a small wound became infected from bacteria in the water. My own granddaughter has twice developed a facial virus after playing in the River. I want nothing more than to enjoy the water safely with her, but the risks are too high. Why would we add more pollution and activity that will only worsen the problem? The State of MD and a home owner named Janet Clausen has already invested millions in successful shoreline restoration projects nearby—Kyle Point ($4 million) and a second example of restoration is the Jabez Branch Tributary ($9.1 million, nine years to complete). Both projects are within a few miles of this proposed site by water. Both sites are designed to reduce water run-off and remove Nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment. Why would the County think it would be ok to destroy when others are restoring? Brewer Pond, a larger and flatter site, would be far more suitable for a public

access plan like this. We only need to look to Beverly Triton Beach Park in Edgewater as an example of what not to do. Please read the one-star reviews—do we really want to go through all this expense, environmental damage, and stress on our natural resources only to end up with a park full of disgruntled visitors? Valentine Creek is simply not the place for it. Without constant supervision, the area will become a magnet for unsupervised gatherings, boat traffic,fires, and litter. Protect what is left of our clean water, preserve the trees and natural shoreline, and choose a location that can safely and sustainably support public access. Reese Scoggins: I live in Arden on the Severn, and I, along with the rest of my family and many of my neighbors, enjoy peaceful walks on this trail. Though I appreciate the effort to keep the paths usable by connecting them, I'm sure you can imagine why a road through the middle of the forest will significantly diminish the beauty and peace. A lot of barely-touched wildlife will be destroyed. I commend the effort to fulfill the demand for public water access. It would be a consolation if the loss would at least serve many people, but the new watered-down plan doesn't seem worth the destruction. As the residents of Valentine Creek have made clear, anything of greater scope would be a mistake. As I see it, the benefit to one group of people (those who walk, run, or bike the trails) will be replaced with another, likely smaller group (those who will launch kayaks). With the cost, effort, and irreversible damage to wildlife, this transaction is hardly positive. I understand the county or some other entity bought the land and now wants to use it to serve the community. It already serves in a valuable way, which shouldn't be taken for granted. We will sincerely miss it when its gone. Thank you for your time. Please note my opposition. I would also greatly appreciate being notified about the next steps.

204. Tobin Finizio: My recollection is that when Brewer's Pond was donated it was expressly for conservation and even potentially research and education. They were adamant that it was not for public use. I think this would very definitely violate both the spirit and letter of that agreement. I also think the violation of this agreement would certainly dissuade individuals from donating land, etc. to the state or county in the future, if they are going to act in bad faith. This seems to be a poor solution both legally and ethically .

205. Debra Young: Valentine Creek Public Access Park is a poor location for the proposed Concept D plan. The significant quantity of tree destruction and development of the steep elevation is difficult and costly with the consequence of increased runoff, shoreline disturbance, and water pollution which will further degrade the already stressed water quality of the area. Given the high cost of development and increased runoff and degradation of already stressed water quality in Valentine Creek and the Severn River, moving forward with the plan would not be a good use of taxpayer funds. We live nearby on The Narrows, and this summer we experienced two significant crab die offs and fish die offs – we have never experienced a die off in this area in our previous three years here. We also noticed a significant decrease in crab population from the past three years. We are avid, frequent kayakers in Plum Creek and Valentine Creek and this year experienced muddy brown water for longer periods and less aquatic and avian activity. We had heavy rain this summer, with advisories not to enter for 72 hours, but we still see people with kayaks and paddleboards on the river or wading – how would this be supervised on the proposed access? We have reacted with hives from paddling or wading on the Severn, Plum Creek and Valentine Creek 4 to 5 days after the rain advisories. Developing another significant access point with additional activity and shoreline disturbance will only worsen the problem. Valentine Creek should not be further developed from being open to the public in its natural state. Without funding constant staff supervision and gates, there is a

significant potential for the area to have significant boat traffic, litter, fires, and group gatherings. Arden constantly has patrols and cameras to protect the beaches, yet there is still litter, destruction, fires, night trespassers, vandalism, and theft. Protect what is left of our clean water, preserve the trees and natural shoreline, and choose a location that can safely and sustainably support public access. Why is the Valentine Creek area being considered for development, considering that the State of Maryland and individuals have invested millions in successful shoreline restoration projects within a few miles by water of the proposed site – Kyle Point ($4 million) and Jabez Branch Tributary ($9.1 million). Shouldn't we be following those examples and restoring Valentine Creek and surrounding areas by reducing water run-off, removing Nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment. If public access is needed, Bargnani Road and Wilson Road are both public county roads in Herald Harbor that have existing water access to launch kayaks or a larger, flatter site such as Brewer Pond would cause less environmental destruction and stress on our natural resources. Please protect Valentine Creek and preserve the trees and natural shoreline by choosing a different location to develop that would support public access both fiscally and environmentally.

206. Daniel and Tanya Mathias: We are vehemently opposed to allowing public access to Brewer's Pond by way of our private residential neighborhood and road known as Sahlin Farm Rd, Annapolis, MD. It is a private road not developed by the county or by county standards to accommodate public access. The road is maintained and paid for solely by the private residences of Sahlin Farm Rd. It is a gated community with private access during specified hours for residents only.

207. David Little: I am a resident of Arden on the Severn 1120 Ridge Place I oppose Concept D2 as currently designed due to safety risks on Valentine Creek Drive and the Old Herald Harbor Road intersection, steep/erosion-prone terrain that makes "water access" impractical, and environmental impacts (Critical Area, FIDS habitat, specimen trees, tidal buffers). I support safer, more cost-effective alternatives such as improvements at Brewer Pond Natural Area. I also request a County-led traffic study with enforceable mitigation, publication of the environmental package (NRI/FSD, FIDS, wetlands, specimen trees, stormwater), an ADA feasibility analysis for the full ~2,200-ft route, and a full capital + O&M estimate with a utilization model. Please include my comment in the record and notify the community about next steps.

208. Charles Englehart: I oppose the creation of the proposed park at the end of Valentine Creek for environmental and practical reasons. Much of my concern has been voiced through the Valentine Creek Civic Association, so I will spare the in depth redundancy. Having to drag a kayak such a long distance from the proposed parking lot to the proposed water access does not make much sense. If the intent is to increase access to the bay, adding parking lots that are at least an hour''s paddle from the bay does not accomplish that goal. The roads in the area are not built for constant boat traffic, nor would it be reasonable to believe they could sustain the traffic. The project will demolish trees in the area and add a tremendous amount of impervious surface right next to the creek. Both of these will increase runoff and pollution of our precious natural resources. Multiple alternatives have been proposed that will cost the county less, destroy less of our natural environment, and provide more convenient options for kayakers and boaters.

209. Helen Little: I'm a resident of Arden on Severn I do not support Concept D2. It poses safety hazards, sits on steep, erosion-prone terrain, and threatens sensitive habitat. The site isn't practical or ADA-feasible. It will also increase traffic. Please consider safer, more cost-

effective options for resident who live and want the beauty to stay the same. and include my comment in the record.

210. Ellison Smith: Thank you for this opportunity to submit my comments on the proposed public water access point at Valentine Creek on the Severn River. My attendance at the meeting was marred by numerous hostile residents speaking out-of-turn and attempting to hi-jack the meeting for their own pofanity laced rants. I understand the mentality of the people but to hear the obscenities and experience the rudeness of others disappointed me. I hope that in future meetings, the adults will behave as such and not let their emotions control them. I'm heavily involved with paddlesports in many ways throughout the area. Public access on the upper Severn is virtually non-existent. This opportunity would be very beneficial to the community, although they would not likely admit it. Many concerns of the residents have been addressed during the initial pre-construction phase with county observations and studies. Native plants, trees and wildlife would not be harmed during the construction process. Sediment controls to protect the water way would be installed and the limit of disturbance to existing trails would be minimal. In addition, trees would be planted as part of the reforestation plan. The slope would not be an obstacle as seen at Spriggs Farm Park. Neither would the distance to the launch as is the case with Quiet Waters Park. There are other options to mitigate the steep grade by using carts for heavier paddlecraft while lightweight craft such as inflatable and rigid paddle boards can be carried. Concerns regarding motorists unfamiliar with the intersection in question can be addressed by contacting local representatives in the county about possible improvements such as rumble strip warnings and lighted signage. The residents there visit unfamiliar destinations regularly, but the risk of being involved in an accident does not deter them in doing so. Combined with the fact that roadway accidents happen everyday and everywhere, the intersection should not be a determining factor. I'd like to ask the county for participation by adding a standup paddleboarder and an alternate to the Valentine Creek stakeholder committee going forward. Thank you for your time in acknowledgeing my comments, have a blessed day.

211. Glen Whisman: I am a resident of Sudbrook Place. I oppose Concept D2 as currently designed due to safety risks on Valentine Creek Drive and the Old Herald Harbor Road intersection, steep/erosion-prone terrain that makes “water access” impractical, and environmental impacts (Critical Area, FIDS habitat, specimen trees, tidal buffers). I support safer, more cost-effective alternatives such as improvements at Brewer Pond Natural Area. I also request a County-led traffic study with enforceable mitigation, publication of the environmental package (NRI/FSD, FIDS, wetlands, specimen trees, stormwater), an ADA feasibility analysis for the full ~2,200-ft route, and a full capital + O&M estimate with a utilization model. Please include my comment in the record and notify the community about next steps.

212. Mindy Whisman: I am a resident of Stratford Hall. I oppose Concept D2 as currently designed due to safety risks on Valentine Creek Drive and the Old Herald Harbor Road intersection, steep/erosion-prone terrain that makes “water access” impractical, and environmental impacts (Critical Area, FIDS habitat, specimen trees, tidal buffers). I support safer, more cost-effective alternatives such as improvements at Brewer Pond Natural Area. I also request a County-led traffic study with enforceable mitigation, publication of the environmental package (NRI/FSD, FIDS, wetlands, specimen trees, stormwater), an ADA feasibility analysis for the full ~2,200-ft route, and a full capital + O&M estimate with a utilization model. Please include my comment in the record and notify the community about next steps.

213. Tamara Tymkiw: I attended this community meeting. I am very familiar with the Valentine Creek community and agree with safety concerns for increased traffic at the intersection of Valentine Creek Drive and Old Herald Harbor Road. The safest way to exit the neighborhood is to roll down both windows to listen for oncoming traffic and then pull out as quickly as possible due to the blind spot. I am also concerned about taxpayer cost due to the difficult terrain. I also do not like the design of the water park. Looking at the map, it seems that it is a long way to hike uphill with a kayak on the way back from the water. I do not feel that the casual kayaker will use Concept D on a routine basis. They may come at first to check it out, but then the kayak chute will become a "white elephant" so to speak, especially since there is kayak launch site at the nearby Smith Marina which is easier to access. Historically, the County did not plan water access for all and developers were allowed to buy up most of the waterfront property. We should not try to fix the problem by destroying something else that locals feel is important to preserve: the Crownsville Woods park with its natural trails and wildlife.
214. Jeremy Schreifels: I am opposed to the Valentine Creek Water Access Trail. The reasons for my opposition include: It will cause environmental degradation, habitat fragmentation, and water quality impacts in an area that is already under significant environmental stress; It is not practical to expect kayakers to haul their kayaks nearly 1/2 a mile from the parking to the launch; The water area is relatively shallow meaning there is a lot of distance to cover between high and low tides; it also makes a fishing pier less practical; The road is narrow and access could be affected by on-street parking; and The cost is significantly higher than other options that may be available to the county
215. Jim Gallagher: Please reconsider moving forward with the Valentine Creek Site. I won't list all of the reasons, as I know you have them recorded and I'd like to save you some time. Let's keep our pristine forest/ walking trail as close to perfect as it is currently. Plus, I'm a senior citizen and the terrain is not suitable for my wife and I to traverse. Isn't it awful that they are trying to get an exception from the ADA for this project? It's quite a slap in our faces!
216. Paul DeRoo: Comment #1:
    a. Paul DeRoo: Thanks to the County for taking input from citizens on various decision making and project proposals. Concerning the concept construct for the Valentine Creek Park project we have several comments to share. The County has done some nice work with the park system in general. Two nearby examples include providing access to the Bike Trail off of Waterbury Road with small size parking to enable bikers to use as a starting point-the right fit for the particular function, small lot on a main road with little intrusion to the local neighborhoods. A second example includes the planning of SouthShore Park, with plans to provide both active and passive recreation, on flat and already cleared land, with good access to Generals' Highway. Both are "best fit" plans by providing solutions to meet the needs of the general public with the appropriate use of the land. While the County may be well-intentioned to make improvements to Valentine Creek Park, the D2 plan is quite frankly not a "best fit" plan for this particular park setting, both the environment and the community. We know you have received numerous comments regarding: Overall safety concerns for the VC community: road width, traffic speed, dangerous intersection Environmental degradation over time even if current best practices are used: with the presence of a relatively undisturbed environment with a land and water ecosystem…heavily wooded, steep slopes, valuable habitat Disturbance of a well-established small family-oriented community on a dead-

end road The need for water access for small craft in this area is a phantom need. The surrounding communities-Indian Landing-Arden-Herald Harbor-Palisades-Downs-Epping Forest-all have water access points already. Usually parks in general are more heavily used by the local communities that are close to the area of a particular park. County projects in general should have the support of and serve positively the local community as a baseline for decision-making. Valentine Creek Community residents have used and will continue to use the access point at Smith's marina for small craft, which has adequate parking, bathrooms and launch point at the water's edge on flat land. We as a residents of Valentine Creek would continue to use the marina (at very reasonable cost) for my kayak launch even if D2 goes forward. In other words, the project is not a "best fit" but a "mis-fit" for both the environment and for the community culture. We would encourage you to cancel plans for the provision of water access through Valentine Creek Park. Please use the funds (which will be expensive) for another site.

b. Comment #2 On behalf of the Valentine Creek Community Association (VCCA), we want to clarify and respond to the Crownsville Conservancy's October 17 letter regarding Concept D.2. First, we respect the role the Conservancy has played historically in preserving land in Crownsville and protecting it from residential development. However, several statements in the letter require correction or clarification so that the public record is accurate and balanced.
    i. 1. Characterization of "Unanimous Support". The letter asserts that there was "unanimous support from the VCCA" for the County's purchase of the property in 2016. To be clear, VCCA as a community has always supported preservation of open space. What cannot be substantiated, however, is the claim of unanimous support for how the land should be used once purchased. Our community has diverse views, and no meeting minutes or documented votes exist to establish unanimity. Suggesting otherwise is misleading, especially since the Conservancy does not represent or speak for VCCA residents.
    ii. False Choice Between Development and Park Construction: The framing that the alternative to a County-developed park was residential development is also misleading. Many residents supported acquisition of the property for open space precisely to prevent development of any kind that would irreparably alter the woods. That does not mean residents consented to a future parking lot, paved roads, or intensive water-access facilities. Suggesting this was an "either/or" choice oversimplifies the community's longstanding commitment to preservation.
    iii. 3. Adequacy of Current Public Access: The Conservancy's letter implies that the current, low-impact status quo does not satisfy the Program Open Space requirement for "public access." We respectfully disagree. Today, the public already uses the woods for hiking, birding, biking, and enjoying the forest's pristine habitat. These activities are consistent with both the letter and spirit of Program Open Space, which emphasizes conservation and recreational opportunities. The idea that heavy infrastructure must be built to meet that standard has never been demonstrated.
    iv. 4. Traffic and Usage Assumptions: The letter states that the proposed park will not attract "hundreds of cars per day" and will "primarily serve nearby residents." With respect, no data or studies are cited to support these claims. Without traffic

counts, projections, or usage analysis, such conclusions are speculative. If the park truly would attract minimal traffic, one must ask why significant sums of taxpayer dollars should be spent paving roads, clearing trees, and building facilities when the land already serves the public well in its natural state.

v. 5. Representation of Community Leaders: The Conservancy's October 1 post on their website referred to consultation with "community leaders" in the design of Concept D.2. To our knowledge, no members of the VCCA Board were invited or consulted in that process. We would appreciate clarity on which leaders were included, and whether the full Conservancy Board formally convened and voted on its stated position. Transparency matters, especially when the most directly impacted community has struggled to have its concerns heard. In closing: VCCA has consistently expressed that we are not opposed to public use of the woods, as that is already taking place. We simply believe that the County's current plan (Concept D.2) is unsafe, impractical, and unnecessary given the existing public use that already occurs. Reasonable alternatives exist, such as smaller dispersed trailheads and preservation-focused improvements, that would expand access without damaging the natural character of the property or overwhelming surrounding neighborhoods. We respectfully ask that the County take our concerns seriously, not as obstacles to public access, but as constructive input toward a better, more sustainable solution. Sincerely, Valentine Creek Community Association Board