

Existing Plans and Policies

Background

The Prince George's County Planning Department is updating and replacing the Approved 2009 Countywide Master Plan of Transportation (MPOT). It is comprehensively developing goals, strategies, and policies to better implement Plan 2035, the Prince George's County General Plan, approved in 2014. Task 6 involves the research, assessment, and report preparation of relevant existing transportation conditions and trends in the County. The work completed for Task 6.17 is focused on a review of the existing plans and policies.

Scope of Work

Task 6.17 involves the review of the plans and policies listed below and identification of potential conflicts and overlaps. The study team determined who would review which document and RK&K's assignments are identified.

- DPW&T Specifications and Standards for Roads and Bridges – RK&K
- DPW&T Urban Street Design Standards – RK&K
- DPR Trail Strategic Plan
- DPW&T Vision Zero Action Plan
- DPW&T Transit Vision Plan – RK&K
- Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program – RK&K (limited to roadways and transit)
- Plan Prince George's 2035 (limited to Transportation and Mobility)
- Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations

Data Collection and Existing Resources

The reports used in this review were located and downloaded from digital sources on Prince George's County Government websites.

Findings

The following section highlight the findings of each report's review, either independently or in relation to another report:

DPW&T Specifications and Standards for Roads and Bridges (2012) (SSRB)

The review of this document primarily focused on the roadway classifications and associated right-of-way width. Road classifications are set based on their primary function, traffic volumes, and adjacent land uses. Design standards are tied to the functional class. Prince George's County applies sixteen classifications, four of which are Scenic and Historic. Three other classifications relate specifically to hiker/biker trails within the urban right-of-way or on private easements.

Table 1 presents the twelve classifications compared to the information provided in Table 4 of the 2009 MPOT. Freeways and Expressways are not classified by Prince George's County as they are Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration facilities where the

right-of-way is obtained and owned by the State of Maryland. Table 4 of the 2009 MPOT provides the right-of-way width for each roadway listed. Within each roadway classification the right-of-way width varies. On some roadways, the right-of-way width is presented by a range or indicated as “varies.” The typical right-of-way width shown in the table is the number represented most often.

Each standard detail for roadway classifications includes a typical section with dimensions and a table showing the right-of-way width. It should be noted that the dimensions shown in the typical sections are not precisely consistent with those in the table. For Standard 100.06 – Urban Primary Residential Road, the width from right-of-way line to right-of-way line is 62’ (72’ for an alternate configuration). However, the companion table shows 60’ (70’). For Standard 100.07- Urban Secondary Residential Road, the width from right-of-way line to right-of-way line is 52’. However, the companion table shows 50’.

For those roadways where an alternate configuration (wider typical section) is to be applied, the master plan right-of-width may be insufficient in some locations. These “pinch points” may result from an obstacle on the property or other situations where the property is protected (e.g., parkland, cemetery, historic building). In these situations, the roadway centerline may need to be adjusted away for the obstacle resulting in a greater impact in the property opposite the obstacle.

Table 1: Right-of-Way Width Comparison

SSRB			2009 MPOT	
Classification	Design R/W Width (alternate configuration width)	Standard No.	Classification	Typical R/W Width (ft)
No DPW&T Classification			Freeways	300
No DPW&T Classification			Expressways	200
Urban Arterial	120 (130)	100.01	Arterials	120
Urban Major Collector	100	100.02	Major Collectors	100
Urban 4-Lane Collector	80	100.03	Collectors	80
Urban 5-Lane Collector	80 (90)	100.04		
Urban Primary Residential Road	60 (70)	100.06	Primary Roads	60
Urban Commercial and Industrial Road	70	100.05	Industrial Roads	70
Urban Secondary Residential Road	50	100.07		
Rural 4-Lane Arterial	130	100.08		
Rural 2-Lane Collector	80	100.09		
Rural Primary Residential Road	60	100.10		
Rural Secondary Residential Road	60	100.11		
Rural Private Residential Road	50	100.12		

Sources: SSRB and 2009 MPOT

DPW&T Urban Street Design Standards (2017) (USDS)

The Urban Street Design Standards was developed for use in Prince George’s County’s Regional Transit Districts and Local Centers as established in *Plan 2035 Prince George’s Approved General Plan*. It recognizes that designs standards in and around transit districts and local centers warrant special consideration, partly because of the multimodal aspect around Complete Streets. They transform traditional suburban-style development into more urban environments increasingly focused on transit, walking, and bicycling. The new urban street typologies serve to overlay the functional classification of the roadway. In these areas, additional considerations are to be evaluated.

The urban street typologies generally overlay on Urban Arterials (Std. No. 100.01), Urban Major Collectors (Std. No. 100.02), Urban 4-Lane Collectors (Std. No. 100.03), Urban 5-Lane Collectors (Std. No. 100.04), Urban Commercial and Industrial Road (Std. No. 100.05), Urban Primary Residential Road (Std. 100.06), and Urban Secondary residential Road (Std. No. 100.07). The overlays contain elements and dimensions that encourage multimodal use of the roadway: slower design speeds, fewer travel lanes, wider sidewalks, greater bicycle accommodation, and shorter crossing distances. New standards for these roadways, shown in Table 2, were created to supplement those listed above.

Table 2: Urban Street Design Standards

USDS		
Classification	Design R/W Width (ft) (alternate configuration widths*)	Standard No.
Mixed Use Boulevard (A) 2 Travel Lanes	99 (89) (83)	100.20
Mixed Use Boulevard (B) 2 Travel Lanes	92 (82) (76)	100.21
Mixed Use Boulevard (A) 4 Travel Lanes	119 (109)	100.22
Mixed Use Boulevard (B) 4 Travel Lanes	116 (106)	100.23
Mixed Use Boulevard (A) Center Turn Lane	93	100.24
Mixed Use Boulevard (B) Center Turn Lane	86	100.25
Neighborhood Connector (A)	83 (75)	100.26
Neighborhood Connector (B)	66 (58)	100.27
Neighborhood Residential	60 (53)	100.28
Industrial Road	48 (57)	100.29
Shared Street	50	100.30
Alley	20	100.31
Separated Bike Lane	N/A	100.32
Bike Lane	N/A	100.33
Shared Lane Marking	N/A	100.34
Shared Use Path	N/A	100.35
Perpendicular Curb Ramp Configuration	N/A	100.36
Curb Extension	N/A	100.37
Street Tree Placement in R/W	N/A	600.21

* Figures in parenthesis indicate alternative configurations related to reductions in median width or optional on-street parking.
Source: USDS

In most cases, the design right-of-way width for the additional urban street types exceed that of the comparable design right-of-way width defined in Standards 100.01 – 100.07. To assess the potential impact associated with these differences, DPW&T and M-NCPPC must define the boundary of the regional transit districts and local centers and determine which roadways within that boundary warrant a new classification based on adjacent land uses and modal share. Typically, reconsiderations of this type would be done through the master plan update process.

Standard Nos. 100.32 – 100.37 and 600.21 can be accommodated without impact to the planned right-of-way width. These classifications are intended to repurpose the existing roadway to support the complete streets concept and increase all users' sense of safety and comfort.

DPW&T Transit Vision Plan

The Prince George's County DPWT Transit Vision Plan 2018-2022 provides recommendations based on a set of goals and objectives to create an action plan. The Transit Vision Plan focuses mainly on enhancements and improvements to the existing bus service – additional service, modification of routes, customer service improvements, and first mile/last mile connections. The Plan recommends implementation phasing and provides estimated improvement costs by phase.

The final section of the Plan includes a brief section on a future rapid transit corridor strategy, recommending the preparation of a Master Plan for a Fixed Guideway System within the County. This plan would evaluate corridors and assess feasible guideway improvements within each corridor. The Plan goes on to say that the improvement recommendations in the earlier parts of the plan form the foundation for transition over time to enhanced rapid transit service in major corridors.

Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program (2022)

The *Department of Public Works and Transportation FY 2022-2027 Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program*, while not specifically conflicting with the Transit Vision Plan, is very focused on roadway improvements, with little funding for transit. The four line items for transit are:

- #4.66.0006 – Bus Mass Transit/Metro Access
- #7.66.0002 - Southern Maryland Rapid Transit
- #7.66.0001 - Maryland Purple Line
- #4.66.0039 - Transit Oriented Development Infrastructure

Plan 2035, Prince George's Prince George's Approved General Plan

The Transportation and Mobility Element of *Plan 2035, Prince George's Approved General Plan* (2014) is the plan most relevant to the Transit Vision Plan. The transportation and mobility goal provided below presents no conflicts with the Transit Vision Plan.

Provide and maintain a safe, affordable, accessible, and energy-efficient multimodal transportation network that supports the County's desired land use pattern and Plan 2035 goals.



Plan 2035, with a longer-term perspective than the five-year vision plan looks beyond improvements to the existing bus services and looks to the need to invest in transit and to identify future corridors. It mentions specifically the Southern Maryland (MD 5) Transit Corridor. The plan identifies the challenges of land use and development patterns that do not presently support transit. It recommends prioritizing investment in targeted areas, with the need to focus on development of a network.

The following table lists the 37 master, sector, and transit district development plans prepared since 2008 that inform the Master Plan of Transportation.

Table 3: Master, Sector, and Transit District Development Plans

Plan	Date
2021 Preliminary Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan	2021
City of College Park Complete and Green Streets Implementation Plan: 30 Percent Design for Five Street Segments	2021
Preliminary Adelphi Road-UMGC-UMD Purple Line Station Area Sector Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment	2021
Greater Cheverly	2018
Mount Rainier Pattern Book	2018
East Riverdale-Beacon Heights	2017
Prince George's Plaza TDDP	2016
Central Avenue Connector Trail Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan	2015
College Park-Riverdale Park TDDP	2015
Approved Landover Metro Area and MD 202 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment	2014
Central Avenue - Metro Blue Corridor TOD Implementation Project Mobility	2014
Eastover/Forest Heights/Glassmanor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment	2014
Landover Metro Area & MD 202 Corridor	2014
Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan	2014
Southern Green Line	2014
Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan	2013
Greenbelt Metro Area and MD 193 Corridor	2013
Largo Town Center	2013
Subregion 5	2013
Subregion 6	2013
Bowie MARC	2010
Central Annapolis Road Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment	2010
Central US 1 Corridor	2010
City of Mount Rainier Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan	2010
Glenn Dale-Seabrook-Lanham	2010
New Carrollton TDDP	2010
Subregion 1	2010
Subregion 4	2010



Landover Gateway Sector Plan	2009
Marlboro Pike	2009
Port Towns	2009
Takoma/Langley Crossroads	2009
Branch Avenue Corridor	2008
Capitol Heights TDDP	2008