

Attachment A: Errata and Technical Corrections

Staff Draft Go Prince George’s

March 24, 2026 Joint Public Hearing

Table of Contents

I	Introduction		1	
II	New Information		5	
III	Errata and Technical Corrections	A	Major Corrections	15
		B	Typographical, Grammar, or Sentence Structure Errors	66
		C	Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location	68
		D	Errors in MPOT Table	73
		E	Adherence to Planning Department and Master Plan Protocols	91
		F	Clarifications	93
		G	Corrections of Factual Errors	106
		H	Corrections of Multiple Error Types or Other Errors	116

Errors and clarifications that could not be resolved in time for the March 24, 2026 Joint Public Hearing are contained in a supplemental document, Attachment B: Errata and Technical Corrections (Planning Board Worksession). These will be identified and resolved for incorporation in the Planning Board’s Resolution of Adoption.

I. Introduction

Within each Section, the following is provided:

Revision Number	Page Number	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
Revision number	Page number or range PW – Plan-wide	Section of plan	Policy or Strategy Number	Description of the error or location where clarification is warranted, or where new information exists that was not available in the Fall of 2024 when this document was finalized.	Description of necessary revision to this document. <u>Underline</u> for insertions Strikethrough for deletions

I. Introduction

Table 1: Acronym Guide

A	Arterial (road function-classification)		MDOT	Maryland Department of Transportation
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials		MI	Micromobility & Transportation Network Companies
ACS	American Community Survey		M-NPPPC	Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
ADA	Americans With Disabilities Act		MP	Master Plan
ADT	American Discovery Trail		MPOT	Master Plan of Transportation
AMTRAK	National Railroad Passenger Corporation		MTA	Maryland Transit Administration
ATHA	Anacostia Trails Heritage Area		NACTO	National Association of City Transportation Officials
AV	Aviation		NASA	NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
BK	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities and Natural Surface Trails		NPS	National Park Service
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit		NTMP	Neighborhood Traffic Management Program
C	Collector (road function-classification)		P	Primary (road function-classification)
CAP	Climate Action Plan		PBCAT	Pedestrian & Bicycle Crash Analysis Tool
CG	Complete and Green Streets		PGCPS	Prince George's County Public Schools
CIP	Capital Improvement Project		PEPCO	Potomac Electric Power Company
CMA	Countywide Map Amendment		PGAtlas	Prince George's County Atlas
CR	Council Resolution		PR	Sidewalks & Pedestrian Mobility
COG	Council of Governments		RES	Residential (street classification)
CPTED	Crime Prevention through Environmental Design		RH	Roads & Highways
CSX	CSX Transportation		ROW	Right-of-Way
DDOT	District Department of Transportation		RTO	Regional Transit Oriented
DPIE	Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement		RS	Rural Scenic Roads
DPR	Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation		RSH	Rural Scenic & Historic Roads
DPW&T	Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation		SH	Special Roadways & County Heritage
DSP	Detailed Site Plan		SHA	Maryland State Highway Administration
E	Expressway (highway classification)		SI	Smart Infrastructure
EV	Electric Vehicle		SS	Sustainability

I. Introduction

F	Freeway (highway classification)		TD	Transportation Demand Management
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation		TDMD	Transportation Demand Management District
GIS	Geographic Information Systems		TM	Transportation Mobility
GM	Goods Movement		TNC	Transportation Network Company
HAWK	High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk		TPB	Transportation Planning Board, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
HCT	High- Capacity Transit		TR	Transit
HIN	High Injury Network		TSA	Transportation Service Area
I	Industrial (road function-classification)		U	Urban Center (urban street typology)
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers		UA	Urban Alley (urban street typology)
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems		UC	Neighborhood Connector (urban street typology)
LED	Light-Emitting Diode		UI	Urban Industrial (urban street typology)
LPI	Leading Pedestrian Interval		UM	Mixed-Use Boulevard (urban street typology)
LOS	Level of Service		UR	Neighborhood Residential (urban street typology)
LOT	Local Transit Oriented		US	Shared Street (urban street typology)
LTS	Level of Traffic Stress		USDS	Urban Street Design Standards
MAA	Maryland Aviation Administration		UAM	Urban Air Mobility
MARC	Maryland Area Regional Commuter		Vision Zero	Prince George's County traffic safety initiative
MC	Major Collector (road function classification)		WMATA	Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
MD-MUTCD	Maryland Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices		WSSC	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission

II. New Information

This document was prepared over a three-year period between September 2021 and August 2024. Since August 2024, events have occurred that were not addressed by this document. They are identified here for incorporation into the Planning Board’s Resolution of Adoption.

Table 2: New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
NI1	PW	Plan-wide		The initial staff draft plan was released in February 2025 but will not be approved until a future year.	Update horizon year, and update any references to the time frame and schedule for plan preparation and approval.
NI2	PW	Plan-wide		Revise Prince George's County Council and Prince George's County Planning Board to reflect membership on the date of approval of the functional master plan	Revise accordingly; additionally update the Foreword from the Planning Board Chair to reflect Chairman Barnes as the current Chair of the Planning Board with new letter.
NI3	PW	Plan-wide		Hyperlinks to map data sources pending at time of publication	Include Hyperlinks to map data sources
NI4	PW	Plan-wide		Acknowledge and update new, retired, reassigned, and former staff, consultants, and "Special thanks to" names.	Update as needed at time of publication
NI5	PW	Plan-wide		Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires state and local governments to ensure that everyone has equal access to participate in government programs and services. The compliance deadline is April 24, 2026.	Update all maps to meet ADA requirements

II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
NI7	PW	Plan-wide		On November 10, 2025, the County Council, sitting as the District Council adopted CR-137-2025, approving the West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan. This sector plan was being prepared concurrently with Go Prince George's; relevant policies and strategies not included in the "2025 Preliminary Plan" should be carried forward into this functional master plan.	See specific corrections below.
NI8	PW	Plan-wide		On September 18, 2025, the Planning Board released the Preliminary Central Avenue-Blue/Silver Line Sector Plan and Proposed SMA to the public. This sector plan was being prepared concurrently with Go Prince George's; relevant policies and strategies from that plan not included in the "2025 Preliminary Plan" should be carried forward into this functional master plan.	See specific corrections below.
NI9	PW	Plan-wide		On October 30, 2025, the Planning Board released the Port Towns Sector Plan and Proposed SMA to the public. This sector plan was being prepared concurrently with Go Prince George's; relevant policies and strategies from that plan not included in the "2025 Preliminary Plan" should be carried forward into this functional master plan.	See specific corrections below.

II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
NI10	20	Ensuring Great Communities		<p>Page 20 (Ensuring great communities...) identifies the federal government's Justice40 Communities Initiative and the Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool as key measures in Go Prince George's.</p> <p>These programs were terminated in 2025 under a new federal administration.</p>	<p>Add clarification "The federal government's Justice40 Communities Initiative and its Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool <u>as they existed in 2024.</u>"</p>
NI11	32	Community Engagement		<p>Community engagement continued after the release of the Staff Draft Plan and valuable input was received from the public, partner agencies, and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>Update the statistics and timeline on Page 32 to reflect community engagement conducted between January 2025 and March 2026.</p>
NI12	35-37	Plan 2035 Center Classification System		<p>Plan 2035 identified designated centers near Purple Line stations as "Future Purple Line Centers". These Centers are designated Centers currently, are eligible for classification in the appropriate Transit-Oriented/Activity Center Zone within the Zoning Ordinance, and references to "future" are no longer appropriate with the Purple Line scheduled to open in 2027.</p>	<p>Delete references to "Future Purple Line centers" throughout the plan and the following text box in this section:</p> <p><u>Go Prince George's amends Plan 2035 by deleting all references to "Future Purple Line Centers."</u></p>

II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
				Page 253 (Transit) states “Capitalize on Prince George’s County’s access to Montgomery County’s Flash Network to connect the Metro Red Line with Chillum and Langley Park. Work with the Montgomery County Department of Transportation, Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration, and the City of Takoma Park to evaluate the potential of a Flash station at or near the intersection of MD 410 (East West Highway) and MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue).”	
NI13	124	Street Recommendations		Additional notes along Queens Chapel Road regarding the Enhanced Bus Stops Amenities Corridor and any adjustments to the road will require SHA to first evaluate the safety and operational implications	<p>Add the following in notes to all UM-207 segments in Table X.</p> <p><u>Designate the segment from MD 500 (Chillum Road) to MD 410 (East-West Highway) as an Enhanced Bus Stop Amenities Corridor</u></p> <p><u>Implementation of the full Mixed-Use Boulevard cross-section for this segment is subject to SHA’s evaluation of safety and operational implications.</u></p>

II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
NI14	125	Street Recommendations		An Urban Alley recommendation identified in the 2025 <i>Approved West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan</i> was missing from the Go Prince George's recommendation table	Add entry for UA-209; no Route ID; Alley #26; City of Hyattsville; District 4; 37th Place; MD 208 (38th Avenue); UA; 20; None; 1; 2025 West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel SP; Notes: no reconstruction needed
NI15	126	Street Recommendations		The classification type for all segments of MD 208 (38th Avenue/Street) should match what is recommended in the 2025 <i>Approved West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan</i> and 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Sector Plan	The MPOT ID for the last MD 208 segment (Allison Street to Hamilton Street) should be UR-213, others should be UC-213; additionally add an entry for US-213 as described in the 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Plan for the segment south of Bladensburg Road).
NI16	127	Street Recommendations		The classification type for the U-218 segment of MD 450 (Annapolis Road) should match with what is recommended in the 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Sector Plan.	Create two rows for the entry for MD 450 (Annapolis Road). Change both MPOT IDs to UM-218, ROW to 98', Type is MUB (B) 4 Lanes, Lanes 4. Carry over notes of both entries First entry "From" is US 1 Alt (Baltimore Avenue), "To" is "MD 202 (Landover Road)"; second entry "From" is "MD 202 (Landover Road)" and "To" is "57th Avenue"
NI17	128	Street Recommendations		The classification type for the UI-222 (US 1 Alt (Baltimore Avenue) should match with what is recommended in the 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Sector Plan	Combine the two two-way pairs of the first UI-222 segment

II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
NI18	129	Street Recommendations		The classification type for all segments of Chillum Road should match with what is recommended in the <i>2025 Approved West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan</i>	Change all segments of Chillum Road west of Queens Chapel Road to UM-227, the USDS type should be UM (B), lanes should be 2 for all segments, and ROW is 98'
NI19	131	Street Recommendations		An Urban Alley recommendation identified in the <i>2025 Approved West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan</i> was missing from the Go Prince George's recommendation table	Replace entry UR-235: change MPOT ID to UA-235, no Route ID; Gaines Alley; City of Hyattsville; District 4; 37th Place; MD 208 (38th Avenue); UA; 20; None; 1; 2025 West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel SP; Notes: no reconstruction needed
NI20	132	Street Recommendations		The classification type for all segments of Nicholson Street should match with what is recommended in the <i>2025 Approved West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan</i>	Change the segment of Nicholson labeled MPOT ID U-243 to UR-243, change USDS Type to UR, and change Min. ROW to 58'
NI21	134	Street Recommendations		The entry for UI-251 is identified with no bicycle accommodation due to heavy commercial traffic. The facility type for this segment of Buchanan Drive should match with what is recommended in the 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Sector Plan.	Change the bicycle facility from "none" to "shared-lane markings and shared-use path" and remove note regarding heavy traffic

II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
NI22	135	Street Recommendations		Several master plan street recommendations identified in the 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Sector Plan were missing from the Go Prince George's recommendation table	Add entries for Urban Center Streets U-260 to U-267 as described in the 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Sector Plan
NI23	151	Street Recommendations		A residential street recommendation identified in the 2025 <i>Approved West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan</i> was missing from the Go Prince George's recommendation table	Add two entries for RES-242: no route ID; 38th Avenue; City of Hyattsville; District 2; Hamilton Street; Jefferson Street; 60; Shared-lane markings; 2; West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel SP no route ID; Jefferson Street; City of Hyattsville; District 2; 38th Avenue; US 1 (Baltimore Avenue); 50; Shared-lane markings; 2; New in Go Prince George's

II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
NI24	186	Road Recommendations		Due to street naming conventions north of Bladensburg, the entries for P-213 have inaccurate and confusing from/to endpoints and facility names (56th Avenue/56th Place).	<p>Change the "From" entry on the first P-213 segment to "MD 450 (Annapolis Road)", the "To" to "Decatur Street/56th Place" and the "Name" to "56th Avenue";</p> <p>Add an additional entry after the first P-213 segment: "Name" is "56th Place", "Ownership" is DPW&T, "From" is "56th Avenue", the "To" is "Gallatin Place", all other entries are the same as the first segment</p> <p>Change the "From" on the last segment to "Gallatin Place", and "Name" to "56th Avenue"</p>
NI25	215	Map 28		Queenstown Drive, when reconstructed for an Urban Street, will terminate at the NW Branch Trail Bridge over the Northwest Branch. The existing line on Map 28. Functional Classification, Hyattsville-Riverdale-Mt. Rainier-Brentwood follows the existing Queenstown Drive	Adjust the line on Map 25 - Starting at Chillum Road, the line for UR-248 should curve toward the left to meet the NW Branch Trail bridge over the NW Branch

II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
NI25 a	253	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Page 253 (Transit) states “Capitalize on Prince George’s County’s access to Montgomery County’s Flash Network to connect the Metro Red Line with Chillum and Langley Park. Work with the Montgomery County Department of Transportation, Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration, and the City of Takoma Park to evaluate the potential of a Flash station at or near the intersection of MD 410 (East West Highway) and MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue).”</p> <p>Subsequent to the public release of the “2025 Preliminary Plan”, in February 2026, the Montgomery County Department of Transportation released the <i>New Hampshire Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Study Report</i>. The report recommends a FLASH station at MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and MD 410 (Ethan Allen Avenue).</p>	<p>Add the following language as a Policy and strategies in the Transit Element:</p> <p><u>Policy TR 13: Advance FLASH BRT service between Prince George’s County and the Metrorail Red Line.</u></p> <p><u>Strategy TR 13.1: Construct FLASH Stations at the following locations, as identified in the 2026 New Hampshire Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Study:</u></p> <p><u>MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) at:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Hillandale/Powder Mill Road</u> - <u>Oakview Drive</u> - <u>Northampton Drive</u> - <u>Quebec Street</u> - <u>Takoma/Langley Transit Center</u> - <u>Merwood Drive</u> - <u>MD 410 (Ethan Allen Avenue)</u> - <u>Sheridan Street.</u>

II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
NI26	253	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Page 253 (Transit) states “Collaborate with DPW&T under the 2024 Microtransit Suitability Analysis to identify suitable areas in the County for microtransit services. The study includes updated methodology which looks at suitability through three lenses: demographics, productivity, and trip demand.”</p> <p>Subsequent to public release of the “2025 Preliminary Plan” the County Council adopted the Transit Vision Plan. This plan recommends several new locations to evaluate for future microtransit services.</p>	<p>Add the following strategies under Policy TR 7:</p> <p>Strategy: Study areas identified in the 2025 <i>Transit Vision Plan</i>, page 28, for future short- to mid-term PGC Link services.</p> <p>Strategy: Collaborate with DPW&T under the 2024 Microtransit Suitability Analysis to identify suitable areas in the County for microtransit services. The study includes updated methodology which looks at suitability through three lenses: demographics, productivity, and trip demand.</p> <p>Add the map of future PGC Link study areas from page 28 of the <i>Transit Vision Plan</i> to this page.</p>

III. A: Major Corrections:

This section contains a description of errors, inconsistencies, new information, and other discrepancies that require a significant revision to the “2025 Preliminary Plan” beyond that which can fit into a table.

III. A1: Major Corrections: Plan Introduction

Revision A1

Page 13

Section: Plan Introduction

Policies/Strategies

N/A

Issues/Errors

1. Page 13 states "Prince George's County includes multiple incorporated areas and communities of choice for families, businesses, and visitors. Go Prince George's replaces the 2009 Countywide Master Plan of Transportation and includes the vision, goals, policies, and strategies for enhancing the vast transportation network of the County. This plan reconciles and consolidates transportation recommendations and policies from the master and sector plans approved since 2009 to provide a more comprehensive and concise plan. It further supports the robust countywide transportation network, which serves unincorporated areas and 27 municipalities."

This statement is misleading, and lacks context as the first paragraph in Go Prince George's. This plan contains many new recommendations for the County's transportation network, as well as refining and updating recommendations from previously approved plans and studies. The first sentence of the plan is in the wrong location. The last sentence is unclear. Approximately a quarter of Prince Georgians live in municipalities; three-quarters do not. As a functional master plan, it is necessarily not as comprehensive as an Area Master, Sector, or Transit District Development Plan.

2. Page 13 states "Go Prince George's embraces access and connections between places of interest, regional activity centers, schools, innovation corridors, and special roadways from established communities to rural areas. The County's connections between goods and services and the highway system are key in the Washington metropolitan region."

This statement is unclear. There is only one Innovation Corridor in Prince George's County. This "2025 Preliminary Plan" notably does not designate any Special Roadways, which by omission means that it effectively recommends de-designating all of the County's Historic and Scenic Roads. The last sentence is awkward. Prince George's County, its people as well as its goods and services, are connected and intractably linked with the Washington metropolitan region through highways, bikeways, and transit.

III. A1: Major Corrections: Plan Introduction

3. Page 13 states "The several thousands of miles of the road network throughout Prince George's County comprise major arterial streets, expressways, and freeways. The transportation network throughout the County includes ways to move by commuter buses, transit, bicycling, walking, and as a motorist."

This statement is confusing. The road network includes, but is not limited to, arterial roads, expressways, and freeways. Arterials are not streets. Commuter buses are transit, it is unclear why this mode warrants its own mention here.

4. Page 13 states "Go Prince George's contains policies for advancing transportation planning including funding recommendations, integrated transportation and land-use planning, transit-oriented development, concurrency and adequate public facility strategies, and corridor congestion management."

This sentence is confusing, unclear, and inaccurate. Go Prince George's does not "contain policies for advancing transportation planning", it is a transportation plan that contains the County's transportation policies. The list of policy areas is inconsistent with the list of plan elements; it names five disjointed transportation topics. While funding recommendations, integrated transportation and land-use planning, transit-oriented development, concurrency and adequate public facility strategies, and corridor congestion management were evaluated at length during the three-year process to develop the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's, policies and strategies to address these topics were deleted prior to the public release of this "2025 Preliminary Plan."

5. Page 13 states "Go Prince George's is a plan to enhance and expand trails, bikeways, sidewalks, transit, and the road network to equitably move people, support transportation network companies and micromobility, efficiently transport goods and services, and provide better commutes, safer streets and curbside management, and expanded mobility via air and water." This list of topics is disjointed and inconsistent. Go Prince George's aims to provide equitable transportation options to all Prince Georgians. However, it contains dozens of recommendations for transportation facilities, and few recommendations for transportation network companies, air mobility, and curbside management.
6. Page 13 states "Go Prince George's reflects the input and ideas received from engaging the community and collaborating with transportation partners." This sentence is repetitive of the first sentence on the next page (page 14).

III. A1: Major Corrections: Plan Introduction

Corrections/Clarifications

Revise the introduction on page 13 as:

Go Prince George's is the countywide functional master plan for Prince George's County. It contains the County's vision for a robust, multimodal transportation network creating a community of choice for residents, businesses, and visitors. The plan contains goals and policies to enhance the County's vast transportation system, and strategies for decisionmakers, federal, State, County, and municipal partners, and other stakeholders to create an integrated, safe, sustainable transportation network that provides access to diverse communities, jobs, goods and services, and places of interest.

Go Prince George's expands opportunity by increasing equity, access, and connectivity between homes, jobs, schools, places of interest, and the broader Washington, DC metropolitan area. The County has a robust transportation network, including heavy rail, light rail, and commuter rail stations, major interstate highways, a growing bicycle and pedestrian network, and freight rail and waterway systems not yet reaching their potential.

Since 2009, more than 100,000 new residents moved into Prince George's County. In that time, many corridors throughout the County have experienced high levels of traffic congestion paired with limited to no transit service. Demand has increased for a variety of housing types in walkable neighborhoods near transit.

As the County's transportation and mobility master plan, Go Prince George's reflects the input of residents, workers, students, visitors, agency and municipal partners, and all those who travel the County's streets, roads, rails, and trails.

Vision: Go Prince George's strives to connect Prince Georgians to an integrated, safe, sustainable transportation network that provides access to diverse communities, jobs, goods and services, and places of interest.

Delete all other text.

III. A2: Major Corrections: Complete and Green Streets Introduction

Revision A2

Pages: 92

Section: Complete and Green Streets (CG)

Policies/Strategies

N/A

Issues/Errors

1. The Complete and Green Streets Element is missing a goal statement.
2. Section 23-146(b) of the Road and Sidewalks Code requires:

All planned County financed and approved road, sidewalk, trail and transit-related construction and reconstruction projects within Regional Transit Districts and Local Centers in the County shall be constructed pursuant to the adopted County Urban Street Design Standards and the applicable master, sector, or functional master plan.

3. Section 27-6206(a) of the Zoning Ordinance requires:

All public streets will be classified by the County according to the system of functional classification defined in the Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation (as may be amended from time to time) and shall be designed and constructed to the County's adopted street design standards as authorized by Subtitle 23, Roads and Sidewalks, of the County Code. Within the Regional Transit Districts and Local Centers as designated by the General Plan (as may be amended from time to time), the Prince George's County Urban Street Design Standards shall apply.

4. Page 92 (Complete and Green Streets) states "Complete Streets is an approach to provide multimodal transportation options to facilitate walking, bicycling, transit ridership, micromobility, and driving for all users." This definition erroneously omits the relationship between the provision of these options and the design and construction of streets. In addition, the verb is in the incorrect tense.
5. Page 92 (Complete and Green Streets states "Go Prince George's aligns with the Maryland Department of Transportation Model Complete Streets Initiative, which is implemented statewide and incorporates Complete Streets in context-sensitive areas to further Vision Zero goals." This language belongs in a callout box and was erroneously inserted into this paragraph, where it is not appropriate.

III. A2: Major Corrections: Complete and Green Streets Introduction

6. Page 92 (Complete and Green Streets) states "In addition, Green Streets supports the implementation of bioretention strategies, stormwater management, and green infrastructure solutions to support biodiversity and livable streets, and addresses climate change resiliency." By defining Green Streets separately, the plan inadvertently suggests that Complete Streets and Green Streets are two different types of streets. Green Streets treatments may be applied to non-urban functional classifications, but all Complete Streets are Green.
7. Page 92 (Complete and Green Streets) states "Go Prince George's looks at a menu of Complete and Green Street best practice alternatives and recommends the "most complete and green" amenities within the County's Regional Transit Districts and Local Transit Centers." This statement is factually inaccurate. Complete and Green Streets elements are not amenities, they are facilities to serve the traveling public and all streets within all General Plan-designated Centers are required to be constructed to the County's Urban Street Design Standards, not just those in Regional Transit Districts and Local Transit Centers.
8. The photo on Page 92 is difficult to discern. Photographs should be a minimum of 300 dpi. In addition, the caption is incomplete. The photograph shows a dedicated bus lane, which is an important and uncommon Complete Street element.
9. Page 92 (Complete and Green Streets) states "An ideal Complete and Green Street accommodates pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, those who ride micromobility devices or buses, delivery trucks, and all types of motor vehicles in a safe and easy-to-use environment, complemented by low-impact design bioretention and stormwater management features and other innovative environmental elements." This is the topic sentence of this introduction and should be moved up.
10. Page 92 (Complete and Green Streets) states "The most successful Complete Streets features are barrier-separated bicycle lanes, dedicated bus lanes..." This sentence should be clarified for easier understanding.
11. Page 92 (Complete and Green Streets) states "Transforming the County's road network, including State highways and municipal roads, into a system of Complete and Green Streets is a necessary step in providing the safe and accessible connections current and future Prince Georgians demand." This statement is critical to this element and should be moved up higher.
12. The footnote on Page 92 should be updated to reflect information and events occurring since July 2024.

III. A2: Major Corrections: Complete and Green Streets Introduction

Corrections/Clarifications

Revise the introduction to the Complete and Green Streets section as follows:

Goal: Prince George’s County is served by a network of Complete and Green Streets.

An ideal Complete and Green Street accommodates pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, those who ride micromobility devices or buses, delivery trucks, and all types of motor vehicles in a safe and easy-to-use environment, complemented by low-impact design bioretention and stormwater management features and other innovative environmental elements.

~~Complete Streets is an approach to provide multimodal transportation options to facilitate walking, bicycling, transit ridership, micromobility, and driving for all users. Go Prince George’s aligns with the Maryland Department of Transportation Model Complete Streets Initiative, which is implemented statewide and incorporates Complete Streets in context-sensitive areas to further Vision Zero goals.¹ In addition, Green Streets supports the implementation of bioretention strategies, stormwater management, and green infrastructure solutions to support biodiversity and livable streets, and addresses climate change resiliency.~~

In 2012, Prince George’s County adopted a Complete and Green Streets policy, which was further refined and extended through the Walkable Urban Streets Act of 2023. Prince George’s County requires that:

~~All planned County financed and approved road, sidewalk, trail, and transit related construction and reconstruction projects shall include environmental site design and facilities for the combined use of motor, emergency and freight vehicles, transit, bicycles and pedestrians, and shall be constructed pursuant to the adopted County Urban Street Design Standards and the applicable master, sector, or functional master plan.~~

In 2024, Prince George’s County adopted new Urban Street Design Standards. Go Prince George’s recommends that all streets within Plan 2035-designated Centers be constructed or reconstructed pursuant to the County’s adopted Urban Street Design Standards or, if applicable, the functional equivalent design standards for state or municipal streets.

~~Go Prince George’s looks at a menu of Complete and Green Street best practice alternatives and recommends the “most complete and green” amenities within the County’s Regional Transit Districts and Local Transit Centers. An ideal Complete and Green Street accommodates pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, those who ride micromobility devices or buses, delivery trucks, and all types of motor vehicles in a safe and easy-to-use environment, complemented by low-impact design bioretention and stormwater management features and other innovative environmental elements. The most successful Complete Streets features include ~~are~~ barrier-separated bicycle lanes, dedicated bus lanes, frequent signalized pedestrian crossings, wide sidewalks with street furniture, attractive and inviting bus shelters, bioretention facilities, and level bus boarding areas.~~

III. A2: Major Corrections: Complete and Green Streets Introduction

Transforming the County’s road network, including State highways and municipal roads, into a system of Complete and Green Streets is a necessary step in providing the safe and accessible connections current and future Prince Georgians demand. In addition, a well-planned and designed curb-space management program ensures easy access for all users as part of a multimodal transportation system. This allows for adequate loading and unloading of transit, micromobility vehicles, large trucks, emergency vehicles, and delivery vehicles, while balancing the needs and demands of parking.

Insert a callout box:

Go Prince George’s aligns with the Maryland Department of Transportation Model Complete Streets Initiative, which is implemented statewide and incorporates Complete Streets in context-sensitive areas to further Vision Zero goals.¹

Insert a callout box:

Complete and Green Streets

A Complete Street is a “street that safely and adequately accommodates motorized and non-motorized users, including pedestrians, bicycles, motor, freight, emergency and transit vehicles, in a manner appropriate to the function and context of the facility.”²

A Green Street is a street or road that safely and adequately accommodates and incorporates best management practices of environmental site design for addressing stormwater runoff, including using small-scale stormwater management practices, nonstructural techniques, and better site planning to minimize the impact of road and sidewalk development on water resources.³

¹ In May 2024, MDOT published its revised Complete Streets Policy with a Context Driven approach. By formalizing a deliberate approach to planning, designing, and constructing streets that are safer for all users, MDOT’s Complete Streets Policy is pledging to deliver on MDOT’s collective commitment to a culture of safety and to making Vision Zero a reality. The revised policy requires that MDOT modal administrations, including SHA and the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), update numerous policies, procedures, manuals, guidelines, and best practices to align with the revised policy. The revised policy also requires MDOT modal administration projects comply with Context Driven: Access & Mobility for All Users 1.0

² County Road and Sidewalks Code Section 23-102(b)(3.1)

³ County Road and Sidewalks Code Section 23-102(b)(8.1)

III. A2: Major Corrections: Complete and Green Streets Introduction

Insert a callout box:

Urban Streets Required in Prince George’s County

Section 23-146(b) of the Road and Sidewalks Code requires:

All planned County financed and approved road, sidewalk, trail and transit-related construction and reconstruction projects within Regional Transit Districts and Local Centers in the County shall be constructed pursuant to the adopted County Urban Street Design Standards and the applicable master, sector, or functional master plan.

Section 27-6206(a) of the Zoning Ordinance requires:

All public streets will be classified by the County according to the system of functional classification defined in the Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation (as may be amended from time to time) and shall be designed and constructed to the County's adopted street design standards as authorized by Subtitle 23, Roads and Sidewalks, of the County Code. Within the Regional Transit Districts and Local Centers as designated by the General Plan (as may be amended from time to time), the Prince George’s County Urban Street Design Standards shall apply.

Update the footnote to reflect updates to MDOT’s Complete Streets Policy since May 2024.

III. A3: Major Corrections: Policy GM 3

Revision A3

Pages 110-111

Section: Goods Movement

Policies/Strategies

All

Issues/Errors

1. Policy GM 1 states "Maximize the County's unparalleled location in the region by expanding its tax base through increased investment in infrastructure that supports transportation, logistics, warehousing, and related industries." Infrastructure improvements to support such industries were identified in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Staff recommend that these improvements should be added as amendments either pursuant to testimony received at this Joint Public Hearing or by the County Council during their review of the adopted plan.
2. Strategy GM 1.1 states "Consider a countywide functional master plan for transportation, logistics, and warehousing to identify areas of the County to access interstate highway system and rail network." This statement is unclear. Goods may move over interstate highways that are not part of the Interstate Highway System, such as US 301.
3. Strategy GM 1.2 states "Identify secure, appropriate locations for trucks to layover, including supportive uses, such as truck stops, where appropriate." "Appropriate" is used twice and is not defined. Potential locational criteria for truck layovers was developed in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Staff recommend that these improvements should be added as amendments either pursuant to testimony received at this Joint Public Hearing or by the County Council during their review of the adopted plan
4. Strategy GM 2.2 states "Coordinate with CSX to determine the potential of future rail service along the Pope's Creek Branch to potentially serve customers at the Collington Local Employment Area and other industrial properties along the line." Table 3 (page 79) and Table 14 (page 199) identify the Pope's Creek Rail Trail as a major bikeway in the County Bikeways Network. This dichotomy may be confusing.

III. A3: Major Corrections: Policy GM 3

5. Policy GM 3 states “Improve commercial vehicle access to industrial areas to support enhanced regional mobility and the movement of goods, while mitigating the impact of commercial vehicle traffic near neighborhoods to reduce residential impacts in the County.” This should be two separate policies, and because Policy GM 1 is specific to one subset of industries, this should move up.
6. Strategy GM 3.1 states “Design an internal, phased roadway system that loops around industrial areas and increases accessibility to business/industrial parks while discouraging through traffic to nearby neighborhoods.” Strategy GM 3.2 states “Establish dedicated truck routes to and within industrial areas in the County that prohibit or limit commercial truck traffic along local and neighborhood roads.” Strategy GM 3.3 states “Increase and improve truck routes to the County’s industrial centers to facilitate efficient ingress, loading, and egress. Evaluate and assess areas for upgrades and enhance truck routes countywide.” These three strategies are duplicative and confusing.
7. The phrase "loops around" could be confusing to a user; this suggests a bypass or perimeter road when what was intended is an internal road network with multiple access points to preclude the need for commercial vehicles to access or pass through residential neighborhoods.

Corrections/Clarifications

Delete all GM Policies and Strategies and replace with:

GM Policies and Strategies

Policy GM 1: Improve commercial vehicle access to and within industrial areas to support enhanced regional mobility and the movement of goods.

Strategy GM 1.1: Design comprehensive industrial roadway systems to allow for increased commercial vehicle ingress, egress, and loading and connectivity to the regional highway network while eliminating the need for commercial vehicles to pass through neighborhoods.

Strategy GM 1.2: Update the County's system of designated Truck Routes, including:

- Increasing Truck Route signage;
- Creating, maintaining, and disseminating an easy-to-access online map of Truck Routes.

Policy GM 2: Mitigate the impact of commercial vehicle traffic near neighborhoods.

Strategy GM 2.1: Identify secure, appropriate locations for trucks to layover, including supportive uses, such as truck stops.

Strategy GM 2.2: Prohibit or limit commercial truck traffic along primary roads and neighborhood streets. Enforce with additional No Trucks Permitted signage.

III. A3: Major Corrections: Policy GM 3

Strategy GM 2.3: Develop a heavy commercial vehicle parking plan focused on locations near major routes, including I-95/495, US 50, US 301, and MD 5.

Policy GM 3: Maximize the County’s unparalleled location in the region by expanding its tax base through increased investment in infrastructure that supports transportation, logistics, warehousing, and related industries.

Strategy GM 3.1: Consider conducting a countywide functional master plan for transportation, logistics, and warehousing to identify areas of the County with sufficient land and access to interstate highways and the national rail network.

Policy GM 4: Increase and improve rail access to and from Prince George’s County industrial and employment centers.

Strategy GM 4.1: As redevelopment occurs or buildings become vacant, work with CSX and property owners to restore rail access to industrially zoned properties, as appropriate.

Strategy GM 4.2: Coordinate with CSX to determine the potential of future rail service along the Pope’s Creek Branch to potentially serve customers at the Collington Local Employment Area and other industrial properties along the line; should no rail service be commercially viable, acquire the right-of-way for construction of the Pope’s Creek Rail Trail. See also Table 3.

Strategy GM 4.3: Work with CSX and property owners to repair or replace the crossing of Beaverdam Creek in the Industrial, Heavy Zone at 2001 Kenilworth Avenue, Capitol Heights.

III. A4: Major Corrections: Introduction to Functional Classification and Facility Tables (pages 120-121)

Revision A4

Pages 120-121

Section: Functional Classification and Facility Tables

Policies/Strategies

N/A

Issues/Errors

1. Page 120 (Functional Classification and Facility Tables) states "To better reflect community values and input in our transportation and mobility system, enhance equity and safety, and balance vehicular throughput, Go Prince George's modifies the functional classification system for roads in the County, as defined in the 2009 MPOT and applied in subsequent plans and plan amendments." This statement can be clarified.

2. Page 120 (Functional Classification and Facility Tables) states:

"Captured in the subsequent tables, most modifications stem from various updates since the 2009 MPOT, including, but not limited to: approved facility recommendations in the area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans, on the date of approval of Go Prince George's."

- The exact delineations of some segments (from/to) may be slightly modified for precision.
- Any road segment whose functional classification has since been updated in any of the master plan, sector plan, or transit district development plans that have superseded the 2009 MPOT, or a road that was added as a master-planned road with a functional classification in any of those plans.
- Any road segment whose ID had been modified in any administrative correction that adjusted codes or other errors in the 2009 MPOT or subsequent plans.
- Any road segment identified in parallel sector plan efforts to Go Prince George's that is different than the 2009 MPOT or applicable previous master or sector plan.
- Any road segment identified by a functional classification type originating after the 2009 MPOT (Residential and Urban Center).

III. A4: Major Corrections: Introduction to Functional Classification and Facility Tables (pages 120-121)

- Any road segment with new or updated recommendations to adhere to Urban Street Design Standards. These are segments mainly within Plan 2035 Centers or areas of multimodal focus and cover the complete street retrofits of previous suburban road functional classifications. This identification may create a few non-contiguous MPOT IDs for road segments that aren't being converted.
- Any roads previously discussed with other agencies that were asked to be added, removed, or modified.

These differences, along with additional details, add a larger volume to the table than the same table within the 2009 MPOT."

This language is extraneous and may create confusion.

- a. Go Prince George's is a standalone master plan of transportation. Every road and street in the County was thoroughly evaluated in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during preparation of the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021.
 - b. Recommendations of previously approved area master, sector, and transit district development plans and the 2009 MPOT were considered, and where they remain the best course of action for the County's transportation network, they are carried forward.
 - c. Changes between the 2009 MPOT, which was amended by 22 other plans, and this plan are not relevant. This plan should not be read in comparison to the 2009 MPOT. Go Prince George's replaces the 2009 MPOT and all previous approved facility recommendations in full.
 - d. Partner agency input is critical in determining recommendations for a corridor but a statement that "any roads previously discussed with other agencies" were modified at the request of those agencies is not accurate. Operating agencies are valuable partners, but Go Prince George's makes many recommendations that are beyond the short- to mid-term horizon many operating agencies plan for.
3. The following language on page 120 belongs in a bulleted list within a callout box:

"These facilities correspond to the key maps succeeding the tables. To find a road segment on the facilities map that corresponds to an entry on the table, look at the MPOT ID. The first letter is the functional classification type. The first numbered digit is the planning subregion where the road segment is located. The last two digits of an MPOT ID are then listed in sequential order per subregion. The exception to the three-digit numbering scheme is freeways, expressways, and arterials. Those use one- or two-digit numbering because they cover multiple subregions."

III. A4: Major Corrections: Introduction to Functional Classification and Facility Tables (pages 120-121)

4. Page 121 states "Go Prince George's establishes a new Functional Classification and Street Typology system. In addition, in July 2024, DPW&T issued an update to the County's adopted Urban Street Design Guidelines. Several prior area master plans and sector plans utilized the County's prior (2017) Urban Street Design Guidelines, and other area master plans and sector plans recommended complete street retrofits of roads with Suburban Road functional classifications. Accordingly, all recommendations in Section III of Go Prince George's replace all recommendations for the identified street segments in prior approved area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans. While some recommendations may be similar to those found in prior approved area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans," especially those approved after adoption of the County's 2017 Urban Street Design Standards, the 2009 MPOT ID, segment to/from identification, County's adopted Urban Street Design Standards Type, County's adopted Urban Street Design Standards Standard, minimum rights-of-way, bicycle or shared-use facility, and notes are new for each facility, and the travel lane recommendations are new for most facilities, usually reflecting the transition from six-lane arterial roads to four-lane Urban Center Streets."

This language is extraneous, confusing, and is covered in other areas of the plan.

5. Page 121 states "All of the facility recommendations in Go Prince George's (Section III) will supersede, in their entirety, all previously approved facility recommendations in the area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans, on the date of approval of Go Prince George's." This plan replaces the 2009 MPOT in its entirety as well, which contains the transportation recommendations for 16 active area master, sector, and transit district development plans approved prior to November 2009.

III. A4: Major Corrections: Introduction to Functional Classification and Facility Tables (pages 120-121)

Corrections/Clarifications

Revise the introduction to the Functional Classification and Facility Tables Element as follows:

Functional Classification and Facility Tables

To better reflect community values and input in our transportation and mobility system, enhance equity and safety, and balance vehicular throughput with the mobility needs of people, Go Prince George's modifies the functional classification establishes a new Functional Classification and Street Typology system for streets and roads in the County, as defined in the 2009 MPOT and applied in subsequent plans and plan amendments. Captured in the subsequent tables, most modifications stem from various updates since the 2009 MPOT, including, but not limited to: approved facility recommendations in the area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans, on the date of approval of Go Prince George's. Go Prince George's evaluated each road and street in Prince George's County in the context of:

- Its current function;
- Its anticipated function upon buildout of the applicable area master, sector, or transit district development plan;
- The Walkable Urban Streets Act of 2023,
- The County's 2024 Adopted Urban Street Design Standards; and,
- The current and future needs of all users of the transportation network.

Users of this plan should note:

- Recommendations of previously-approved Area Master, Sector, or Transit District Development Plans that implement the goals, policies, and strategies of Go Prince George's are carried forward.
- Recommendations of the 2025 Staff Draft Central Avenue-Blue/Silver Line Sector Plan and the 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Sector Plan are carried forward.
- Some streets and roads are recommended for different functional classifications as they traverse different neighborhoods, contexts, and operational needs. This may result in a few non-contiguous functional classifications and MPOT IDs over the length of a corridor.
- The exact delineations of some segments (from/to) recommended in prior plans may be slightly modified for precision.

III. A4: Major Corrections: Introduction to Functional Classification and Facility Tables (pages 120-121)

- Any road segment whose functional classification has since been updated in any of the master plan, sector plan, or transit district development plans that have superseded the 2009 MPOT, or a road that was added as a master-planned road with a functional classification in any of those plans.
- Any road segment whose ID had been modified in any administrative correction that adjusted codes or other errors in the 2009 MPOT or subsequent plans.
- Any road segment identified in parallel sector plan efforts to Go Prince George's that is different than the 2009 MPOT or applicable previous master or sector plan.
- Any road segment identified by a functional classification type originating after the 2009 MPOT (Residential and Urban Center).
- Any road segment with new or updated recommendations to adhere to Urban Street Design Standards. These are segments mainly within Plan 2035 Centers or areas of multimodal focus and cover the complete street retrofits of previous suburban road functional classifications.
- This identification may create a few non-contiguous MPOT IDs for road segments that aren't being converted.
- Any roads previously discussed with other agencies that were asked to be added, removed, or modified.

These differences, along with additional details, add a larger volume to the table than the same table within the 2009 MPOT.

These facilities correspond to the key maps succeeding the tables. To find a road segment on the facilities map that corresponds to an entry on the table, look at the MPOT ID. The first letter is the functional classification type. The first numbered digit is the planning subregion where the road segment is located. The last two digits of an MPOT ID are then listed in sequential order per subregion. The exception to the three-digit numbering scheme is freeways, expressways, and arterials. Those use one- or two-digit numbering because they cover multiple subregions.

The 36 facility maps display road segments across the County and are shown sequentially from north to south. The key map on page 206 can help locate the detailed maps on the following pages. Each will display the locations for road segments (using the MPOT ID or state route number) and its general location within the County. The same road segment can appear in multiple maps. Facilities can also be located with the search function or through PGAtlas.

Using Facility Maps and Tables

"These facilities correspond to the key maps succeeding the tables. To find a road segment on the facilities map that corresponds to an entry on the table, look at the MPOT ID. The first letter is the functional classification type. The first numbered digit is the planning subregion where the road segment is located. The last two digits of an MPOT ID are then listed in sequential order per subregion. The exception to the three-digit numbering scheme is freeways, expressways, and arterials. Those use one- or two-digit numbering because they cover multiple subregions."

III. A4: Major Corrections: Introduction to Functional Classification and Facility Tables (pages 120-121)

The implementation of a specific roadway configuration (such as vehicular lanes, accommodations for all users including, but not limited to, persons with disabilities, pedestrians, bicycle users and transit users) is established by the relevant specifications and standards for the specific owner/operator of the public right-of-way. The Department of Public Works and Transportation, for instance, has existing specifications and standards for roadway design and is updating these for all roadway classifications in the County's road inventory.

Go Prince George's establishes a new Functional Classification and Street Typology system. In addition, in July 2024, DPW&T issued an update to the County's adopted Urban Street Design Guidelines. Several prior area master plans and sector plans utilized the County's prior (2017) Urban Street Design Guidelines, and other area master plans and sector plans recommended complete street retrofits of roads with Suburban Road functional classifications. Accordingly, all recommendations in Section III of Go Prince George's replace all recommendations for the identified street segments in prior approved area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans. While some recommendations may be similar to those found in prior approved area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans, especially those approved after adoption of the County's 2017 Urban Street Design Standards, the 2009 MPOT ID, segment to/from identification, County's adopted Urban Street Design Standards Type, County's adopted Urban Street Design Standards Standard, minimum rights-of-way, bicycle or shared-use facility, and notes are new for each facility, and the travel lane recommendations are new for most facilities, usually reflecting the transition from six-lane arterial roads to four-lane Urban Center Streets.

For all recommendations, Sidewalk Clear Zones and Street Tree and Furnishing Zones are to be constructed pursuant to the requirements of the County's adopted Urban Street Design Standards and Zoning Ordinance. On-street parking is recommended only along those blocks where rights-of-way exist after accommodating pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders.

All of the facility recommendations in Go Prince George's (Section III) will supersede, in their entirety, all previously approved facility recommendations in the area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans, on the date of approval of Go Prince George's. Upon its approval, Go Prince George's replaces the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation in its entirety and all facility recommendations within previously-approved Area Master, Sector, and Transit District Development Plans.

III. A5: Major Corrections: Implementation

Revision A5

Plan-wide

Policies/Strategies

N/A

Issues/Errors

1. Prince George’s County master plans contain an implementation matrix or other means by which the lead entity in charge of implementing a strategy is identified, along with potential partner agencies. This informs the public, stakeholders, and decisionmakers of the responsible parties with which they should work to implement the plan’s recommendations. The process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s was summarily terminated prior to developing this table. Policies and strategies specific to implementation were located in various locations throughout the plan, including, erroneously, in the Monitoring and Evaluation Section.

An implementation matrix is substantive as it regards the implementing entities and timeframes (short-, mid-, or long-term) in which the plan expects implementation to occur. Staff must await the results of this joint public hearing to determine whether or not the Planning Board can amend the plan to insert these timeframes, or whether the County Council must amend the adopted plan to do so.

However, staff recommends moving language within the “2025 Preliminary Plan” to create an Implementation Element consisting of implementation-specific policies and strategies.

2. Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “As sidewalks, bicycle, and/or shared-use facilities are constructed, and where they already exist, install pedestrian- and bicycle-scale wayfinding signage showing major destinations and services along or accessed via intersecting sidewalks, bicycle, and/or shared-use facilities, per the 2021 Wayfinding Process Manual.”

Should testimony be received on wayfinding, staff can make further recommendations, including restoring a Wayfinding Element to the plan for consideration by the Planning Board. Staff propose an interim policy and strategies to consolidate wayfinding recommendations in one location within the IM Element.

III. A5: Major Corrections: Implementation

3. Page 252 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Expand the capacity of Prince George’s County and its partners to implement the recommendations of Go Prince George’s. Identify, fund, and retain the necessary staff resources at key County and regional agencies to increase the construction of facilities and provision of services identified in Go Prince George’s and track the implementation process.”

Many implementation policies and strategies were developed in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Several strategies were relocated to the Monitoring and Evaluation section.

4. Page 252 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Consider future pricing strategies that redistribute traffic volumes to non-peak hours, manage through trips, free up capacity for goods movement, and provide income streams for transit and other congestion-reducing enhancements to the transportation system.”

An entire section on road pricing, including specific facility recommendations for tollways, was developed in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". This language was inserted following the collaborative plan development process and appears to summarize several strategies as well as add the redundant word "future". All recommendations aim toward the future. This language can be relocated to the IM Element.

5. Page 253 (Complete Streets) states “Regularly evaluate transportation design standards and regulations to determine whether the standards and/or regulations contribute to unsafe conditions for any user of the facility subject to the standard (whether the user is intended, occasional, or accidental).”
6. Page 253 (Complete Streets) states "Collaborate with the Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration, peer agencies, and stakeholders throughout Maryland to ensure a revised, suitable, and consistent approach to context designation is incorporated into the next iteration of Context Driven solutions, based on planning data and analysis.”
7. Page 253 (Complete Streets) states "Collaborate with various County departments, implementing agencies, law enforcement, public health agencies, and academic institutions to establish a database and a methodology for the systemic safety evaluation following best practices established by the U.S. Department of Transportation and other similar agencies.”

III. A5: Major Corrections: Implementation

8. Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states "Update the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that applicable sidewalks and shared-use paths are well lit. Implement pedestrian-level lighting provided by standalone 12- to 16-foot-high poles with post-mounted luminaires to increase the safety and comfort for pedestrians. Additional easements may be required for the installation of consistent pedestrian lighting throughout the project limits where right-of-way constraints exist.⁴" The dimensions and design of such fixtures may evolve over time.
9. Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states "Amend the County Code to define and require the installation of pedestrian-scale lighting on all sidewalks and shared-use paths." This language is duplicative and should be deleted.
10. Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states "Update street cross sections to reflect modified functional classifications and support multi-modal facilities in suburban and rural areas." Cross-sections are used in plans and standards. This can be clarified.
11. Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states "'Evaluate and analyze development review process to further support public-private partnerships for street improvement processes as part of the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance."

This language is unclear. It is unclear how development review processes can support public-private partnerships, and incorporating these into the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance requires further analysis. The Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance was thoroughly evaluated, and multiple policies and strategies identified, developed in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

This language requires analysis beyond the Joint Public Hearing. Staff will evaluate any relevant testimony on this topic and recommend any necessary revisions to the Planning Board for their consideration.

12. Page 254-255 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states "Support placemaking and art in public right-of-way, including expanding Planning Assistance to Municipalities and Communities where feasible, and focus public resources and capacity to design, construct, regulate, and maintain urban streets, urban public open spaces, and the public realm."

As written, this can be duplicative of Strategy CG 10.2. Revised, this can be several implementation recommendations.

13. Page 255 (Sustainability) states "Consider establishing a framework to hold regular/annual meetings with utility providers to coordinate planning investment and development needs."

Such meetings occur periodically, so such a framework exists. Revise and add as a strategy under Policy IM 1.

III. A5: Major Corrections: Implementation

14. Page 255 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Enhance infrastructure to support construction, operation, security, and resilience of the Federal Bureau of Investigation headquarters in Greenbelt, including the Greenbelt Metro Station, Greenbelt MARC Station, the internal roadway network, and access to I-95/495 (Capital Beltway).

This language is unclear and does not define the infrastructure that requires enhancement or what is meant by "enhancement". This is policy language. Subsequent to the public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan" the federal government postponed the relocation of the FBI to Greenbelt and proposed moving it to the Ronald Reagan Building in the District of Columbia.

15. Page 255 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Implement Plan 2035’s land use recommendations, creating and/or facilitating shorter vehicle trips and more non-vehicle trips through denser, mixed-use development and robust multimodal infrastructure.”
16. Page 256 (Development Review Process) states: Streamline the permitting process for shared-use path and trail construction.¹⁵”
17. Page 256 (Development Review Process) states: “Update the Transportation Review Guidelines to apply the latest Institute of Transportation Engineers Manual Guidelines.”

It is unclear which part of the ITE Manual should update which part of the TRG. This language requires analysis beyond the Joint Public Hearing. Staff will evaluate any relevant testimony on this topic and recommend any necessary revisions to the Planning Board for their consideration.

18. Page 257 (Development Review Process) states: “Coordinate with developers, applicants, and property owners to identify corridor preservation strategies that can be implemented concurrently with proposed or ongoing development.”

This statement is in error. The appropriate time to coordinate with developers, applicants, and property owners to identify corridor preservation strategies is prior to proposed or ongoing development, when such development is being planned.

19. Page 257 (Development Review Process) states: Consider updating the County Code and/or the County’s adopted Specifications and Standards for Roadway and Bridge Design to require the use of Leading Pedestrian Intervals countywide.

The type of consideration requires clarification. Leading pedestrian intervals were evaluated thoroughly during Go Prince George's. While they are recommended, there are additional considerations, including cost vs. the size of the County, that have to be taken into account.

III. A5: Major Corrections: Implementation

20. Page 257 (Development Review Process) states: “Evaluate opportunities to require sidewalk dedication, easements, reservation, or other requirements to enter into acquisition negotiations for development applications other than subdivisions, such as building and/or grading permits, where subdivision is not required.”
21. Page 257 (Development Review Process) states: “Amend the County Zoning Ordinance to require construction, to the maximum extent allowable, of the sidewalk, public realm, stormwater management, bicycle facility, transit facility, parking, and vehicle cartway recommendations of Go Prince George’s, as amended by future area master plans and sector plans, as a condition of approval for detailed site plans, special exceptions, and building permits.”
22. Page 257 (Development Review Process) states: “Review and consider amendments to the County’s Subdivision Regulations governing the adequacy of transportation, pedestrian, and bikeway facilities.”

These regulations were evaluated throughout the collaborative three-year process to develop the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 and were the primary reason the County Council granted the Planning Board an extension of the period to prepare the Staff Draft Plan in February 2023. This work was underway in the summer of 2024 but was unilaterally halted, and recommendations unilaterally deleted, prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

The use of the phrase "review and consider" does not accurately reflect the amount of reflection and consideration of this topic prior to the summer of 2024, and is therefore in error.

Staff recommend that these improvements should be added as amendments either pursuant to testimony received at this Joint Public Hearing or by the County Council during their review of the adopted plan; staff recommends interim language below that incorporates this language from the “2025 Preliminary Plan” into the IM Element.

23. Page 257 (Public-Private Partnerships) states: “Support and promote workforce development programs and initiatives. Facilitate a partnership between Prince George’s County Public Schools, Employ Prince George’s, Prince George’s Community College, M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation, and WMATA to create a dedicated training and mentorship program to develop the next generation of WMATA’s workforce.

This is a policy and a strategy. This also omits DPW&T, who also operates bus services and could provide these opportunities as well.

III. A5: Major Corrections: Implementation

24. Page 257 (Public-Private Partnerships) states: “Engage stakeholders, especially in Equity Emphasis Areas, to support mobility and transportation equity initiatives and programming.

Multiple policies and strategies specific to the Equity Theme of this plan, and a map showing the Equity Emphasis Areas, was erroneously deleted prior to public release of the “2025 Preliminary Plan.” Unless this topic is raised in public testimony, allowing for further analysis, staff recommends an interim policy copying language from page 16.

Corrections/Clarifications

Restore the Implementation Section as follows:

Plan 2035 (page 272) notes that:

Successful implementation of Plan 2035 begins with the full participation of all Prince Georgians and requires the efforts of every level of government: County, municipal, state, and federal.

Go Prince George’s requires focused, dedicated, and sustained leadership and effort to achieve the transformation of the County’s transportation and mobility network. Like Plan 2035, ongoing civic engagement, new relationships and partnerships, and intergovernmental coordination are critical to delivering a world-class transportation system. This section contains several implementation policies and strategies to advance Go Prince George’s.

Policy IM 1: Increase capacity to implement Go Prince George’s.

Strategy IM 1.1: Identify, fund, and retain the necessary staff resources at key County and regional agencies to increase the construction of facilities and provision of services identified in Go Prince George’s and track the implementation process.

Strategy IM 1.2: Focus public resources and capacity to design, construct, regulate, and maintain urban streets, urban public open spaces, and the public realm.

Strategy IM 1.3: Expand the Planning Assistance to Municipalities and Communities program to support placemaking and art installation within public rights-of-way.

Strategy IM 1.4: Hold regular/annual meetings with utility providers to coordinate planning investment and development needs.

III. A5: Major Corrections: Implementation

Strategy IM 1.5: Create Business Improvement Districts, with the use of the Business Improvement District Toolkit, and/or similar entities responsibility for the maintenance of the public realm.

Policy IM 2: Monitor, evaluate, and incorporate transportation best practices into policies, facilities, operations, and regulations for Prince George's County's transportation system.

Strategy IM 2.1: Implement Plan 2035's land use recommendations, creating and/or facilitating shorter vehicle trips and more non-vehicle trips through denser, mixed-use development and robust multimodal infrastructure.

Strategy IM 2.2: Collaborate with various County departments, implementing agencies, law enforcement, public health agencies, and academic institutions to establish a database and a methodology for the systemic safety evaluation following best practices established by the U.S. Department of Transportation and other similar agencies.

Strategy IM 2.3: Consider pricing strategies that redistribute traffic volumes to non-peak hours, manage through trips, free up capacity for goods movement, and provide income streams for transit and other congestion-reducing enhancements to the transportation system.

Policy IM 3: Amend the Prince George's County Code to implement Go Prince George's.

Strategy IM 3.1: Amend the County Zoning Ordinance to require construction, to the maximum extent allowable, of the sidewalk, public realm, stormwater management, bicycle facility, transit facility, parking, and vehicle cartway recommendations of Go Prince George's, as amended by future area master plans and sector plans, as a condition of approval for detailed site plans, special exceptions, and building permits.

Strategy IM 3.2: Amend the County's Subdivision Regulations to update the traffic, pedestrian, and bicycling adequacy requirements and to incorporate the TSA Map on page 38 of this plan.

Strategy IM 3.2: Update the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that applicable sidewalks and shared-use paths are well lit. Implement pedestrian-level lighting to increase the safety and comfort for pedestrians. Additional easements may be required for the installation of consistent pedestrian lighting throughout the project limits where right-of-way constraints exist.

Strategy IM 3.3: Streamline the permitting process for shared-use path and trail construction.

Policy IM 4: Evaluate and update applicable municipal, County, and state street, roadway, and other facility design standards and guidelines to support safe and multimodal access for all users.

III. A5: Major Corrections: Implementation

Strategy IM 4.1: Update street and road design specifications and standards to reflect modified functional classifications and support multi-modal facilities in suburban and rural areas.

Policy IM 5: Protect needed future rights-of-way from encroachment by development and/or minimize future impacts on development from construction, operation, and maintenance of transportation facilities.

Strategy IM 5.1: Coordinate with developers, applicants, and property owners prior to designing a proposed development to identify corridor preservation strategies that can be implemented concurrently with proposed or ongoing development. prior to or during development of a property.

Policy IM 6: Enhance transportation infrastructure to support construction, operation, security, and resilience of federal installations.

Strategy IM 6.1: Create a robust, safe, resilient, and secure multimodal transportation system to support future development at the Greenbelt Metro Station, including a new headquarters for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Policy IM 7: Amend the Code of Maryland and other state regulations to implement Go Prince George's.

Strategy IM 7.1: Evaluate opportunities to require sidewalk dedication, easements, reservation, or other requirements to enter into acquisition negotiations for development applications other than subdivisions, such as building and/or grading permits, where subdivision is not required.

Policy IM 8: Support and promote workforce development programs and initiatives.

Strategy IM 8.1: Facilitate a partnership between Prince George's County Public Schools, Employ Prince George's, Prince George's Community College, M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation, DPW&T, and WMATA to create a dedicated training and mentorship program to develop the next generation of WMATA's workforce.

Policy IM 9: Increase investment and access to support equitable and affordable mobility options in communities that historically lacked investment.

Strategy IM 9.1: Engage stakeholders, especially in Equity Emphasis Areas, to support mobility and transportation equity initiatives and programming.

Insert footnote to Strategy IM 3.1: References recommendations from the 2021 *Northern Gateway SPACEs Study for MD 193: 30% Design and Engineering Report*, 31, and *The Village of Brandywine Sidewalk and Streetscape Improvements Study: 30% Design and Engineering Report*, 36, and applies them countywide. These studies recommend "standalone 12- to 16-foot-high poles with post-mounted luminaires" but best practices may evolve.

III. A5: Major Corrections: Implementation

Insert footnote to Strategy IM 3.2: Carries forward from the 2018 DPR Strategic Trails Plan, 139.

Insert footnote to Policy IM 5: Updates Strategic Transportation Policy and Master Plan Implementation Policy 4 from the 2009 MPOT.

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Revision A5

Page 248

Section: Monitoring and Evaluation

Policies/Strategies

N/A

Issues/Errors

1. Page 248 states "Page 248 (Monitoring and Evaluation) states "This portion of Go Prince George's is a guide to assist transportation partners, municipalities, and other stakeholders with the implementation of this plan. It ensures that interagency coordination will be at the forefront of effectively and efficiently using resources among partners. In addition, the goal is to leverage resources in a fiscally responsible way to fund, prioritize, and implement a safe and broadly accessible multimodal transportation network in Prince George's County. Further exploration of topical areas with pending studies or aspirational recommendations for consideration may be necessary as part of the monitoring and evaluation of this plan.

One aspect of transportation and mobility that requires additional prioritization, including the development of new monitoring and evaluation tools, is the safety of transportation network users. Enhancing safety analysis is essential for the County to meet the Vision Zero targets and help implementing agencies better identify, target, and address areas of particular concern or impact. Multi-transportation agency coordination is necessary to ensure equitable and affordable transportation options are provided to transit users.

Tracking Progress by Performance Measures

Go Prince George's carries forward six performance measures from Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan (Plan 2035) and establishes 24 new performance measures toward implementation of the plan's goals. See Table 17: Plan 2035 Transportation and Mobility Monitoring Table and Table 18: Go Prince George's Indicators of Success."

This language can be clarified to more effectively describe this section of the plan.

2. Table 18 contains numerous corrections. See Section A5 below.

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

- Footnote 5 on page 248 states "Plan 2035 Five-Year Update (2019), 47, recommends the County use an additional metric for modal shift, by looking at the percentage of commuter trips made by automobile. Commuter journeys have the biggest impact on congestion and roadway capacity. Looking at the modal split in commuting will allow an assessment of the viability of the alternatives, and provide insight into how to increase use of the alternatives."

This plan is where such a metric would be incorporated as an amendment to Plan 2035.

- The phrase “aspirational recommendations for consideration” is misleading and inaccurate. These recommendations (pages 251-257) were moved from the policies and strategies (Section III) to this section and mislabeled “aspirational.” This is inaccurate. These recommendations are strategies to implement the vision and goals of Go Prince George’s but were moved to this section prior to the public release of the “2025 Preliminary Plan.” Their characterization in this fashion and location may suggest to the reader that these issues were not evaluated thoroughly as part of the collaborative three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021; they were.

They have the same weight and importance as the strategies in Section 3 and should be located there. See recommendations below:

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6a	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states "Collaborate with multiple agencies in maintaining, sweeping, cleaning, and clearing snow from channelized cycle tracks and bikeways."	Add as strategy under Policy BK 1
A6b	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Partner with community organizations, nonprofits, institutions, rider groups, and bicycle advocacy groups to host low-cost or free bicycle events, bike rides, bikeshare opportunities, and events.”	Add as strategy under Policy BK 11
A6c	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Evaluate the potential for pedestrian scrambles or other all-way vehicular stops at high-pedestrian-use intersections, where feasible.”	Add as strategy under Policy PR 3

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6d	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states Develop conceptual plans and seek additional funding to address bicycle safety in the rural portions of the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail (MD 382 [Croom Road] concept provides a model for on-road facilities, and North Point State Park Greenway Trail in Baltimore County provides a model for separated multi-use pathways).”	Add as strategy under Policy BK 7
A6e	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Develop conceptual plans and seek additional funding to enhance MD 4 (Pennsylvania Avenue) and Eastern Avenue NE (using the Bladensburg Green Streets Initiative as a model).”	Add as strategy under Policy CG 11
A6f	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Evaluate designs in the context of the Broad Creek Historic District Design Guidelines, the County’s current scenic and historic road design guidelines, as it pertains to providing bicycle accommodations along Rural Scenic and Historic Roads.”	Add as strategy under Policy BK 7
A6g	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Work with the National Park Service, Department of Public Works and Transportation, State Highway Administration, and the community to provide signage for the designated Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail on-road bicycle route as part of the national trail system.”	Add as strategy under Policy BK 7

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6h	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Analyze pedestrian (and bicycle) crashes using information from police crash reports via the Pedestrian and Bicyclist Crash Analysis Tool (PBCAT) to identify road users’ behaviors most likely to lead to pedestrian and bicyclist traffic injuries and fatalities and develop strategies to modify those identified behaviors.”	Add as strategy under Policy CG 11
A6i	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Continue to support the recommendations of the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation to create an interjurisdictional corridor congestion management working group to include, at a minimum, Prince George’s, Anne Arundel, Montgomery, Howard, and Charles Counties, and the Washington, D.C., Maryland, and Virginia Departments of Transportation, to identify priority congestion management corridors crossing these jurisdictions and recommending strategies for addressing the problems associated with cross-jurisdictional congestion. This working group may be convened and staffed by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.” This is duplicative of Strategy SI 3.6	Delete
A6j	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Regularly conduct safety and security analyses on off-road, shared-use paths and natural-surface trails. Work with the community to identify safety concerns, maintain and relocate trees and vegetation where necessary, and partner with public safety officials through community service opportunities.”	Add as strategy under Policy BK 1

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6k	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Promote Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation’s shared-use paths and trails on various platforms to ensure visibility and public accessibility of information.”	Add as strategy under Policy BK 12.

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6l	251	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 251 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Develop a shared-use path, bikeway, and trail lighting policy to enable Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to consider requests for park trail lighting from municipalities, developers, and civic organizations. The policy will enable DPR to determine if proposed shared-use path, bikeway, and trail segments would benefit from lighting. The standards should be developed so that they can be used by DPR, developers, and others to conduct lighting studies and design/engineer shared-use path, bikeway, and trail lighting systems for installation in areas where it has been determined that lighting is appropriate.”</p> <p>This statement is confusing as written. DPR does not manage all of the shared-use paths, bikeways, and trails in the County. If an external party requests trail lighting for safety considerations, it is unclear how DPR would determine how a facility "benefits" from lighting.</p>	<p>Revise as follows:</p> <p>Develop a <u>uniform</u> shared-use path, bikeway, and trail lighting policy <u>and design standards</u> to enable Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) <u>facility owners/operators</u> to consider requests for park trail lighting from municipalities, developers, and civic organizations. The policy will enable <u>the facility owner/operator</u> DPR to determine if proposed shared-use path, bikeway, and trail segments would benefit from lighting. The standards should be developed so that they can be used by DPR, <u>facility owners/operators</u>, developers, and others to conduct lighting studies and design/engineer shared-use path, bikeway, and trail lighting systems for installation in areas where it has been determined that lighting is appropriate.</p> <p>Add as a strategy under Policy BK 1.</p>

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6m	252	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 252 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Support local streetscape plans and strategies to incorporate street furnishings and elements, such as receptacles, bus shelters, wayfinding signage, and trees, as appropriate. Partner with Business Improvement Districts and Community Development Corporations on sidewalk maintenance agreements.”</p> <p>The first sentence is a policy erroneously formatted as strategy language. This statement misuses the phrase "as appropriate" to indicate something that is rarely inappropriate.</p>	<p>Delete the first sentence and add a parallel Policy under the PR Element:</p> <p>Policy PR 2: <u>Incorporate street furnishings and elements, such as receptacles, bus shelters, wayfinding signage, and trees, where sidewalk space exists.</u></p> <p>Strategy PR 2.1: <u>Partner with Business Improvement Districts and Community Development Corporations on sidewalk maintenance agreements.</u></p> <p>Cross-reference with CG Element. Relocate all streetscaping strategies to this policy. Renumber subsequent policies and strategies.</p>

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6n	252	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 252 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Coordinate with the Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration to leverage existing traffic signal warrant studies as part of Purple Line planning to determine the installation of new vehicular or pedestrian signals to improve safety through traffic signal optimization. “</p> <p>The Purple Line is under construction and any improvements based on "existing traffic signal warrants" have already been planned and are under construction or complete. In addition, traffic signal optimization is based upon improving traffic flow, not serving the needs of pedestrians.</p>	Delete statement.
A6o	253	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 252 (Pedestrian, Path, and Bicycle Facilities) states “Regularly conduct pedestrian safety and accessibility studies of all sidewalks and pedestrian crossings in areas with high levels of pedestrian traffic and/or identified through the County’s High Injury Network or Vision Zero Action Plan, or the State’s Pedestrian Safety Action Plan.”</p>	Add as strategy under Policy PR 3 and move footnote 3 on page 252 to that page.
A6p	253	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 253 (Complete Streets) states “Consider techniques, such as color, style, and iconography, to enhance roadway signage consistent with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices.</p> <p>This is duplicative.</p>	Delete statement.
A6q	253	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 253 (Scenic Roads) states “Work with DPW&T to update the Specifications and Standards for Roadways and Bridges, Section IV, Appendix F, Guidelines for the Design of Scenic and Historic Roadways.”</p>	Add as strategy under Policy SH 1

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6r	<i>Reserved</i>			
A6s	253	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 253 (Transit) states “Promote multi-transportation agency coordination to ensure equitable and affordable transportation options are provided to transit users.	Add as strategy under Policy TR 4
A6t	253	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 253 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Amend Plan 2035 to ensure the County’s land use and transportation policies and nomenclatures are aligned, as recommended by the Master Plan Evaluation Program process. This language is redundant to the plan relationship language on page 54.	Delete

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6u	254	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states "Evaluate and analyze development review process to further support public-private partnerships for street improvement processes as part of the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance."</p> <p>This language is unclear. It is unclear how development review processes can support public-private partnerships, and incorporating these into the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance requires further analysis. The Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance was thoroughly evaluated, and multiple policies and strategies identified, developed in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>This can be clarified in three strategies.</p>	<p>Delete from page 254 and add revised language as strategies under Policy IM 3:</p> <p><u>Strategy: Evaluate and analyze development review process to further support public-private partnerships for street improvement processes as part of the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance.</u></p> <p><u>Strategy: Evaluate opportunities to support public-private partnerships during development approval processes.</u></p> <p><u>Strategy: Evaluate the Adequate Public Facilities requirements within the Subdivision Regulations to identify potential updates to support construction of street improvements.</u></p>

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6v	254	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Consider Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles when designing transportation facilities, especially transit stops or stations, parking facilities, sidewalks, shared-use paths, and trails, to ensure that the design of such facilities does not create unsafe environments or conditions.</p> <p>This is duplicative of Strategy PR 1.1</p>	Delete language.
A6w	254	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Analyze sidewalks in compliance with codes and standards on existing County, state, municipal, and federal streets and roads and update the Capital Improvement Plan at DPR and other partner agencies, where appropriate.⁵”</p> <p>DPR is not the primary agency for sidewalk construction and reconstruction. Codes and standards evolve and this language lacks clarity on how such an analysis should be conducted and in what intervals of time.</p>	<p>Add as strategy under Policy PR 1 and add Footnote 5 on page 254 to that page:</p> <p>Strategy: Analyze sidewalks in <u>for</u> compliance with <u>current</u> codes and standards on existing County, state, municipal, and federal streets and roads and update the <u>applicable</u> Capital Improvement Plans <u>to bring sidewalks up to the current applicable codes or standards where necessary to implement the recommendations of this plan and the applicable Area Master, Sector, or Transit District Development Plan.</u> at DPR and other partner agencies, where appropriate.</p>

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6x	254	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Coordinate with the Prince George’s County Police Department, municipal police departments, and DPIE to ensure CPTED principles are effectively incorporated in new infrastructure and development and provide guidance and education to residents and businesses.” ⁷ ”	Correct spelling and add as a strategy under Policy IM 3, carrying over Footnote 7 from page 254.
A6y	254	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states: “Communicate and coordinate County Bikeway Network components with neighboring jurisdictions in the region and Maryland.” Maryland is in the region.	Add as strategy under Policy BK 7.: Strategy: Communicate and coordinate County Bikeway Network components with neighboring jurisdictions in the region and Maryland.
A6z	254	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Manage curb space throughout the County to best advance the vision, land use, economic prosperity, and design goals of Plan 2035. Create a countywide curb space inventory and update it annually to reflect changes in curb space regulation and new development activity. This duplicates Policy CG 12 and Strategy CG 12.1.	Delete.

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6aa	254	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Create a dedicated curb space management plan that evaluates the County’s curb space inventory and future needs and identifies additional goals, policies, and strategies to manage curb space in the County’s diverse neighborhoods and land use contexts.</p> <p>This duplicates Strategy CG 12.1.</p>	Delete
A6bb	254	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Proactively identify curbside loading zones for businesses that lack sufficient off-street or alley loading facilities. There should be clear delineation on a block between curb space dedicated to freight/goods loading and unloading and other uses, so that delivery vehicles are not blocking parking spaces or space dedicated to other curbside uses.”</p>	Add as strategy under Policy CG 12
A6cc	254	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Evaluate the County Code for opportunities to clarify, modernize, and simplify regulations for the private use of curbside space for food trucks, seating for eating/drinking establishments, and other commercial uses. Evaluate the appropriate location criteria for installing on-street and on-sidewalk parking corrals for bicycles, scooters, and other micromobility devices to reduce sidewalk clutter and improve ease of use.”</p> <p>This duplicates Strategy CG 12.2.</p>	Delete

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6dd	255	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 255 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Create pedestrian and/or shared-use paths crossing over or under the Baltimore-Washington and Suitland Parkways, both standalone facilities and those running on or adjacent to roadways passing under or over the parkways.	Add as strategy under Policy BK 1
A6ee	255	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 255 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Identify all streets, roads, highways, and transportation infrastructure that support emergency management, disaster response, and disaster recovery operations. Prioritize them for improvements and maintenance and aggressively seek federal funding dedicated to these purposes for these facilities, highlighting their importance.</p> <p>This language is unclear and redundant. Multiple facilities were identified in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 and/or identified for improvements or further analysis by the 2023 Prince George's County & City of Laurel Hazard Mitigation Plan but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>	<p>Incorporate into a new Policy SS 4:</p> <p><u>Policy SS 4: Prioritize maintenance and improvements to transportation infrastructure that supports evacuation, emergency management, disaster response, and disaster recovery operations.</u></p> <p><u>Strategy SS 4.1: Aggressively seek federal funding dedicated for emergency management, disaster response, and disaster recovery for qualifying transportation improvements.</u></p>
A6ff	255	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 255 (Sustainability) states “Participate in regional efforts to support the deployment of electric vehicles (EVs) and EV charging infrastructure.¹¹”</p> <p>This is duplicative of Strategy SS 2.4</p>	Delete on page 255 and integrate Footnote 11 on page 255 with Strategy SS.2.4.

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6gg	255	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 255 (Sustainability) states “Identify opportunities to implement electric and non-carbon-fueled vehicles across all modes.¹² “</p> <p>This is duplicative of Strategy SS 1.1.</p>	Delete on page 255 and integrate Footnote 12 on page 255 with Strategy SS.1.1.
A6hh	255	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 255 (Sustainability) states "Provide options for the design of pervious surfaces such as the use of permeable pavement for areas of occasional vehicle access.</p> <p>This statement is duplicative of Strategy SS 2.1</p>	Delete
A6ii	255	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 255 (Sustainability) states “Identify strategies to reduce impervious surfaces by amending the County Code and/or standards and coordinating with County agencies. Include in this discussion the reduction of parking requirements, use of shared-drive aisles and driveways, and the sizes of roadways.¹⁴ “</p>	Delete on page 255, add as a strategy under Policy SS 2 and carry over Footnote 14 from page 255.
A6jj	255	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 255 (Sustainability) states “Develop a working group of industry experts and partner with professional organizations that specialize in roadway designs and green infrastructure.</p> <p>It is unclear what this working group would do.</p>	Delete

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6kk	255	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 255 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states “Create pedestrian and/or shared-use paths crossing over or under the Baltimore-Washington and Suitland Parkways, both standalone facilities and those running on or adjacent to roadways passing under or over the parkways.	Add as strategy under Policy BK 1
A6ll	256	Monitoring and Evaluation	Page 256 (Development Review Process) states: “Streamline the permitting process for shared-use path and trail construction. ¹⁵ ”	Add as strategy under Policy IM 3 and carry over Footnote 15 from page 256.

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

A6m m	257	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 257 (Development Review Process) states: “Consider updating the County Code and/or the County’s adopted Specifications and Standards for Roadway and Bridge Design to require the use of Leading Pedestrian Intervals countywide.”</p> <p>The type of consideration requires clarification. Leading pedestrian intervals were evaluated during Go Prince George’s but the plan could benefit from further analysis. While they are recommended, there are additional considerations, including cost vs. the size of the County, that have to be taken into account.</p>	<p>Revise Strategy PR 6.4 as follows:</p> <p><u>Strategy 6.4: Incorporate Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPI) at traffic signals countywide, where feasible.</u></p> <p><u>Strategy 6.4.1: Prioritize LPI installation at locations identified in the County’s High Injury Network, Vision Zero Action Plan, or the State’s Pedestrian Safety Action Plan.</u></p> <p><u>Strategy 6.4.2: Assign the next-highest priority to intersections within Regional Transit Districts.</u></p> <p><u>Strategy 6.4.3: Conduct pedestrian counts to determine further prioritization of LPI installation.</u></p> <p><u>Strategy 6.4.4: Consider updating the County Code and/or the County’s adopted Specifications and Standards for Roadway and Bridge Design to require the use of Leading Pedestrian Intervals countywide.</u></p>
----------	-----	---------------------------------	---	---

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6m m			(continued)	Prior to Planning Board adoption, recommend a text box explaining what LPI is and what challenges Countywide implementation face.
A6nn	257	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 257 (Development Review Process) states: Revise the County Code to facilitate the implementation of Plan 2035, Go Prince George’s, and the County’s approved area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans.</p> <p>This language is not specific and redundant to more specific recommendations in Go Prince George's.</p>	Delete
A6oo	257	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 257 (Public-Private Partnerships) states: “Partner with micromobility providers to ensure access to micromobility options in underserved areas of the County.</p> <p>This is repetitive of Policy MI 1, it is difficult to ensure access to on-demand services, and "underserved" is not defined in this document.</p>	Delete

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Rev.	Pg.	Section	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
A6pp	257	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 257 (Public-Private Partnerships) states: “Evaluate park-and-ride lots and consider exploring and expanding to other areas to support more multimodal transportation options and partnerships with transportation network companies.</p> <p>This statement is unclear and general.</p>	Delete
A6qq	257	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 257 (Public-Private Partnerships) states: "Continue to coordinate with schools, colleges, and universities to support connections to transportation hubs, especially in growth activity areas.</p> <p>This statement is unclear and general. "Growth activity areas" is not a term Prince George's County uses to define activity centers.</p>	<p>Add a strategy under Policy PR 7 as follows:</p> <p><u>Strategy PR 7.5: Continue to coordinate with schools, colleges, and universities to support connections to transportation hubs.</u></p>
A6rr	257	Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>Page 257 (Public-Private Partnerships) states: “Support creation of innovation corridors and main streets, where feasible and context sensitive.</p> <p>This statement conflicts directly with Plan 2035, which defines the Innovation Corridor very specifically.</p>	Delete

III. A6: Major Correction: Monitoring and Evaluation Element

Corrections/Clarifications

The language on page 248 should be revised to state:

This portion of Go Prince George's is a guide to assist transportation partners, municipalities, and other stakeholders with the implementation of this plan. It ensures that interagency coordination will be at the forefront of effectively and efficiently using resources among partners. In addition, the goal is to leverage resources in a fiscally responsible way to fund, prioritize, and implement a safe and broadly accessible multimodal transportation network in Prince George's County. Further exploration of topical areas with pending studies or aspirational recommendations for consideration may be necessary as part of the monitoring and evaluation of this plan.

One aspect of transportation and mobility that requires additional prioritization, including the development of new monitoring and evaluation tools, is the safety of transportation network users. Enhancing safety analysis is essential for the County to meet the Vision Zero targets and help implementing agencies better identify, target, and address areas of particular concern or impact. Multi-transportation agency coordination is necessary to ensure equitable and affordable transportation options are provided to transit users.

Tracking Progress by Performance Measures

Go Prince George's establishes 30 performance measures to determine progress toward achieving the vision of a County connected to an integrated, safe, sustainable transportation network that provides access to diverse communities, jobs, goods and services, and places of interest. Go Prince George's carries forward six performance measures from Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan (Plan 2035) and establishes 24 new performance measures toward implementation of the plan's goals. See Table 17: Plan 2035 Transportation and Mobility Monitoring Table and Table 18: Go Prince George's Indicators of Success.

By working collaboratively to monitor progress towards implementation of the plan's policies and strategies, Prince George's County and its transportation partners will efficiently and effectively leverage resources to create the safe and broadly accessible multimodal transportation system this County needs to thrive.

III. A7: Major Corrections: Monitoring and Evaluation: Table 18: Go Prince George’s Indicators of Success

Revision A7

Pages 249-250

Section: Monitoring and Evaluation

Policies/Strategies

N/A

Issues/Errors

1. Table 18 establishes a target year of 2050. Several performance indicators, however, have nearer-term target years.
2. Table 18 contains an indicator entitled "Micromobility Options" with a target of increasing micromobility options every five years. Micromobility options are not defined. What is increasing every five years is not defined. Options may mean different modes or different providers, and may increase or decrease depending on considerations such as corporate mergers and bankruptcies.
3. Table 18 contains an indicator entitled "Progress on Urban Street Implementation" that contains a strategy and a process, not a performance measure. The performance measure "Construct Urban Streets" measures the same thing.
4. Table 18 contains four redundant/duplicative indicators:
 - a. "Construct Urban Streets", focusing on new streets to the exclusion of reconstructed streets.
 - b. "Miles of Streets Reconstructed or Built to Urban Street Standards (Total)
 - c. "Miles of Existing Streets Reconstructed or Built to Urban Street Standards (Annual)" that establishes a target of 5.85 linear miles per year for 25 years.
 - d. "Existing Streets Reconstructed in Designated Downtowns"

All streets in all designated Centers must be reconstructed to the Urban Street Design Standards within 10 years of the Council's approval of a ten-year construction plan pursuant to the Walkable Urban Streets Act of 2023; Go Prince George's can serve as that plan. An annual target may get the County to this goal.

III. A7: Major Corrections: Monitoring and Evaluation: Table 18: Go Prince George's Indicators of Success

5. Table 18 contains an indicator entitled "Construct Urban Streets" with a ten-year target. The interval, accordingly, should be 10 years.
6. Table 18 contains an indicator entitled "Carbon Emissions". This is duplicative of the Plan 2035 indicator "County Greenhouse Gas Emissions" identified in Table 17.
7. Footnote 5 on page 248 states "Plan 2035 Five-Year Update (2019), 47, recommends the County use an additional metric for modal shift, by looking at the percentage of commuter trips made by automobile. Commuter journeys have the biggest impact on congestion and roadway capacity. Looking at the modal split in commuting will allow an assessment of the viability of the alternatives, and provide insight into how to increase use of the alternatives."

This plan is where such a metric would be incorporated as an amendment to Plan 2035.

8. Table 18 contains an indicator entitled "Sidewalks Provided in and near Healthy Food Access Areas" Multiple policies and strategies to increase access to healthy food, and a map of Healthy Food Access Areas, were developed in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". See Attachment C.

Corrections/Clarifications

1. Delete the target year of 2050.
2. Add an indicator for automobile mode share.
3. Remove this line from Table 18 and add a strategy on page 93 as follows:

Strategy CG 1.11: Monitor implementation of the Urban Street Design Standards, reporting annually on linear feet implemented, obstacles/barriers to implementation, and recommended improvements/enhancements.

4. Delete "carbon emissions" indicator.

III. A7: Major Corrections: Monitoring and Evaluation: Table 18: Go Prince George’s Indicators of Success

5. Revise Table 18 as follows:

Indicator	Description	Data Source	Target (by 2050)	Interval (Years)
<u>Automobile Mode Share</u>	<u>Percentage of all trips taken by automobile</u>	<u>U.S. Census Bureau</u>	<u>Decrease</u>	<u>1</u>
Progress on Urban Street Implementation	Monitor implementation of the Urban Street Design Standards, reporting annually on linear feet implemented; obstacles/barriers to implementation; and recommended improvements/enhancements.	DPW&T	Ongoing Reporting	1
Construct Urban Streets	Percentage of new urban streets constructed <u>or reconstructed</u> pursuant to the County’s Adopted Urban Streets Design Standards or the municipal/state functional equivalent, in the locations recommended by Go Prince George’s.	DPW&T SHA Municipalities	100% of Streets in Designated Centers (within 10 years of approval of Go Prince George’s) 75% of Other Recommended Streets	<u>10</u>

III. A7: Major Corrections: Monitoring and Evaluation: Table 18: Go Prince George’s Indicators of Success

Indicator	Description	Data Source	Target (by 2050)	Interval (Years)
Miles of Streets Reconstructed or Built to Urban Street Standards (Total)	Miles of existing streets reconstructed, or new streets built, where recommended by Go Prince George’s, to the County’s Urban Street Design Standards, or the municipal/ state functional equivalent.	DPW&T	146	5
Miles of Existing Streets Reconstructed or Built to Urban Street Standards (Annual)	Miles <u>Annual percentage</u> of existing streets reconstructed, or new streets built, per year, where recommended by Go Prince George’s, to the County’s Urban Street Design Standards or the municipal/state functional equivalent.	DPW&T	5.85/year for 25 years <u>10% per year to 2036</u>	1
Existing Streets Reconstructed in Designated Downtowns	Percent of existing streets in Downtowns reconstructed, where recommended by Go Prince George’s, to the County’s Urban Street Design Standards or the municipal/ state functional equivalent.	DPW&T	100% by 2035	1

III. B: Typographical, Grammar, or Sentence Structure Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
B1	30	Agency Partners and Municipalities		Section should read "Agency and Municipal Partners"	Rename section to "Agency and Municipal Partners"
B2	45	Bus		The RTA connects riders to the Greenbelt Metro Station	The Regional Transportation Agency of Central Maryland (RTA) operates routes connecting <u>to</u> the Greenbelt Metro Station.
B3	69	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		Page 69 states "Bicycle facilities are part of an enhanced transportation network in addition to a comprehensive sidewalk network. This mode of transportation is part of transportation demand strategies to reduce dependence on single-occupancy vehicles." These two sentences are unclear.	Delete these two sentences.
B4	106	Waterways		Page 106 (Waterways) states "...add service to supplement the line established by the water taxi linking to surrounding communities in the region, and support recreation and commuting by canoe, kayak, and boat". This sentence can be clarified. No jurisdiction surrounds Prince George's County. Canoes and kayaks are boats.	Revise as: add <u>water taxi</u> service to supplement the line established by the water taxi linking connecting to surrounding neighboring communities in the region , and support recreation and commuting by canoe, kayak, and <u>other watercraft</u> ".

III. B: Typographical, Grammar, or Sentence Structure Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
B5	129	Street Recommendations		For the third and fourth entries for U-227, the segment end (third entry) and segment beginning (fourth entry) is incorrectly referred to as "21st Street"	For U-227's third segment's "To" column and the fourth segment's "From" column, change "21st Street" to "21st Place"
B6	134	Street Recommendations		The facility name for the first segment of UC-254 is incorrect, as the street is only named Varnum Street for that section.	For the first UC-254 segment, remove "/Arundel Road" from the facility name.
B7	150	Street Recommendations		The Facility Name for RES-232 was inadvertently referred to as "Tennyson Road"	For RES-232, change "Tennyson Road" to "Tennyson Street"

III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
C1		Plan-wide		This document contains several page breaks in the middle of a sentence. Documents are easier to read when sentences do not traverse page breaks.	Insert page breaks at the end of sentences, rather than mid-sentence. This can be addressed at the next publication of the plan.
C2		Plan-wide		Pages 262-263 contain hyperlinks to approved Area Master, Functional Master, Sector, and Transit District Development Plans as they existed in the winter of 2024. Over the life of Go Prince George's, the Planning Department website will be reorganized, and plans will be superseded. Subsequent to the February 2025 release of this "Preliminary Plan" all of the weblinks on this page were terminated following a website redesign.	Delete these two pages. Incorporate links within the body of the document wherever necessary, and refer users to the Planning Department website, where they may search for particular publications.
C3	67-69	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		Pages 67-69 contain an explanation of Bicycle Level-of-Stress. This language was intended to be in a callout box and not in-line text.	Correct this in the next publication.

III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
C4	73	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 7	Policy BK 7 should be Policy BK 1.	Revise Policy BK 7 as Policy BK 1 and renumber subsequent policies and strategies accordingly
C5	79	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		This element should be reorganized so that policies and strategies associated with the County Bikeways Network, Tables 2 and 3, and Maps 15 and 16 are on consecutive pages for easy reference.	Reorganize accordingly for the next publication.
C6	86	Transit	TR 12	Policy TR 12 states "Facilitate electric bus service". All bus electrification strategies should be listed under this policy.	Reorganize accordingly for the next publication.
C7	88	Micromobility and Transportation Network Companies		Page 88 (Micromobility and Transportation Network Companies) states "Examples of micromobility vehicles include both stand-up and sit-down electric scooters, pedal-assist and throttle-assist e-bikes, and Segways. Personally owned bicycles are not categorized under micromobility; however, shared bike services like Capital Bikeshare are typically included." This type of informational text belongs in a callout box, not in-line text.	Insert in callout box.

III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
C8	100	Special Roadways and County Heritage		Page 100 (Special Roadways and County Heritage" states "Prince George’s County’s rich history is documented, interpreted, and presented to communities and visitors along its network of historic and scenic roads, scenic byways, and parkways." This should be formatted as one of the section's goal statements.	Format as goal statement.
C9	100	Special Roadways and County Heritage		Page 100 (Special Roadways and County Heritage) states "Scenic and historic viewsheds, designated Heritage Areas, natural features, and culturally significant landscapes are conserved and celebrated for the benefit of residents and visitors to enjoy the County’s parkways, greenways, parks, and beautiful natural areas." This should be formatted as one of the section's goal statements.	Format as goal statement.
C10	105	Scenic Roads and County Heritage (SH)	SH 8.2	Strategy SH 8.2 states "Incorporate equestrian usage into designs for the Potomac Heritage and Henson Creek Stream Valley trail extensions in the Broad Creek Historic District. Trail alignments should avoid impact on sensitive archeological and ecological areas." This should be two separate strategies.	Strategy SH 8.2: Incorporate equestrian usage into designs for the Potomac Heritage and Henson Creek Stream Valley trail extensions in the Broad Creek Historic District. <u>Strategy SH 8.3:</u> Trail alignments should avoid impact on sensitive archeological and ecological areas. Strategy SH 8.34...
C11	106	Waterways	WW 2	Strategy WW 2 states "Expand the network of designated water trails in the County." Policy WW 1 is specific to the Patuxent River Water Trail. These should be switched.	Switch policy numbers.

III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
C12	108	Aviation	AV 1.5	Strategy AV 1.5 states "Explore opportunities for aircraft and UAM innovation and educational programs, in collaboration with colleges and universities." Though the remainder of Policy AV 1 consists of errors, this strategy remains viable and is best paired with the College Park Airport.	Revise and add to Policy AV 3: Strategy AV 3.4: Explore opportunities for aircraft and <u>urban air mobility</u> (UAM) innovation and educational programs, in collaboration with <u>PGCPS, colleges and universities, and College Park Airport.</u>
C13	112	Smart Infrastructure (SI)		Page 112 (Smart Infrastructure) states "Prince George's County and its partners use emerging technologies and shared information to manage the County's transportation network." This is intended to be the goal statement for this inserted section but the policies and strategies do not implement this goal. This sentence is also repeated almost word-for-word as the final sentence of the introduction.	Format this statement as a goal statement and delete the last sentence of the introduction.
C14	115	Sustainability		Page 115 (Sustainability) states "Develop a Prince George's County transportation and mobility network that is environmentally sustainable, with minimal net impact on the natural environment." This statement was inserted into this section to serve as a goal statement but is not formatted as a goal nor does it read as a goal.	Format this statement as a goal statement and revise as: Develop a Prince George's County <u>has a</u> transportation and mobility network that is environmentally sustainable, with minimal net impact on the natural environment.

III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
C15	115	Sustainability		Page 115 (Sustainability) states "Because activities pertaining to transportation compose 48 percent of the County's annual greenhouse gas emissions (as of 2018)," A footnote is missing.	Add a footnote as follows: <i>Prince George's County Climate Action Plan, "Figure IV-2. Year 2018 County GHG Emissions by Sector", page 24.</i>

III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
C16	121	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		<p>Page 121 states "Go Prince George's establishes a new Functional Classification and Street Typology system. In addition, in July 2024, DPW&T issued an update to the County's adopted Urban Street Design Guidelines. Several prior area master plans and sector plans utilized the County's prior (2017) Urban Street Design Guidelines, and other area master plans and sector plans recommended complete street retrofits of roads with Suburban Road functional classifications. Accordingly, all recommendations in Section III of Go Prince George's replace all recommendations for the identified street segments in prior approved area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans. While some recommendations may be similar to those found in prior approved area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans," especially those approved after adoption of the County's 2017 Urban Street Design Standards, the 2009 MPOT ID, segment to/from identification, County's adopted Urban Street Design Standards Type, County's adopted Urban Street Design Standards Standard, minimum rights-of-way, bicycle or shared-use facility, and notes are new for each facility, and the travel lane recommendations are new for most facilities, usually reflecting the transition from six-lane arterial roads to four-lane Urban Center Streets."</p> <p>This language is extraneous, confusing, and is covered in other areas of the plan.</p>	Delete the selected language

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Staff identified the following corrections and clarifications of information in the Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables 5-13, pages 122-198.

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D1	123	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UC-200 are reversed in error.	For the UC-200 entry, the "From" column should read "UC-201", and the "To" column should read "MD 193B (Campus Drive)"
D2	123	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UC-201 are reversed in error.	For the UC-201 entry, the "From" column should read "Campus Drive", and the "To" column should read "Mowatt Lane"
D3	123	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UC-202 are reversed in error.	For the UC-202 entry, the "From" column should read "UC-201", and the "To" column should read "UC-200"
D4	123	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UC-203 are reversed in error.	For the UC-203 entry, the "From" column should read "Adelphi Road", and the "To" column should read "UC-201"
D5	123	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified same-number segments per classification type from west to east, or south to north. The two segments for UM-204 were identified out of order.	The row for the UM-204 segment identified with "MD 410 (East West Highway)" in the "From" column should be moved to before the segment identified with "Calverton Dr." in the "From" column

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D6	124	For a road with a name change at an intersection, Staff has typically identified both names with a "/" in between. A segment endpoint for U-207 and UM-207 was identified with the road name and the direction where the road is in error.	Remove the (SB) and (NB) for Avondale Overlook Drive and 24th Avenue for the "From" and "To" entries for U-207 and UM-207 and replace with a "/"
D7	126	For the UR-212 row, the entry for the USDS Type column is missing	For UR-212, in the column "USDS Type" Add "UR"
D8	129	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified same-number segments per classification type from west to east, or south to north. The two segments for UC-226/UM-226 were identified out of order.	The row for the UC-226 segment identified with "Breezewood Drive" in the "From" column should be moved to after the UM-226 segment identified with "MD 193 (Greenbelt Road)" in the "From" column
D9	131	The segments for U-236 and U-221 overlap between Farragut Street and US 1 (Baltimore Avenue).	For entry "UM-236", in the "TO" column , replace "US 1" with "Farragut Street".
D10	132	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified same-number segments per classification type from west to east, or south to north. The two segments for U-239/UR-239 were identified out of order. Additionally, the start and end points of both road segments are also reversed in error.	The row for the U-239 segment identified with "Adelphi Road "in the "From" column should be moved to after the UR-239 segment identified with "Belcrest Road" in the "From" column Additionally, both segments should have their "From" and "To" entries swapped.

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D11	132	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified same-number segments per classification type from west to east, or south to north. The three segments for U-243/UR-243 were identified out of order. Additionally, the start and end points of the second and third road segments are also reversed in error.	<p>The first U-243 and row and third U-243 row should be swapped.</p> <p>Additionally the other two U-243/UR-243 segments (Ager to Approx... and Approx... to Little Branch) should have their "From" and "To" entries swapped.</p>
D12	133	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified same-number segments per classification type from west to east, or south to north. The two segments for UR-245 were identified out of order. Additionally, the start and end points of both road segments are also reversed in error.	<p>The row for the UR-245 segment identified with "Ager Road" in the "From" column should be moved to after the UR-245 segment identified with "Lancer Road" in the "From" column</p> <p>Additionally, both segments should have their "From" and "To" entries swapped.</p>
D13	136	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The three segments for UR-301 were identified out of order. Additionally, the street naming was identified incorrectly for two segments of UR -301.	<p>Move the first UR-301 segment to after the other two UR-301 segments, change the Route ID to "MD 564, the Facility Name to "Chestnut Avenue/9th Street, "Ownership is "SHA" (certify if true), "From" is "11th Street", and "To" is "Chestnut Avenue"</p> <p>Change the "To" on the now second UR-301 segment to "MD 564 (Chestnut Avenue/9th Street)"</p> <p>all other entries for these three segments should remain the same</p>

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D14	137	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UM-310 are reversed in error. Additionally, the name of the segment ends need to be simplified for user identification.	For the UM-310 entry, the "From" Column should read "MD 197 (Laurel Bowie Road)" and the "To" column should read "Lemons Bridge Road"
D15	137	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UM-313 are reversed in error.	For the UM-313 entry, the "From" column should read "MD 197 Collington Road" and the "To" column should read "New Road B-BLTC(UC-311)"
D16	137	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UM-318 are reversed in error.	For the UM-318 entry, the "From" column should read "New Road H (UC-317)" and the "To" column should read "Lemons Bride Road (UC-307)"
D17	138	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UC-321 are reversed in error.	For the UC-321 entry, the "From" column should read "Evergreen Parkway" and the "To" column should read "New Road K (UC-320)"
D18	138	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UC-322 are reversed in error.	For the UC-322 entry, the "From" column should read "Evergreen Parkway" and the "To" column should read "New Road K (UC-320)"
D19	138	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UM-328 are reversed in error.	For the UM-328 entry, the "From" column should read "Harry S Truman Dr", and the "To" column should read "Medical Center Drive"

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D20	138	The "From" and "To" endpoints for UM-329 are reversed in error, and additionally, need to be revised for clarification.	For the UM-329 entry, the "From" column should read "Jericho Park Road", and the "To" column should read "Patuxent River Tributary (North of UM-310)"
D21	139	There are two road segments identified as UM-330 - both were initially one-way pairs and are being recommended to convert to two-way with Complete Streets.	For the UM-330 road segment identified with "Largo Drive West", change the MPOT ID to "UM-328". Additionally move that entire road to before the other UM-228 (Largo Center Drive) segment
D22	139 140 146	Some endpoint names need to be adjusted to align with typical naming conventions	<p>For either "From" or "To", change "End" or "cul-de-sac" or similar to "[direction] terminus" on the following entries: UM-300, UM-335, P-401</p> <p>For either "From" or "To", where the road is on the Washington, DC Line, change "Washington D.C. Line" or similar to "Eastern Avenue NE" for the following entries: UM-211, UM-405, A-11, A-12, C-200, C-214, C-408, C-420, F-2</p> <p>For either "From" or "To", where the road is on the Washington, DC Line, change or "Washington D.C. Line" or similar to "Southern Avenue SE" on the following entries: UM-405, U-406, U-427, UM-706, UM-707, A-43 first segment, C-415, C-430, C-701, C-703, E-3</p>

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D23	139	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UM-339 are reversed in error.	For the UM-339 entry, the "From" column should read "Northview Drive", and the "To" column should read "US 301 (Robert Crain Highway)"
D24	144	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified same-number segments per classification type from west to east, or south to north. The two segments for UM-600 were identified out of order.	The row for the UM-600 segment identified with "Presidential Parkway" in the "From" column should be moved to after the UM-600 segment identified with "MD 4 (Pennsylvania Avenue)" in the "From" column
D25	145	The Facility name for UM-601 is missing, and the "From" entry needs clarification	Add "Armstrong Lane" as the facility name, and Change the text in "From" to "Westphalia Road"
D26	145	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UM-602 are reversed in error.	For the UM-602 entry, the "From" column should read "Woodyard Road", and the "To" column should read "Dower House Road Extended"
D27	145	UC-700 is a new recommendation in Go Prince George's	Add "New in Go Prince George's" to the Master/Sector Plan column
D28	145	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for UR-701 are reversed in error.	For the UR-701 entry, the "From" column should read "Southern Avenue SE", and the "To" column should read "Afton Street"

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D29	146	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for the second UC-703 entry are reversed in error.	For the second UC-703 entry, the "From" column should read "Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Road", and the "To" column should read "Oakland Way"
D30	148	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for the first RES-213 segment are reversed in error. Additionally, the segment identified did not include the full span of the street.	For the first RES-213 entry, the "From" column should read "Mustang Drive. ", and the "To" column should read "Eastpine Drive"
D31	149	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for the first RES-224 segment are reversed in error.	For the RES-224 entry, the "From" column should read "62nd Avenue", and the "To" column should read "Powhatan Street"
D32	150	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for the first RES-226 segment are reversed in error.	For the RES-226 entry, the "From" column should read "66th Avenue", and the "To" column should read "Patterson Street"
D33	150	The "From" and "To" entries for RES-227 were not clarified.	Change the "From" for RES-227 to "57th Avenue" and "To" to "60th Place"
D34	150	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for the first RES-228 segment are reversed in error.	For the RES-228 entry, the "From" column should read "MD 201 (Kenilworth Avenue)", and the "To" column should read "59th Avenue"
D35	150	RES-231 covers the same span as the second segment of RES-222	Delete row for RES-231

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D36	150	The endpoint description for RES-233 is too detailed.	In the "To" for RES-233, delete everything but "Oliver Street"
D37	150	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for the first RES-237 segment are reversed in error.	For the RES-237 entry, the "From" column should read "Brentwood Levee Trail (at 37th Street and Allison Street)", and the "To" column should read "Northwest Branch Trail"
D38	151	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The two segments for RES-238 were identified out of order. Additionally, the start and end points of the "35th Place" segment are also reversed in error.	The row for RES-238 identified with "Gallatin Street" in the "Facility Name" column should be moved to after the segment identified with "35th Place" in the "Facility Name" column Additionally the "35th Place" segment should have its "From" and "To" entries swapped.
D39	152	The endpoint for RES-406 is incorrect, as Parkland Drive does not intersect with Marlboro Pike.	For the "To" column for RES-406, change "Marlboro Pike" to "Old Silver Hill Road"
D40	152	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified same-number segments per classification type from west to east, or south to north. The two segments for RES-408 were identified out of order.	The row for the RES-408 segment identified with the "From" column as "South of Ellis Avenue" and "To" column is "Marlboro Pike" should be moved to before the RES-408 segment identified with the "From" column as "Gunther Street" and "To" column is "MD 332". Additionally "South of Ellis Avenue" should be changed to "South of Ellis Street".

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D41	154	The Urban Street Reclassification UM-109 covers the same section of US 1 as parts of A-9, so the latter needs to be adjusted.	Delete the A-9 row that covers US 1 from MD 212 to MD 200 (fourth row). For the A-9 segment with a "To" entry of "Cherry Lane" (fifth row), change the "From" to "Edge of Muirkirk MARC Center"
D42	155	There is a segment end error in the third segment of A-16	Change the "From" of the third A-16 segment (First with facility name "Greenbelt Road") from "Greenbelt Road" to "MD 430 (Greenbelt Road)"
D43	155	The information for the three segments of A-16 whose "Facility Name" is "Greenbelt Road" and "Vehicle Lane" is 4-6 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine the fourth and fifth rows of A-16 ("Facility Name": "Greenbelt Road", "Vehicle Lane" is 4-6): MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared-use facility, Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "CSX Railroad Bridge". "To" column should be "Frankfort Drive ". District is 3 and 4"
D44	156	The section of MD 704 from MD 202 to Ardwick Ardmore was inadvertently covered by two MPOT IDs - A-22 and UM-419. The intent was to provide an Urban Street Design Segment for the City of Glenarden, so the other segments of MD 704 need to be adjusted accordingly.	Change the "To" column for the first A-22 segment from "I-95/I-495 (Capital Beltway)" to "MD 202 (Landover Road)", and Change the "From" column for the second A-22 segment from "I-95/495 (Capital Beltway)" to "Ardwick-Ardmore Road"
D45	158	There is a segment end naming error in the third segment of A-29	For the third A-29 segment, change the "To" column entry "Campus Drive/Park Place" to "Geaton Park Place"

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D46	158	The information for the two segments of A-36 with Facility Name "White House Road" are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine the two rows of A-36 with the Facility Name of "White House Road": MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, District, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared use facility and Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "Richie Marlboro Road" and "To" columns should be "MD 202 (Largo Road)"
D47	159	The end point for the fourth A-40 segment should be adjusted for clarity	For the forth A-40 segment, "To" column, delete "toward MD 214". Additionally, for the fifth A-40 segment, "From" column, delete "toward MD 214".
D48	161	The facility name for the second to last segment of A-55 is missing.	Add facility name "Mattawoman Drive" for the sixth segment of A-55
D49	162	The MD 201 portion of Edmonston Road (owned by SHA) ends at Powder Mill Road. Additionally, the segment ends of other A-56 segments are confusing and need to be adjusted for clarity.	For the third segment of A-56, add Route ID MD 201, change ownership to "SHA", and for the "To" column, change "Odell Road" to "MD 212A (Powder Mill Road)". Additionally, for the fourth segment, in the "From" column, change "Odell Road" to "MD 212A (Powder Mill Road)", and for the final segment, in the ""From" column, change "Old Baltimore Pike" to "Edmonston Road at Old Baltimore Pike"

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D50	162	The Facility Name for the unbuilt A-59 segment (Kenilworth Avenue Extended) implies connection to Kenilworth Avenue. It does not connect to its parent name road, nor does it the other segment of A-59 (Konterra Drive), it connects to Edmonston Road Therefore the MPOT ID and Facility Name should be changed.	<p>Rename the second A-59 segment to "Edmonston Road Extended", change the MPOT ID to A-58, and move the row to before the A-59 (Konterra Drive) segment.</p> <p>Second, under the last A-56 segment, under Notes, change "This improvement is alternate to extending Kenilworth/Edmonston Road over the railroad to the southern end of A-59 in the near term." to "This improvement is a near-term alternative to extending Edmonston Road over the railroad (recommendation A-58) to connect to MD 206."</p> <p>Finally, under UM-106, delete the Notes "Key connection to A-56 and A-59."</p>
D51	162	The A-59 segment with the Facility Name "Konterra Drive" is a SHA owned road with no Route ID shown.	For A-59, add Route ID "MD 206" and change Ownership to "SHA".
D52	163	The facility name is missing for the first and second segments of A-63.	Complete the missing entries in A-63 by filling in the appropriate Facility names: 'Mattawoman Drive' and 'Mattawoman Drive Extended', respectively.
D53	164	The segment for MC-200 covers the same span as U-221, and can be deleted.	Move Notes for MC-200 over to the U-221 entry and consolidate with other notes, and delete row MC-200.
D54	164	The owner of Hanover Parkway (MC-201/C-211) was listed as "DPW&T" erroneously	For entry MC-201 and C-211, change the "Ownership" from "DPW&T" to "City of Greenbelt"

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D55	173	The number of recommended vehicle lanes for the C-339 segments was inputted incorrectly	Change vehicle lanes of both segments of C-339 from 4 to 2
D56	174	The second segment of C-347 was intended to be an extension of Ardwick Ardmore Road north of the Enterprise Forest subdivision (as seen in Plat Book VJ 165, page 20 (1992)) instead of C-347 continuing on Yellowwood Lane.	Change the following information on the first C-347 segment: "To" is "Yellowwood Lane" Change the following information on the second C-347 segment: "Facility Name" is "Ardwick-Ardmore Road Extension", "From" is "Yellowwood Lane". Keep all other entries for the two C-347 segments.
D57	174	The bicycle facility recommended for C-349 is a lower tier facility than what already exists on the road.	Change the bicycle facility recommendation for both segments of C-349 to "bicycle lanes"
D58	176	A segment of Addison Road was erroneously given the incorrect MPOT ID and endpoint road	Change the MPOT ID for C-409 (Addison Road) to C-408, and change the "To" from "MD 214 (Central Avenue)" to "MD 704 (Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard)"
D59	176	One of the C-412 segment ends "Brightseat Business Park Road" is a roadway no longer under consideration for a master-plan recommendation, therefore the two rows can be combined.	Combine both rows of C-412. Combine plans in the "Master/Sector Plan" column, the "From" column should be "MD 214 (Central Avenue)" and "To" column should be "Sean Taylor Road/Brightseat Road", all other entries for C-412 remain the same.

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D60	177	The endpoint of one of the C-426 segments was incorrectly identified.	For the second C-426 segment in the "To" column, change "Jordan Park Blvd." to "Ritchie Road". Additionally for the third C-426 segment in the "From" column, change "Jordan Park Blvd." to "Forestville Road".
D61	177 - 178	The information for the two segments of C-513 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine Rows 1-2 of C-513: "From" column should be "MD 5 at Spine Road", and "To" column should be "MD 223 (Woodyard Road/Piscataway Road)"; all other entries can remain the same. Combine Rows 4-5 of C-513: "From" column should be "Chris Mar Avenue", and "To" column should be "Kirby Road"; all other entries can remain the same.
D62	179	The endpoint for C-527 needs to be adjusted for clarity.	Change the "From" column for C-527 from "A-55 (Accokeek Road)" to "MD 373 (Accokeek Road) near McKendree Road"
D63	179	The segment lengths of P-501 and C-526 need to be adjusted based on built roadway.	Adjust the segment lengths of C-526: "From" is "MD 210 (Indian Head Highway)" and "To" is "Caribbean Way"

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D64	181	The first segment of C-613 needs to be split to designate road segments that are not part of MD 381 (SHA-maintained).	Split the first segment of C-613. The first segment should not have a Route ID, Ownership is DPW&T, "From" is "MD 5 at Spine Road" and "To" is "US 301 (Crain Highway)", the other segment should have a Route ID of MD 381, Ownership SHA, "From" should change to "US 301 (Crain Highway)", and "To" should be "300 feet east of Cherry Tree Crossing Road"; all other entries for the two segments should be the same as the original.
D65	183	There is a road naming error in C-708	For the "To" in the second C-708 entry, change "Tanger Avenue/MGM National Avenue" to "Tanger Boulevard/MGM National Avenue"
D66	185	The section of P-103 (Sellman Road) from Cherry Hill Road to the Beltsville Community Center driveway already has a shared-use path on the north side of the road, contradicting the recommended multimodal/bicycle facility.	Split the section of P-103 with existing shared use path (the "From" is "Cherry Hill Road" and "To" is "Beltsville Community Center", multimodal facility is "Shared-use Path", all other entries are the same), The remainder section is From "Beltsville Community Center" to "Rhode Island Avenue", multimodal facility is bicycle lane, everything else is the same.

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D67	185	The ownership of Edmonston Road (P-200) was listed as DPW&T erroneously.	Add a new row for P-200. "From" is "MD 193 (Greenbelt Road)", "To" is "Springhill Drive" Master Plan is 2013 MD 193, ownership is "City of Greenbelt" Additionally, the first P-200 segment should remain the same, except that "To" is "MD 193 (Greenbelt Road)"
D68	185	P-204 is a duplicate of the information of UR-243	Delete entry P-204
D69	186	The "To" in P-217 is incorrect.	From P-217, Change the "To" from "Ivywood Avenue" to "Jutewood Avenue"
D70	187	For segment identification convention, Staff has typically identified segments from west to east, or south to north. The start and end points of the road segment for P-223 were reversed in error.	For the P-223 entry, the "From" column should read "Eastern Avenue NE", and the "To" column should read "19th Avenue"
D71	187	The start and endpoints for P-304 are incorrect as this section of Robert Crain Highway is not signed as US 301.	For the "From" entry of P-304, change "US 301/MD3" to "MD 3"
D72	189	The segment lengths of P-501 and C-526 need to be adjusted based on built roadway.	Adjust the lengths of P-501: "From" is "Caribbean Way" and "To" is "MD 373 (Livingston Road)".
D73	190	Entry P-512 has a multimodal facility error.	change the recommended multimodal facility for the first and third P-512 entry from painted bicycle lane to shared-use path

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D74	190	The name of the endpoint of P-602 needs to be adjusted for clarity.	For P-602, the "To" entry should be changed from "E-6" to "MD 202 (Largo Road) near Kent Drive"
D75	194	The information for the three segments of F-1 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine the three rows of F-1: MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, District, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared use facility and Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "I-95/495 (Capital Beltway)" and "To" columns should be "Howard County line"
D76	194	A section of F-2 from the Washington D.C. Line to the US 50 (John Hanson Highway) is not managed by NPS and should be removed from its classification.	For the first row of F-2, change the "From" from "Washington, D.C. Line" to "US 50 (John Hanson Highway)/MD 201 (Kenilworth Avenue)". The other segment will be moved to the recommendation for E-2.
D77	194	The information for the first three segments of F-4 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine the first three rows of F-4 (Facility Name: John Hanson Highway, District: 5): MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared use facility, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "District" is 3 and 5, Vehicle Lanes is 4-6, "From" column should be "Washington, D.C. line" and "To" column should be "MD 410 (Veterans Parkway)"; combine notes.

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D78	195	Recommended number of vehicle lanes for F-6 are missing.	Add recommended vehicle lanes for F-6: 4-6 lanes for the segment from MD 717 (Water Street) to the Anne Arundel County Line, and 6 lanes for all other segments.
D79	197	The information for the last two segments of E-1 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity. Additionally, these segments were considered for a classification downgrade but were entered incorrectly in preliminary tables.	Combine the last two rows of E-1: Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, District, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared use facility and Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "US 301 (Robert Crain Highway)" and "To" column should be "Anne Arundel County line". This new segment should have an MPOT ID of A-32, and moved to the Arterial Recommendations table, after the other A-32 segment.
D80	197	The section of MD 201 (Kenilworth Avenue) south of US 50 will need to be added to a different classification in the recommendation table after the adjustment to F-2.	Add a new row for E-2, and move row to before the existing entry. District is 5, "From" is "Eastern Avenue NE", "To" is "US 50 (John Hanson Highway)/Baltimore-Washington Parkway", Min. ROW is Varies, recommended vehicle lanes is 6, Master Plan is 2018 Greater Cheverly Sector Plan; all other entries are same as other E-2 entry.

III. D. Errors in Master Plan of Transportation Facility Tables

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
D81	197	The first two segments of E-6 have errors in their segment end points	<p>For the first row of E-6, change "From" from "F-10/TW-2" to "US 301 (Robert Crain Highway)/MD 4 (Stephanie Roper Highway)", and change "To" from "MD 725 (Main Street/Marlboro Pike)" to "MD 202 (Largo Road) near Kent Drive"</p> <p>For the second row of E-6, change "From" from "MD 725 (Main Street/Marlboro Pike)" to "MD 202 (Largo Road) near Kent Drive"</p>
D82	197	The information for the third and fourth segment of E-6 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine the third and fourth rows of E-6 : MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, District, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared use facility and Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "MD 193 (Watkins Park Drive)" and "To" column should be "Prince Place"

III. E. Adherence to Planning Department and Master Plan Protocols

Staff identified the following errors where the “2025 Preliminary Plan” failed to meet the Planning Department’s protocols or standard master planning processes; the proposed revisions and clarifications will increase the ability of this functional master plan to function as a master plan for Prince George’s County.

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
E1		Plan-wide		Multiple statistics and tables are missing the date or year in which the data was reported.	Add dates to all statistical references.
E2		Plan-wide		All maps must be at a resolution that is readable. The version posted on the Planning Department website contains blurry maps at a resolution where details are difficult to view.	Update all maps to minimum 300 dpi resolution.
E3		Plan-wide		Several maps identify the source as a specific Planning Department GIS Job #. GIS Job # are internal information relevant only to the Prince George's County Planning Department and not to plan users.	Add an appendix with all map sources, as done in other recently approved plans.
E4		Plan-wide		Page numbers are identified in multiple ways	Reference all page numbers as “page...”
E5		Plan-wide		Multiple policies and strategies also advance other policies and strategies.	Whenever a policy or strategy advances another policy or strategy, add a cross-reference.
E6		Plan-wide		Policy SS 1 (page 116) only contains one strategy. There are many strategies within Go Prince George's that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Add cross-references to these strategies.	Add cross-references to all strategies whose implementation reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

III. E. Adherence to Planning Department and Master Plan Protocols

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
E7	70	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		Strategy BK 1.1 recommends construction of a bikeway system but does not cross-reference any recommendations.	Insert cross-references
E8	114	Smart Infrastructure		<p>Policy SI 2 states "Develop, adopt, and broadly promote digital applications that will better inform the County's commuters and drivers."</p> <p>A policy with no strategies is an error. This language works as a strategy under Policy SI 3 (Revised Policy SI 2).</p>	<p>Delete Policy SI 2 and renumber it as Strategy SI 2.7.</p> <p>Renumber Policy SI 3 as SI 2 and renumber strategies accordingly.</p>

III. F. Clarifications

Staff identified the following language and/or graphics where clarification is warranted.

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F1		Plan-wide		<p>Go Prince George's, upon its approval, will replace, in its entirety, the Transportation and Mobility Element of Plan 2035. Numerous cross-references to information and recommendations within Plan 2035 that are being carried forward, updated, or replaced in Go Prince George's were erroneously deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>This has potential to cause considerable confusion, especially when determining the transportation and mobility recommendations that apply to a development application. The purpose of Go Prince George's is to combine and consolidate transportation recommendations in one location. This plan should strive to avoid deleting recommendations in previously-approved area master, sector, transit district development, and functional master plans and replacing them with nothing.</p>	<p>Insert and/or restore cross-references to Plan 2035 policies and strategies and whether or not a particular policy or strategies carries forward, expands upon, or replaces a Plan 2035 policy or strategy.</p>
F2		Plan-wide		<p>This document makes several references to roads when referring to streets or to both streets and roads.</p>	<p>Revise all references to the street and road network as "streets and roads" where necessary.</p>

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F3		Plan-wide		The plan should use consistent language when referring to active transportation infrastructure. Facilities intended for the use of more than one mode of active transportation, such as bicyclists and pedestrians, should be referred to as “shared-use” paths or facilities.	Revise as necessary.
F4	16	Our Themes		Page 16 (Our Themes) states "Each of the Go Prince George’s policies and recommendations incorporates at least one of its six overarching themes." Only the policies are explicitly identified by theme.	Revise to read "Each of the Go Prince George’s policies and recommendations incorporates at least one of its six overarching themes."
F5	44	Transit		All of the information on this page is specific to rail transit; page 45 discusses bus transit	Change header on page 44 to Rail Transit
F6	45	Bus		MTA Commuter Bus services connect destinations outside Prince George's County with destinations inside the County. The morning commuter services terminate in the District of Columbia and it is important context to mention this.	Revise description of commuter bus services as: 7 commuter bus lines in the County operated by MTA servicing connecting residents of Anne Arundel, Calvert, Charles, and Prince George's County with the District of Columbia, Metro stations, MARC, various cities, and Charles and Calvert Counties with stops in...

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F7	98	Roads and Highways		<p>Page 98 (Roads and Highways) identifies one improvement to the road and highway system as "Access management that is appropriate to the functional classification of the street, road, or highway;"</p> <p>Access management requires other considerations beyond functional classification.</p>	<p>Revise this sentence as</p> <p>Access management that is appropriate to <u>the context of the neighborhood and the functional classification of the street, road, or highway;</u></p>
F8	99	Roads and Highways	RH 5	<p>Policy RH 5 states "Improve transportation system performance through several transportation system management strategies to keep commuter traffic on highways and major roads to prevent encroachment of through traffic into residential neighborhoods."</p> <p>This policy contains extraneous or duplicative language that distracts from its intent, which is "prevent encroachment of through traffic into residential neighborhoods." It is possible that this language was incorrectly formatted as a policy instead of a strategy under Policy RH 4.</p>	<p>Delete policy and replace with:</p> <p><u>Proactively manage the transportation system to discourage cut-through and commuter traffic on residential streets.</u></p>

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F9	121	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		Page 121 states "All of the facility recommendations in Go Prince George's (Section III) will supersede, in their entirety, all previously approved facility recommendations in the area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans, on the date of approval of Go Prince George's." This plan replaces the 2009 MPOT in its entirety as well, which contains the transportation recommendations for 16 active area master, sector, and transit district development plans approved prior to November 2009.	Delete this sentence and replace it with: <u>Upon its approval, Go Prince George's supersedes the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation in its entirety and all facility recommendations within previously-approved Area Master, Sector, and Transit District Development Plans.</u>

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F10	106	Waterways	WW 1.1	Strategy WW 1.2 contains a footnote that states "Sites of interest identified, 2009 MPOT, 11." This footnote is unclear.	<p>Revise Strategy WW 1.2 as follows:</p> <p>Create maps to show <u>water trail users access to public land, water and other access points, facilities such as pavilions, campsites, potable water, and/or restrooms; and other scenic, historic, or natural features that can be explored from the river. <u>Historic sites that may be accessed, viewed, or interpreted from the Patuxent River Water Trail include:</u></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Mount Calvert</u> • <u>Selby Landing and Jackson Landing at Jug Bay Natural Area</u> • <u>Magraders Ferry</u> • <u>Milltown Landing</u> • <u>Cedar Haven Park</u> • <u>Mattaponi Creek</u> • <u>Black Swamp Creek</u>

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F10	106	Waterways	WW 1.1	(continued from previous page)	Revise footnote as follows: Sites of interest identified, 2009 MPOT, <u>Carries forward and expands upon Interpretative Trails and Long Distance Bicycle Routes in Prince George’s County Policy 2, Strategy 2, of the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation, page 11.</u>
F11	109	Aviation	AV 2.2	Strategy AV 2.2 states "Coordinate with Joint Base Andrews and key stakeholders on future updates to the Joint Land Use Study and Air Installation Compatible Use Zones pertinent to the base and surrounding County properties." A primary focus of JBA/County coordination is the impact of the base on people in Prince George's County, and vice versa.	Revise as: Coordinate with Joint Base Andrews and key stakeholders on future updates to the Joint Land Use Study and Air Installation Compatible Use Zones pertinent to the base and <u>the surrounding community County properties.</u>
F12	112	Smart Infrastructure	SI 1	Policy SI 1 states "Advance utilities to support smart infrastructure technology in the public right-of-way." It is unclear what is meant by "advance utilities". Strategies SI 1.1 through 1.3 do not describe what changes to utilities, or which utilities, should be improved to implement smart technology.	Revise Policy SI 1 as: Advance utilities to support <u>Increase smart infrastructure and technology in the public right-of-way.</u>

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F13	112	Smart Infrastructure		Strategies SI 1.1 and SI 1.2 are duplicative. In addition, public EV charging stations are transportation infrastructure governed by this master plan.	<p>Revise as:</p> <p>Strategy SI 1.1: Provide curbside electric vehicle charging infrastructure in a manner that encourages EV use.</p> <p><u>Strategy SI 1.2-Evaluate the potential for installation of EV infrastructure countywide and identify priority locations for curbside EV charging stations for users. Amend this master plan to incorporate priority EV charging locations, to inform future capital and development projects.</u></p>
F14	115	Sustainability		Page 115 (Sustainability) states "Go Prince George's revisits and updates the recommendations in the 2017 Approved Prince George's County Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan." The relationship between Go Prince George's and the 2017 Resource Conservation Plan (RCP) can be clarified.	<p>Revise as:</p> <p>Go Prince George's builds upon revisits and updates the recommendations in <u>of</u> the 2017 <i>Approved Prince George's County Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan.</i></p>

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F15	116	Sustain-ability		<p>Policy SS 3 states "Promote green infrastructure for shared-use paths, trails, and off-street parking." This statement is unclear. Because shared-use paths exist and are planned for parkland, this policy could be misinterpreted as recommending that such facilities be constructed within the Countywide Green Infrastructure Network.</p> <p>Strategy SS 3.1 states "Promote green initiatives to reduce heat effects in all paved surfaces, including driveways."</p> <p>Strategy SS 3.1 directly implements Policy GI 8 of the 2017 RCP by reducing the heat island effect but does not define this nor does it identify what "green initiatives are".</p>	<p>Delete Policy SS 3 and revise/move the strategy under Policy SS 2.</p> <p><u>Strategy SS 2.5: Reduce heat effects in all paved surfaces, including driveways, by using alternate paving materials, increasing tree canopy, and other measures.</u></p> <p>Add a footnote that states:</p> <p><u>This strategy amends Policy GI 8 of the 2017 Approved Green Infrastructure Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan, where it becomes Strategy GI 8.7.</u></p>

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F16	153	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		The information for the two segments of A-1 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine the two rows of A-1: MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, District, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared-use facility, Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "Montgomery County Line". "to" column should be "I-95"
F17	153	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		The information for the two segments of A-6 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine the two rows of A-6: MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, District, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared-use facility, Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "MD 206 (Virginia Manor Road/Konterra Drive)". "to" column should be "US 1(Baltimore Avenue)"

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F18	154	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		The information for the last two segments of A-11 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine the last two rows of A-11: MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, District, Bicycle or shared-use facility, Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "MD 320 (Piney Branch Road)". "To" column should be "Montgomery County line", the Min Row should be 100-130
F19	155	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		The information for the two segments of A-16 with the facility name "University Boulevard" are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine the first two rows of A-16: MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared-use facility, Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "Adelphi Road". "To" column should be "Greenbelt Road.". District is "1 and 3"

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F20	167	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		The information for the last three segments of MC-701 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine the last three rows of MC-701: MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, District, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared use facility and Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "Rosecroft Drive" and "To" columns should be "Allentown Road"
F21	170	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		The information for the first two segments of C-300 Church Road, (with 4 Vehicle Lanes recommended) are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.	Combine the first two rows of C-300: MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, District, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared use facility and Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "Oak Grove Road" and "To" columns should be "Mt. Oak Road/Woodmore Road"

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F22	172	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		The information for the various segments of C-314 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity. Additionally, the facility names and ownership of some segments of C-314 need revisions for clarity.	<p>Combine the third and fourth rows of C-314: MPOT-ID, Route ID, Ownership, District, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared use facility and Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "Facility Name is "Lanham Severn Road", "From" column is "Springfield Road/Hillmeade Road" and "To" column should be "Brady Avenue"</p> <p>The facility name of the now fourth row of C-314 should be "9th Street", and the "To" should change from "11th Street" to "Chestnut Avenue".</p> <p>The facility name of the now fifth row of C-314 should be "11th Street", and the "From" should change from "11th Street" to "MD 564 (Chestnut Avenue/9th Street)"</p>

III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
F23	172	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		<p>The information for the various segments of C-314 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity. Additionally, the facility names and ownership of some segments of C-314 need revisions for clarity.</p> <p>(continued from previous page)</p>	<p>Combine the last two rows of C-314 (Facility Name: Race Track Road): MPOT-ID, Facility Name, District, Bicycle or shared use facility and Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; Remove the "MD 564" in Route ID, and change "SHA" to "DPW&T" for "Ownership", Min. ROW is now 90-100, the "From" column should be "Lloyd Station Road" and "To" column should be "Jericho Park Road"</p>
F24	173	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		<p>The information for the two segments of C-341 are alike and the rows can be consolidated for clarity.</p>	<p>Combine the third and fourth rows of C-341: MPOT-ID, Route ID, Facility Name, Ownership, District, Min. ROW, Bicycle or shared use facility and Vehicle Lanes, and Master/Sector Plan columns remain the same; "From" column should be "I-95/I-495 (Capital Beltway)" and "To" column should be "Soil Conservation Road/Aqua Road"</p>

III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
G1		Plan-wide		Section 27-3502(d)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance authorizes the Planning Department to prepare a staff draft plan. There is no such thing as a "preliminary" General, Area Master, Sector, or Functional Master Plan in Prince George's County. Furthermore, many decisions concerning the County's transportation network are made during the review and approval of preliminary plans of subdivision, which are referenced within the plan. These are often referred to as "Preliminary Plans".	Replace all references to "Preliminary" in relation to the Staff Draft Master Plan with "Staff Draft".
G2		Plan-wide		The plan makes several references to the Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement as an implementing agency for transportation improvements. While DPIE issues permits for construction of infrastructure within the County, they do not construct or maintain infrastructure.	Update all references to DPIE as a regulatory agency and not an implementing agency.
G3		Plan-wide		In several locations, the plan recommends Prince George's County "ensure" a particular outcome. While plans may recommend outcomes, and identify strategies to help implement them, the only way Prince George's County can ensure a transportation outcome is to enact regulations and/or construct infrastructure that guarantees the desired outcome. This word should only be used in circumstances where such actions are possible.	Delete references to policies and strategies "ensuring" an outcome.

III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
G4	17	Our Themes		<p>Page 17 (Our Themes: Community of Choice) states:</p> <p>"A well-maintained and connected network of streets, paths, bikeways, trails, and more provides Prince Georgians with the optimum variety of mode choices. This plan supports a Complete Streets Road Network enhanced for a particular mode (pedestrians, bicycles, transit, vehicles, trucks). It also focuses on the benefits of flexible design standards, and needed infrastructure improvements to connect to the County's communities of choice."</p> <p>This sentence is unclear and factually inaccurate as drafted.</p> <p>a) The other Theme statements in this section begin with an action. b) This plan recommends a network of Complete Streets. c) Streets and Roads are functionally different facilities. d) Complete Streets accommodate all modes, which is why they are called "Complete".</p>	<p>Revise to read:</p> <p>"<u>A Construct</u> a well-maintained and connected network of <u>Complete Streets</u> streets, paths, bikeways, trails, and more, provides <u>providing</u> Prince Georgians with the optimum variety of mode choices <u>to maximize accessibility and help the County become the community of choice in the National Capital Region.</u> This plan supports a Complete Streets Road Network enhanced for a particular mode (pedestrians, bicycles, transit, vehicles, trucks). It also focuses on the benefits of flexible design standards, and needed infrastructure improvements to connect to the County's communities of choice."</p>

III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
G4	17	Our Themes (continued)		<p>e) Go Prince George's does not focus on the benefits of flexible design standards. It recommends streets be designed pursuant to specific design standards, which themselves offer the designer limited flexibility to address unavoidable conflicts.</p> <p>f) Prince George's County does not contain any communities that are not communities of choice. Plan 2035 envision the entire County as a community of choice for the region. Go Prince George's does this, in part, by creating transportation options for travelers.</p>	See previous page
G5	30	Agency Partners and Municipalities		Oxon Hill is not a National Park Service Facility. Oxon Cove Park & Oxon Hill Farm is.	Correct accordingly.
G6	30	Agency Partners and Municipalities		MTA also operates the MARC Camden Line and the MARC Penn Line in Prince George's County	Correct accordingly.
G7	30	Agency Partners and Municipalities		DPIE does not manage road operations	Correct accordingly.

III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
G8	32	Community Engagement		<p>Page 32 (Community Engagement) states "Go Prince George's captures places of interest including connections to international airports..."</p> <p>Go Prince George's connects travelers to places of interest throughout the region.</p>	<p>Revise this sentence as follows:</p> <p>"Go Prince George's captures <u>connects</u> <u>people to</u> places of interest, including connections to international airports....."</p>
G9	35-37	Plan 2035 Center Classification System		The 2022 <i>Approved Adelphi Road-UMGC-UMD Purple Line Station Area Sector Plan</i> designated UMD West as a Local Transit Center.	Move UMD West from Campus Center to Local Transit Center and update Map 2. Plan 2035 Growth Policy Map.
G10	35-37	Plan 2035 Center Classification System		The 2022 <i>Approved Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan</i> renamed the Bowie State University MARC Station Campus Center.	Revise Campus Centers to reflect the official name and update Map 2. Plan 2035 Growth Policy Map.
G11	39	Roads		Section labeled Roads features primarily Interstate and US Highways. Section should be labeled "Major Highways"	Correct accordingly.

III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
G12	88	Micromobility		<p>Page 88 (Micromobility and Transportation Network Companies) states "Micromobility options at transportation hubs include shared bikes and scooters by transportation network companies, such as the scooter program established in 2019 by the University of Maryland and the City of College Park."</p> <p>The University of Maryland, College Park, and the City of College Park first partnered to bring micromobility services to College Park in 2016, with the initial program extended to the Town of University Park in 2017.</p>	Correct accordingly.
G13	108	Aviation	AV 1.1	<p>Strategy AV 1.1 states "Identify appropriate locations within Prince George's County where vertiports should be located to facilitate vertical take-offs/landings and autonomous aircraft." Such flight activity is prohibited by the Federal Aviation Administration everywhere in Prince George's County except the far southeastern tip where very few residents live or work.</p>	Delete Strategy AV 1.1

III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
G14	108	Aviation	AV 1.2	<p>Strategy AV 1.2 states "Update County and Zoning codes to ensure that existing airports and future vertiports meet design standards for optimal access and use."</p> <p>This statement may be confusing. Optimal access and use is not defined. Design standards are not identified. Future vertiports are not likely to be instituted due to airspace restrictions. The College Park Airport is owned and operated by the Commission and is not subject to zoning. A change to the Zoning Ordinance may not affect operations at the County's sole remaining private general aviation airport, Potomac Airfield, which operates pursuant to SE-1130, approved by the Board of County Commissioners on March 19, 1965.</p>	Delete Strategy AV 1.2
G15	108	Aviation	AV 1.4	<p>Strategy AV 1.4 addresses energy support for "future UAM vehicles" which are prohibited in much of Prince George's County due to flight restrictions associated with national security.</p>	Delete Strategy AV 1.4

III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
G16	109	Aviation	AV 2	<p>Policy AV 2 states "Continue to support the critical operations and viability of Joint Base Andrews."</p> <p>It is unclear what threats to the viability of JBA exist. The supporting strategies and explanatory information fail to mention the formal role of JBA in reviewing development applications in the Military Installation Overlay (MIO) Zone. Strategy AV 2.1 states "Continue ongoing collaboration with Joint Base Andrews planning staff to identify and address issues related to sustaining base operations." The County's coordination with JBA on planning, land use, economic development, and compatibility issues is expansive, including, at times, JBA personnel up to the base commander.</p>	<p>Revise as:</p> <p>Policy AV 2: Continue to support the critical operations and viability of Joint Base Andrews <u>Naval Air Facility Washington as a critical national defense installation and major County employer.</u></p> <p>Strategy AV 2.1 Continue ongoing collaboration with Joint Base Andrews planning staff to identify and address issues related to <u>base compatibility, economic development, and sustaining</u> base operations.</p>
G17	109	Aviation	AV 3.1	<p>Strategy AV 3.1 states "Expand the operational capacity of College Park Airport by protecting runway approaches, expanding vertical aircraft operations (helicopters, drones, vertical take-off and landing craft, etc.), and ensuring dedicated operational funding sources remain available." Vertical take-off and landing and unmanned aerial vehicle traffic are generally prohibited in the Washington Flight Restricted Zone and the security parameters associated with flight activity preclude the type of private and/or commercial on-demand aerial services envisioned by Strategy AV 3.1.</p>	<p>Revise as:</p> <p>Expand the operational capacity of College Park Airport by protecting runway approaches, expanding vertical aircraft operations (helicopters, drones, vertical take-off and landing craft, etc.), and ensuring dedicated operational funding sources remain available.</p>

III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
G18	109	Aviation	AV 3.3	<p>Strategy AV 3.3 states "Work with the owners of Freeway Airport to identify and eliminate challenges to ongoing operations." This strategy conflicts with Strategy LU 3.1 of the 2022 Approved Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan, which states:</p> <p>"LU 3.1: Should Freeway Airport be unable to redevelop pursuant to Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-20006, and should it cease operation as an airport, the properties located at 3600, 3702, and 3900 Church Road (Tax ID 0801258, 0801357, 0801290, 0801340, 0801241, 0801274, 0801233, 0801282, and 0728741) should be redeveloped with medium-density single-family, attached or detached housing. Uses other than aviation, single-family attached or detached housing, or rural or agricultural uses do not conform with this master plan. Map 16. Future Land Use, designates this property in the Residential Medium land use category."</p>	<p>Revise as:</p> <p>Work with the owners of Freeway Airport to identify and eliminate challenges to ongoing operations <u>so they may continue to provide general aviation services until such time as they redevelop pursuant to the recommendations of Strategy LU 3.1 of the 2022 Approved Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan.</u></p>

III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
G19	109	Aviation	AV 4	<p>Policy AV 4 states "Accommodate helipads in appropriate areas." Strategy AV 4.1 states "Update County and Zoning Codes to ensure mitigation measures are in place to ensure noise ordinances address decibel concerns."</p> <p>This policy and its supporting strategy does not identify how helipads can be "accommodated" or where "appropriate" areas are. New helipads do not appear to be permitted anywhere in Prince George's County that is subject to zoning. The Zoning Ordinance is part of the County Code. Vertical take-off and landing is generally prohibited in the Washington Flight Restricted Zone and the security parameters associated with flight activity preclude the type of private and/or commercial on-demand aerial services envisioned by Strategy AV 3.3. Existing helipads and helistops in Prince George's County were either approved under the Prior Zoning Ordinance, which permitted them, or are public facilities not subject to zoning.</p>	Delete Policy AV 4 and supporting strategies.
G20	125	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		In the "To" column for the second UM-208 entry, that segment of Riverdale Road is not a state highway.	For the second entry of UM-208, remove "MD 410" and the parenthesis around "Riverdale Road" in the "To" column.

III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
G21	164	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		The bicycle facility existing along Hanover Parkway is a shared-use path. The recommended bicycle and pedestrian facility should be changed to reflect this.	Change the Bicycle or Shared-Use Facility for C-211 to “Shared use path”
G22	206 - 242	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		Maps 19-55 are labeled "Functional Classification". Functional classification is a descriptive term but may be unclear to a plan user. These maps represent the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation for Streets and Roads.	Revise Maps 19-55 with the header "Countywide Master Plan of Transportation: Streets and Roads" and add "Functional Classification" as the header to the legend.
G23	255	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Page 255 (Sustainability) states “Co-locate utilities in urban settings to reduce or minimize the impact on the green infrastructure network.</p> <p>It is unclear what this statement is in reference to. Utilities are regularly co-located within vaults, overhead, or in vertical alignment.</p>	Delete

III. H. Corrections of Multiple Error Types or Other Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
H1		Plan-wide		Tables and Maps in Section 3 should be relocated to the appropriate location within Section 2, adjacent to the applicable policies and strategies. Users of Prince George's County plans are accustomed to policies, strategies, and facility recommendations being in the same location and may not reference facility recommendations in the back of the plan.	At the time of the next publication, place all tables and maps as close as possible to their applicable strategy.
H2		Plan-wide		Each element within Section II begins with a goal statement. Formatting clearly indicating Goal Statements was erroneously deleted during publication of the 2025 Staff Draft Plan.	In the next publication, format goal statements to clearly stand out.
H3		Plan-wide		The phrase "as appropriate" was added to several policies and strategies prior to the public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". The plan does not define what is "appropriate" or "inappropriate", and public perception of such often depends on proximity to one's own home, and not the best interests of Prince George's County. The private sector may use this unclear phrasing to justify not implementing a plan recommendation.	Delete the phrase "as appropriate" from all policies and strategies. Substitute "where appropriate" where locational considerations determine whether or not a recommendation is applicable.

III. H. Corrections of Multiple Error Types or Other Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
H4	93	Complete and Green Streets	CG 1.2	<p>Strategy CG 1.2 states "Revise the County Code to address modified or alternative street designs to meet the intent of the Urban Street Design Standards."</p> <p>The project team that developed the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's worked closely with the County Council, DPW&T, and other stakeholders to develop the County's 2024 Urban Street Design Standards pursuant to Walkable Urban Streets Act of 2023.</p> <p>Modified or alternative street designs were considered during that process and during the process to develop the Staff Draft Plan but further evaluation is necessary prior to legislative revisions. Alternate design standards would be implemented through the Urban Street Design Standards themselves, not necessarily a change to the County Code.</p>	<p>Revise as "Revise <u>Evaluate potential revisions to the Urban Street Design Standards to the County Code</u> to address <u>situations where</u> modified or alternative street designs <u>may be necessary</u> to meet the intent of the Urban Street Design Standards.</p>

III. H. Corrections of Multiple Error Types or Other Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
H5	93	Complete and Green Streets	CG 2	<p>Policy CG 2 states "Comply with Complete Street Standards as published by Maryland State agencies".</p> <p>The intent of this policy is covered by Strategy CG 1.1. "Maryland State agencies" do not have "Complete Street Standards". Pursuant to Section 27-6206(a) of the Zoning Ordinance, "Within the Regional Transit Districts and Local Centers as designated by the General Plan (as may be amended from time to time), the Prince George’s County Urban Street Design Standards shall apply."</p> <p>It is unclear from how this is written whether all roads must somehow comply to "Complete Street Standards" or just certain roads. Clearer, more understandable language was prepared in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Policies published without strategies are errors.</p>	Delete

III. H. Corrections of Multiple Error Types or Other Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
H6	93	Complete and Green Streets	CG 3	<p>Policy CG 3 states "Implement the new Urban Center Streets throughout Prince George's County."</p> <p>This language is too broad, does not reflect the fact that many roads throughout the County are not appropriate for reconstruction as Complete and Green Streets, and does not contain strategies. Specific policies and strategies on application of the Urban Street Design Standards were prepared in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Policies published without strategies are errors.</p>	Delete

III. H. Corrections of Multiple Error Types or Other Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
H7	98	Roads and Highways	RH 2	<p>Policy RH 2 states "Identify vehicular thoroughfares that facilitate travel between neighboring counties and jurisdictions."</p> <p>A policy with no strategies is an error. This statement is unclear and was inserted into this document following the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Identification is not a policy statement.</p> <p>"Vehicular thoroughfares" is undefined and unclear. Dozens of streets cross the District of Columbia border and carry vehicles, some could be considered "thoroughfares". The primary purpose of a transportation plan is to identify operational and investment policies and strategies to help create the place envisioned by the General Plan. The major transportation corridors that enter and exit Prince George's County are well known to most residents and stakeholders and were identified in the Existing Conditions analysis. This statement should be deleted.</p>	Delete Policy RH 2 and renumber subsequent policies.

III. H. Corrections of Multiple Error Types or Other Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/Clarification
H8	116	Sustainability	SS 2	Policy SS 2 states "Implement the recommendations of the 2017 Approved Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan to promote green infrastructure." Strategy SS 2.4 expands upon Strategy GI 14.5 of the RCPAGE Additional policies and strategies of the RCP are carried forward in Go Prince George's but are not consistently cross-referenced in this document.	<p>Revise Footnote 4 on page 116 to state:</p> <p>Carries forward Strategy GI 14.4 and expands on Strategy GI 14.5 of the 2017 Approved Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan (2017 RCP), page 58 and expands upon Strategy TM 7.1 of Plan 2035. <u>This strategy amends Strategy GI 14.5 of the 2017 RCP as a sub-bullet.</u></p> <p>Add cross-references to the 2017 RCP where necessary.</p>
H9	117	Sustainability		Map 18, Electric Vehicle Charging Stations in Prince George's County, does not have a date. The title of the map should be clarified that it represents existing stations on a certain date.	Add the date and "Existing" to the title and the citation