

# I. Introduction

## Attachment C: Identified Issues Not Addressed and Critical Errors

### Staff Draft Go Prince George's

### March 24, 2026 Joint Public Hearing

On November 17, 2009, the Prince George's County Council, sitting as the District Council, approved the current 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*. Subsequent to that, the District Council approved Plan Prince George's 2035 (Plan 2035), the County's General Plan, 22 Area Master, Sector, and Transit District Development Plans, four Functional Master Plans, and new Subdivision, Zoning, and Woodland Conservation Ordinances. During this period, the Prince George's County Planning Department and its partner agencies conducted dozens of transportation and transportation-related studies cover a variety of topics. In 2020, the Planning Department began scoping a new countywide master plan of transportation, which was initiated on September 21, 2021, through the District Council's adoption of CR-79-2021.

Between November 17, 2009 and August 2024, thousands of staff, stakeholder, and County resident hours were spent planning for the future of Prince George's County's expansive and complex transportation system. Planning Department staff and contractors spent nearly three years identifying and analyzing the transportation, mobility, and accessibility opportunities and challenges facing Prince George's County. Working collaborative with federal, regional, State, and County agencies, other stakeholders, and the public, Planning Department staff drafted a comprehensive set of goals, policies, and strategies to implement the County's growth and development goals through the provision of the full range of transportation, mobility, and accessibility facilities and services.

Between August 2024 and February 2025, the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's prepared as authorized under CR-79-2021 was unilaterally and arbitrarily transformed into the "2025 Preliminary Plan" presented at this Joint Public Hearing. Hundreds of pages of explanatory information, necessary context, policies, and strategies, many of which are essential to addressing the County's transportation needs, were summarily deleted from this document prior to its public release. The "2025 Preliminary Plan" contains many references to this deleted material, which confuses the reader.

In addition to the 285 errors identified in Attachments A and B, this Attachment contains 150 deletions and inappropriate insertions that cannot be addressed through the normal corrections process. This material is substantive and can only be added to the plan through the processes permitted through Section 27-3502 of the Zoning Ordinance:

1. The Planning Board or District Council may remand the "2025 Preliminary Plan" to staff to address some or all of the issues described below.
2. The Planning Board may amend the plan based on testimony received on some or all of the topics described below.

# I. Introduction

3. The District Council may amend the plan based on testimony received on some or all of the topics described below.
4. The District Council may amend the plan to address the topics below and host a Joint Public Hearing on those amendments.
5. The District Council may initiate a major amendment to Go Prince George's after its initial approval.

In the interests of transparency and responsible stewardship, the Planning Department identifies those topics that were identified and thoroughly evaluated over the 15 years of comprehensive and collaborative transportation planning for Prince George's County and for which explanatory language, context, policies, and/or strategies were prepared by staff pursuant to CR-79-2021 but were unilaterally, summarily, and arbitrarily deleted or omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan" prior to its review by partner agencies and public release.

**Staff advise that several topics are critical errors that require a comprehensive resolution prior to adoption and/or approval of this functional master plan.** Some issues may be able to be thoroughly resolved if testimony is received at this joint public hearing on those topics. Other issues will require the District Council to amend the adopted Go Prince George's and hold a second public hearing on those amendments. These topics are described in Section II: Critical Errors below.

Several items were unilaterally inserted into the "2025 Preliminary Plan" that were not evaluated during the three-year collaborative process to develop a Staff Draft of Go Prince George's; incorporating these items into a comprehensive master plan of transportation requires additional time, input, consideration, and interagency coordination beyond the timeframe allotted for adoption and approval of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". In addition, partner agencies provided language in late 2024 and early 2025 for the Planning Department's consideration that was arbitrarily inserted into the "2025 Preliminary Plan" without discussion, coordination, or deliberation. In some cases, this language conflicts with the overall aims of Go Prince George's or Plan 2035, or may be clarified with the appropriate coordination to maximize its impact and effectiveness.

# I. Introduction

## Table of Contents

I	Introduction			1
II	Critical Errors (In Order of Importance)	A	Deletion of Traffic Adequacy Recommendations	6
		B	Omission of Master Plan Rights-of-Way	10
		C	Omission of Southern Maryland Regional Transit Corridor Recommendations	12
		D	Omission of Project Prioritization Recommendations	16
		E	Deletion and De Facto De-Designation of Scenic and Historic Roads	23
		F	Deletion of US 301 Alternatives	32
		G	Deletion of High Capacity Transit (HCT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Recommendations	35
		H	Deletion/Omission of Entire Plan Elements	42
III	Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”		Our Themes	44
			Growing and traveling sustainably	45
			Empowering people through connections	45
			Community Engagement	45
			Legal Context	46
III			Updating the County’s Transportation Policies and Strategies	47

# I. Introduction

	Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	48
III	Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	54
		Transit	62
		Micromobility	68
		Complete and Green Streets	73
		Roads and Highways	82
		Special Roadways and County Heritage	83
		Waterways	83
		Goods Movement	86
		Sustainability	87
		Monitoring and Evaluation	87
IV	Late Insertions		91

# I. Introduction

Within each Section, the following is provided:

<b>Page Number</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>P/S</b>	<b>Plan Language</b>	<b>Challenge</b>
Page number	Section of plan	Policy or strategy number	Language in plan	Challenges created by the insertion or deletion.

## II. Critical Error: A. Deletion of Traffic Adequacy Recommendations

### Summary of Issue

Prince George's County requires applicants for a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision to meet certain traffic level-of-service (LOS) standards to receive a Certificate of Adequacy. Plan 2035 establishes LOS criteria by designated Transportation Service Area (TSA). The County's LOS standards reflect traditional suburban engineering considerations measuring the number of vehicles that travel through an intersection per lane per hour and a ratio of a roadway segment's traffic volume vs. its design capacity.

When an intersection or road segment fails to meet the County's LOS standard, the two customary methods used to mitigate this situation so that a Certificate of Adequacy may be granted is to either:

- a) Reduce the number of trips generated by the proposed development and/or
- b) Construct road improvements that improve the speed and volume of traffic flow.

These approaches may work in suburbanizing greenfields, but in a first-tier suburb like Prince George's County, three challenges exist that make this approach unworkable:

1. Acquiring land to widen roads, most of which is developed with businesses or homes, is prohibitively expensive and time-consuming.
2. The County's robust transit and multimodal network supports high-density development, especially around Metrorail stations. The density of development appropriate for transit station areas, and recommended by Plan 2035, cannot occur if the Planning Board must assume most trips are occurring by car, and a proposed development is held to an LOS standard that assumes speedy vehicular travel.
3. Existing and planned neighborhoods inside the Capital Beltway and/or around transit stations are densely populated and have many pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and micromobility users, which must have safe access and mobility requiring slower motor vehicle speeds.

Strategy TM3.2 of Plan 2035 states:

*Evaluate the LOS standards for all modes in Regional Transit Districts to determine appropriate levels of service.*

Strategy TM3.4 of Plan 2035 states:

*The Planning Board's Transportation Review Guidelines shall be reviewed and updated as needed to incorporate best multimodal practices during implementation of the strategies in Plan 2035 and adopted and approved master plans and sector plans, as well as future amendments to the MPOT.*

Strategy TM3.5 of Plan 2035 states:

*Adopt a single set of multimodal LOS standards (superseding the standards for each mode) at a future time when multimodal LOS analysis procedures have been fully accepted. The Planning Board should amend its Transportation Review Guidelines to utilize the new multimodal standards and analysis procedures at that time.*

## II. Critical Error: A. Deletion of Traffic Adequacy Recommendations

For these reasons, in 2018, the County Council enacted new LOS standards for Certificates of Adequacy, codified in Table 24-4502 of the Subdivision Regulations. These standards differ from those in Plan 2035 to allow greater traffic congestion for development in the Regional, Transit-Oriented and Local Transit-Oriented base and Planned Development Zones.

Publication of Go Prince George's was delayed for a year to give the Planning Department sufficient time to further evaluate this issue and recommend workable solutions that advance the goals of Plan 2035 while ensuring appropriate vehicle traffic facilities in suburban and rural areas. Staff presented this issue to the County Council Committee of the Whole on May 30, 2023 as a major challenge warranting the one-year extension granted by the County Council to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's.

For these reasons, on November 10, 2025, the District Council amended Plan 2035 and the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* to eliminate the traffic LOS standard within the West Hyattsville Local Transit Center.

Working in collaboration with partner agencies, advocacy groups, elected officials, and other stakeholders, staff drafted numerous policies and strategies recommending new Level of Service standards and new Transportation Service Areas, as well as other targeted legislative and policy changes.

### **Challenges**

Following the three-year collaborative process to prepare a Staff Draft of Go Prince George's pursuant to CR-79-2021, multiple policies and strategies addressing traffic adequacy were unilaterally and summarily deleted prior to agency review and public release of the 2025 "Preliminary Plan".

Deletion of these recommendations means that critical agency and public consideration of these necessary changes faces a two-year delay. This issue is the most important omission in the "2025 Preliminary Plan" and requires action prior to plan adoption or approval.

## II. Critical Error: A. Deletion of Traffic Adequacy Recommendations

### What the “2025 Preliminary Plan” Says

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE1	38	Transportation Service Areas		<p>Page 38 (Transportation Service Areas) states:</p> <p>"Plan 2035 established Transportation Service Areas (TSAs) so that certain transportation policies, including the requirements for adequacy of road/highway facilities, could be assigned geographically. Go Prince George’s replaces those TSAs with new TSAs that reflect the limited ability to add road/highway lanes and to the fundamental differences between areas in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center Zones and other areas of the County."</p>	<p>The establishment of new TSAs and new vehicle level-of-service (LOS) standards was a primary reason for undertaking Go Prince George's, and developing and finalizing these areas and standards was the principal purpose for the County Council's grant of a 12-month extension of the period to prepare the Staff Draft Plan in 2023.</p> <p>This language on page 38 alludes to the purpose of the new TSA maps without any of the associated context and relationship to new LOS standards.</p> <p>Detailed explanatory text and new LOS recommendations were developed in collaboration with partner agencies and reflective of planning best practices in transit-served neighborhoods of inner-ring suburbs, such as Montgomery County. Between the development of these standards and the final release of the 2025 Preliminary Plan, this explanatory text and the LOS standards were deleted from the plan.</p>

## II. Critical Error: A. Deletion of Traffic Adequacy Recommendations

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE2	99	Roads and Highways	RH 4	Policy RH 4 states "Establish realistic and appropriate traffic level-of-service standards for the determination of adequacy of roads and highways within a first-tier suburb."	<p>A policy with no strategies is an error. No context language is provided to explain what "realistic and appropriate" is; such language was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>Traffic levels-of-service standards were researched and evaluated, and new standards prepared, in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>

## II. Critical Error: B. Omission of Master Plan Rights-of-Way

### Summary of Issue

The Planning Department inadvertently omitted recommendations for five master plan rights-of-way from the “2025 Preliminary Plan”. This omission, should it be adopted and approved without amendment, would effectively delete five master-planned roads from the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation. One of these roads is Surratts Road, which is recommended for a grade-separated interchange with MD 5 (Branch Avenue).

Deletion of master plan rights-of-way inhibits the ability of the Planning Board and operating agencies to secure private reconstruction of the right-of-way to the applicable master-planned number of travel lanes, bicycle accommodation, and other planned features. In many areas of the County, it would inhibit the ability of the Planning Board to require dedication or reservation of land for future transportation improvements.

The rights-of-way are the following:

<b>MPOT ID</b>	<b>Facility Name</b>	<b>Ownership</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Min. ROW</b>	<b>Bicycle or Shared-Use Facility</b>	<b>Vehicle Lanes</b>	<b>Master/Sector Plan</b>	<b>Notes</b>
C-606	Osborne Hill Drive	DPW&T	9	MD 223 (Woodyard Road)	South Osborne Road	80	Shared-use path	4	Replaces 2013 Subregion 6 MP	Barrier-separated cycle path may be appropriate in areas with ROW constraints.
C-606	South Osborne Road	DPW&T	9	Osborne Hill Drive	US 301 (Robert Crain Highway)	80	Shared-use path	4	Replaces 2013 Subregion 6 MP	Barrier-separated cycle path may be appropriate in areas with ROW constraints.
C-607	Rosaryville Road	DPW&T	9	MD 223 (Woodyard Road)	US 301 (Robert Crain Highway)	80	Shared-use path	4	Replaces 2013 Subregion 6 MP	Includes interchange with US 301. Barrier-separated cycle path may be appropriate in areas with ROW constraints.
C-608	Duley Station Road	DPW&T	9	Old Indian Head Road	Wallace Lane	80	Shared-use path	2 to 4	Replaces 2013 Subregion 6 MP	Formerly MC-602. Build initially at two lanes, widen to four if needed.

## II. Critical Error: B. Omission of Master Plan Rights-of-Way

MPOP ID	Facility Name	Ownership	District	From	To	Min. ROW	Bicycle or Shared-Use Facility	Vehicle Lanes	Master/Sector Plan	Notes
C-608	Duley Station Road	DPW&T	9	Wallace Lane	Country Ridge Drive	80	Shared-use path	2	Replaces 2013 Subregion 6 MP	Formerly MC-602.
C-608	Duley Station Road	DPW&T	9	Country Ridge Drive	MD 382 (Croom Road)	80	Shared-use path	2	Replaces 2013 Subregion 6 MP	
C-609	Surratts Road	DPW&T	9	Brandywine Road	Dangerfield Road	80	Shared-use path	4	Replaces 2013 Subregion 5 MP	Includes interchange with MD 5.
C-609	Surratts Road	DPW&T	9	Dangerfield Road	Frank Tippet Road	80	Shared-use path	2	Replaces 2013 Subregion 6 MP	
C-610	Cattail Way	DPW&T	9	Mattawoman Drive	Missouri Avenue	80	Shared-use path	4	Replaces 2013 Subregion 6 MP	Barrier-separated cycle path may be appropriate in areas with ROW constraints. Unbuilt as of November 15, 2024.
C-610	Mangrove Drive Extended	DPW&T	9	Missouri Avenue	Cherry Tree Crossing Road (Approximately 3,300 feet north of MD 381)	80	Shared-use path	4	Replaces 2013 Subregion 5 MP	Barrier-separated cycle path may be appropriate in areas with ROW constraints. Unbuilt as of November 15, 2024.

### **Challenges**

Because of the substantive nature of facility recommendations, this omission can only be corrected through amendments based on public testimony at this Joint Public Hearing or by County Council amendment.

## II. Critical Error: C. Omission of Southern Maryland Regional Transit Corridor Recommendations

### Summary of Issue

The Southern Maryland Regional Transit Corridor connects White Plains in Charles County to the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station largely along MD 5.

The 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* recommends a fixed guideway transit extension south along MD 5 from the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station. Maps 24, 25, 32, and 39 clearly show the MD 5 corridor as a future transitway.

Strategic Transportation Policy and Master Plan Implementation Policy 4, Strategy 1f, recommends:

*Implement a corridor preservation process that will protect needed future rights-of-way from encroachment by development and/or minimize future damages to development from construction, operation, and maintenance of transportation facilities by:*

- *Identifying potential transportation facility/development conflicts early in the development review process (or sooner, if possible).*
- *Coordinating with developer applicants and property owners to identify corridor preservation strategies that can be implemented concurrently with the development.*
- *Obtaining dedications of right-of-way where improvements along existing road frontage are needed.*
- *Using the reservation process in the Subdivision Ordinance for facilities on new alignments such as freeways, expressways, controlled-access roadways, and fixed-guideway transit routes, stations, parking facilities, and maintenance facilities.*
- *Recommending dedications of rights-of-way for facilities on new alignments through Road Ordinance agreements as an alternative to reservation.*
- *Recommending use of building restriction lines or modification to the site plans to remove proposed building footprints from the future right-of-way areas where reservation or dedication are not appropriate.*<sup>1</sup>

The land use and transportation recommendations of the 2013 *Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan* and the 2013 *Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan* anticipate future fixed guideway transit in this corridor.

Strategy TM 2.2 of Plan 2035 recommends “TM2.2 Identify new transitway corridors that will support the Plan 2035 development priorities and amend the Master Plan of Transportation Transit Element to include the updated corridors.”

---

<sup>1</sup> 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*, page 69.

## II. Critical Error: C. Omission of Southern Maryland Regional Transit Corridor Recommendations

Plan 2035 states

*Given the rapid growth in Charles County and southern Prince George’s County and the resulting congestion along US 301 and MD 5, transit along the MD 5 corridor has been the subject of a series of studies. In 2010, the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) completed the Southern Maryland Transit Corridor Preservation Study to evaluate a number of potential alignments along the corridor. It selected a preferred alignment from White Plains to the Branch Avenue Metro Station (to be preserved through local land use plans), along with nine proposed and two future station locations (see Map 13). Using 2009 dollars, it estimated that construction costs would range from \$1.0 billion (for bus rapid transit) to \$1.4 billion (for light rail). In 2013, the Southern Maryland Rapid Transit Study was initiated for the purpose of determining a Locally Preferred Alternative for the Federal Transit Administration and developing an environmental document, including updated costs and ridership estimates.<sup>2</sup>*

The MD 5 Corridor is identified on Map 13, Potential Transitway Corridors, as an “Ongoing Transit Corridor Study”.<sup>3</sup> The Maryland Department of Transportation Maryland Transit Administration is currently conducting a Planning and Environmental Linkages Study for what is now the Southern Maryland Regional Transit (SMRT) Corridor.

On November 4, 2025, the County Council and County Executive identified SMRT as a top transit priority and requested that the project move into further review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) following conclusion of the current study. This recommendation has been carried forward throughout the life of Go Prince George’s.

During the three-year process to develop the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s initiated by CR-79-2021, working in collaboration with partner agencies, advocacy groups, elected officials, and other stakeholders, staff drafted numerous policies and strategies advancing SMRT, explicitly recommending its continued planning, design, station location, construction, and opening for service. SMRT is considered one of the highest priority transit projects, and transit-oriented development opportunities, in Prince George’s County.

### **Challenges**

The “2025 Preliminary Plan” does not contain a map or table of future transit corridors nor does it explicitly recommend preservation of rights-of-way along MD 5 and other previously recommended master planned transit corridors.

---

<sup>2</sup> Plan 2035, page 142.

<sup>3</sup> Plan 2035, page 143.

## II. Critical Error: C. Omission of Southern Maryland Regional Transit Corridor Recommendations

An explicit policy and supporting strategies recommending construction of SMRT and specific station areas were unilaterally, summarily, and arbitrarily deleted from the “2025 Preliminary Plan”. A map showing the recommended right-of-way for this corridor was omitted, and the only explicit language referencing SMRT is a note that MD 337 (Allentown Road) is a “potential Southern Maryland Rapid Transit corridor alignment” and a statement in the introduction to the Transit Element that states “Additional services are needed to connect Prince Georgians to destinations within the County.”<sup>4</sup> In keeping with this approach, another consideration of Go Prince George’s is the major ongoing State and County initiative to provide increased transit access in the southern part of the County, the Southern Maryland Rapid Transit system.”

The deletion of specific language recommending advancement of SMRT from the County’s master plan of transportation threatens the ability of MTA to complete the project and compete for federal funding moving forward.

The omission of the SMRT corridor on a map is a critical error. Its inclusion would permit the Planning Board to require dedication or reservation of rights-of-way for guideways, stations, station access, traction power facilities, and other infrastructure as properties along the alignment apply for Preliminary Plans of Subdivision. Should this plan be adopted and approved without such a map, and without explicit text the Planning Board can use in lieu of a map, the Planning Board’s ability to secure dedication of rights of way leaves the State with the expensive and time-consuming task of acquiring the necessary land through fee simple purchase or other arrangement.

---

<sup>4</sup> MD 5 is not identified in the “2025 Preliminary Plan” as a potential Southern Maryland Regional Transit corridor.

## II. Critical Error: C. Omission of Southern Maryland Regional Transit Corridor Recommendations

### What the “2025 Preliminary Plan” Says

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE3	85	Transit	TR 8	Policy TR 8 states "Implement fixed or dedicated transitway along appropriate transportation networks to supplement HCT/BRT."	This policy language was inserted into the Staff Draft Plan after its preparation and prior to its final release in error. The strategies associated with this Policy are intended to implement the Maryland MTA's Southern Maryland Rapid Transit (SMRT) corridor along MD 5 (Branch Avenue/Crain Highway) between Charles County and the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station. This was identified by Prince George's County's October 22, 2024 joint FY 2025-2030 Consolidated Transportation Program priority letter from the County Council and the County Executive to the Secretary of Transportation as a top transit priority.
CE4	85	Transit	TR 8.2	Strategy TR 8.2 states "Include station locations where the benefit will be maximized for transit-supported development in Prince George's County."	"Include" is not an action term and is inappropriate as the verb within a strategy. This statement is confusing as written. While transit stations should be located in areas where ridership may be maximized; choosing station locations solely on their ability to support transit-oriented development discounts other station location criteria and ignores the realities of the SMRT corridor, where some stations may be located in areas where redevelopment opportunities are limited or where parking is necessary to draw from a broader catchment area. Considerations for station locations for SMRT and other corridors were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

## II. Critical Error: D. Omission of Project Prioritization Recommendations

### Summary of Issue

Plan 2035 acknowledges that the County's infrastructure investment practices often fail to acknowledge the County's General Plan. Plan 2035 states:

*We must annually coordinate the review of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) across all county agencies to align the priorities set forth in Plan 2035 with County programs and operating budgets. As part of this process, we must prioritize investments in publicly funded infrastructure and facilities that are consistent with the Strategic Investment Map.*<sup>5</sup>

Strategy PD1.6 states:

*Prioritize capital improvement projects that encourage new private investment and create walkable communities. Potential projects include public streets, streetscape amenities, underground utilities, and advanced information and communication technology infrastructure.*

Strategy S1.2 states:

*Develop a coordinated annual work plan for the County that focuses on Plan 2035 priority programs and establishes how they will be implemented. These programs should be coordinated with other relevant agencies in order to maintain consistency, reduce duplication of work, and leverage public dollars in a more effective manner.*

Planning staff recommended Equity Focus Areas to identify neighborhoods where investment should be prioritized to expand access and mobility options to the County's historically underserved population. The Equity Focus Areas include:

- The federal government's 2024 Justice40 Initiative.
- MWCOG Equity Emphasis Areas
- County-identified Healthy Food Priority Areas
- Plan 2035-designated Neighborhood Reinvestment Areas

### Challenges

A follow-up step was to identify and prioritize projects that a) invest in Equity Emphasis Areas and b) advance the recommendations of Plan 2035, as a critical tool for agencies and decisionmakers.

This process was unilaterally, summarily, and arbitrarily terminated in fall 2024. The Equity Focus Areas and any recommendations associated with them were also deleted.

---

<sup>5</sup> Plan 2035, page 254

## II. Critical Error: D. Omission of Project Prioritization Recommendations

The absence of any project prioritization scheme or criteria fails to inform agencies and decisionmakers as to Prince George’s County’s priorities when it comes to transportation investment. This is exacerbated by the number of policies and strategies in the “2025 Preliminary Plan” that recommends the County prioritize something:

Page	Policy/ Strategy	Priority
15		Mobility decisions are prioritized to benefit Prince Georgians, visitors to the County, and those conducting business in our County while balancing the access of cross-county commuters and interstate motorists.
16		Prioritize projects that improve safety for all Prince Georgians.
19		Investing in projects, programs, and people that save lives and prevent injury in the transportation network is Prince George’s County’s highest priority.
64	PR 1.1	Prioritize Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles when designing transportation facilities, especially for 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.
64	PR 2.1	During the design and re-design of streets, roads, and pedestrian facilities, prioritize street crossings, including mid-block crossings, as applicable, which eliminate long distances for pedestrians.
65	PR 6.5	Prioritize pedestrian safety by designing and constructing crosswalks with ADA-compliant materials and finishings, including, but not limited to stamped concrete, tactile pavers, painted intersections, raised intersections, crosswalks on speed tables, and other pedestrian priority measures
66	PR 7.4	Prioritize coordination between the Prince George’s County Public School System and the implementing transportation improvement agencies, including but not limited to, DPW&T, DPIE, MDOT, and municipalities.
70	BK 1	Prioritize the development of a County bicycle and shared-use network with facilities that allow and encourage safe and efficient bicycle travel throughout Prince George’s County and connect neighborhoods to the regional bicycle network.
70		Strategy BK 1.2 Prioritize infrastructure projects that provide grade-separated crossings of major highways (I-95/I-495, US 50, MD 214, etc.), railroads, and rivers to increase connectivity of the countywide network of shared-use paths.

## II. Critical Error: D. Omission of Project Prioritization Recommendations

Page	Policy/ Strategy	Priority
70		Strategy BK 1.3 Consider “road diets” for overbuilt roadways to allow space for, and to prioritize, the development of hard-surface, shared-use paths, barrier-separated bicycle lanes, sidewalks, shared lane markings, and cycle tracks. This includes, but is not limited to, arterials and collector roadways.
71	BK 3	Prioritize safe bicycle travel to public schools
72	BK 4.3	Prioritize pathway infrastructure/retrofit upgrades, and path rehabilitation projects that will improve safety for trail users, including widening shared-use paths built to outdated standards.
73	BK 7.1	Strategy BK 7.1 Prioritize construction of the County Bikeways Network.
74	BK 10.1	Prioritize preservation of existing equestrian trail corridors and connections to other trail networks and parks.
83	TR 4.2	Prioritize access to transit during street reconstruction and redevelopment projects
93	CG 1.4	Prioritize the provision of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure versus on-street parking on all streets and roads throughout Prince George’s County, particularly within one-half mile of all public schools.
115		The County should prioritize transportation improvements that provide viable options for all people who need to travel in Prince George’s County.
255		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.

## II. Critical Error: D. Omission of Project Prioritization Recommendations

### What the “2025 Preliminary Plan” Says

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE5	19	Our Priorities		Page 19 (Our Priorities) states "Go Prince George's is a plan for how Prince George's County transportation partners and incorporated areas prioritize projects to ensure that Prince George's County is a viable place to live, work, play, learn, shop, recreate, and visit."	<p>This statement is inaccurate.</p> <p>a) "Incorporated areas" is a geographic place, not an entity that implements transportation recommendations.</p> <p>b) Municipalities are valued and important transportation partners in an integrated and interdependent transportation system. Calling them out in this sentence suggests the plan treats them differently than other important partner agencies.</p> <p>c) The goal of Go Prince George's is to create communities of choice in the National Capital Region by increasing connectivity and accessibility. Mere viability is inconsistent with Plan 2035.</p> <p>In addition, this sentence states that this plan prioritizes projects. However, project prioritization criteria developed during the planning process were omitted from the 2025 Preliminary Plan.</p>

## II. Critical Error: D. Omission of Project Prioritization Recommendations

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE6	20	Ensuring Great Communities		Page 20 (Ensuring great communities...) states "Go Prince George's uses five measures to identify which communities will benefit most when new mobility, accessibility, and connectivity investments are made..."	These measures were used to identify and prioritize projects during the development of Go Prince George's, however, all further references to these measures, associated prioritization criteria, and priority projects, were deleted in the 2025 Preliminary Plan.
CE7	52	Equity		<p>Page 52 is intended to describe how Go Prince George's incorporates equity into its policies and strategies. The language on page 52, including a two paragraph pull quote from the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, does not describe how Go Prince George's incorporates equity or MWCOG's Equity Emphasis Areas.</p> <p>Project prioritization criteria and the plan's Equity Focus Areas, using the MWCOG Equity Emphasis Areas, and a list of projects to be prioritized, was developed during preparation of the 2025 Staff Draft Plan but was deleted prior to its public release.</p>	
CE8	70	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 1	Policy BK 1 on page 70 states "Prioritize the development of" a County bikeway and shared-use network."	The strategies under Policy BK 1 do not list how Prince George's County would prioritize such a network, or what prioritization means in this context.

## II. Critical Error: D. Omission of Project Prioritization Recommendations

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE9	70	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 1.2	Strategy BK 1.2 states "Prioritize infrastructure projects that provide grade-separated crossings of major highways (I-95/I-495, US 50, MD 214, etc.), railroads, and rivers to increase connectivity of the countywide network of shared-use paths."	This document does not explain how such projects would be prioritized.

## II. Critical Error: D. Omission of Project Prioritization Recommendations

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE10	85	Transit	TR 7.8	Strategy TR 7.8 states "Identify opportunities to provide special transit or other shuttle services from locations within Equity Emphasis Areas to places of interest throughout the County."	<p>This strategy is unclear.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Special transit" is undefined.</li> <li>2. This document is the process through which such opportunities were identified, and opportunities to connect Equity Emphasis Areas to opportunities were developed during preparation of the Preliminary Plan but was deleted prior to its public release.</li> <li>3. How Go Prince George's prioritizes investment in Equity Emphasis Areas is unclear, as explanatory text and maps were deleted from the Staff Draft Plan prior to its public release.</li> <li>4. Residents of Equity Emphasis Areas require access to critical needs, services, and opportunities, not just "places of interest."</li> </ol> <p>Language and specific project recommendations detailing ways in which residents in the County's most in-need neighborhoods could be better connected to critical needs, services, and opportunities were developed during preparation of the Staff Draft Plan but was deleted prior to its public release. The identity of key transportation investments serving Equity Focus Areas was omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>

## II. Critical Error: E. Deletion and De Facto De-Designation of Scenic and Historic Roads

### Summary of Issue

With a handful of exceptions, the County Council has used its approval of area master, functional master, and sector plans to designate Historic and Scenic Roads pursuant to their authority under Section 23-102(b)(17)(C) and (H) of the Road and Sidewalks Code. The most comprehensive and most recent of these actions was its 2009 approval of the *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*. Table 5, Special Roadways, of the 2009 MPOT (as possibly amended by subsequent plans) is the definitive list of the County's designated Scenic Roads and/or Historic Roads. "The Master List of Scenic and Historic Roads (Table 5: Special Roadways, at the end of this chapter) is a listing of roads that have been designated as scenic or historic by the County Council and includes additional historic roads that are proposed to be designated with the adoption of this plan." <sup>6</sup>

CR-79-2021 directed the Planning Department to prepare a replacement to the 2009 MPOT and states "WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 27-640(a) of the Zoning Ordinance, upon approval by County Council of Prince George's County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council, the proposed functional master plan will amend portions of Plan 2035 and the County's active master plans and will replace the 2009 Countywide Master Plan of Transportation."

During the three-year process to develop the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by CR-79-2021, working in collaboration with partner agencies, advocacy groups, elected officials, and other stakeholders, staff drafted numerous policies and strategies directed at preserving and enhancing the County's Scenic and Historic Roads, including the time-consuming process of creating a new set of functional classifications for Scenic and Historic Roads and evaluating all potentially scenic or historic roads in the County for potential classification. This reclassification would also serve to document, in several tables, Scenic and Historic Roads for the County Council to re-designate through its approval of Go Prince George's.

### Challenges

The "2025 Go Prince George's Preliminary Plan" does not specifically designate Rural Roads or Scenic Roads nor does it explicitly carry forward the master list from 2009. Approval of this plan by the County Council without such a list would effectively de-designate all 54 Scenic and Historic Roads in the County.

Dozens of policies and strategies associated with Scenic and Historic Roads were unilaterally, summarily, and arbitrarily deleted and/or omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan" prior to partner agency review and public release.

Should this plan be adopted and approved without restoration of this information, Prince George's County would cease to have any Scenic and/or Historic Roads. As a result, an enterprising applicant might argue that they do not need to meet the County's Guidelines for the Design of Scenic and Historic Roadways, and might construct permanent obstructions to viewsheds, because "this is no longer a Historic Road".

---

<sup>6</sup> 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*, page 48.

## II. Critical Error: E. Deletion and De Facto De-Designation of Scenic and Historic Roads

### What the “2025 Preliminary Plan” Says

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE11	100	Special Roadways and County Heritage		This document contains an element on Special Roadways and County Heritage.	Special roadways are mentioned several times in this document but are not defined.
CE12	100	Special Roadways and County Heritage		Page 100 (Special Roadways and County Heritage) states "Special Roadways and Heritage Areas include scenic roads, historic roads, and Maryland scenic byways."	A definition of “special roadway” and other key definitions were omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan". A fuller description of what constitutes a "special roadway" or a "heritage area" may better introduce this chapter to a reader.
CE13	101	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 1.2	Strategy SH 1.2 states "Consider additional factors when evaluating or re-evaluating Historic Roads beyond identification in the 1828 Levy Court Road Survey."	The use of "consider" and "evaluating" in the same sentence is redundant. Consideration of factors is inherent in evaluation. As a strategy this is unclear; this language was originally drafted as policy language, with supporting strategies identifying considerations for historic road designation, developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

## II. Critical Error: E. Deletion and De Facto De-Designation of Scenic and Historic Roads

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE14	101	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 1.3	Strategy SH 1.3 states "Incorporate best practices from the most recent SHA guidelines for Context-Sensitive Design for Maryland Scenic Byways."	This language is unclear: into what should such guidelines be incorporated? What within these guidelines are considered "best practices"? Should existing scenic byways in the County be retrofit to these standards? Multiple policies and strategies for Maryland Scenic Byways in Prince George's County were prepared in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE15	101	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 1.4	Strategy SH 1.4 states "Install viewable interpretative signage at each endpoint of National Historic Trails, Scenic Byways, and other Rural Historic Roads or Rural Scenic and Historic Roads in Prince George's County."	This statement lacks context. Who should be able to view such interpretive signage? Rural Historic Roads and Rural Scenic and Historic Roads are not defined in this document: Entire sections of the plan defining Historic Roads, Scenic Roads, Rural Historic Roads, and Rural Scenic and Historic Roads, including policies and strategies to define and design these roads, designation of roads in the County in these categories, and the nature of amenities to be added were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

## II. Critical Error: E. Deletion and De Facto De-Designation of Scenic and Historic Roads

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE16	101	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 2.4	Strategy SH 2.4 states "Designate Livingston Road within the Rural and Agricultural Area and the Broad Creek Historic District as a Rural Scenic Road, thus upholding the historic district guidelines previously adopted by the County Council, in accordance with the County's scenic and historic road design guidelines."	<p>Rural Historic Roads and Rural Scenic and Historic Roads are not defined in this document: Entire sections of the plan defining Historic Roads, Scenic Roads, Rural Historic Roads, and Rural Scenic and Historic Roads, including policies and strategies to define and design these roads, designation of roads in the County in these categories, and the nature of amenities to be added were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>In addition, this statement conflicts with Strategy SH 2.3, which recommends updating the Broad Creek Historic District Design Guidelines: as worded, this recommendation would require evaluating a re-design of this road under the existing guidelines this plan of which this plan recommends amendment. The County's scenic and historic road design guidelines do not accommodate bicycles and pedestrians, which may also conflict with Strategy SH 2.3.</p>

## II. Critical Error: E. Deletion and De Facto De-Designation of Scenic and Historic Roads

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE17	103	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 4	Policy SH 4 states "Preserve the rural character of Prince George's County Rural Roads."	Entire sections of the plan defining Historic Roads, Scenic Roads, Rural Historic Roads, and Rural Scenic and Historic Roads, including policies and strategies to define and design these roads, designation of roads in the County in these categories, and the nature of amenities to be added were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Rural Roads are not defined in this plan, despite multiple references.
CE18	103	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 4.1	Strategy SH 4.1 states "Evaluate opportunities during future master and sector plan development to designate Rural Roads in the Established Communities whose rural characteristics and low-density surrounding development are consistent with a rural setting. Create new cross sections and explore new street classifications to support adaptive repurposing of rural roads to incorporate additional facilities and/or green space, as part of adaptive design solutions to reduce the width of paved surfaces, where feasible."	Because numerous strategies, including facility designations, associated with Rural Roads and rural road design and management that were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan", this strategy lacks important context. The plan does not recommend similar designations in the Rural and Agricultural Areas, which is an error. The second sentence is a separate strategy.

## II. Critical Error: E. Deletion and De Facto De-Designation of Scenic and Historic Roads

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE19	103	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 4.2	Strategy SH 4.2 states "Prepare corridor management plans for significant designated scenic roadways."	This statement may be confusing because the specific designated Scenic Roads were identified in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE20	103	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 5	Policy SH 5 states "Manage traffic flow along Rural Scenic Roads (RS), Rural Historic Roads (RH), or Rural Scenic and Historic (RSH) Roads." Strategy SH 5.1 states "Design, construct, and sign RS, RH, or RSH to reduce vehicle speeds, increase awareness of sudden vehicle stops and turns, and alert motorists to the presence of bicyclists, and, if applicable, equestrians or pedestrians."	These statements and references may be confusing because entire sections of the plan defining Historic Roads, Scenic Roads, Rural Historic Roads, and Rural Scenic and Historic Roads, including policies and strategies to define and design these roads, designation of roads in the County in these categories, and the nature of amenities to be added were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

## II. Critical Error: E. Deletion and De Facto De-Designation of Scenic and Historic Roads

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE21	103	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 6.1	Strategy SH 6.1 states "Conduct a wayfinding signage program and evaluate and establish historic and scenic corridors, as feasible."	<p>This sentence is unclear in multiple ways.</p> <p>The evaluation of scenic and historic corridors was performed through the collaborative three-year process to develop the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but the results of this evaluation were unilaterally and erroneously deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". A "wayfinding signage program" is undefined. Neither general establishment of a program or the evaluation of historic and scenic corridors has anything to do with the subject of Policy SH 6, enhancing National Park Service parkways in the County. This language was unilaterally and erroneously inserted into this document prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>An entire Wayfinding Element, including policies and strategies, was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>

## II. Critical Error: E. Deletion and De Facto De-Designation of Scenic and Historic Roads

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE22	103	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 6.3	Strategy SH 6.3 states "Conduct traffic analysis and evaluate traffic controls, as appropriate."	It is unclear what the purpose of this statement is. Staff evaluated existing traffic controls on the Suitland Parkway at MD 637 (Naylor Road) and Forestville Road during three-year process to develop the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but the results of this evaluation, including recommendations to eliminate both at-grade intersections, were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". The Suitland Parkway is a master-planned Freeway where traffic controls are not recommended.
CE23	105	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 8.1	Strategy SH 8.1 states "Evaluate designs in the context of the Broad Creek Historic District Design Guidelines, the County's current scenic and historic road design guidelines."	This statement is unclear and incorrect as written. In addition to a grammatical error, it is unclear which facilities require evaluation under these guidelines. A cross-reference to Strategy SH 2.3, which recommends updating the Broad Creek Historic District Design Guidelines to support bicycle and pedestrian use, would be helpful. In addition, the current DPW&T Guidelines for the Design of Scenic and Historic Roadways do not anticipate, much less guide, provision of bicycle or pedestrian accommodation.

## II. Critical Error: E. Deletion and De Facto De-Designation of Scenic and Historic Roads

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE24	253	Monitoring and Evaluation		Page 253 (Complete Streets) states “Establish wayfinding programming to indicate Historic Routes, National Historic Trails, and Recreational and Cultural Interest Areas with signs within the County.”	<p>An entire section on Scenic and Historic Roads, including several policies and strategies on wayfinding, was prepared in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>An entire Wayfinding Element, including policies and strategies, was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>

Unless testimony is received to point out this error, the only way to designate Historic and Scenic Roads will be for the County Council to amend the adopted plan, which would facilitate a second joint public hearing on amendments.

## II. Critical Error: F. Deletion of US 301 Alternatives

### Summary of Issue

I-95 is the primary highway for passenger and goods movement on the East Coast of the United States. Between Carmel Church, Virginia and Wilmington, Delaware, VA 207, US 301, and DE 1 constitute the principal bypass of the Washington, DC and Baltimore metropolitan areas. I-95 is expected to carry over 240,000 vehicles per day in Prince George's County in 2050. US 301 was expected to carry 130,000 vehicles per day in Prince George's County prior to the doubling in capacity of the Harry W. Nice/Thomas "Mac" Middleton Bridge between King William County, Virginia and Charles County in 2023. It is anticipated, though not yet forecast, that traffic between Virginia and Maryland on this corridor will significantly increase, as well traffic coming into Prince George's County from Charles and St. Mary's Counties.

Neither the Capital Beltway, which carries I-95 between Virginia and College Park, or Robert Crain Highway, which carries US 301 between Charles County and Bowie, contains sufficient capacity to carry this forecasted traffic without significant delays and congestion. While Go Prince George's advocates increasing goods movement on rail, capacity limitations on the East Coast freight rail network will limit our ability to get trucks off the road.

The 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*, the 2013 *Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan*, the 2013 *Approved Subregion 6 Master Plan*, and the 2022 *Approved Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan* recommend the upgrade of US 301 between Charles County and Anne Arundel County to a limited-access freeway (F-10). This facility has been the preferred alternative of MDOT and Prince George's County since the 1980s.

The primary barrier to construction of F-10 has been its cost. Through the three-year collaborative process to prepare a Staff Draft of Go Prince George's, the Planning Department and its contractors conducted a specific and thorough analysis of current and future traffic conditions in the US 301 corridor, analyzed past and ongoing SHA plans for F-10, and looked at similar corridors throughout the region and nation to determine potential alternatives. Several alternatives, each with supporting policies and strategies, were developed to address both the challenges of future interstate and regional traffic in the corridor as well as the economic development opportunities presented by a future limited-access roadway. Both tolled and free alternatives were considered. Parallel service road and interchange locations and configurations were also developed for each alternative.

### Challenges

All results of the extensive analysis, policies, and strategies associated with US 301 alternatives were unilaterally, summarily, and arbitrarily deleted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan" prior to its construction. This document effectively carries forward the recommendations for F-10 from prior plans, with a few nuances in the Facility Tables. The challenge this presents is that the lack of serious consideration of tolled or other alternatives to a traditional freeway means further delays in addressing what is anticipated to be continual increases in traffic congestion.

## II. Critical Error: F. Deletion of US 301 Alternatives

This issue is identified here because these errors and/or omissions meet one or more criteria:

- 1) They are substantive and cannot be addressed through the traditional correction process.
- 2) The Planning Board may only amend the plan to correct these errors based on public testimony received on these topics.
- 3) The County Council may need to amend the plan to address these errors or omissions.

### What the "2025 Preliminary Plan" Says

<b>Error/ Omission</b>	<b>Page Number</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>P/S</b>	<b>Plan Language</b>	<b>Challenge</b>
CE25	39	Roads			Figure 4, Traffic Volumes on US 301 in Prince George's County, 2022, lacks any context on the Roads page. This is because an entire section dedicated to US 301 and the unique challenges and opportunities was developed during preparation of the 2025 Preliminary Plan but was deleted prior to plan release.

## II. Critical Error: F. Deletion of US 301 Alternatives

CE26:

MPOT ID	Route ID	Facility Name	Ownership	District	From	To	Min. ROW	Bicycle or Shared-Use Facility	Vehicle Lanes	Master/Sector Plan
F-10	US 301	Robert Crain Highway	SHA	9	MD 5 (Branch Avenue)	Old Crain Highway	300–450	Shared-use path	6-8	Replaces 2013 Subregion 5 MP
<p><b>Notes:</b> Includes new Interchanges at: C-528/Dyson Road or Missouri Avenue; C-607/Rosaryville Road; and MD 382 (Croom Road).</p>										
F-10	US 301	Robert Crain Highway	SHA	6g	Old Crain Highway	Leeland Road	300–450	Shared-use path	4-8	Replaces 2013 Subregion 6 MP
<p><b>Notes:</b> Upgrade to full controlled-access facility. Includes Interchanges at MD 4 and E-6/MD 202 extension. Construct a shared-use path along both sides of the upgraded facility. Where the shared-use path would be immediately adjacent to protected bicycle facilities on A-61, the bicycle facilities on the west side of F-10 can connect to and be served by the A-61 facilities.</p>										
F-10	US 301	Robert Crain Highway	SHA	4g	Leeland Road	Mount Oak Road	200	Shared-use path	6-8	Amends 2022 Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity MP
<p><b>Notes:</b> Upgrade to full controlled-access facility. Due to development on the corridor, the alignment is likely east of that identified in the 2009 MPOT between Trade Zone Avenue and Excalibur Road. Final alignment will require further study.</p> <p>Construct full Interchanges at: Leeland Road (with access to the west only); Trade Zone Avenue/Claggett Landing Road; MD 214 (Central Avenue) (Including a connection between Central Avenue and the parallel A-61 arterial); and Mitchellville Road/Queen Anne Bridge Road.</p> <p>Construct a shared-use path along both sides of F-10. Where the shared-use path would be immediately adjacent to protected bicycle facilities on A-61, the bicycle facilities on the west side of F-10 can connect to and be served by the A-61 facilities.</p>										
F-10	US 301	Robert Crain Highway	SHA	4	Mount Oak Road	US 50 (John Hanson Highway)	200	Shared-use path	6-8	Amends 2022 Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity MP
<p><b>Notes:</b> Upgrade to full controlled-access facility. Construct complete Interchange at MD 197 (Collington Road). Construct a shared-use path along both sides of F-10. Where the shared-use path would be immediately adjacent to protected bicycle facilities on A-61, the bicycle facilities on the west side of F-10 can connect to and be served by A-61.</p>										
F-10	MD 3	Robert Crain Highway	SHA	4	US 50 (John Hanson Highway)	Belair Drive/ Melford Drive	200	Shared-use path	6-8	2022 Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity MP

## II. Critical Error: G. Deletion of High-Capacity Transit (HCT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Recommendations

### Summary of Issues

The 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* recommends several corridors for future fixed guideway or high-capacity transit services, including, but not limited to:

- Extensions of the Purple Line south of New Carrollton
- Extensions of Metrorail to Westphalia and BWI/Thurgood Marshall International Airport
- New or extended fixed guideway transit services to National Harbor and along:
  - o US 1
  - o US 50
  - o MD 5
  - o MD 210

Strategic Transportation Policy and Master Plan Implementation Policy 4, Strategy 1f, recommends:

*Implement a corridor preservation process that will protect needed future rights-of-way from encroachment by development and/or minimize future damages to development from construction, operation, and maintenance of transportation facilities by:*

- *Identifying potential transportation facility/development conflicts early in the development review process (or sooner, if possible).*
- *Coordinating with developer applicants and property owners to identify corridor preservation strategies that can be implemented concurrently with the development.*
- *Obtaining dedications of right-of-way where improvements along existing road frontage are needed.*
- *Using the reservation process in the Subdivision Ordinance for facilities on new alignments such as freeways, expressways, controlled-access roadways, and fixed-guideway transit routes, stations, parking facilities, and maintenance facilities.*
- *Recommending dedications of rights-of-way for facilities on new alignments through Road Ordinance agreements as an alternative to reservation.*

## II. Critical Error: G. Deletion of High-Capacity Transit (HCT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Recommendations

- *Recommending use of building restriction lines or modification to the site plans to remove proposed building footprints from the future right-of-way areas where reservation or dedication are not appropriate.*<sup>7</sup>

Maps 1-44 of the 2009 MPOT identify specific corridors for future transit.

Plan 2035 recommends the following:

*Policy 2: Expand and improve transit service, particularly on routes connecting Downtowns, the Innovation Corridor, and Regional Transit Districts in order to maximize the economic development potential and synergies between these areas.*

*TM2.1 Invest in existing bus service and in new bus and light rail transit service to connect Downtowns, the Innovation Corridor, and Regional Transit Districts. Coordinate transit planning initiatives with local municipalities, the County, the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA), and the State of Maryland.*

*TM2.2 Identify new transitway corridors that will support the Plan 2035 development priorities and amend the Master Plan of Transportation Transit Element to include the updated corridors. Concentrate medium- to high-density residential development along priority transit way corridors to provide the density necessary to sustain higher levels of rail and bus service.*

*TM2.3 Implement the recommendations for MetroBus Priority Corridor Networks recommended in Momentum—The Next Generation of Metro (Strategic Plan 2013-2025) through continued coordination with WMATA, the State of Maryland, and the County. Amend the Master Plan of Transportation as necessary.*

*TM2.4 Update the Transit Services Operations Plan to reflect the Plan 2035 future land use plan and local and regional transit planning initiatives.*<sup>8</sup>

Map 13, Potential Transitway Corridors, in Plan 2035 identifies the County’s recommended future transit corridors.<sup>9</sup> The Maryland Department of Transportation Maryland Transit Administration is currently conducting a Planning and Environmental Linkages Study for what is now the Southern Maryland Regional Transit (SMRT) Corridor.

---

<sup>7</sup> 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*, page 69.

<sup>8</sup> Plan 2035, pages 154-155.

<sup>9</sup> Plan 2035, page 143.

## II. Critical Error: G. Deletion of High-Capacity Transit (HCT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Recommendations

Concurrent to Go Prince George's:

- WMATA completed and implemented its Better Bus Initiative, redesigning the entire region's local bus network.
- DPW&T drafted its *Transit Vision Plan*, identifying short- and mid-term high-capacity corridors the County wishes to explore further.
- The Montgomery County Department of Transportation studied expanded FLASH BRT service along MD 650 (New Hampshire Avenue) and MD 193 (University Boulevard).

During the three-year process to develop the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by CR-79-2021, working in collaboration with partner agencies, advocacy groups, elected officials, and other stakeholders, staff drafted numerous policies and strategies advancing High-Capacity Transit and Bus Rapid Transit in Prince George's County, including policies, strategies, and facility recommendations for new corridors, station locations, and services for further study and consideration. These recommendations included those identified by the planning efforts above, as well as other corridors identified through staff's multi-year analysis of the County's transportation system, the active Area Master, Sector, and Transit District Development Plans, and other studies.

### **Challenges**

The "2025 Preliminary Plan" does not contain a map or table of future transit corridors nor does it explicitly recommend preservation of rights-of-way along previously recommended master planned transit corridors.

Dozens of policies and strategies to advance high capacity transit and BRT in Prince George's County, including specific corridors, potential station locations, and other service and infrastructure recommendations were unilaterally, summarily, and arbitrarily deleted or omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan". A map showing the recommended rights-of-way for these corridors was omitted, and the only explicit language referencing HCT/BRT is a statement in the introduction to the Transit Element that states "Additional services are needed to connect Prince Georgians to destinations within the County."<sup>10</sup> In keeping with this approach, another consideration of Go Prince George's is the major ongoing State and County initiative to provide increased transit access in the southern part of the County, the Southern Maryland Rapid Transit system."

The deletion of specific language recommending advancement of HCT/BRT from the County's master plan of transportation could impair the ability of MTA, DPW&T, WMATA, or MCDOT to complete their respective projects and compete for federal funding moving forward.

---

<sup>10</sup> MD 5 is not identified in the "2025 Preliminary Plan" as a potential Southern Maryland Regional Transit corridor.

## II. Critical Error: G. Deletion of High-Capacity Transit (HCT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Recommendations

The omission of the transit corridors on a map is a critical error. Its inclusion would permit the Planning Board to require dedication or reservation of rights-of-way for guideways, stations, station access, traction power facilities, and other infrastructure as properties along the alignment apply for Preliminary Plans of Subdivision. Should this plan be adopted and approved without such a map, and without explicit text the Planning Board can use in addition to, or in lieu of, a map, the Planning Board's ability to secure dedication of rights of way leaves service operators with the expensive and time-consuming task of acquiring the necessary land through fee simple purchase or other arrangement.

This issue is identified here these errors and/or omissions meet one or more criteria:

- 1) They are substantive and cannot be addressed through the traditional correction process.
- 2) The Planning Board may only amend the plan to correct these errors based on public testimony received on these topics.
- 3) The County Council may need to amend the plan to address these errors or omissions.

### What the "2025 Preliminary Plan" Says

<b>Error/Omission</b>	<b>Page Number</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>P/S</b>	<b>Plan Language</b>	<b>Challenge</b>
CE27	84	Transit	TR 6	Policy TR 6 states "Expand bus priority measures and other treatments to enable development of a Countywide HCT/BRT network including an electric bus fleet system."	Numerous policies and supporting strategies addressing opportunities for high capacity transit, bus rapid transit, bus priority measures, and electrification of the bus fleet were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Structurally, this Policy should be three distinct policies, each with supporting strategies.

## II. Critical Error: G. Deletion of High-Capacity Transit (HCT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Recommendations

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE28	85	Transit	TR 9	Policy TR 9 states "Increase commuter bus, light rail, commuter rail, and streetcar service in and to Prince George's County."	This policy lacks any strategies. Future transit services in Prince George's County were evaluated thoroughly in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but policies, strategies, and associated graphics were but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Each mode warrants its own policy and supporting strategies.
CE29	85	Transit	TR 10	Policy TR 10 states "Enhance Bus Rapid Transit options in Prince George's County using exclusive or mixed-vehicle rights-of-way to connect Prince George's County's Downtowns."	This policy was inserted into the plan following its preparation but prior to its public release and is duplicative of other policies and strategies. Potential future BRT/HCT corridors were evaluated and identified during preparation of the Staff Draft Plan, but were deleted prior to its public release. In addition, this policy reflects a topic that was not specifically evaluated: connecting the County's downtowns. Planned BRT services are anticipated in key corridors, which may or may not connect to individual downtowns but do not connect all three Downtowns, as could be interpreted by this statement.
CE30	85	Transit	TR 10.1	Strategy TR 10.1 states "Evaluate opportunities to implement a branded Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system in Prince George's County."	This is policy language incorrectly formatted as a strategy, with supporting strategies having been developed during preparation of the Preliminary Plan but was deleted prior to its final release.

## II. Critical Error: G. Deletion of High-Capacity Transit (HCT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Recommendations

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE31	85	Transit	TR 8	Policy TR 8 states "Implement fixed or dedicated transitway along appropriate transportation networks to supplement HCT/BRT."	This policy language was inserted into the Staff Draft Plan after its preparation and prior to its final release in error. The strategies associated with this Policy are intended to implement the Maryland MTA's Southern Maryland Regional Transit (SMRT) corridor along MD 5 (Branch Avenue/Crain Highway) between Charles County and the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station. This was identified by Prince George's County's October 22, 2024 joint FY 2025-2030 Consolidated Transportation Program priority letter from the County Council and the County Executive to the Secretary of Transportation as a top transit priority.

## II. Critical Error: G. Deletion of High-Capacity Transit (HCT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Recommendations

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE32	87	Transit		Table 4 identifies High-Capacity Transit corridors identified in the Transit Vision Plan.	<p>During the transformation of the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's into the "2025 Preliminary Plan", Planning Department staff were prohibited from coordinating with staff from DPW&amp;T to finalize these corridors and to ensure the TVP evaluated corridors identified in the County's previously approved master, sector, and transit district development plans. Additional corridors were identified during development of the Staff Draft Plan but were deleted prior to its public release. Table 4 should also be located adjacent to the appropriate strategies for easy cross-reference.</p> <p>Important context explaining the difference between corridors recommended for short- to mid-term implementation, as recommended in the TVP, vs. additional corridors identified through the plan process, was omitted from this document, inaccurately suggesting that additional corridors were not evaluated.</p>

## II. Critical Error: H. Deletion/Omission of Entire Plan Elements

### Summary of Issues

The Planning Department and its partner agencies conducted numerous plans and studies following the November 2009 approval of the *Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*. These efforts informed and influenced the Department's preparation of a Staff Draft of Go Prince George's pursuant to CR-79-2021. The fundamental purpose of a functional master plan is to implement the General Plan. The Staff Draft of Go Prince George's was intended to help achieve the vision and goals of Plan 2035 by connecting Prince Georgians to the things they need and want, and by connecting the world to Prince George's County. Staff and Department contractors spent three years analyzing and evaluating the County and its transportation system to determine what it needs to achieve its goals.

The staff and consultant project team compiled several dozen pages of contextual, background, and other information to guide the reader through the myriad opportunities and challenges presented by the County's transportation network. Working in coordination with its partner agencies, the Planning Department prepared goals, policies, and strategies to address the following transportation and mobility topics:

- Themes
  - Safety
  - Equity and Sustainability
  - Multimodality
  - Supporting Prince George's County's Land Use Goals
- How Prince Georgians Get Around
  - Pedestrians, Placemaking, and the Public Realm
  - Bicycling, Shared Use, Equestrian, and Blueways
  - Micromobility
  - Transit
  - Complete and Green Streets
  - Roads and Highways
  - Special Roads and Heritage Areas
- Goods Movement
- Making the System Work
  - Transportation Demand Management and Intelligent Transportation Systems
  - Parking and Curbside Management
  - Wayfinding
- Implementation

## II. Critical Error: H. Deletion/Omission of Entire Plan Elements

### Challenges

Work to refine and finalize the Staff Draft Plan for partner agency review was suspended in the fall of 2024. Entire sections of the plan were unilaterally, summarily, and arbitrarily deleted and/or omitted from the “2025 Preliminary Plan”. Included in these deletions/omissions were:

- Contextual information that underlie plan recommendations.
- Critical information for reader understanding of the plan and the County’s complex transportation system.
- Recommendations for the following important transportation and mobility topics:
  - o Traveler and system safety
  - o Equitable investment, especially to underserved populations
  - o Investments to support the County’s land use goals
  - o Placemaking and the public realm, including specific locations for new public spaces
  - o Implementing Complete and Green Streets
  - o Implementing a County Bikeways Network
  - o Addressing Interstate and Regional Traffic
  - o Designating Scenic and Historic Roads
  - o Increasing Access to County Destinations
  - o Transportation Demand Management and Congestion Mitigation
  - o Intelligent Transportation Systems
  - o Parking and Curbside Management, including provision and regulation of on-street parking.
  - o Wayfinding

These deletions, and others identified in this errata package, represent approximately 50% of the time, effort, and funding dedicated to Go Prince George’s since 2021. They result in a document, the “2025 Preliminary Plan,” that does not adequately address the transportation opportunities and challenges in Prince George’s County and does not reflect the valuable input and partnership of our partner agencies, stakeholders, and the public since 2009.

These issues are listed here because they meet one or more criteria:

- 1) They are substantive and cannot be addressed through the traditional correction process.
- 2) The Planning Board may only amend the plan to correct these errors based on public testimony received on these topics.
- 3) The County Council may need to amend the plan to address these errors.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

The “2025 Preliminary Plan” contains policies, strategies, facility recommendations, and other language and maps that refer to items that were thoroughly evaluated during the three-year collaborative process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s pursuant to CR-79-2021 but that were unilaterally, summarily, and arbitrarily deleted prior to agency review and public release of the “2025 Preliminary Plan”.

These issues are listed here because they meet one or more criteria:

- 1) They are substantive and cannot be addressed through the traditional correction process.
- 2) The Planning Board may only amend the plan to correct these errors based on public testimony received on these topics.
- 3) The County Council may need to amend the plan to address these errors.

They are listed in the order they appear in this document.

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE33	17	Our Themes		Page 17 (Our Themes: Collaboration) states "Support real-time information, open-source data, transparency, monitoring, reporting, departmental and agency cooperation, database management, and options for parking, loading and unloading, and goods movement. Technology is a vital tool for collaboration, ensuring that the policies and programs guiding our region’s future are closely coordinated and well integrated."	Strategies associated with this theme developed during the planning process were deleted from the 2025 Preliminary Plan.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE34	24	Growing and traveling sustainably		Page 24 (Growing and traveling sustainably) contains four paragraphs of text that were inserted in the incorrect location. This language has little to do with the priority identified. Language explaining this priority, and how Go Prince George's addresses it, was developed during preparation of the 2025 Preliminary Plan but was deleted prior to plan release.	
CE35	25	Empowering people through connections		Page 25 (Empowering people through connections) contains a paragraph of text that was inserted in the incorrect location. This language has little to do with the priority identified. Language explaining this priority and how Go Prince George's addresses it, and specific policy and service recommendations for connecting underserved communities, cohorts, and individuals, were developed during preparation of the 2025 Preliminary Plan but was deleted prior to plan release.	
CE36	32	Community Engagement		Page 32 (Community Engagement) states "During the public engagement for this plan, there were frequent issues shared on “growth management” coupled with “inadequate infrastructure.” The additional comments received can be found at <a href="http://pgplan.org/go">pgplan.org/go</a> ."	In addition to grammatical challenges, this statement can be misleading. There were many issues raised during the public engagement for Go Prince George's, and concerns about growth management, which is outside the scope of this plan, and the perceived "inadequacy" of the transportation network were just two of many issues identified. In addition, additional comments received on the plan were not posted on the Planning Department website.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE37	54-55	Legal Context		<p>Page 54 (Legal Context) states: "In addition, some policies and strategies will supersede policies and strategies in previously approved area master, sector, and/or transit district development plans, the 2001 <i>Approved Anacostia Trails Heritage Area Management Plan: A Functional Master Plan for Heritage Tourism</i>, the 2008 <i>Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan, Formula 2040: Functional Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space</i> (approved 2013), and the 2017 <i>Approved Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan</i>. This Plan includes a list of specific amendments to Plan 2035 and various other functional master plans and a list of specific policy and strategy amendments to active area master, sector, and transit district development plans."</p>	<p>Numerous amendments to these plans were identified during preparation of the Staff Draft Plan but were deleted prior to its public release. Numerous policies and strategies were drafted during the preparation of the Staff Draft Plan that carry forward or slightly modify policies and strategies in active area master, sector, and/or transit district development plans and were deleted from the Staff Draft Plan prior to public release. This information is critical to a comprehensive countywide transportation master plan.</p> <p>In addition, this language is unclear as to whether or not a plan user needs to consult the transportation and mobility recommendations of the applicable master, sector, or transit district development plan.</p> <p>A list of specific amendments within this document was omitted.</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE38	54-55	Legal Context		Page 54 (Legal Context) states: "Go Prince George's also incorporates the following plans and studies in their entirety, except where specifically identified in this plan...Upon approval of Go Prince George's, these plan elements, plans, and manuals will have the legal force of a functional master plan and are to be considered part of this document, as specifically amended by the text and maps of this master plan."	<p>1) There is no language describing what happens if a conflict exists between the study and the plan.</p> <p>2) These studies were intended to be posted as online appendices to the Staff Draft Plan. They were not.</p> <p>3) The West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan was approved on November 10, 2025.</p> <p>4) To reinforce this point, key policies, strategies, and facility recommendations from these plans and studies were identified within the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release.</p> <p>It is unclear from the Staff Draft Plan which recommendations carry forward or update recommendations from the cited plans and studies, and there is no conflict resolution language.</p>
CE39	62	Updating the County's Transportation Policies and Strategies		Page 62 contains general information on how to best read and use this document. This section has historically been named "How to Use this document" and the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's contained this context, but this header and its associated context was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Furthermore, Go Prince George's establishes a new vision, priorities, themes, goals, policies, and strategies for transportation and mobility. It completely replaces Plan 2035's Transportation and Mobility element. References to this element should only be made to the extent that Go Prince George's carries recommendations or information forward from Plan 2035.	

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE40	64	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility		Page 64 (Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility) states "A comprehensive sidewalk network further supports the development of a comprehensive multimodal transportation network and 15-minute communities while addressing first-mile/last-mile connections."	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This was intended as a goal statement.</li> <li>2. This statement was inserted into the "2025 Preliminary Plan" prior to its public release without relation to the policies and strategies of the PR Element. Policies and strategies that would address this goal were developed during preparation of the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan", leaving the County without sufficient policy guidance and direction on how to achieve this goal.</li> <li>3. There is not sufficient time to address this error within the period allotted for Planning Board adoption.</li> </ol>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE41	64	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 1	Policy PR 1 states to "Construct, reconstruct, and maintain a complete system of sidewalks"	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan does not contain a definition of what a "complete system of sidewalks is."</li> <li>2. Construction of new sidewalks, reconstruction of existing sidewalks, and perpetual maintenance of sidewalks are each complex and costly endeavors for which there are several strategies to best accomplish. Numerous policies and strategies to improve and increase the County's pedestrian access and experience were developed during preparation of the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</li> <li>3. The most important strategies to implement this policy would be specific instructions on how, where, and when sidewalks should be constructed and what characteristics are most important to ensure the desired pedestrian system. Numerous policies and strategies to accomplish this were developed during preparation of the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</li> <li>4. There is not sufficient time to address this error within the period allotted for Planning Board adoption.</li> </ol>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE42	64	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 1.1	Strategy PR 1.1 recommends prioritization of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) techniques. The plan contains no information explaining what CPTED is, what these techniques are, and how to incorporate them into transportation facilities to increase user safety and the perception of user safety.	
CE43	64	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 1.2	Strategy PR 1.2 recommends evaluating intersections for retrofit with pedestrian refuge islands. Detailed, location-specific recommendations were omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  In particular, this plan should carry forward the recommendation of the <i>2020 Forestville TNI Area Pedestrian Accessibility Study</i> for a pedestrian refuge area at 2709 Ritchie Road.  In addition, the strategy has grammatical errors. This strategy should be located under the same strategy as Strategy PR 2.1.	
CE44	64	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 1.3	Strategy PR 1.3 states "Evaluate and implement when practicable, the filling of gaps in continuous lighting, with priority being given to high-incident areas or High Injury Network (HIN) corridors identified in the Vision Zero Action Plan 2020-2025."	There are no impracticable situations where gaps in continuous lighting cannot be filled. Such an evaluation would require specific elements. Gaps in pedestrian scale lighting exist not only in "high-incident" areas; people will generally not walk where they perceive it to be unsafe. Providing continuous lighting is critical to encourage walking to and from destinations and transit.  More detailed recommendations were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE45	64	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 1.5	Strategy PR 1.5 states "Develop and adopt a draft lighting policy, developed by M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation for use on shared-use paths in natural areas and park settings	Identification of lead agencies in strategies is not necessary, and an adopted policy is not a draft policy. Furthermore, a lighting policy is not an implementation strategy of constructing, reconstructing, and maintaining “a complete system of sidewalks.” It is a pedestrian safety action item that warrants its own policy and supporting strategies.
CE46	64	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 2	Policy PR 2 combines a policy (designing for more direct routes) with another policy or a strategy (reducing crossing distances). Numerous policies and strategies relating to pedestrian safety were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".	
CE47	64	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 2.1	Strategy PR 2.1 states "During the design and re-design of streets, roads, and pedestrian facilities, prioritize street crossings, including mid-block crossings, as applicable, which eliminate long distances for pedestrians.”	The phrase "as applicable" is unclear here. It is unclear from this strategy where and under what circumstances mid-block crossings should be considered. It is also unclear what prioritization would mean in this case, based on the language provided. Detailed context and specific recommendations were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE48	65	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 3	Policy PR 3 has no strategies. Prince George's County does not produce plans where policies have no strategies. Detailed strategies to implement this recommendation were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted or moved to other policies prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Strategy PR 1.1 is more applicable in this location than under Policy PR 1.	
CE49	65	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 4	Policy PR 4 states "Leverage traffic signal warrant studies and conduct additional formalized speed studies at areas of concern to determine mitigations for safety risks."	<p>This is a strategy mislabeled as a policy and in a confusing location within the element. Traffic signal warrant studies do not necessarily determine risk to pedestrians. "Additional formalized speed studies at areas of concern" presumes that speed is the primary cause of vehicle-pedestrian incidents.</p> <p>An entire Safety Element was prepared during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Some policies and strategies were relocated to other locations, but critical context, such as prioritization of safety improvements and maps of the County's High Injury Network, were deleted.</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE50	65	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 6.6	Strategy PR 6.6 states "Develop and maintain a list of intersections with frequent pedestrian-involved incidents. The list should be used to conduct further studies of areas of concern".	Both Prince George's County and the Maryland Department of Transportation do this currently, and such lists were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's to identify high-priority locations in Prince George's County where pedestrian improvements could improve safety conditions, but this information was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE51	66	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 7.2	Strategy PR 7.2 states "Promote equitable transportation options for students within the district."	Strategies are actions. "Promote" represents policy language. This strategy should be a policy with supporting strategies explaining what "equitable transportation options" are and how they could be provided in Prince George's County. Strategy language with the appropriate context and a focus on Safe Routes to School was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  There is not sufficient time to address this error within the period allotted for Planning Board adoption.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE52	66	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 7.4	Strategy PR 7.4 states "Prioritize coordination between the Prince George’s County Public School System and the implementing transportation improvement agencies, including but not limited to, DPW&T, DPIE, MDOT, and municipalities."	It is unclear on what topic these agencies are coordinating. It is unclear how and by what means such coordination would be prioritized. DPIE is not a transportation improvement agency.
CE53	70	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 1.3	Strategy BK 1.3 states "Consider “road diets” for overbuilt roadways to allow space for, and to prioritize, the development of hard-surface, shared-use paths, barrier-separated bicycle lanes, sidewalks, shared lane markings, and cycle tracks. This includes, but is not limited to, arterials and collector roadways."	"Consider" is not an action term appropriate for a plan. Go Prince George's identifies specific improvements that qualify as road diets; these are not cross-referenced or identified here. Policies and supporting strategies, as well as additional location-specific recommendations, for road diets were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  Whether or not to re-characterize “road diets” in lieu of current federal requirements may require more time to evaluate than is allotted for adoption of this plan.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE54	70	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 1.4	Strategy BK 1.4 states "Maintain and enhance the existing County bicycle network, where feasible."	<p>This statement was inserted into the 2025 Staff Draft plan in error. There are no existing County bicycle facilities where maintenance is infeasible. Dozens of specific enhancements to the existing County bikeway network were identified in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>There is not sufficient time to address this error within the period allotted for Planning Board adoption.</p>
CE55	70	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 1.5	Strategy BK 1.5 states "Conduct detailed planning studies along corridors previously recommended by the 2009 MPO and prior master, sector, and transit district development plans to identify on- and off-road alternative routes to ensure connectivity while reducing environmental and financial impacts."	<p>Such corridors were explicitly identified and developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to its public release. In addition, significant evaluation of these corridors was conducted, and specific recommendations in this document reflect that analysis. Several recommendations for bicycle facilities were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Finally, it is unclear to what the specified on- and off-route routes are alternatives; this should be clarified.</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE56	70	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 1.7	Strategy BK 1.7 states "Identify safe alternatives for bicycle, equestrian, and shared-use connections previously recommended in master plans, sector plans, transit district development plans, and planning studies."	This is a policy that was formatted as a strategy, with supporting strategies developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". It is unclear to what bicycle accommodations such connections would be safe alternatives, or what safe means in this context.
CE57	70	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 2	Policy BK 2 states "Develop a County Bikeways plan that connects all Plan 2035-designated Centers to surrounding neighborhoods, and to the regional bikeway and shared-use path network."	<p>This language was inserted into this document in place of specific recommendations for a County Bikeways Network that were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>Specific recommendations deleted from this document include, but are not limited to, prioritized bikeway and shared-use projects, a menu of preferred bicycle accommodation identifying the appropriate bicycle or shared-use facility for a particular street or neighborhood, and a network of new bicycle routes to schools.</p> <p>Also, this is a policy with no strategies. The erroneous deletion of the County Bikeways Network affects other strategies that reference it within this document, as well.</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE58	70	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 3.1	Strategy BK 3.1 states "Evaluate all roadways within one-half mile of all public schools to identify opportunities to construct additional protected bicycle facilities."	Most roadways within one-half mile of all public schools were evaluated for this, and dozens of bikeway recommendations were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE59	71	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		Page 71 contains a full-page graphic describing the American Discovery Trail, which is in its infancy as a concept. Descriptions of the East Coast Greenway, a formal bikeway network that exists and is signed from Maine to Florida and that serves Prince George's County, and recommendations to improve facilities along both were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".	

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE60	72-73	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 4	<p>Policy BK 4 states "Evaluate and capitalize on opportunities presented by available rights-of-way to fill gaps and extend shared-use paths and to create greenways and linear parks throughout Prince George’s County, linked by and featuring shared-use paths."</p> <p>Policy BK 8 states "Acquire and utilize utility easements to enhance the bikeway, shared-use, and natural surface trail network, where feasible."</p>	<p>Such opportunities were evaluated at length during development of the 2025 Staff Draft Plan but recommendations to implement bikeways in these rights-of-way were deleted prior to its public release. Furthermore, Footnote 3, a reference that the intended rights-of-way include public lands and utility corridors, is a formatting error. Recommendations to evaluate and construct shared-use paths in utility corridors, including breakout text describing such a facility in Montgomery County, were developed during preparation of the 2025 Staff Draft Plan but were deleted prior to public release of the “2025 Preliminary Plan”.</p>
CE61	72	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 4.3	<p>Strategy BK 4.3 states "Prioritize pathway infrastructure/retrofit upgrades, and path rehabilitation projects that will improve safety for trail users, including widening shared-use paths built to outdated standards."</p>	<p>Specific language explaining how what such infrastructure is, how and over what such projects should be prioritized, and where such projects should occur, was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE62	72	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 5	Policy BK 5 states "Support low-stress bicycle use by establishing connected neighborhood bicycle boulevard systems."	Specific areas for construction or further evaluation of bicycle boulevards, some of which are carried over from prior plans and studies, were identified in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE63	73	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 7.3	Strategy BK 7.3 states “Construct a network of natural-surface trails throughout the County that provide active transportation experiences.”	This language was inserted under Policy BK 7 prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  However, a table of natural-surface trail recommendations was omitted from the document.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE64	73	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 7.4  BK 7.5	<p>Strategy BK 7.4 states "Construct the segments of nationwide shared-use path and trail networks in Prince George’s County as hard-surface bikeways or shared-use paths."</p> <p>Strategy BK 7.5 states "Collaborate with state and federal partners to fund trails, shared-use connections, and bikeways in the East Coast Greenway, expanding bikeable opportunities for Prince Georgians as well as access to County destinations."</p>	<p>Language explaining what these nationwide networks are, where they are located, why or how such facilities should be prioritized, and associated maps were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>Furthermore, this strategy is a policy with supporting strategies that were likewise deleted prior to this document's public release.</p>
CE65	73	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 9	<p>Policy BK 9 states "Acquire, repurpose, and utilize abandoned railroad rights-of-way to enhance the bikeway and shared-use network."</p>	<p>Repurpose and utilize are, in this instance, duplicative. Furthermore, multiple strategies and location-specific recommendations were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Accordingly, Strategy BK 9.1 is shown as the only strategy under Policy BK 9, lacking any and all context.</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE66	74	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 10	Policy BK 10 states "Provide enhanced equestrian and hiker/equestrian trails connecting the Established Communities to the Rural and Agricultural Area."	<p>Critical context that explains these recommendations and their importance in advancing Strategy EP8.4<sup>11</sup> and Strategy TM1.8<sup>12</sup> of Plan 2035 was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>This deletion is critical, because Go Prince George's will replace, in its entirety, the Plan 2035 Transportation and Mobility Element.</p>
CE67	74	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 11.2	Strategy BK 11.2 states "Consistent with the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, provide a minimum of four short-term bicycle parking spaces at all nonresidential properties and a minimum of four long-term bicycle parking spaces at all nonresidential properties larger than 50,000 feet of gross floor area" and then goes on to cite the lengthy provisions of the Zoning Ordinance in a footnote. Language explaining the specific legislative amendments required to implement this recommendation was omitted from the “2025 Preliminary Plan”.	

<sup>11</sup> “...promote agritourism....”, page 136

<sup>12</sup> “Coordinate future transportation and mobility improvements as outlined in the [2009 MPOT], the Plan 2035 Transportation and Mobility Element, and the Star-Spangled Banner Scenic Corridor Plan to ensure the County’s rural character is preserved. Improvements include promoting the County’s equestrian heritage—focused on trails that facilitate access to the Prince George’s Equestrian Center, Jug Bay Natural Area, and Rosaryville State Park—and preserving existing equestrian trail corridors within the Rural and Agricultural Areas.”

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE68	75	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		Table 1, Corridors Recommended for Study for Future Bikeways, Paths, or Trails, contains descriptions of the proposed study corridors but do not identify the challenges that have been identified by DPR and other partner agencies that prevent these corridors from being constructed as originally planned. The most important context, whether or not these corridors are master-planned facilities, and the associated impact on right-of-way dedication requirements, is missing. The future use of rights-of-way dedicated pursuant to prior master, sector, or transit district development plans is not identified.	
CE69	75-81	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		All maps, tables, and figures in the BK Element lack context, important citation information, and cross-references to specific policies and strategies. Policies and strategies to implement a Countywide Bikeways Network and to improve Prince George's County segments of the National Trail Network were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  Map 16 includes off-road and road-based National Trails; this map should be clarified and specific facility improvements to complete these trails restored to the plan.	
CE70	82	Transit		Page 82 (Transit) states "Improve safety through placemaking with enhanced amenities and aesthetics and functional improvements to create a sense of place at transit hubs and stations."	This statement is unclear as written. Go Prince George's contains policies, strategies, and street typologies; a plan does not provide an "opportunity to advance", it advances. It is unclear how ridership would be enhanced (vs. increased and/or the rider experience improved). Fixed-guideway transit is used in this sentence but not defined elsewhere in the plan.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE71	83	Transit	TR 4.2	Strategy TR 4.2 states "Prioritize access to transit during street reconstruction and redevelopment projects."	Prioritizing access to transit suggests a comparative relationship with some other aspect of the project. Construction crews are required to maintain access to transit during street reconstruction; an appropriate strategy would contain specific examples of how such access may be improved. Such examples were identified during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the “2025 Preliminary Plan”.
CE72	84	Transit	TR 6.1  TR 6.2	Strategy TR 6.1 states "Evaluate the potential for additional bus priority measures, including bus priority signals, along all arterials and mixed-use boulevards."  Strategy TR 6.2 states "Evaluate the potential of bus-only lanes or shared bus-bike lanes."	Numerous policies and supporting strategies addressing opportunities and recommended locations for bus priority measures, including bus priority signals and bus-only lanes, were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Important context and supporting strategies for shared bus-bicycle lanes were also deleted prior to public release of the 2025 Staff Draft Plan.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE73	84	Transit	TR 6.3	Strategy TR 6.3 states "Evaluate the transition to a zero-emission bus (ZEB) fleet system that includes supported infrastructure such as maintenance facilities, charging stations, and other improvements critical to a successful transition."	Policies and supporting strategies were omitted from the “2025 Preliminary Plan”. DPW&T specifically requested that Go Prince George’s address this topic but the planning process was terminated prior to doing so.
CE74	85	Transit	TR 7.1	Strategy TR 7.1 states "Support the use of paratransit and other smaller vehicles to provide first- and last-mile connections in several County corridors."	<p>This is policy language presented as a strategy, with supporting strategies and specific locations for future study having been developed through previous plans and studies and through the Planning Department's analysis and collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's; these were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>In addition, the use of existing paratransit fleet vehicles for regular microtransit uses could divert resources from critical services for the disabled and mobility-impaired.</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE75	85	Transit	TR 7.2	Strategy TR 7.2 states "Support the use of paratransit and other smaller vehicles to provide moderate-ridership, medium-distance shuttle services."	<p>This is policy language presented as a strategy, with supporting strategies and specific locations for future study having been developed through previous plans and studies and through the Planning Department's analysis and collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's; these were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>In addition, the use of existing paratransit fleet vehicles for regular microtransit uses could divert resources from critical services for the disabled and mobility-impaired.</p>
CE76	85	Transit	TR 7.3	Strategy TR 7.3 states "Evaluate the feasibility of implementing microtransit or on-demand transit throughout the County."	As of February 2025, when the Staff Draft Plan was released to the public, Prince George's County operated a microtransit system. Policies and supporting strategies to expand this program were omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE77	85	Transit	TR 7.8	Strategy TR 7.8 states "Identify opportunities to provide special transit or other shuttle services from locations within Equity Emphasis Areas to places of interest throughout the County."	<p>This strategy is unclear.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Special transit" is undefined.</li> <li>2. This document, the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation, is the process through which such opportunities were identified, and opportunities to connect Equity Emphasis Areas to opportunities were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's; these were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</li> <li>3. How Go Prince George's prioritizes investment in Equity Emphasis Areas is unclear, as explanatory text and maps were deleted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan" prior to its public release.</li> <li>4. Residents of Equity Emphasis Areas require access to critical needs, services, and opportunities, not just "places of interest." Policies and supporting strategies detailing ways in which residents in the County's most in-need neighborhoods could be better connected to critical needs, services, and opportunities were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's; these were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</li> </ol>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE78	85	Transit	TR 8.3	Strategy TR 8.3 states "Provide related shuttle or circulator bus service, as feasible".	The locations of where such services could be provided or further studied were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE79	85	Transit	TR 9.1	Strategy TR 9.1 states "Partner with bus operators to explore more commuter stops to connect to new park-and-ride lots that serve the region."	This strategy is unclear as written and was added in error to the “2025 Preliminary Plan” prior to its public release. Policies and strategies to expand both commuter bus services and park-and-ride facilities, including specific corridors in which such services should be located, were evaluated thoroughly during development of the Staff Draft Plan but was deleted prior to its public release.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE80	85	Transit	TR 12.1	Strategy TR 12.1 states "Evaluate the addition of bus charging infrastructure at frequently used bus layover locations, MARC stations, Purple Line stations, and park-and-ride facilities."	This strategy excludes bus storage facilities and Metrorail stations. Buses do not currently serve MARC stations in the County that are not colocated with Metrorail stations, and standalone Purple Line stations in the County do not have areas for bus layovers; most stations do not have dedicated pickup and drop off areas. Bus charging infrastructure is but one element of electric bus service that requires accommodation during the development process and specific retrofit instructions. Specific strategies for electric bus services were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE81	88	Micromobility		Page 88 (Micromobility and Transportation Network Companies) states "Micromobility is a viable alternate mode for users to conduct short trips, and an opportunity to supplement longer trips by connecting transit locations to destinations."	This statement can be clarified for clearer understanding. Micromobility is not defined anywhere in this document; a definition of micromobility was identified during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE82	89	Micromobility	MI 2.1	Strategy MI 2.1 states "Expand bikeshare in the County, specifically throughout all Regional Transit Districts and Local Transit Centers, and in locations identified in prior area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans and studies."	The wording of this strategy requires a plan user to refer back to recommendations in prior plans that are superseded by this plan. These recommendations were gathered during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's and were explicitly identified but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE83	89	Micromobility	MI 2.2	Strategy MI 2.2 states "Support siting of bikeshare stations throughout the County. DPR staff should continue to act as a liaison with DPW&T regarding management, maintenance, and operational issues related to use of DPR property locations for bikeshare services."	This is a policy warranting several supporting strategies. Bikeshare 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 but omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  This statement cites page 138 of the 2018 DPR Strategic Trails Plan but is redundant. It should be clear to any reader that DPR staff would liaise with anyone wishing to use DPR property. In addition, this last sentence should be in a callout text box, not within the text of a strategy.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE84	90	Micromobility	MI 3	Policy MI 3 states "Coordinate with transportation network companies to ensure safe passenger loading and unloading areas". Several strategies to implement this policy were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".	This is a policy warranting several supporting strategies. Bikeshare strategies were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". This statement cites page 138 of the 2018 DPR Strategic Trails Plan but is redundant. It should be clear to any reader that DPR staff would liaise with anyone wishing to use DPR property. In addition, this last sentence should be in a callout text box, not within the text of a strategy.
CE85	90	Micromobility	MI 3.1	Strategy MI 3.1 states "Promote incentives for using micromobility or creating geofencing where feasible."	This language is unclear as written. Promotion of micromobility use is a policy that should have several strategies; such strategies were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  Geofencing has many definitions, including in relationship to micromobility. This language was inserted into the 2025 "Preliminary Plan" prior to its public release: geofencing is not defined, and how it would be implemented in Prince George's County, by whom, and for what purpose, is not identified.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE86	90	Micromobility	MI 5.1  MI 5.2	<p>Strategy MI 5.1 states "Conduct a planning effort with TNCs to determine highly used pick-up and drop-off areas and identify optimal locations for safe loading/unloading of passengers."</p> <p>Strategy MI 5.2 states "Create rideshare hubs in high-traffic locations to support safe ingress/egress of vehicles."</p>	<p>Strategies identifying optimal locations for the safe loading/unloading of TNC passengers and rideshare hubs, as well as characteristics of such hubs, were omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan". As written, these strategies are duplicative.</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE87	90	Micromobility	MI 6	Policy MI 6 states "Establish and maintain Transportation Demand Management Districts (TDMD) in areas where vehicle trip reduction procedures, strategies, and programs are required."	<p>The use of the phrase "required" suggests that TDMD are only necessary in places where the County Code or other Ordinance requires them. Establishment and maintenance of TDMD are two different policy areas requiring a host of strategies. It has been long understood that Subtitle 20A of the County Code, which regulates TDMD, needs updating to reflect modern TDM practices and the challenges the County has faced in establishing TDMD in the past.</p> <p>This and several other strategies associated with establishment of TDM Districts, including the carrying forward of TDMD recommended by previously approved master, sector, and transit district development plans were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". This policy and supporting strategies are unclear as to which previously recommended or established TDMD this plan recommends eliminating or creating.</p>
CE88	90	Micromobility	MI 6.1	Strategy MI 6.1 states "Evaluate the potential for a TDM District or Districts within Prince George’s County Code. This will be achieved by facilitating a TDM Plan under the advisement of the TDM Technical Advisory Committee."	This document contains no information as to what a TDM plan is, what a TDM Technical Advisory Committee is, and does not accurately reflect that TDM Districts were evaluated during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but recommended districts were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE89	92	Complete and Green Streets		Page 92 (Complete and Green Streets) states "In addition, a well-planned and designed curb space management program ensures easy access for all users as part of a multimodal transportation system."	An entire Parking and Curbside Management Element, containing context, information, policies, and strategies for curbside management were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE90	93	Complete and Green Streets	CG 1.1	Strategy CG 1.1 states "For roads and streets in these areas owned and/or maintained by the State of Maryland or a municipality, construct and reconstruct these streets to the functional equivalent of the County's adopted Urban Street Design Standards."	This statement references "these areas" and "these streets" but does not identify where such facilities are located. This strategy is intended to apply wherever the County's Urban Street Design Standards apply.
CE91	93	Complete and Green Streets	CG 1.5	Strategy CG 1.5 states "Design streets to incorporate traffic calming, including narrower vehicle lanes, one-way to two-way street conversion, roundabouts, curb extensions, tighter curb radii, mid-block pedestrian crossings, planted medians, and planted landscape buffers."	This language packs too many traffic calming methods into one strategy to be useful. Considerations for where such treatments may be most useful or necessary, or what such treatments may incorporate, were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  In addition, the wording of this strategy is unclear as to what streets should incorporate traffic calming.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE92	93	Complete and Green Streets	CG 1.8	CG 1.8 states "Conduct access management studies along suburban commercial arterial corridors to reduce conflict points between modes."	Context, including definitions and why access management is so important to safety, and specific corridors for further study, were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE93	95	Complete and Green Streets	CG 4	Policy CG 4 states "Construct urban public open spaces consistent with the Urban Park Guidelines of <i>Formula 2040: Functional Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space.</i> "	This is a strategy formatted as a policy. Detailed, specific recommendations, including multiple policies and strategies on how and where to construct urban public open spaces as part of the public realm and within or abutting the public right-of-way were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the “2025 Preliminary Plan”.  Policies published without strategies are errors.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE94	95	Complete and Green Streets	CG 5	Policy CG 5 states "Ensure that neighborhood streets safely accommodate all users."	Detailed, specific recommendations, including multiple policies and strategies on how to safely accommodate all users on neighborhood streets were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the “2025 Preliminary Plan”. This policy also references "Neighborhood streets" which is not a classification or description used by Prince George's County or referenced in this plan. Policies published without strategies are errors.
CE95	95	Complete and Green Streets	CG 6.3	Strategy CG 6.3 states "Construct the following Complete and Green Street segments, as recommended in the 2021 <i>City of College Park Complete and Green Streets Implementation Plan: 30 Percent Design for Five Street Segments</i> , pursuant to the City of College Park’s design standards."	Specific street recommendations, referenced as "the following Complete and Green Street segments" were developed in collaboration with the City of College Park during the process to develop the 2021 study and were incorporated into both this strategy and the facilities table, but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan"

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE96	95	Complete and Green Streets	CG 7.3	Strategy CG 7.3 states "Utilities should be underground where feasible."	<p>The undergrounding of utilities is a complex and costly effort that requires interagency coordination, legally-binding memoranda of understanding or agreements, and should be limited to areas where the public realm is most important, and therefore the cost justified. Where and who pays for the undergrounding of utilities should be specified.</p> <p>Specific policy and strategy language containing these details was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>
CE97	95	Complete and Green Streets	CG 8	Policy CG 8 states "Ensure that sidewalks are ADA-compliant."	<p>The plan does not previously identify the Americans with Disabilities Act or what "ADA-compliant" means. Key context language and definitions, as well as specific recommendations, were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". In addition, no strategies are identified that would "ensure" that the thousands of miles of sidewalk in Prince George's County, many constructed prior to the 1990 enactment of ADA, are brought into compliance.</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE98	96	Complete and Green Streets	CG 9.2	Strategy CG 9.2 states "Coordinate plantings with the County’s TreePlotter inventory."	This language was added to the plan following the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s and prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". The TreePlotter inventory is not defined in this document, and/or such definition was deleted. It is unclear how such actions would be coordinated and with whom.
CE99	96	Complete and Green Streets	CG 10.1	Strategy CG 10.1 states "Comply with Facilities Strategy 4.4b from Formula 2040: Functional Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space to “clarify acceptable ownership and management arrangements for urban parks, including publicly-owned and operated, publicly-accessible but privately-owned and operated, and other public-private partnerships. The goal should be to ensure public access to these urban spaces, where feasible.”	The word "comply" is used incorrectly here. There are several strategies lodged within this one strategy that warrant their own strategy, including strategies for different approaches to public open space ownership, management, and access. The word "comply" would be replaced with "carry forward" in circumstances where a previously approved strategy is carried forward into Go Prince George's. Several strategies intended to implement this policy were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE100	96	Complete and Green Streets	CG 10.2	Strategy CG 10.2 states "Support placemaking in the public right-of-way by incorporating public art, interpretive signage, and cultural amenities."	Specific locations for placemaking interventions developed during previous plans and studies and during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE101	96	Complete and Green Streets	CG 11	Policy CG 11 states "Ensure that streets safely accommodate all users."	The use of "ensure" is not appropriate. This policy only contains one strategy; "ensuring" that the County's streets safely accommodate all users requires multiple strategies. An entire Safety Element was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's, coordinated closely with the County and State's Vision Zero initiatives, but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE102	96	Complete and Green Streets	CG 11.1	Strategy CG 11.1 states "Provide bicycle and pedestrian connections to off-road trails and shared-use paths from nearby intersections, culs-de-sac, and dead-end streets, where feasible."	This is a policy incorrectly formatted as a strategy. Such a policy and supporting strategies, including location-specific recommendations, were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". This strategy also bears little relationship to Policy CG 11 and was likely placed here prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE103	97	Complete and Green Streets	CG 13.1	Strategy CG 13.1 states "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 ease of use."	A strategy is an action: this strategy should say "Evaluate and identify the appropriate location criteria..."; the evaluation of this criteria was underway in the summer of 2024 but was halted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". In addition, such a strategy should be cross-referenced to the MI Element.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE104	97	Complete and Green Streets	CG 14	Policy CG 14 states "Manage on-street parking in context-sensitive areas."	<p>There is no such thing as "context-sensitive areas." Parking should always be managed with sensitivity to the context of the particular neighborhood, street or road, availability of rights-of-way, and land uses along a block. This policy language can be revised to reflect its intent.</p> <p>Staff note that an entire Parking and Curbside Management Element was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>
CE105	97	Complete and Green Streets	CG 14.1	Strategy CG 14.1 states "Evaluate the feasibility of parking districts in context-sensitive areas."	<p>There is no such thing as "context-sensitive areas." Parking should always be managed with sensitivity to the context of the particular neighborhood, street or road, availability of rights-of-way, and land uses along a block. This policy language can be revised to reflect its intent.</p> <p>Staff note that an entire Parking and Curbside Management Element, including policies and strategies regarding parking districts, was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". An evaluation of parking management feasibility would be more appropriate under Policy CG 15.</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE106	97	Complete and Green Streets	CG 15	Policy CG 15 states "Conduct a parking management study, where feasible, in Prince George’s County."	<p>There is no place in Prince George's County where a study of parking is infeasible. Direction to conduct a study is a strategy, not a policy.</p> <p>Staff note that an entire Parking and Curbside Management Element, including policies and strategies concerning parking management, was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>
CE107	97	Complete and Green Streets	CG 15.1	Strategy CG 15.1 states "Incorporate performance parking zones with demand-based parking rates as part of a future study."	<p>This statement is unclear, in part due to the erroneous deletion of definitions for "performance parking" and "demand-based parking" prior to publication of the "2025 Preliminary Plan" and because of confusing sentence structure. A plan strategy should be written "Incorporate [or implement] performance parking zones with demand-based parking rates" or "Study the feasibility and applicability of performance parking zones with demand-based parking rates."</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE108	98	Roads and Highways		Page 98 (Roads and Highways) identifies one improvement to the road and highway system as "Strategies for increased public and private investment in regional highway facilities".	Entire sections of explanatory text, policies, and strategies identifying recommended improvements and funding for the County's freeway, tollway, and expressway network were developed collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE109	98	Roads and Highways	RH 1	Policy RH 1 states "Create a hierarchical network of roads and highways that facilitate efficient vehicular travel through Prince George's County."	A policy with no strategies is an error. Staff notes that numerous policies and strategies describing how Prince George's County will create such a network were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". This section does not identify the functional classifications that make up this hierarchy.
CE110	99	Roads and Highways	RH 5.1	Strategy RH 5.1 states "Incorporate traffic calming strategies, including, but not limited to, road diets, barrier-separated bicycle facilities, bulb outs, chicanes, narrowed lanes, more frequent traffic control devices, and other technologies and signage."	It is unclear where these strategies should be incorporated. Definitions of these strategies, and specific recommendations carried forward from prior plans and studies, were omitted from the “2025 Preliminary Plan”.  There is not sufficient time to address this error within the period allotted for Planning Board adoption.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE111	99	Roads and Highways	RH 5.2	Strategy RH 5.2 states "Evaluate intersection and volume-to-capacity performance at regular intervals as part of the traffic analysis process."	The intent, purpose, and meaning of this statement are unclear. While intersection and volume-to-capacity performance are important transportation system measures, it is unclear how evaluating them prevents encroachment of traffic into neighborhoods. This statement mentions "at intervals" without explaining the interval. This statement refers to a "traffic analysis process" without explaining what this process is, when it occurs, and what it has to do with the County's transportation system. This strategy appears to be relevant to Policy RH 4 rather than Policy RH 5.
CE112	99	Roads and Highways	RH 5.3	Strategy RH 5.3 states "Consider traffic studies submitted with development applications in regular updates of the County's Roadway Adequacy Map."	This statement is unclear because its context, parallel strategies, and a proposed, regularly-updated Roadway Adequacy Map to inform stakeholders of recent system performance were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE113	99	Roads and Highways	RH 6	Strategy RH 6 states "Construct and maintain a network of arterial roads that connects communities."	A policy with no strategies is an error. Multiple policies and strategies to facilitate construction of an arterial network, including location-specific strategies, were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE114	99	Roads and Highways	RH 7	Policy RH 7 states "Connect neighborhoods to the arterial road network, shopping, services, and other amenities."	This policy lacks context and is unclear. A policy with no strategies is an error. Strategies for Major Collector roads, including locations where sidewalks are recommended, were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE115	99	Roads and Highways	RH 8.1	Strategy RH 8.1 is a policy incorrectly formatted as a strategy. There are no strategies to implement this policy and a policy with no strategies is an error.	
CE116	105	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 9.2	Strategy SH 9.2 states "Update the ATHA Management Plan and develop a strategic trail development plan."	These are two strategies, and the phrase "develop strategic trail development plan" could be confusing, since Go Prince George's is the County's strategic trail development plan.  ATHA is currently updating its comprehensive management plan; as of March 4, 2026 there is no timetable for completion. Resolution of this issue will not occur in the period allotted for Planning Board adoption.
CE117	106	Waterways		Page 106 (Waterways) is missing a goal statement	

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE118	106	Waterways	WW 1.1	Strategy WW 1.1 states "Continue to expand the Patuxent River natural surface shared-use (hiker/equestrian) trails along the Patuxent River, and access as feasible. Connectivity between parks and existing trails should be prioritized."	This recommendation is unclear as to which trails should be expanded, what such expansion entails, and how such trails support water access and river use. The phrase "access as feasible" is unclear in a sentence discussing trails; does this refer to access to trails or access from the trails to the river, or something different? Existing trails largely run within parks, so it is unclear what "Connectivity between parks and existing trails should be prioritized" nor is it clear how this plan prioritizes such trails or over what such trails should be prioritized.
CE119	106	Waterways	WW 2	Policy WW 2 states "Expand the network of designated water trails in the County."	The strategies within this Policy do not expand the network of designated water trails in the County, nor does this plan explicitly identify Water Trails, except on Maps 56-58 (without names and without clarity along the external waterways). The absence of such clear specific recommendations could be interpreted that all existing and recommended water trails from the 2009 MPOT, as amended, would be deleted.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE120	106	Waterways	WW 2.1	Strategy WW 2.1 states "Use the water trails plan developed by the Maryland Office of Tourism to guide development of new water trails. Develop a trail plan to provide interpretive and wayfinding guidance."	<p>Multiple policies and strategies concerning expansion of waterborne transportation in the County, including detailed recommendations on wayfinding and interpretation, were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". This strategy should be split into two strategies. This document does not explain what the Maryland Office of Tourism water trails plan entails or how it relates to the unique circumstances of Prince George's County.</p> <p>An entire Wayfinding Element, including policies and strategies, was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>
CE121	106	Waterways	WW 2.2	Strategy WW 2.2 states "Consider additional water access points along the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, as feasible."	This statement is unclear. Are the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers existing or planned water trails? The use of "as feasible" is redundant with "consider." What one is considering in this circumstance is the feasibility of such access. Additional context language and specific recommendations were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE122	107	Waterways	WW 3	Policy WW 3 states "Increase Anacostia and Potomac River passenger options for Prince Georgians."	Strategy WW 3.3 states "Explore the feasibility of passenger ferry operations on the Anacostia River". Additional recommendations and considerations for Anacostia River ferry service, including vertical clearance concerns and the need for immediate interagency coordination given plans for a shared-use crossing of the river between Kenilworth Park and the United States National Arboretum, were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George’s but were omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE113	110	Goods Movement		Page 110 (Goods Movement) lacks a goal statement.	
CE114	110	Goods Movement	GM 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 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.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE115	110	Goods Movement	GM 1.2	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. A recommendation to consider a countywide functional master plan for transportation, logistics and warehousing that could further address this topic was omitted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE116	115	Sustainability		This document contains an element on Sustainability. Sustainability is not defined, either in general or in relation to transportation and mobility, and is not used in the introduction to this element.	
CE117	248	Monitoring and Evaluation		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 during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE118	251	Monitoring and Evaluation		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."	An entire Wayfinding Element, including policies and strategies, was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE119	253	Monitoring and Evaluation		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."	This language may be inserted as a strategy under Policy IM 2, but staff anticipate public testimony that may permit a more thorough evaluation of public health and its relationship to transportation.
CE120	253	Monitoring and Evaluation		Page 253 (Complete Streets) states "Collaborate with state agencies to implement facility improvements at County MARC Stations, including improvement of station platforms, ensuring safe access between both sides of stations, expansion of bus service to stations, and expansion of station amenities."	Specific facility improvements were identified during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were omitted from public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  Staff anticipate testimony that may permit a more thorough evaluation of the County's MARC Stations.

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/ Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE121	253	Monitoring and Evaluation		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."	The use of non-traditional colors, styles, and iconography may impact eligibility for federal funding under the current federal administration. Determining whether or not this recommendation should be revised may take longer than the period allotted for Planning Board adoption.
CE122	253	Monitoring and Evaluation		Page 253 (Complete Streets) states "Establish wayfinding programming to indicate Historic Routes, National Historic Trails, and Recreational and Cultural Interest Areas with signs within the County."	<p>An entire section on Scenic and Historic Roads, including several policies and strategies on wayfinding, was prepared in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>An entire Wayfinding Element, including policies and strategies, was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>

### III. Additional Deleted or Omitted Material Referenced in “2025 Preliminary Plan”

Error/Omission	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
CE123	253	Monitoring and Evaluation		Page 253 (Complete Streets) states "Construct wayfinding signs and other media directing riders to the County Bikeways Network. Install uniform wayfinding throughout the County Bikeways Network that reinforces a single system, regardless of shared-use path ownership."	An entire Wayfinding Element, including policies and strategies, was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
CE124	255	Monitoring and Evaluation		Page 255 (Sustainability) states “Partner with local energy providers to develop alternative fueling stations for compressed natural gas, liquefied petroleum gas, biofuels, and electric vehicles.”	This recommendation (GI 14.5) from the 2017 <i>Approved Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan</i> warrants reconsideration given the evolution of alternative fuels since 2017.
CE125	257	Monitoring and Evaluation		Page 257 (Public-Private Partnerships) states: “Continue to support efforts to explore innovative ways to support the improvements of eligible facilities. Identify non-traditional and innovative funding streams for critical transportation systems and projects, particularly transit and non-motorized facilities and systems.	This statement is unclear without additional context.  The general nature of this comment prevents its resolution in the period allotted for Planning Board adoption.

## IV. Late Insertions

Following suspension on the collaborative development of Go Prince George’s pursuant to CR-79-2021, but prior to public release of the “2025 Preliminary Plan”, several new concepts were unilaterally and arbitrarily added to the document. These topics were not evaluated by staff or contractors and bore little tangible relationship to the rest of the plan, Prince George’s County’s transportation and mobility environment, the County’s land use patterns, or Plan 2035.

Three concepts in particular created major challenges

- 15-minute communities as a goal
- Smart Infrastructure
- Air Mobility

These terms were not defined, their relationship to Prince George’s County not clearly articulated, and the costs to and benefits from these topics not considered before they were unilaterally inserted into the County’s draft master plan of transportation.

These issues are listed here because they meet one or more criteria:

- 1) They are substantive and cannot be addressed through the traditional correction process.
- 2) The Planning Board may only amend the plan to correct these errors based on public testimony received on these topics.
- 3) The County Council may need to amend the plan to address these errors.

### 15-Minute Communities

“15-minute communities” is the concept of building neighborhoods so that “the essential needs of residents are accessible on foot or by bicycle within a short perimeter in high-density areas.”<sup>13</sup> Plan 2035 recommends a system of Regional Transit Districts and Local Centers that strive to achieve this goal, and Go Prince George’s recommends development of a street, bicycling, and walking network that increase the potential to create 15-minute neighborhoods in transit-served areas of the County.

However, this nuance is not articulated in the “2025 Preliminary Plan”. Further analysis, discussion, and evaluation is necessary to make a clear connection between Go Prince George’s and 15-minute cities.

---

<sup>13</sup> Carlos Moreno, *The 15-Minute City: A Solution to Saving Our Time and Our Planet* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2024), 13.

## IV. Late Insertions

### Smart Infrastructure

Engineer Fix defines Smart Infrastructure as:

*...the next evolution of essential public systems, transforming static physical assets into adaptive, responsive, and data-driven networks. This concept involves integrating digital technology and information systems directly into traditional structures like roads, power grids, and water systems. The goal is to create networks that constantly monitor their own performance and surrounding environment, enabling real-time adjustments and optimization. By connecting the physical and digital worlds, smart infrastructure provides superior performance, efficiency, and reliability for communities.<sup>14</sup>*

Integrating smart infrastructure into the County's and region's transportation system has the potential to greatly improve the efficiency, cost, and safety of travel. Further analysis, discussion, and evaluation is necessary to maximize the potential of smart infrastructure for the County's transportation system.

### Air Mobility

An entire Aviation element was unilaterally inserted into the "2025 Preliminary Plan" to focus on Urban Air Mobility.

The Federal Aviation Administration defines Urban Air Mobility as:

*[Advanced Air Mobility (AAM)] aims to develop an air transportation system that moves people and cargo between local, regional, intraregional, and urban locations not previously served or underserved by aviation using innovative aircraft, technologies, and operations. While AAM supports a wide range of passenger, cargo, and other operations within and between urban and rural environments, UAM focuses on flight operations in and around urban areas.<sup>15</sup>*

UAM includes air taxis and air delivery using a variety of vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL) aircraft, including unmanned aerial vehicles and helicopters. This topic is covered extensively in Attachment A: UAM is prohibited in the vast majority of the County due to flight restrictions around the National Capital Region. cursory evaluation of this topic would have precluded its insertion into the plan.

---

<sup>14</sup> Liam Cope, "What Is Smart Infrastructure and How Does It Work?", *Engineer Fix*, November 6, 2025, accessed online March 3, 2026 at <https://engineerfix.com/what-is-smart-infrastructure-and-how-does-it-work/>.

<sup>15</sup> Federal Aviation Administration, *Urban Air Mobility (UAM) Concept of Operations Version 2.0*, April 26, 2023, accessed online March 3, 2026 at [https://www.faa.gov/sites/faa.gov/files/Urban%20Air%20Mobility%20%28UAM%29%20Concept%20of%20Operations%202.0\\_1.pdf](https://www.faa.gov/sites/faa.gov/files/Urban%20Air%20Mobility%20%28UAM%29%20Concept%20of%20Operations%202.0_1.pdf).

## IV. Late Insertions

Other language and graphics were unilaterally inserted into the plan and create challenges of coherence and readability given conflicting language or deletions elsewhere in the plan.

These include:

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
L11	14	Our Values		Page 14 (Our Values) states "Creating Great Places: Prince George's County is in a prime location in the Washington, D.C. area, and is home to one of the most active interstate highways (I-95) and a highly supported passenger rail corridor (Amtrak's Northeast Corridor). Prince George's County has unique communities of very dense urban and suburban residential areas, employment centers, agricultural farm lands, and rural areas. Providing adequate safe infrastructure to sustain communities is essential to supporting the creation of great places to live, work, shop, recreate, and visit while providing adequate transportation management for communities inside and outside the County."	This sentence has nothing to do with creating great places. An accurate description of this value was created early in the process of developing Go Prince George's and served as a focus for the planning process and the drafting of the plan. However, that accurate language was deleted and this unrelated language was inserted in the "2025 Preliminary Plan" prior to its public release.

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI2	19-27	Our Priorities		<p>The Our Priorities section identifies the five main priorities for Go Prince George's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Ensuring great communities to live, work, play, learn, shop, and recreate</li> <li>* Enhancing multi-agency coordination and public-private partnerships</li> <li>* Providing multimodal transportation choices</li> <li>* Growing and traveling sustainably</li> <li>* Empowering people through connections</li> </ul> <p>Pages 19-27 contain these priorities as headers, with what is supposed to be explanatory text beneath. During the formatting of the Preliminary Plan document, unrelated text was inserted in this section, and descriptions of these priorities was deleted.</p>	
LI3	20	Ensuring Great Communities		<p>Page 20 (Ensuring great communities...) states "This priority includes providing access to healthy foods and quality health care, as part of neighborhood-serving uses to support 15-minute communities. All stakeholders are requested to partner in the transformation of the integrated transportation system from one that conveys vehicles through and out of the County. The opportunity to safely travel throughout the County on a variety of reliable, accessible modes of transportation is an achievable goal."</p>	<p>The stated priority of this section is "Ensuring great communities to live, work, play, learn, shop, and recreate." This paragraph was inserted in this section while language explaining this priority and how Go Prince George's addresses it was developed during preparation of the 2025 Preliminary Plan but was deleted prior to plan release.</p>

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI4	20	Ensuring Great Communities		<p>Page 20 (Ensuring great communities...) states "To continue to support this effort, Plan 2035's Strategic Investment Program identifies five "downtowns" in the County for prioritization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hyattsville Crossing (Prince George's Plaza)</li> <li>• New Carrollton</li> <li>• Downtown Largo</li> <li>• Suitland</li> <li>• Branch Avenue Metro</li> </ul> <p>Investing in our "downtowns" will attract jobs, businesses, and amenities for Prince Georgians, while focusing on deploying smart infrastructure to advance access management in those areas."</p>	<p>This language lacks critical context and follow-up elsewhere in the plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Critical context language explaining how investing in the Downtowns ensures great communities, and how this relates to transportation and mobility, was developed during the planning process but was deleted from the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</li> <li>2) The phrase "focusing on deploying smart infrastructure to advance access management in those areas" lacks context or relationship to the purpose of the Ensuring Great Communities priority.</li> <li>3) This language states that Downtowns are prioritized. However, prioritization criteria and associated policies and strategies were deleted in the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</li> <li>4) Downtowns are defined in Plan 2035 and are a formal plan designation. The word Downtown should be capitalized and not in quotation marks.</li> </ol>

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI5	23	Providing multimodal transportation choices.		Page 23 (Providing multimodal transportation choices) contains six paragraphs of text that were inserted in the incorrect location. This language has little to do with the priority identified. Language explaining this priority, and how Go Prince George's addresses it, was developed during preparation of the 2025 Preliminary Plan but was deleted prior to plan release.	
LI6	56-59	Transportation Planning Terms		<p>Pages 56-59 contain a detailed glossary of transportation planning terms.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Some definitions may conflict with definitions in the Prince George's County Code.</li> <li>2) Many definitions are extensive and overly technical.</li> <li>3) This glossary has an inappropriate level of citation. Individual definitions should be cited for clear cross-reference.</li> <li>4) Several terms refer to topics, tools, or concepts that were thoroughly evaluated during preparation of the Staff Draft Plan but were deleted prior to public release.</li> <li>5) This glossary defines terms that may not be used until 50-100 pages further in the plan document.</li> <li>6) This glossary breaks the flow of the plan document with pages of extremely detailed, context-free definitions.</li> </ol>	

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI7	65	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 5	Policy PR 5 states "Manage the construction of pedestrian connections to encourage safe public access in rural and scenic vistas".	Policies and supporting strategies were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's to improve pedestrian access at rural and scenic vistas but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Furthermore, "manage the construction" is not policy language nor is it appropriate language in a planning document. Appropriate policy language would establish a policy of providing safe pedestrian access to or within rural and scenic vistas, with a supporting strategy to construct specific pedestrian amenities at specific locations. Furthermore, Strategy PR 5.1 has nothing to do with Policy PR 5.
LI8	65	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility	PR 5.1	Strategy PR 5.1 states "Connect adjacent non-residential development through means other than roadside sidewalks, where feasible."	This language is confusing and fails to mention the cross-property access requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations. This language also has nothing to do with Policy PR 5.
LI9	67	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		Page 67 states "hared-use paths, dedicated bicycle lanes, equestrian facilities, and trails are key to creating a multimodal transportation network to safely move Prince Georgians through diverse neighborhoods."	This should be formatted and clearly identified as a Goal Statement. Also "shared" is not spelled correctly."  This goal also does not address the economic development potential of the County's trail network, which was the primary reason why Equestrian and Natural Surface Trails are included in Go Prince George's.

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI10	67	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		Page 67 states "Prince George's County has bikeway, shared-use path, greenway, and trail networks that spur economic development, promote active transportation and equestrian activities, and help bridge gaps in equity."	This language is adapted from the Department of Parks and Recreation's Strategic Trails Plan (2018) without context or relationship to surrounding paragraphs. Greenways are not defined until page 72.
LI11	83	Transit	TR 2  TR 3	<p>Policy TR 2 states "Improve safety through placemaking with enhanced amenities and aesthetics and functional improvements to create a sense of place at transit hubs and stations."</p> <p>Policy TR 3 states "Promote placemaking strategies and wayfinding signage programs at transit hubs and stations."</p>	<p>These policies are duplicative, and Policy TR 2 does not make sense as written. The strategies listed under Policy TR 2 do not relate to the ostensible purpose of the policy, and Policy TR 3 has no strategies. Numerous policies and strategies were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's to address transit hub, station, and stop design and function but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>An entire Wayfinding Element, including policies and strategies, was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI12	83	Transit	TR 4.1	Strategy TR 4.1 states "Design bus routes that allow safe and efficient connections to all Centers and the Innovation Corridor."	<p>This is policy language identified as a strategy. Strategy language would describe methods of bus route design and attributes of a well-designed bus route, as well as key destinations within Centers and the Innovation Corridor. Bus routes need not only connect to the Innovation Corridor, but to key destinations along US 1 and MD 193.</p> <p>Numerous policies and strategies were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's to address bus routing during preparation of the Staff Draft Plan but were but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI13	89	Micromobility		<p>Page 89 (Micromobility and Transportation Network Companies) states "Prince George's County considers Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is a process or procedure intended to reduce motor vehicle trips during specified periods of the day. This includes, but is not limited to, strategies such as car/vanpools, and improved pedestrian and bicycle access and facilities. Programs are developed by employers, chambers of commerce, and local government to encourage the use of alternative modes. A Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD) is a legally defined geographic area in which vehicle trip reduction procedures, strategies, and programs are required. TDMDs allow the County to work with employers to implement TDM and support the multimodal investments and denser, more compact land nodes"</p>	<p>An entire Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Intelligent Transportation Services (ITS) element, with an introduction, goal, policies, and strategies, was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>The relationship between TDM, Micromobility, and Transportation Network Companies is unclear from the organization and language in this introduction. Additional clarification, context, and recommendations are warranted. In addition, the last sentence of this introduction was accidentally cut off.</p>

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI14	89-90	Micromobility	MI 1  MI 4	<p>Policy MI 1 states "Expand micromobility services throughout the County in areas of need."</p> <p>Policy MI 4 states "Increase micromobility options in Prince George's County"</p>	These are duplicative and should be combined. In addition, expansion of micromobility services throughout the County, given the size and diversity of the County and the diversity of micromobility modes, is too general a topic for a single policy.
LI15	90	Micromobility	MI 6.1	Strategy MI 6.1 states "Evaluate the potential for a TDM District or Districts within Prince George's County Code. This will be achieved by facilitating a TDM Plan under the advisement of the TDM Technical Advisory Committee."	This document contains no information as to what a TDM plan is, what a TDM Technical Advisory Committee is, and does not accurately reflect that TDM Districts were evaluated in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but recommended districts were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

# IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI16	93	Complete and Green Streets	CG 1.3	<p>Strategy CG 1.3 states "Where necessary, establish agreements for ownership and maintenance of sidewalks to ensure regular upkeep and a state of good repair for sidewalks, street trees and vegetation, street furniture, trash/recycling receptacles, streetlights, and other streetscape elements."</p>	<p>This recommendation was arbitrarily carried forward verbatim from a prior study without consideration of its broad scope and countywide applicability.</p> <p>A critical element of Go Prince George's is the concept of public ownership of public rights-of-way. Private ownership of pathways for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists should always be a last resort and must always be partnered with public use easements maintained by a public entity that ensure public access to the County's transportation network.</p> <p>The footnote citation for this recommendation states that it "carries forward Street Furniture Recommendation 1 from the 2021 <i>The Village of Brandywine Sidewalk and Streetscape Improvements Study 30% Design and Engineering Report</i>, 36, and applies it countywide."</p> <p>Countywide application of this strategy requires slight rewording to acknowledge that non-public ownership of streets and sidewalks is discouraged and runs counter to the stated principles of Go Prince George's, Prince Georgians Come First.</p>

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI17	95	Complete and Green Streets	CG 6	Policy CG 6 states "Construct all new streets in the Innovation Corridor and Established Communities to the County's adopted Urban Street Design Standards."	This policy applies the Urban Street Design Standards to all new roads in Prince George's County outside of the Rural and Agricultural Area. The strategies contained within this policy lack sufficient detail and this Policy conflicts with hundreds of road recommendations elsewhere in this plan. The strategies fail to acknowledge that amendments to the County Code would be necessary to accomplish this. Every road and street in Prince George's County beyond local streets within residential subdivisions was evaluated thoroughly for possible application of the USDS, and the recommendations for UC streets were developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's; this policy was inserted into this document prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI18	95	Complete and Green Streets	CG 6.1  CG 6.2	<p>Strategy CG 6.1 states "Work with development applicants to design all internal streets in accordance with the County's adopted Urban Street Design Standards."</p> <p>Strategy CG 6.2 states "Consider constructing or reconstructing streets to the County's adopted Urban Street Design Standards, especially through new development projects."</p>	<p>Not only are these strategies repetitive, but one is definitive "work with development applicants to design all..." and the other is too weak to be used as strategy language: strategies should never recommend consideration of something the plan wants to happen. Detailed policies, strategies, and facility recommendations applying the USDS to streets outside the Regional Transit Districts and Local Centers was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan" and replaced with these unclear and duplicative strategies.</p>
LI19	96	Complete and Green Streets	CG 9.2	<p>Strategy CG 9.2 states "Coordinate plantings with the County's TreePlotter inventory."</p>	<p>This language was added to the plan following the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's and prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". The TreePlotter inventory is not defined in this document, and/or such definition was deleted. It is unclear how such actions would be coordinated and with whom.</p>

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI20	96	Complete and Green Streets	CG 12	Policy CG 12 states "Manage curb space throughout the County to best advance the vision and land use, economic prosperity, and design goals of Plan 2035."	<p>This policy is written incorrectly and confuses its topic, curb space, with the public realm, which is behind the curb. Go Prince George's contains policies and strategies that advance the vision and associated goals of Plan 2035; curbspace management does not advance land use or design goals except to the extent it supports economic prosperity. These details and nuances do not belong in a policy statement but are more appropriate in a text box. This language was inserted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>In addition, an entire Parking and Curbside Management Element was developed during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but was deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI21	97	Complete and Green Streets	CG 16	Policy CG 16 states "Accommodate parking demand by using existing parking supply more efficiently."	<p>This policy does not contain strategies, is more general than other policies on the same topic, and is so fundamental to the purpose of policies on parking and curbside management that it is unclear why it warrants its own policy with no supporting strategies.</p> <p>This policy was inserted into the "2025 Preliminary Plan" and does not bear relationship to the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's. Staff notes that an entire Element dedicated to Parking and Curbside Management was developed during the plan development process.</p>
LI22	98	Roads and Highways	RH 3	Policy RH 3 states "Improve transportation system performance through several transportation system management strategies for commuter traffic."	<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 prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". System management policies and strategies were under evaluation in the summer of 2024 but this evaluation was halted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". This policy is also duplicative of Policy RH 5. Finally, the wording of this statement appears to ignore local and regional trips, which make up a significant portion of trips in Prince George's County.</p>

## IV. Late Insertions

Insertion	Page Number	Section	P/S	Plan Language	Challenge
LI23	99	Roads and Highways	RH 8	Policy RH 8 states "Improve multimodal connectivity through strategic reconstruction of collector roads as Complete and Green Streets."	This policy is in the incorrect location, it should be in the CG element. Location-specific recommendations were identified in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
LI24	99	Roads and Highways	RH 9.1	Strategy RH 9.1 states "Identify locations for trucks to layover and stop."	This strategy belongs in the GM Element. Several locations were identified for further analysis in in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".
LI25	112	Smart Infrastructure		<p>Following the three-year collaborative three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's, a section on "Smart Infrastructure" was unilaterally inserted into this document prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan". Parallel to this action, entire sections on Parking and Curbside Management, Transportation Demand Management, and Intelligent Transportation Systems, including policies and strategies on each, were deleted. The introduction to the inserted Smart Infrastructure section describes several technologies for which there are no policies or strategies below it or other applicability to Prince George's County's transportation system.</p> <p>The introduction does not mention electric vehicles, which represent two-thirds of Policy SI 1's recommendations and confuses the installation of pedestrian signals with a technological advancement.</p>	