

**Staff Analysis of Testimony**  
**2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation**  
**Proposed Minor Amendment**  
**September 12, 2023, Public Hearing Record**

**Table of Contents**

I	Introduction			
II	Analysis of Testimony	A	General Testimony	
III	List of Speakers			
IV	List of Exhibits			

**I. Introduction**

**Purpose of the Analysis of Testimony and Process**

This analysis of testimony is intended to identify areas where staff recommend the Planning Board amend the Minor Amendment in its resolutions of adoption and endorsement in response to issues raised in public testimony. Analysis of testimony on a master/sector plan or SMA does not, and is not intended to, do the following:

- Provide a point-by-point analysis of all issues raised in public testimony.
- Calculate, quantify, or determine public or community sentiment based on the amount of testimony received and/or the amount/percentage of testimony received in favor of, or opposed to, a particular course of action.

Following the Planning Board’s work session on this analysis of testimony, the Planning Board may adopt, adopt with amendments, deny, or remand (to staff) the Minor Amendment. Once adopted, the Planning Board then transmits the Minor Amendment to the District Council. The District Council may review the adopted Minor Amendment in a work session and then determine whether to approve them, approve them with amendments based on the record, deny the plan, remand one or both of them to the Planning Board for further analysis, or propose amendments to the plan not based on information contained in the record of public testimony. If the District Council proposes amendments to the minor plan amendment that are not based on information in the record of public testimony, a second Joint Public Hearing of the District Council and Planning Board must be held on those amendments only.

**Staff Recommended Actions**

At the direction of the Planning Board, recommendations in this analysis will be incorporated into the Planning Board’s Resolution of Adoption, and will include, as an attachment, an Errata Sheet containing corrections and clarifications.

This report analyzes 2 exhibits and 2 pages of transcribed oral testimony (representing 2 speakers) from the Joint Public Hearing on the Minor Amendment to the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* held on September 12, 2023, and 1 exhibit and 1 page of written testimony submitted before the close of public record on September 27, 2023. Copies of the transcript and all exhibits submitted before the close of public record are included as attachments. Following a review of the exhibits and oral testimony, Planning Department staff analyzed the issues raised in the testimony, offers the Department’s response and several recommendations for changes to the text and maps of the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*, as amendments, in response to testimony.

This analysis is organized as follows:

Within each Section, the following is provided:

# I. Introduction

Issue No.	Summary of Issues	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross References	Exhibit/Speaker #	Staff Recommendation	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
<b>Topic</b>							
Serial number	Summary of issues raised in testimony	Staff analysis of testimony (including a summary of how the staff draft sector plan or proposed SMA addresses the issue raised)	References to Specific Plan Policies/Strategies or Page Numbers	List of exhibits/speakers providing testimony on this topic	Staff recommendation to Planning Board (if any)	Planning Board Action (completed after adoption)	District Council Action (completed after approval)

Within the testimony analysis, the following symbols are used:

Underline indicates language added to the minor amendment.

[Bracket] indicates language deleted from the minor amendment.

## Acronym Guide

CR-26-2014	Council Resolution 26-2014		CR-72-2023	Council Resolution 72-2023	
CTP	Consolidated Transportation Program		D&E	Development & Evaluation	
F-6	Freeway-6 (referring to Maryland State Highway 4)		F-10	Freeway-10 (referring to future US 301 Highway)	
FY	Fiscal Year		ROW	Right(s)-of-Way	
SHA	State Highway Administration		US	United States Highway	

## II. Analysis of Testimony – A. General Testimony

### Testimony in General Support of the Minor Plan Amendment to the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation

All speakers and exhibits expressed support for the minor amendment.

### Testimony in General Opposition to the Minor Plan Amendment to the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation

There was no testimony submitted in opposition to the minor amendment.

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
<b>SUPPORT FOR SECTOR PLAN</b>							
A1	Speaker notes that the master planned F-10 project cannot occur due to the previously approved removal of parcels from ROW preservation in CR-26-2014.	CR-26-2014, which instructed the removal of the two tracts north of the F-6/F-10 interchange from ROW preservation, does not impact the tracts to the south, nor does it directly impact the viability of constructing the F-10 project. However, the removal of the parcels from ROW preservation in CR-26-2014 and CR-72-2023 may indicate a need to redesign the interchange at hand.	Plan-wide	V1 – Robert Antonetti	No change to minor amendment.		
A2	Speaker notes the F-10 project is not within the State Highway Administration 7-year CTP, has not been within a CTP in a while, and is actually proposed in the most recent draft to be removed from the CTP.	Staff acknowledges that SHA has not allocated funding for F-10 since at least 2009. In their most recent CTP Draft for FY 2024-2029, a study of the US 301 Corridor from the Potomac River to US 50, which includes the F-10 section, is expected to be removed from their D&E Program, the justification of which being it’s an “Older corridor-level project in need of reevaluation.” (Page A-4).  Nevertheless, F-10 remains an integral transportation facility in the 2009 <i>Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation</i> and has continued to be an important facility in many subsequent master and sector plans by the County, most recently the <i>2022 Bowie-Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan</i> .	Plan-wide	V1 – Robert Antonetti	No change to minor amendment.		
A3	Speaker acclaims the benefits of the Bob Hall distribution company to Prince George’s County, including its longevity, its treatment of employees, charity work and participation in local communities and organizations. The speaker also indicates the Master Plan of Transportation “impedes” the company’s ability to grow and stay at their current location, unless their property were to be removed from right-of-way preservation.	No comment.	Plan-wide	V2/3 – Daniel Hoose	No change to minor amendment.		

### III. List of Speakers

Verbal Testimony #	Speaker Signup #	Name	Title	On Behalf Of
V1	1.	Robert Antonetti	Attorney, Shipley and Horn	Bob Hall, LLC
V2	2.	Daniel Hoose	General Manager, Bob Hall, LLC	Bob Hall, LLC

#### IV. List of Exhibits

Exhibit No.	Item Description	Received From	Date
1.	Resolution of Initiation (CR-072-2023) and -Proposed Minor Plan Amendment to the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation	M-NCPPC	8/29/2023
2.	<i>2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation</i>	M-NCPPC	8/29/2023
3.	Summary of verbal testimony in support of the proposed minor amendment (Speaker number two),	Daniel Hoose (V2/3)	9/12/2023

