Countywide Master Plan of Transportation

Resolution CR-54-2009

Attachment Three

Amendment 3

[Replacement Chapter VII, Strategic Transportation Policy and Master Plan Implementation]

Chapter VII: Strategic Transportation Policy and Plan Implementation

Introduction

A significant amount of the funding for major transportation initiatives comes from federal and state programs. Even with privately funded facilities, federal and state oversight and permitting roles are significant. Since 1977, the Planning Board has applied an adequate public facilities (APF) test on a case-by-case basis to identify the transportation facilities needed to handle the traffic expected to be on the roadway system at the time development occurs. The APF test was added to the Prince George's County Code in 1981, and all new subdivided lots are required to be tested before approval by the Planning Board.

The effectiveness of the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation (MPOT) will depend on the successful implementation of the goals, policies, and strategies it recommends to support each tier, center, and corridor preferred development pattern. The plan recommends possible solutions to the most pressing transportation functional systems challenges, such as:

- Planning coordination between and within local, state and regional agencies.
- Imbalances between transportation and land use.
- Funding shortages.
- Congestion and poor air quality as a symptom of lack of sustainability.
- Transportation network problems that result in a lack of viable modal alternatives to using the single-occupancy vehicle (SOV).

A significant part of the transportation planning challenge is to remain current with the full range of land use, facility, and project policies and decisions that are made at the local, regional, and state levels that affect the operational viability of each element of the county transportation network. Capital funding and programming decisions, for example, at Metrorail stations in the county should ensure that all modes of access and mobility to and around that station—pedestrian, biker, transit and automotive—are considered and accommodated.

Transportation and Land Use

The General Plan recommends policies that seek to improve the balance between transportation and land use. Policies such as ensuring that the transportation infrastructure is balanced and makes full provision for pedestrians, bicyclists, and high-occupancy vehicles (HOV), as well as motorists, are intended to help to manage growth, particularly in the Developed and Developing Tiers and in Centers. Planning transit-oriented development (TOD) at higher densities and intensities at centers and along corridors ensures maximum utilization of that infrastructure. Adopting a comprehensive parking policy also helps create a better transportation/land use balance by equalizing or better reflecting the actual public utility costs to the county of SOV travel, compared with those of alternative modes.

Almost all consequential land use planning and zoning authority is vested in local government in all 23 counties of Maryland. Section 24-124 of the Prince George's County Code requires adequate roads before a development can be approved for construction. However, the APFO is just one of a number of growth management tools. The county's experience to date using APFO to guide, manage, and target land use indicates that APFO can conflict with other regulations and policies that are also intended to provide sufficient, timely public funding for transportation facilities. These two objectives need to be integrated,

or augmented, at both the planning and project review and approval stages, so that the policies intended to achieve facility adequacy and funding adequacy complement rather than compete with each other. Accommodating the growth and development envisioned by the General Plan may require more comprehensive transportation adequacy policies, particularly for the non-automobile modes.

POLICY 1:
The plan recommends a multimodal transportation adequacy policy to develop targeted implementation strategies to accommodate the congestion created by preferred development within a very limited and clearly defined set of transportation and land use planning conditions. Properly targeted to the specific conditions of such priority General Plan Centers, the multimodal adequacy strategy can provide flexibility in managing congestion, ensure multimodal options within each Center, and identify transportation facility and service funding strategies that balance land use and transportation. The Maryland Smart Growth Initiative already directs state assistance and road and other public facility investments to Priority Funding Areas that are designated and certified by local jurisdictions and reviewed by the state. This initiative provides some broad geographical guidelines on where new development must be located in order to benefit from state infrastructure improvements or financial assistance[1]. Multimodal transportation adequacy should be evaluated as one transportation and land use integration tool, particularly for attracting and targeting TOD at General Plan Metropolitan Centers.

Strategies:

1. Continually evaluate other planning and regulatory tools and best practices for determining the multimodal adequacy of transportation facilities and of facility funding, to accommodate development and revitalization in the Developed and Developing Tiers and priority General Plan Centers.

2. Evaluate impact fees and concurrency[2] staging as a policy for identifying funding for new infrastructure from developers as part of the multimodal adequacy strategy.

3. Examine best practices and state-of-the-art methods for determining multimodal, as opposed to automotive only, transportation system and facility adequacy. The evaluation should particularly concentrate on tools that accurately analyze the site-specific impacts on all modes of county transportation facilities and systems of projects that are consistent with the General Plan growth and development vision for Prince George's County.

    a. For the Developed Tier, the following consideration of transportation modal adequacy: (1) pedestrian and cyclist; (2) public transportation; (3) HOV; and (4) SOV.
    b. For the Developing Tier Centers, the following consideration for transportation modal adequacy: (1) multi-occupancy vehicle; (2) public transportation; (3) SOV; (4) cyclist; and (5) pedestrian.

Transportation Infrastructure Financing

Federal and State Roles
In 2009, all levels of government in the United States were failing to keep pace with the demand for transportation investment. Existing revenues were being used just to keep pace with the preservation and

[1] For example, recent General Assembly legislation (HB373) now permits localities to list transit-oriented development projects as candidates for state financial support through the Transportation Trust Fund.
[2] Concurrency is: a growth management concept intended to ensure that the necessary public facilities and services are available concurrent with the impacts of each stage of development.

maintenance of aging transportation systems. On February 26, 2009, the Final Report of the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission (NSTIFC) was presented to the President and Congress, in response to a requirement of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETY-LU). The Report was prepared to assess future federal highway and transit investment needs, evaluate the future of the federal Highway Trust Fund, and explore alternative funding and financing mechanisms for surface transportation. The entire Report is available for review at http://financecommission.dot.gov/.

The NSTIFC reviewed a wide range of issues and options and concluded that federal funding for surface transportation must be transitioned from the current indirect and increasingly ineffective user pay system of federal fuel taxes and vehicle charges to a more robust system that incorporates a more direct user pay structure. A direct user charge system can raise substantially greater revenues and is more sustainable in the long term. Further, the NSTIFC concluded that the most viable approach in the long run will be a system that is based directly on miles driven (commonly referred to as a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) fee system). This approach also will strengthen state and local governments' ability to assess charges that better capture actual costs with their own pricing systems where appropriate (e.g., based on time of day, location, vehicle weight, and fuel economy). The NSTIFC recognizes, however, that such a transition cannot be made overnight and that the immediate needs are simply too critical to wait.

A multipronged approach was recommended to meet both short-term and longer-term challenges:

- Protect and Enhance the Highway Trust Fund (HTF).
  The Highway Trust Fund has served us well and should be continued as the foundation for our user-based surface transportation funding system to ensure ongoing accountability.

- Transition to a New Revenue System.
  Recognizing the problems inherent in the current fuel tax–based system, particularly over the longer term, the NSTIFC recommends paying our way shifting to a system based on more direct user charges, using measures of miles traveled as the basis. This transition process should commence immediately and have as its goal deployment of a comprehensive new system by 2020.

- Address the Near-Term Federal Funding Crisis.
  Meanwhile, to address the immediate and critical investment gap, the NSTIFC recommends one-time increases in and indexing of existing Highway Trust Fund revenue sources. These adjustments should be made in conjunction with the upcoming reauthorization of the federal surface transportation program.

- Facilitate State and Local Investment.
  Concurrently, the federal government should put in place policies that allow and encourage state and local governments to raise additional funds from targeted user-based mechanisms such as tolling and pricing. While other funding mechanisms undoubtedly are important at the state and local level, federal policy does not generally play a significant role with those.

As background to the specific policy recommendations, the Commission arrived at a number of critical findings:

- The current federal surface transportation funding structure that relies primarily on taxes imposed on petroleum-derived vehicle fuels is not sustainable in the long term and may erode more quickly than previously thought.

- At current levels of taxation, the existing structure is unable to generate sufficient revenues to meet the federal share of demonstrated national system needs—and the gap between revenues and needs will continue to widen.

- In the current environment, where needs far outstrip resources, state and local policy makers are struggling to meet the most basic requirements for simply maintaining the existing system.

- Among the key roles the federal government can play is to offer new incentives to help state and local officials overcome friction points in using new funding approaches, including but not limited to the option to charge tolls to construct new highway capacity in metropolitan areas and other types of direct user fees to the extent that states and localities find it appropriate and effective to use those strategies to raise their non-federal shares.

- Properly structured financing techniques, including partnerships with the private sector, can provide important help by leveraging future revenue streams to meet upfront capital investment needs.

- A funding and finance framework that relies on more direct forms of user charges such as a VMT fee system is the consensus choice for the future.

The NSTIFC report is the basis for legislative initiatives for reauthorization of federal surface transportation financing that are currently being introduced and reviewed by the Congress. At the state level, MDOT is following the progress of these initiatives, but as of June 2009, it is too early to predict the state's response to the surface transportation reauthorization legislation. To the extent that federal programs require matching or in-kind participation from the state, the General Assembly will need to formulate a response in order to secure federal funding for Maryland's transportation programs.

Local Role
The 2002 General Plan includes the following objectives for public sector financing of transportation infrastructure (page 64):

- Increase public funding of transportation infrastructure in the Developed Tier.
- Increase public funding and attract and encourage more private funding of transportation infrastructure in Developing Tier Centers and Corridors.
- Encourage and increase the proportion of private sector funding of needed transportation infrastructure in the Developing and Rural Tiers outside of Centers and Corridors.

While the MPOT recommends review of the standards used for APF determinations in order to measure impacts on pedestrians, cyclists and transit as well as automobile users, APF is not, in and of itself, a financing strategy. The public sector financing role in transportation for most local jurisdictions in the United States is participative. This means that there is (or should be) a local policy guiding the allocation of transportation infrastructure financing coming from local government, in order to "steer" the funding available from all sources toward the local policy goals. The General Plan provided the basis for this policy. Given the dialogue now underway at the federal level, it will be more important than ever that Prince George's County participate in transportation financing partnerships with federal and state government, as well as with private development and financing entities, in order to secure the needed funding to support the transportation systems that the county and its communities need. If the county is successful in this regard, then the APF process will work well in meeting the county's transportation and development goals. However, if transportation financing is not addressed collaboratively, no APF or other development exaction process will be successful in meeting these goals.

The Planning Department began a study of alternative APF procedures for the General Plan centers and corridors in 2009, and this study is also examining the impact of non-local travel on the APF review process. A second study of options for financing local transportation needs is beginning in 2009.

POLICY 2:

The full range of transportation facility and systems funding mechanisms and policy options should be regularly evaluated to identify the most operationally and fiscally balanced way to fund needed transportation facilities, systems, and services, particularly those facilities and systems that accommodate development that attains the General Plan growth vision for Prince George's County.

Strategies:

1. Establish an interagency working group consisting of MDOT, DPW&T, MNCPPC and Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) to:
   a. Identify nonpublic funding for critical transportation, particularly transit and nonmotorized facilities and systems.
   b. Research and evaluate best practices used elsewhere to fund critical transportation infrastructure and services.
   c. Coordinate transportation funding initiatives with neighboring Maryland jurisdictions as well as state and regional agencies.
   d. Conduct a regular transportation funding mechanism assessment of transportation projects in the county's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the Prince George's County submission for the Maryland Department of Transportation's Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP).

Interagency Coordination

POLICY 3:

Interagency coordination is a critical component to implementing transportation projects. This coordination among the counties and regional agencies occurs as part of the development of the CTP and through the metropolitan planning process with the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board's development of its Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP). There are a number of other existing interagency and interjurisdictional mechanisms for addressing various elements of the county transportation network.

However, a key issue identified in the plan has been the best way to accommodate and manage through traffic in Prince George's County. In addition to public and policymaker comment received during the work on the plan, several master plans approved since the 1982 Master Plan of Transportation—such as the Bowie, Subregion 1 and Subregion 5 master plans—identified cross-county traffic, principally during the peak-period commute, as a major and growing concern. The baseline transportation demand analysis conducted for the plan indicates that, by 2030, through-traffic will be an even greater operational challenge for the county's transportation network. Resolution of the problems related to this challenge extends beyond Prince George's County and, to some extent, beyond Maryland.

Strategies:

Create an interjurisdictional corridor congestion management working group to include, at a minimum, Prince George's, Anne Arundel, and Charles Counties and the Maryland Department of Transportation to:

1. Identify priority congestion management corridors crossing these jurisdictions and recommending strategies for addressing the problems associated with cross-jurisdictional congestion.

2. Recommend strategies for addressing the problems associated with cross-jurisdictional congestion and intercounty through-traffic problems and needs, including, but not limited to:
   a. Traffic and operational problems related to the County Council's request for restoration of A-58 or its functional equivalent between Prince George's County and Anne Arundel County
   b. Failing levels of service (LOS) of Hanover Parkway and Cherrywood Lane and
   c. Other traffic and operational challenges associated with the buildout land use projected by the approved master plans for this part of Prince George's County.

Strategic Transportation Planning: Master Plan Monitoring and Implementation

POLICY 4:

The updated Countywide Master Plan of Transportation is likely to have a "shelf life" that exceeds a number of key operational life spans for critical parts of the county transportation infrastructure. For example, when the 1982 Master Plan of Transportation was approved, the Metrorail system was still in its operational infancy and was not facing the pressing problem of periodic maintenance and major replacement of today. Similarly, critical components of the county highway system, such as the Capital Beltway, will face a variety of capital maintenance, upkeep, and major renovation challenges before the next countywide master plan of transportation for Prince George's County is undertaken, adopted, and approved.

Perhaps more importantly, over the life of this functional master plan, master and sector plans governing the land use "base" of the county transportation network will continually be undertaken and approved, changing the attendant land uses, mixes, and densities, and where they are concentrated throughout Prince George's County. Long-term policy adjustments must also respond to county charter requirements for term limits for the County Executive and County Councilmembers, and to the property tax rate limitations that have been in place since the approval of the TRIM referendum in 1978.

Experience to date with the 2002 General Plan has highlighted the need for a continual monitoring and plan coordination process to ensure that the most operationally and fiscally important modal recommendations of the plan be regularly evaluated. At a minimum these recommendations must be checked for consistency with the latest land use planning and growth assumptions and policies reflected in future master plans as they are updated. Further, for the General Plan vision for the county to be achieved, development project review and approval procedures must work in consonance with an effective means of ensuring both facility and funding adequacy within the county transportation network.

Strategies:

1. Create a strategic transportation planning implementation and review process to:
   a. Review the transportation recommendations of master (land use) plans, particularly in General Plan centers and corridors, for consistency with and impacts on the modal recommendations of MPOT.
   b. Periodically review and report to the Planning Board and County Council on the MPOT modal recommendations for their continued consistency with, and ability to accommodate,

the overall growth and development vision for Prince George's County as reflected in the current and subsequent updates to or amendments of the General Plan.

c. Monitor and coordinate implementation of the specific systems, facilities, and modal recommendations of MPOT and corresponding transportation—particularly fixed guideway transit and pedestrian mobility—recommendations of master plans.
d. Review the planning, project programming, and regulatory relationships between county, state, regional, and federal agencies that affect the implementation of the recommendations contained in this functional master plan.
e. Conduct a continual best practices review of transportation systems, facilities, and service innovations that would improve the transportation/land use connection and help achieve county growth, development, and revitalization goals and policies.
f. 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:
    i. Identification of potential transportation facility/development conflicts early in the development review process (or sooner, if possible).
    ii. Coordination with developer applicants and property owners to identify corridor preservation strategies that can be implemented concurrently with the development.
    iii. Obtaining dedications of right-of-way where improvements along existing road frontage are needed.
    iv. 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.
    v. Recommending dedications of rights-of-way for facilities on new alignments through Road Ordinance agreements as an alternative to reservation.
    vi. 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.

g. Apply the criteria in the "*Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*" (with recommended revisions) to the review of development applications. All locations within a transit-supportive development should be within a ten-minute walk (1,500 feet) of a transit stop or a street or roadway designed to primary residential standards or higher.

h. Review street and road design standards, regulations and guidelines with both county and state operating agencies, to ensure continual consideration of pedestrian mobility and safety requirements, particularly in the Developed and Developing Tiers, and within and near General Plan Centers and corridors.

Transit-Oriented Development

Transit-oriented development represents an opportunity to increase transit use, reduce automobile trips and vehicle miles traveled, and implement the General Plan vision for growth and quality development at Centers with Metrorail stations. Although the defining characteristics of successful TOD are very site-specific, they almost all embody a number of underlying working premises:

- Density: Concentrating residential, employment, shopping, and recreational land uses makes them more easily accessible by transit, walking, and biking and has more than doubled transit use in successful TOD projects.

- Diversity: Creating a mix of complementary land uses in closer proximity to one another and to transit-as is the goal of Maryland's Live Where You Work Program-eliminates automobile, especially single-occupant vehicle (SOV), trips.

- Design: Transit-supportive design is critical to the placemaking that establishes a connection between land use, transit, and other nonmotorized travel modes in a way that will make each of these modes more attractive and efficient for a wider range of trips. Successful TOD projects elsewhere in the metropolitan area and the nation have illustrated that policies that encourage transit-supportive density and diversity will not matter unless the TOD project is well designed.

The three types of General Plan Centers in Prince George's County vary in character. Slightly more than half (17 of 26) are also rail transit stations that are or can be served by comparatively extensive feeder bus service to other areas of the county.

- Metropolitan Centers such as Branch Avenue, College Park-University of Maryland, Greenbelt, or New Carrollton are multimodal transit centers that serve a higher volume of commuters than other Centers. They are envisioned as having a high enough density and intensity of land use and economic activities to enable them to become both major transit centers and "destination places" characterized by quality employment, commercial and retail development. Metropolitan Centers are also envisioned as including higher density residential development in or near their transit facilities. These locations offer direct travel by Metrorail, and often other modes besides the automobile, to the other activity centers throughout the Washington region.

- Regional Centers, such as Naylor Road, Prince George's Plaza, Oxon Hill, or Westphalia may already have Metrorail or MARC stations or bus service, or may have the potential to become a transit center. These centers are envisioned as regionally marketed commercial, retail, office, or institutional development that principally serves other parts of the county. These locations offer direct connections to Metrorail via the Purple Line or other transit service, such as Metrobus and TheBus.

- Community Centers, such as the West Hyattsville Metro are or have the potential to be focal points for transit service or park-and-ride facilities. They tend to have a concentration of land uses that serve the surrounding community and can include mixed-use and higher-intensity redevelopment that serve the locality.

As of the preparation of this plan, studies or plans for eleven of the General Plan Centers with Metrorail stations have been completed:

- Addison Road
- Capitol Heights
- Cheverly
- College Park-University of Maryland (Approved in 1997)
- Greenbelt
- Largo Town Center
- Morgan Boulevard
- Naylor Road
- Suitland

Background

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) was created by a 1966 interstate compact between Maryland, the District of Columbia and Virginia to plan, build and operate a regionwide rail system that eventually served a 1,500-square-mile area with a population of 3.5 million. Approximately 16 percent of Metrorail's mileage and stations are located in Prince George's County, and one of every five Metrorail riders boards a train in Prince George's County. The Metrorail system has a regional bus counterpart, Metrobus, which operates 34 routes in the county and transports over 66,000 passengers daily. Metrobus complements the county bus transit system, TheBus, operated by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), which provides community circulator and rail station feeder service on 24 routes that carry over 16,200 passengers daily[3].

Metrorail service in Prince George's County expanded over a 26 year period. The initial Orange Line segment opened to the public in 1978. The Blue Line opened to Addison Road in 1980 and the northern Green Line opened to Greenbelt in 1993. The southern Green Line extension to Branch Avenue opened in 2001 and marked the completion of Metrorail's adopted regional system of 103 miles and included 83 stations. Metrorail's first extension of the Blue Line to Largo Town Center in 2004 occurred in Prince George's County. Additionally, the Maryland Department of Transportation proposes to open the initial Purple Line segment from New Carrollton to Bethesda to the public in 2017.

Although past evidence suggests that TOD can be most effectively attracted by either light or heavy rail transit, the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) is evaluating the feasibility of bus rapid transit (BRT) in several transit corridors in the county, particularly on MD 5 from Branch Avenue Metrorail Station to Charles County. BRT is a lower-cost alternative that operates on dedicated rights-of-way at frequencies that can approximate light rail service. Usually BRT is treated as a precursor to light rail and is introduced in corridors where ridership that can create TOD opportunities is building to levels that can sustain light rail. (See the *Technical Bulletin to the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*.)

As a market-driven feature of the first tier of suburban communities close to Washington, D.C., TOD is not new to Prince George's County. For example, in the early 1900s the urban streetcar lines of the Capitol Traction (later D.C. Transit) Company served what were then sparsely developed residential areas of the county such as Brentwood, Capitol Heights, Mount Rainier, and Suitland. In so doing, they provided the early transit corridors that attracted some of the first wave of suburban development.

Challenges and Opportunities

There are a number of opportunities to attract quality TOD to Prince George's County. Fourteen of the 15 Metrorail stations in the county are located in the Developed Tier, which is the most densely developed part of the county. At least nine of these 15 station have ridership levels that have not yet exceeded station boarding capacity. This indicates that Prince George's County's segment of Metrorail could absorb enough of Metrorail's remaining ridership demand, to create the potential to attract more quality TOD. Furthermore, current planning for the Purple Line will provide opportunities to apply many lessons learned during Metrorail construction, and elsewhere in the country, about integrating transit system design with land use planning.

Transit-oriented development planning, on the foundation of the existing Metrorail and MARC rail-transit system in Prince George's County, will require overcoming some challenges. In Prince George's

[3] Source: Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation and Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority.

County, a number of Metrorail Green and Orange Line stations were constructed in or along intercity railroad rights-of-way. This reduced construction costs but produced what might be considered a "TOD retrofit" challenge. As a consequence many of these station sites are somewhat isolated from surrounding communities and the adjoining land uses that might otherwise be redeveloped to attract, or at least complement, TOD.

Further, all but one of the county's 15 Metrorail stations are in the Developed Tier, which contains most of the mature, built-up communities in Prince George's County. This will mean attracting quality transit-oriented redevelopment, particularly small area infill, in this part of the county. That, in turn, will require planning, designing, and siting transit-oriented redevelopment such that it is integrated into existing communities that otherwise may not require—or even want—comprehensive or massive redevelopment.

POLICY 1:

Provide for a transit system that supports the General Plan development pattern in the Developed and Developing Tiers and within each General Plan center and corridor.

Strategies:

1. Coordinate with the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation(DPW&T), the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) to create an urban-scale, integrated rail and bus transit network for the Developed Tier, to take maximum operational advantage of all Metrorail and MARC commuter rail stations in that tier.

2. Develop a comprehensive development-oriented transit strategy for the Developed Tier that ensures the planning, design, and operation of transit facilities that can be integrated as much as possible with mixed use, higher density, TOD within safe, all-weather walking distances of Metrorail and MARC stations.

3. Coordinate creation of a comprehensive bus transit network in the Developing Tier that reflects and builds on the operational priorities of the TSOP and capitalizes on opportunities for modal integration (particularly pedestrian, bicycle, and feeder bus) at General Plan Centers and Corridors in the Developing Tier.

4. Ensure that future development projects in the Developing Tier include street and road cross-sections that are compatible with transit bus operations and requirements, particularly within and near Developing Tier Centers and Corridors.

5. Develop a comprehensive development-oriented transit strategy for Developing Tier centers and corridors that integrates future planning, design, and operation of transit facilities with TOD, particularly mixed use, higher density development within safe all-weather walking distances of the Metrorail, the Purple Line, MARC, and other fixed guideway transit stations in the Developing Tier.

6. Fully apply the concepts, guidance, and principles of the *Strategic Framework for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) in Prince George's County* at all Metrorail and identified MARC stations in Prince George's County, to include:

    - An organizational vehicle for TOD planning, coordination and implementation with the Department of Public Works and Transportation, the Maryland Department of Transportation, and the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority.

- A process for identifying and recommending TOD priority sites in Prince George's County.

THE PUBLIC POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR **TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT**
The decisions of developers and lenders to provide the private capital and resources required for successful TOD projects are primarily market based. They are not necessarily based on what is best for supporting transit service, reducing auto dependence, or community building. Developers and lenders are looking for:

1. Certainty with a low, or at least acceptable, level of risk: Even some developers who have successfully constructed mixed-use development may not feel that the effort required is worth the return.

2. Simple, predictable real estate investments: Mixed-use, infill and TOD and redevelopment in urban areas may be more difficult to achieve than conventional single-use development.

3. Easy financing and approval processes: Developers and lenders are looking for predictability and certainty in TOD projects in Prince George's County. They have been more active in other parts of the metropolitan area than in Prince George's County because they perceive that single-use, automobile-oriented projects can be approved and financed more competitively than TOD.

POLICY 1:
General Plan policies provide a basis for considerable transit-oriented development opportunities around the county's Metrorail and MARC stations. To achieve the General Plan goals and objectives for TOD, this plan recommends a number of TOD-supportive government planning and implementation strategies:

Strategies:
1. Community Outreach: Undertake a continual and broad-ranging community outreach program to:
   a. Educate citizens, local officials, and property and business owners about TOD's role in realizing the General Plan vision for Prince George's County.
   b. Market the county's TOD potential to the development community.
   c. Engage civic and community associations in affected neighborhoods in discussions and review, as specific TOD proposals are developed for each station area.

2. TOD Planning: As part of the strategic transportation planning process recommended above in this chapter, establish a TOD planning sequence to:
   a. Periodically review the status of TOD planning in the county.
   b. Conduct and update evaluations of the TOD potential of each station area.
   c. Prepare development concepts for the priority sites.
   d. Prepare development strategies that define each site's final TOD vision.
   e. Undertake a project implementation program to secure developer commitments to each priority TOD site.
   f. Regularly evaluate each project's progress.

3. Development Regulations: Revise development regulations as follows:
   a. Evaluate options to update county development regulations and other regulations that affect TOD in the county.
   b. Examine ways to simplify ("green tape") the application, review, and permit processes for those projects that are consistent with General Plan guidelines and goals for development at centers.
   c. Develop a procedure for expeditiously changing the zoning of strategic properties on station area sites that are priority TOD projects.

4. Land and Site Assembly: Investigate strategies for land assembly, including the feasibility of using the eminent domain powers of the Redevelopment Authority or the county. Funding sources for land acquisition should be identified. Other potential tools that should be evaluated include density and intensity bonuses, land cost write-downs, or other incentives to help transit-oriented developers assemble properties.

5. Incentives: Investigate the applicability and feasibility of incentives to attract and encourage TOD, such as:
   a. The county should inventory all programs and funding sources that can be used to encourage quality TOD for each station.
   b. The county should ensure that infrastructure funding is phased and targeted to provide needed facilities such as street improvements, sidewalks, parks, and libraries.
   c. The county should investigate funding alternatives for needed improvements within TOD areas. The use of infrastructure financing districts or tax increment finance districts should be considered.

6. Evaluate the following TOD best practices for their applicability in Prince George's County:
   a. Study the market and be prepared to "sell" TOD early and often.
   b. Clearly define the TOD desired. Be very sensitive to the particular characteristics and opportunities of each individual site.
   c. Be willing to wait. Be willing to "front" some of the investment needed to attract TOD.
   d. Review proposed TOD sites for opportunities for vertically, as well as horizontally, mixed uses.
   e. Examine and require developers to propose innovative parking management that achieve transit-supportive densities.
   f. Ensure community involvement and "buy-in," which is essential if TOD projects are to successfully incorporate density increases.
   g. Streamline ("green tape") the regulatory review and permitting procedures for TOD projects.
   h. Continually review zoning and other county land use, growth, and development controls for consistency with the ultimate vision for the entire project.
   i. If proposed TOD projects are intended to help break Prince George's County out of a market niche, ensure that that is one of the principal goals of that TOD from the outset of the project.
   j. Develop lead site assembly procedures, which are often the most significant single public sector commitment to make a TOD project worth the risk to developers and investors.
   k. Ensure consistency and complementarity in the role that the local redevelopment agency plays in attracting TOD projects.