

**Attachment B: Errata and Technical Corrections**

**Staff Draft Go Prince George’s**

**Spring 2026 Planning Board Worksession (Date TBD)**

**Table of Contents**

I	Introduction		1	
II	New Information		3	
III	Errata and Technical Corrections	B	Typographical, Grammar, or Sentence Structure Errors	9
		C	Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location	10
		D	Errors in MPOT Table	22
		E	Adherence to Planning Department and Master Plan Protocols	23
		F	Clarifications	25
		G	Corrections of Factual Errors	34

This document identifies errors, corrections, clarifications, and new information identified by staff prior to the March 24, 2026 Joint Public Hearing but for which staff is unable to identify a resolution by February 27, 2026.

These will be identified and resolved for incorporation in the Planning Board’s Resolution of Adoption.

# I. Introduction

Within each Section, the following is provided:

<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Page Number</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>P/S</b>	<b>Issue/Error</b>	<b>Correction</b>
Revision number	Page number or range PW – Plan-wide	Section of plan	Policy or Strategy Number	Description of the error or location where clarification is warranted, or where new information exists that was not available in the Fall of 2024 when this document was finalized.	Pending further analysis

## II. New Information

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

**Table 2: New Information**

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
NI27		Plan-wide	SH 9	<p>Policy SH 9 (page 109) states "Invest in infrastructure to support expansion of heritage and historical tourism in the Anacostia Trails Heritage Area (ATHA)."</p> <p>In March 2025, the County Council adopted CR-38-2025 and, in May 2025, the Maryland Heritage Areas Authority adopted an expansion of ATHA to cover the entirety of Prince George's County. This necessitates revisiting of all policies and strategies in Go Prince George's to identify opportunities to advance ATHA's mission while updating policies and strategies that may have been previously limited to ATHA's former geographic boundary. (Source: Anacostia Trails Heritage Area, "Heritage Area Expansion Leads to Increased Cultural Tourism Investment in Prince George’s County, MD," July 21, 2025, accessed online February 18, 2026 at <a href="https://anacostiatrials.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Press-Release-ATHA-Heritage-Area-Countywide-Expansion-And-Cultural-Tourism-Grants-7-21-25.pdf">https://anacostiatrials.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Press-Release-ATHA-Heritage-Area-Countywide-Expansion-And-Cultural-Tourism-Grants-7-21-25.pdf</a>)</p>	
NI28		Plan-wide		In February 2025, the Maryland Department of Transportation issued the "MDOT Complete Streets Implementation Plan."	
NI29		Plan-wide		The "2025 Preliminary Plan" was released in February 2025. The Prince George's County Transit Vision Plan was adopted by the County Council on May 13, 2025.	

## II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
NI30		Plan-wide		Several master plan roadway recommendations identified in the 2026 Staff Draft Central Avenue-Blue/Silver Line Sector Plan were missing from the Go Prince George's recommendation tables	
NI31	24	Growing and traveling sustainably		<p>Page 24 (Growing and traveling sustainably) states "Prince George's County can enhance its transportation facilities with a focus on advancing green infrastructure and green streets. The County and its partners must work to construct the next generation of major transportation projects. They include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensions of Metrorail and other fixed-guideway transit services,</li> <li>• Capacity enhancements on interstates, where feasible,</li> <li>• Interchange upgrades, and</li> <li>• Conducting planning, preliminary engineering, and final design for these facilities.</li> </ul> <p>Additional edits are required to tie the infrastructure investments identified here with the purpose of this section (sustainability).</p> <p>Recommendations to implement these bullets were developed during preparation of the 2024 Preliminary Plan but erroneously deleted prior to plan release.</p> <p>In addition, during development of Go Prince George's, WMATA was studying potential extensions of Metrorail, including one to National Harbor via Forest Heights. In 2025, following release of the Preliminary Plan, WMATA decided to not advance any proposed extensions into Prince George's County.</p>	

## II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
NI32	28	Where we work		Figure 2. Major Employers in Prince George's County, requires updating to reflect current data.	
NI33	86	Transit	TR 11	<p>Policy TR 11 states "Expand the quality, frequency, and geographic footprint of local bus services in Prince George's County." The strategies identified within Policy TR 11 are all variations of "implement WMATA's Better Bus Network" and "implement all recommendations of Prince George's County's 2025 Transit Vision Plan."</p> <p>Each strategy under Policy TR 11 is, in itself, a policy statement erroneously identified as a strategy, with supporting strategies explaining how and where to expand bus service in Prince George's County having been developed during preparation of the Staff Draft Plan but deleted prior to its public release. A map showing where future high-capacity transit services are recommended is missing. This is a critical error, because identification of transit corridors on a master plan of transportation is a key first step in securing State or Federal funding for a project, and also permits the Planning Board to require dedication or reservation of rights-of-way.</p>	
NI34	88	Micromobility		<p>Page 88 (Micromobility and Transportation Network Companies) states "In 2024, Capital Bikeshare was the region's leading bikeshare provider, with stations throughout the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. There were 34 Capital Bikeshare stations in Prince George's County and 5 additional stations within 2 blocks of the County border as of December 2024."</p> <p>Update information to reflect the current number of stations.</p>	

## II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
NI35	92	Complete and Green Streets		The footnote on Page 92 should be updated to reflect information and events occurring since July 2024.	
NI36	95	Complete and Green Streets	CG 6.4	Strategy CG 6.4 states "Incorporate the recommendations of the 2024 <i>Carole Highlands Safe Mobility Study</i> ." This suggests that all recommendations identified as part of this study should be carried forward. This study was published too late for its recommendations to be incorporated in the "2025 Preliminary Plan"	
NI37	96	Complete and Green Streets	CG 9	<p>Policy CG 9 states "Ensure that all sidewalks in Prince George’s County are shaded by native, well-maintained street trees, where feasible."</p> <p>In addition to use of "ensure", the use of the phrase "where feasible" suggests infeasibility without defining it. The policy is missing explanatory text that could describe to a plan user what the plan considers as feasible, along with strategies to address areas with insufficient street trees and how they may be accommodated. Since the release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan" , the County Council adopted a new Woodland Conservation Ordinance; this policy should be re-evaluated in the context of the new requirements and best practices.</p>	

## II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
NI38	100	Special Roadways and County Heritage		<p>Page 100 (Special Roadways and County Heritage) states "Prince George's County contains the Anacostia Trails Heritage Area and portions of the Southern Maryland State and National Heritage Area."</p> <p>Since the "2025 Preliminary Plan" was released, the Anacostia Trails Heritage Area was expanded to all of Prince George's County. Additional policies and strategies are required to accommodate this expansion.</p>	
NI39	105	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 9.3	<p>Strategy SH 9.3 states "Add amenities to the ATHA trails system, nearby communities, and points of interest to connect visitors, residents, and other interested parties to the amenities within ATHA. Improvements can include trailhead parking areas, restrooms, bicycle racks and lockers, drinking fountains, and public art. Interpretive panels and signs explaining the natural and historic features should be installed at appropriate points."</p> <p>As ATHA is now a countywide entity, additional information is required.</p>	
NI40	127	Street Recommendations		The classification type for the U-218 segment of MD 450 (Annapolis Road) should match what is recommended in the 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Sector Plan.	
NI41	135	Street Recommendations		The classification type and multimodal facilities for UM-255 (MD 201 (Kenilworth Avenue)) should match what is recommended in the 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Sector Plan	

## II. New Information

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
NI42	149	Street Recommend- ations		The classification type and multimodal facilities for RES-219 (Tilden Street) should match what is recommended in the 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Sector Plan	
NI43	149	Street Recommend- ations		The classification, multimodal facilities for RES-221 (54th Place/55th Avenue) should match what is recommended in the 2026 Staff Draft Port Towns Sector Plan	

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

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction
B8	93	Complete and Green Streets	CG 1	<p>Policy CG 1 states "Pursuant to the Prince George's County Code and the Functional Classifications and Street Typologies, update roadway improvements as specified."</p> <p>This sentence is unclear as written. The Functional Classifications and Street Typologies are consistent with the Prince George's County Code. The primary purpose of a countywide functional master plan of transportation is to identify the type of roadways, streets, and other facilities that should be constructed. Road improvements are not "updated", they are constructed. This statement is not worded as a policy. The purpose of the CG Element is to construct complete streets in appropriate locations throughout the County: the first policy in this section should reflect that purpose.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
C17	15	Our Values		<p>Page 15 (Our Values) states "Prince Georgians Come First: An interconnected transportation network will connect Prince Georgians to places of interest and diverse communities." This sentence does not relate to the value statement "Prince Georgians Come First" and was erroneously inserted in this section.</p> <p>Additional time is necessary to determine the appropriate location for this statement.</p>	
C18	15	Our Values		<p>Page 15 (Our Values) states "Sustainable infrastructure will minimize the impact on the environment. Hosting a variety of non-vehicular options, including a robust transit system, bicycle, micromobility, and other active transportation will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Every Prince Georgian should live within 15 minutes of the region's transit or park-and-ride lots. Access to the robust trails, pathways, and award-winning parks further supports sustainability for our natural resources."</p> <p>This language contains several sentences that do not relate to each other and to how Go Prince George's prioritizes sustainability. A description of this value statement was crafted during development of the Staff Draft Plan but deleted and replaced with this language prior to its public release. Additional time is necessary to determine the appropriate language and location for this statement.</p>	
C19	21	Enhancing multi-agency coordination		<p>Page 21 (Enhancing multi-agency coordination) contains two paragraphs of text that were erroneously inserted in the incorrect location. This language has little to do with the priority identified.</p> <p>Additional time is necessary to determine the appropriate location for these statements.</p>	

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
C20	24	Growing and traveling sustainably		<p>Page 24 (Growing and traveling sustainably) states "Prince George's County can enhance its transportation facilities with a focus on advancing green infrastructure and green streets. The County and its partners must work to construct the next generation of major transportation projects. They include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensions of Metrorail and other fixed-guideway transit services,</li> <li>• Capacity enhancements on interstates, where feasible,</li> <li>• Interchange upgrades, and</li> <li>• Conducting planning, preliminary engineering, and final design for these facilities.</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations to implement these bullets were developed during preparation of the 2025 Preliminary Plan but erroneously deleted prior to plan release.</p> <p>In addition, during development of Go Prince George's, WMATA was studying potential extensions of Metrorail, including one to National Harbor via Forest Heights. In 2025, following release of the Preliminary Plan, WMATA decided to not advance any proposed extensions into Prince George's County.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
C21	44	Transit		<p>Page 44 (Transit) states "Prince George's County has unparalleled access to the regional and national transportation network, a key asset that positions the County for economic and cultural dominance over the next 25 years."</p> <p>This is an important statement that was erroneously moved from the front of the plan to page 44. This statement should go in the plan's introduction, with a descriptive sentence specific to rail transit on page 44.</p> <p>Additional time is necessary to determine the appropriate location for these statements.</p>	
C22	88	Micromobility		<p>Page 88 (Micromobility and Transportation Network Companies) states "With advancements in technology and lowering costs, electric bicycles are growing in popularity. These bicycles, which provide motorized assistance to pedaling, allow for higher-speed bicycling and assist riders in climbing hills or combating fatigue. These vehicles have introduced bicycling to many people who otherwise would not ride and have improved food and small package delivery in many neighborhoods."</p> <p>This language belongs in the BK element, in a callout box. Additional time is necessary to determine the appropriate solution for this error.</p>	

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
C23	84	Transit		<p>Footnote 8 on page 84 states "Strategy TR 4.4 amends the 2009 Approved Marlboro Pike Sector Plan, Transit Policy 1, Strategy 3, by deleting a recommendation in the sector plan to create this park-and-ride by relocating the existing park-and-ride lot at Penn-Mar Shopping Center. The Penn-Mar Park-and-Ride should remain in service." Strategy TR 4.4 was erroneously deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>Additional time is necessary to determine the appropriate solution for this error.</p>	
C24	89	Micromobility	MI 1.1	<p>Strategy MI 1.1 states "Reduce conflicts between pedestrians, micromobility users, and bicyclists."</p> <p>This is a policy that warrants multiple strategies, including Strategy MI 1.3, which states "Establish a speed threshold by which micromobility vehicles may use the sidewalk in substitution for using a street." However, Strategies MI 1.1 and MI 1.3:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Have nothing to do with Policy MI 1. These are best suited under a Policy that addresses micromobility safety.</li> <li>2) Conflict with each other</li> </ol> <p>Policies and strategies addressing expansion of micromobility services and micromobility safety were developed in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p>	

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification	
C25	90	Micromobility	MI 4.2	Strategy MI 4.2 is duplicative of Strategy MI 1.2  Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.		
C26	90	Micromobility	MI 4.3	Strategy MI 4.3 belongs under Policy MI 5 and is duplicative of Policy MI 5.  Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.		
C27	90	Micromobility	MI 5	Policy MI 5 was inserted erroneously into the 2025 "Preliminary Plan" prior to its final release. It references Transportation Demand Management Strategies without any advance context. Such strategies were drafted in collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.		
C28	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 collaboration with partner agencies and stakeholders during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but were unilaterally and erroneously deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.		
C29	<i>Reserved</i>					

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
C30	105	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 8.3	<p>Strategy SH 8.3 states "Trail connections within this corridor should be accommodated on public parkland and within public road rights-of-way where feasible. Notwithstanding this, trail easements are still necessary for the preservation of equestrian trails in the Rural and Agricultural Area."</p> <p>1. These are two separate strategies. 2. Recommendations for trail easements apply to the entire Rural and Agricultural Area and should be moved elsewhere in the plan and cross-referenced in this strategy.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	
C31	115	Sustainability		<p>Page 115 (Sustainability) states "Develop a Prince George's County transportation and mobility network that is environmentally sustainable, with minimal net impact on the natural environment."</p> <p>This statement was inserted into this section to serve as a goal statement but is not formatted as a goal nor does it read as a goal.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	
C32	<i>Reserved</i>				

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
C33	118, 246	Sustainability  Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Pages 118 and 246 contains a photograph of Guilford Drive in its current state, a two lane primary road with a substandard sidewalk on the east side and no sidewalk on the west side. The plan recommends a complete re-construction of this street segment to the County's Adopted Urban Street Design Standards. A more appropriate photo may better tell the story of the applicable element of the plan.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	
C34	122- 198	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		<p>Tables 5-13 contain a column entitled "Master/Sector Plan". This column is intended to show any recommendations carried forward from prior plans. It is formatted across tables inconsistency and unclearly.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	
C35	<i>Reserved</i>				
C36	253	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Page 253 (Complete Streets) states " Regularly evaluate transportation design standards and regulations to determine whether the standards and/or regulations contribute to unsafe conditions for any user of the facility subject to the standard (whether the user is intended, occasional, or accidental)."</p> <p>Additional time is necessary to determine the appropriate location for this recommendation.</p>	

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
C37	253	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>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.</p> <p>This recommendation is overly broad and recommends something that already occurs. Additional time is necessary to determine the appropriate location for this recommendation.</p>	
C38	253	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>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.</p> <p>Additional time is necessary to determine the appropriate location for this recommendation.</p>	

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
C39	254	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states " Evaluate areas identified in previous plans or studies for recommended pedestrian connections to determine feasible locations and design of sidewalks. Prior planning efforts recommended constructing sidewalks in these communities but did not identify specific street segments or blocks. Specific locations would be identified through further study. These recommendations amend the applicable area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans in these areas."</p> <p>This language was inserted in error. Areas identified in previous plans or studies for recommended pedestrian connections were a) evaluated as part of those plans or studies and/or b) recommended for further evaluation through those plans and studies.</p> <p>These recommendations were carried forward during the three-year process to prepare the Staff Draft of Go Prince George's initiated by, and pursuant to, CR-79-2021 but were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>In addition, the final statement of this paragraph states that "these recommendations amend the applicable area master plans, sector plans, and transit district development plans in these areas." It is unclear to which recommendations this statement refer: does this sentence amend previously approved plans that recommended specific improvements or would the results of future studies automatically amend the applicable master, sector, or transit district development plan (which is not permitted through the Zoning Ordinance)?</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
C40	254	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Page 254 (Plan 2035 and Zoning Updates) states " Continue to implement the County’s Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP), promoting and maintaining the safety and livability of the County’s residential neighborhoods. The NTMP provides a process for identifying, evaluating, and addressing undesirable traffic conditions related to speed and excessive volumes. Residents, elected officials, or neighborhood associations may request a traffic study for a particular area under this program. Study outcomes may include recommendations for traffic-calming devices.”</p> <p>This is a strategy and information combined. Additional time is required to identify the appropriate resolution of this error.</p>	
C41	255	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Page 255 (Sustainability) states " Review and amend the County Code, Road Code, and/or Standards to ensure that new roadway lighting meets the guidelines for minimization of light spillover and sky glow, provides lighting in the appropriate spectrums, and relies wherever possible on low-energy light sources such as LED or solar-powered streetlights.9</p> <p>This statement can be clarified. It is unclear as to what "guidelines" exist for minimization of light spillover.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
C42	255	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>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."</p> <p>Additional time is required to determine whether or not to carry forward or amend this recommendation of the 2017 RCP.</p>	
C43	256	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Page 256 (Development Review Process) states: "Update the Transportation Review Guidelines to apply the latest Institute of Transportation Engineers Manual Guidelines."</p> <p>It is unclear which part of the ITE Manual should update which part of the TRG.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	
C44	256-257	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Page 256-257 (Development Review Process) states: "Evaluate the potential of dedicating rights-of-way to facilities on new alignments through Road and Sidewalks Code agreements as an alternative to reservation, in accordance with proportionality."</p> <p>This statement is unclear. The Road and Sidewalks Code is enforced at the time of permit; dedication as a condition of an approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, which is a prerequisite for a permit.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	

### III. C. Formatting Errors/Item in Incorrect Location

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
C45	257	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Page 257 (Development Review Process) states: “Use the reservation process in the Subdivision Regulations for facilities on new alignments such as freeways, expressways, other controlled-access roadways, and fixed-guideway transit routes, stations, parking facilities, and maintenance facilities.”</p> <p>It is unclear what the purpose of this language is or why it is in the plan. Recommending the use of reservations could be interpreted as encouraging their use in lieu of permanent dedication.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	
C46	257	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>Page 257 (Public-Private Partnerships) states: " Work with developers to encourage rideshare, bikeshare, and carpool programs and to allocate funds to subsidize non-single-occupant vehicle transportation for tenants.”</p> <p>Developers do not do either of these things.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	
C47	257	Monitoring and Evaluation		<p>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.”</p> <p>This statement is unclear without additional context. Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	

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

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

Rev.	Pg.	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
D83	197- 202	All facilities should have an MPOT ID.  Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.	

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

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

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
E9	72	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 6	Policy BK 6 states "Increase motorists’ awareness of bicyclists by providing signage and bicycle and pedestrian priority signals at key intersections to improve safety." This erroneously combines policy language ("Increase motorists' awareness of bicyclists") with strategy language ("by providing...").  Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.	
E10	73	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 7.2	Strategy BK 7.2 recommends construction of identified shared-use path network but cross-references to specific facility recommendations were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".  Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.	

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

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
E11	87	Transit		<p>Figure 8 is completely illegible. Figures below 300 dpi are not permitted in Planning Department publications. In addition, numerous photographs of bus priority and bus-only lanes were taken by the Planning Department during preparation of the Staff Draft Plan but were erroneously excluded from the public release version. In addition, the Urban Street Design Standards were adopted in 2024; the caption is incorrect.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	
E12	95	Complete and Green Streets	CG 7	<p>Policy CG 7 states to "regularly" refine the USDS; Strategy CG 7.1 says to "regularly identify" implementation challenges and to periodically update the USDS. Neither of these define the interval or period in which such evaluations and potential updates should occur. This is an error: intervals and periods should always be defined.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	

### III. F. Clarifications

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

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
F25		Plan-wide		<p>This document makes several references to 15-minute communities. While the plan does create numerous pathways and travel options to increase accessibility, the County's sprawling, primarily residential land use pattern makes creating 15-minute communities challenging except along transit routes and in the first-ring suburbs inside the Capital Beltway.</p> <p>Creating 15-minute communities for all Prince Georgians, as stated on page 63, was never contemplated during the development of the 2025 Staff Draft Plan and while many of the plan's recommendations will accomplish the ideal of 15-minute communities, references inserted into the plan prior to its public release are inconsistent and inaccurate. Creating a land use pattern throughout Prince George's County that gives all Prince Georgians the ability to access all of their daily needs within a 15-minute walk, bicycle ride, or transit trip is well beyond the scope of Go Prince George's.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify potential future amendments to the plan that could advance the ideal of 15-minute communities, since this topic was not explored during the three-year collaborative process to develop the Staff Draft Plan.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	

### III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
F26	64	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility		<p>Page 64 (Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility) states "Strengthening the transportation network with complete sidewalks will encourage Prince Georgians to travel more easily to places to recreate, work, live, and shop with a mix of uses and activities."</p> <p>This sentence is unclear and confusing. "Complete sidewalks" is undefined. In a list of potential destinations, recreation is not the primary one in a list.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	
F27	<i>Reserved</i>				
F28	67	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		<p>Define "all users" of facilities to highlight who these facilities can accommodate.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	

### III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
F29	74	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails	BK 10.3	<p>Strategy BK 10.3 states "Carry forward recommendations from the 2013 <i>Approved Subregion 6 Master Plan</i> and the 2009 <i>Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation</i> for a comprehensive equestrian/hiker trail network."</p> <p>Cross-references to specific recommendations were deleted prior to public release of the "2025 Preliminary Plan".</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this error.</p>	
F30	<i>Reserved</i>				
F31	93	Complete and Green Streets		<p>Strategy GC 1.6 states "Minimize pedestrian exposure by reducing crossing distances wherever possible." This should be clarified that the exposure limitation desired is exposure to moving vehicles.</p> <p>Because this strategy is useful to apply not only to Complete and Green Streets but to all roadways pedestrians must cross, it should be located in the PR section.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.</p>	

### III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
F32	93	Complete and Green Streets		<p>CG 1.9 states "Design new roads for near-term operational considerations, while preserving rights-of-way for future changes in classification".</p> <p>This language is too general to be an effective strategy, and has the potential to be misused by applicants during the approval of preliminary plans of subdivision to avoid dedicating sufficient rights-of-way for ultimate master plan buildout, effectively preventing such buildout from ever occurring. Additional context is necessary to avoid this scenario.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.</p>	
F33	98	Roads and Highways		<p>Page 98 (Roads and Highways) states "To support the growth of population and jobs within the Established Communities of the County, the existing road and highway infrastructure will need improvements to support a more efficient multimodal transportation network. The improvements to the road and highway network are recommended to be consistent with the goals, strategies, and policies of Plan 2035 for the Established Communities." These sentences can be reworded for clarity.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.</p>	

### III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
F34	98	Roads and Highways		<p>Page 98 (Roads and Highways) identifies one improvement to the road and highway system as "Construction of context-sensitive roads and highways to serve existing and future development in the Established Communities".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Roads and highways do not serve development. They serve people.</li> <li>2. How roads and highways can be context-sensitive is not defined anywhere in this document.</li> </ol> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.</p>	
F35	100	Special Roadways and County Heritage		<p>This document contains an element on Special Roadways and County Heritage. Special roadways are mentioned several times in this document but are not defined.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify where and what form such a definition should take.</p>	
F36	100	Special Roadways and County Heritage		<p>Page 100 shows a photo of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway as an example of a "scenic/historic road".</p> <p>While this is true, the photo shows a six-lane freeway with a large freeway directional sign. Other examples of scenic and historic roads may better illustrate historic and/or scenic characteristics.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.</p>	

### III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
F37	101	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 1.1	<p>Strategy SH 1.1 states "Carry forward all applicable policies and strategies from the Rural Character Conservation Plan of the 2017 Approved Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan." This recommendation is unclear: applicable to what or to whom?</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the applicable policies and strategies, cross-references to which were erroneously deleted prior to final publication.</p>	
F38	104	Special Roadways and County Heritage	SH 7	<p>Footnote 7 to Policy SH 7 states "Carries forward action items from the 2012 National Park Service Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail Comprehensive Management Plan Action Plan, J-1 through J-10, and applies them to all National Historic Trails and Scenic Byways countywide."</p> <p>However, this document does not link to that plan, which may not be posted online indefinitely. It is unclear what action items are carried forward and their implications for the County's transportation system. In addition, Strategy SH 7.6 lacks context and is unclear as written. It should be clarified and appropriately cited.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.</p>	
F39	116	Sustainability	SS 1	<p>Policy SS 1 states "Support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions". This is an awkward phrase that can be clarified for purpose. Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.</p>	

### III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
F40	116	Sustainability	SS 2.1	<p>Strategy SS 2.1 states "Provide alternative options in the design of impervious surfaces, such as the use of permeable pavement for areas of occasional vehicle access." The Road and Sidewalks Code and the Zoning Ordinance provide guidance and requirements for permeable pavement and should be referenced here in amendment to the 2017 RCP.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.</p>	
F41	116	Sustainability	SS 2.2	<p>Strategy SS 2.2 states "Where trails must be located within a regulated buffer, they should use low-impact design practices, where feasible." Low-impact design practices are not identified, cross-referenced, or defined in this document.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.</p>	
F42	116	Sustainability	SS 2.3	<p>Strategy SS 2.3 states "Review and amend the County and applicable codes to ensure that new roadway lighting meets the guidelines for dark skies compliance." "Dark skies compliance" is not defined in this plan.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this statement.</p>	

### III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
F43	120-121	Functional Classification and Facility Tables		<p>Page 120 and 121 states "The implementation of a specific roadway configuration (such as vehicular lanes, accommodations for all users including, but not limited to, persons with disabilities, pedestrians, bicycle users and transit users) is established by the relevant specifications and standards for the specific owner/operator of the public right-of-way. The Department of Public Works and Transportation, for instance, has existing specifications and standards for roadway design and is updating these for all roadway classifications in the County's road inventory."</p> <p>There is a photograph on page 121 with the following caption:</p> <p>"Go Prince George's modifies the functional classification system for roads in the County, but the roadway configuration is established by specifications and standards for the owner/operator."</p> <p>(see next page)</p>	

### III. F. Clarifications

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
F44	120-121	Functional Classification and Facility Tables  (continued)		<p>Section 24-4201(b) and (c) of the Subdivision Regulations states:</p> <p><i>(b) The rights-of-way of all highways, streets, trails, and transit facilities shown on the General Plan, Functional Master Plans, and the applicable Area Master Plan or Sector Plan shall be shown on the preliminary plan of subdivision and, when reserved or dedicated, shown on the final plat.</i></p> <p><i>(c) All streets proposed for dedication to public use shall comply with the standards in:</i></p> <p><i>(1) Section 27-6200, Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation, and all other applicable standards in Subtitle 27: Zoning Ordinance;</i></p> <p><i>(2) Subtitle 23: Roads and Sidewalk, of the County Code;</i></p> <p><i>(3) These Regulations;</i></p> <p><i>(4) The Specifications and Standards for Roadways and Bridges;</i></p> <p><i>(5) The standards of the State Highway Administration for state facilities; and</i></p> <p><i>(6) Applicable regulations of municipalities having jurisdiction.</i></p> <p>These statements were inserted into the plan at the request of DPW&amp;T. They can easily be misinterpreted, unintentionally and intentionally, by stakeholders and applicants, to suggest that the facility owner can supersede the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation.</p> <p>Go Prince George's, as amended by future Area Master and Sector Plans, establishes the number of travel lanes, the recommended bicycle accommodation, and additional transit, green street, or pedestrian amenities as needed to implement the vision of the applicable plans. Such facilities must then be designed to the specifications of the State, County, or municipality with jurisdiction over that road, or, in the case of private roads, the Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p>This language will be reconciled with DPW&amp;T prior to Planning Board adoption.</p>	

### III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Staff identified the following factual errors in the “2025 Preliminary Plan” and identifies the appropriate corrections.

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
G24	34	Implementing Plan 2035		<p>The formatting of the text box for the Innovation Corridor is inconsistent with the other descriptions of Plan 2035 Policy Areas. The Innovation Corridor is an element of the Strategic Investment Map. The definition of the Strategic Investment Map is:</p> <p>"Realizing our vision hinges on one important commitment—our commitment to strategically prioritize and target our resources. Plan 2035 developed the Strategic Investment Map to explicitly identify where we should invest the majority of county, state, and federal money and resources in the near- to midterm to realize meaningful change in the County. The Strategic Investment Map will help Prince George’s County determine where and how to focus our Capital Improvement Program, direct grant applications and matching funds, prioritize tax incentive programs and tax increment financing districts, and allocate program resources and funding."</p> <p>The primary way in which the public sector can invest to implement Plan 2035 is by funding transportation projects. This warrants explanation within Go Prince George's.</p> <p>Additional time is required to add the Plan 2035 Strategic Investment Map and summary descriptions of the geographies within it, including the Innovation Corridor.</p>	

### III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
G25	39	Roads		<p>Page 39 (Roads) states "US 50 is the primary east-west highway from California to Maryland and is home to major regional attractions."</p> <p>This statement is inaccurate. US 50 is a major east-west US highway serving several major metropolitan areas but is not the primary east-west highway between California and Maryland.</p> <p>Additional time is required to correct this error.</p>	
G26	39	Roads		<p>Page 39 (Roads) states "The County's strategic location along the I-95 corridor positions it as a leading destination for hospitality, tourism, transportation, logistics, and warehousing."</p> <p>Other descriptors on page 39 explain characteristics of the highway and its regional significance. I-95 is the primary highway on the East Coast of the United States, connecting Maine and Florida. It is a strategic location for all businesses, including the ones listed here; it is not a destination for hospitality, tourism, etc. in itself.</p> <p>Additional time is required to correct this error.</p>	

### III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
G27	46	Walking & Bicycling		<p>The graphic on page 46 depicts the County's average sidewalk with as 4-5 feet. This suggests that a complete inventory exists containing the measurements of the County's sidewalk network. This is not accurate, though it is a fair generalization to suggest that most of the County's sidewalks were built to a 20<sup>th</sup> Century suburban standard of 4-5 feet wide.</p> <p>This graphic also lacks context: the extent of sidewalks that are ONLY 4-5 feet wide is a major transportation challenge facing Prince George's County and a significant barrier to implementing Plan 2035.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate correction for this graphic.</p>	
G28	64	Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility		<p>Page 64 (Sidewalks and Pedestrian Mobility) states "Creating safe pedestrian public access between transportation options and placemaking areas includes complying with the American Disabilities Act, incorporating pedestrian crossings, and expanding existing sidewalks, where appropriate." This sentence is unclear and confusing. Sidewalks connect to a variety of places, not just "placemaking areas" which is not a real thing, much less something people travel to. There is no American Disabilities Act. Pedestrian access is important whether it is public or private.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate corrections for this statement.</p>	

### III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
G29	67	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		<p>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."</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate corrections for this statement.</p>	
G30	67	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		<p>Page 67 states "Cross-county trails are key connections between residential communities and recreational areas."</p> <p>There are no current cross-county trails. The County's existing medium-distance trails connect residential communities to a variety of destinations throughout the region, including, but not limited to, recreational areas.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate corrections for this statement.</p>	
G31	67	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		<p>Page 67 states "Bikeshare usage has also grown as another way to connect users for short trips to places of interest in the County. Several bikeshare stations have been installed at parks and other public places."</p> <p>Bikeshare stations along the Anacostia River Trail Network and at the Capitol Heights and Southern Avenue Metrorail Stations connect users to destinations in the District of Columbia as well. There are only two stations in Prince George's County parks</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate corrections for this statement.</p>	

### III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
G32	67	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		<p>Page 67 states "Shared-use paths and hard-surface trails are paved facilities for public access to rural and suburban roads and within parks. They are intended to supplement or complement built sidewalks and bike lanes, and are not a replacement of those facilities."</p> <p>This statement is in error. Shared-use paths and hard-surface trails are paved facilities that provide public access to a wide range of destinations similarly to how roads provide motor vehicles access to destinations. They do not provide access to roads. They provide access from various points along an integrated transportation network with total separation from motor vehicles, usually in dedicated rights-of-way. They do not supplement built sidewalks and bicycle lanes, and are always preferable to on-road bicycle lanes.</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate corrections for this statement.</p>	
G33	69	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		<p>Page 69 states "The Prince George's County shared-use path system of trails is classified in the 2018 Strategic Trails Plan as follows...."</p> <p>The Countywide Master Plan of Transportation classifies all transportation facilities in Prince George's County.</p> <p>Additional time is required to coordinate with DPR to accurately articulate the relationship between DPR's shared-use path classification system and this plan.</p>	

### III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
G34	69	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		<p>Various transportation agencies across Maryland have programs and initiatives to support the development and expansion of comprehensive bicycle facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maryland State Highway Administration: The Maryland State Highway Administration provides a statewide network of bicycle routes, many located in Prince George’s County. Per State law, a bicycle is defined as a vehicle and is required to be operated similar to motorized vehicles, including complying with all traffic signals and signs. Local municipalities may have additional laws for bicyclists."</li> </ul> <p>The last two sentences have nothing to do with "programs and initiatives to support the development and expansion of comprehensive bicycle facilities."</p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate corrections for this statement.</p>	

### III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
G35	69	Bikeways, Shared-Use Paths, Equestrian Facilities, and Natural Surface Trails		<p>Page 69 states "Existing and planned major shared-use paths (trails and greenways) that are integral to Prince George’s County are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Washington, Baltimore, and Annapolis Recreation Rail-Trail</li> <li>• Anacostia Trails Heritage Area</li> <li>• Anacostia River Trail System</li> <li>• Henson Creek Trail</li> <li>• Woodrow Wilson Bridge Trail</li> <li>• Little Paint Branch Trail</li> <li>• East Coast Greenway</li> <li>• The American Discovery Trail</li> <li>• Rhode Island Avenue Trolley Trail</li> <li>• Cross-County Trail Connection</li> <li>• Chesapeake Beach Rail Trail</li> <li>• Patuxent River Water Trail</li> <li>• Patuxent River Park Hiker/Biker/Equestrian Trails"</li> </ul> <p>Nearly half of this list are not shared-use paths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anacostia Trails Heritage Area</li> <li>• East Coast Greenway</li> <li>• The American Discovery Trail</li> <li>• Cross-County Trail Connection</li> <li>• Patuxent River Water Trail</li> <li>• Patuxent River Park Hiker/Biker/Equestrian Trails</li> </ul> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate corrections for this statement.</p>	

### III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
G36	94	Complete and Green Streets		<p>The photograph on Page 94 does not show a Complete and Green Street. It shows a regular street with a crosswalk and vegetation.</p> <p>Additional time is required to resolve this error.</p>	
G37	98	Roads and Highways		<p>Page 98 (Roads and Highways) identifies one improvement to the road and highway system as "Reconstruction of inadequate facilities (such as roads without curbs and gutters, appropriate shoulders, or adequate bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure)"</p> <p>Roads and highways without curbs and gutters are not necessarily inadequate. Freeways usually do not have curbs. Roads in rural areas do not have curbs and gutters; the County's and state's design standards for roads and highways do not require curbs and gutters.</p> <p>"Inadequate" has a special transportation definition in a County with an Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance: this plan and the County Code refer to inadequate roads and highways as those that do not have sufficient capacity to allow the required traffic levels-of-service. A better term can convey the intent of this statement.</p> <p>Additional time is required to resolve this error.</p>	

### III. G. Corrections of Factual Errors

Rev.	Pg.	Section	P/S	Issue/Error	Correction/ Clarification
G38	112	Smart Infrastructure	SI 1.3	<p>Strategy SI 1.3 is inaccurate. The provision of basic pedestrian signals is not smart infrastructure. Pedestrian signals were invented in 1868. As referenced in the introduction, this strategy was intended to recommend incorporation of leading pedestrian intervals as standard at all intersections.</p> <p>Strategy SI 1.3 should be revised as follows:</p> <p><u>Update the County's Traffic Signal Management Plan to incorporate leading pedestrian intervals at all intersections signals for pedestrians as standard equipment.</u></p> <p>Additional time is required to identify the appropriate location for this strategy.</p>	