CR-33-2011/CR-61-2011
A RESOLUTION concerning
Adequate Transportation Facilities – Brandywine Road Club

Contributing to the Stress is Traffic Congestion that is Quality of Life Health and Welfare Issue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Contents</th>
<th>ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings, Open Records, and Transparency in Government</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxpayers, who fund every expenditure made by government, deserve to know exactly how government spends their tax dollars. After all, ethics is transparency and accountability— is a “process that requires us to disclose fully and truthfully our performance to those who are entitled to know,” our voters.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4 is the Zoning of the Medical Center DSP-09011</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed usage of the Brandywine Road Club in CR-33-2011</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This no restriction/moratorium on Building Developers have to provide for the quality of life such as public facilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Post states erroneous facts as to Stephen’s Crossings Residential units being 450</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one talked to the Community but the Gazette</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 8 has a dog in this fight because such a facility will impact traffic on Routes 210 and 4, and all the connecting roads leading to 301 and Brandywine. We all share the goal of promoting commercial development in appropriate places, but once again adequate public facilities is a major issue. I suggest that a traffic study be done before making a judgment whether Stephen’s Crossing would be smart growth or not-so-smart growth.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The County Council still treating the Districts as if they operate singularly “Council Courtesy” continues.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFSM Committee / Council Testimony CR-61-2011</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that applications for development projects located entirely within a Mixed Use, Commercial, Industrial, or Employment and Institutional Area (&quot;E-I-A&quot;) Zone, or combination thereof, may use the Brandywine Road Club as a means for satisfying the requirements of Section 24-124 of the Prince George’s County Code; furthermore that is consistent with and in addition confirms with the recommendations of the sub regions master plan in effect as pursuant to mncpp-c and the community planning division and...&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much these project cost?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Metropolitan Orthopedics Institute Pays $2.5M to Settle Upcoding Allegations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to address the reputations of these Business as it’s relates to the Effects and Reputation of the County.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even with this we would accept the Greater Metropolitan Orthopedics but there is NO guarantee that we will or would obtain other services. In addition pursuant to the M-X-T plans to Expand this Medical Center Focus.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-X-T Development</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facts of the M-X-T Stephen’s Crossing................................................................. 6

Unfavorable Referral by Community Planning South Division—PLANNING ISSUES ........ 6

2/3 Residential, only 181.1 sqft of Retail w/Commercial. 450,000 sqft of Commercial/Retail is what should be realized in this M-X-T Zone. Villages of Timothy Branch has 250,000 sqft of Commercial ............... 8

How does the County Council ignore SHA and MNCPPC as to the facts of A-63 and the much needed MD5/Rt 301 Improvements. In this referral by SHA dated September 2, 2010 (highlighted area). ................................................................. 9

The future relocation of the US301 mainline and the proposal half diamond interchange would be impact the conceptual site plan for Stephen’s Crossing at Brandywine. So then upon approval and review we would expected the County Council to abide by what is right in approving of this development and or basing our Legislation on such. ........................................................................................................ 9

What the Developer is stating and the facts are totally difference. ........................................ 9

Past Behavior is a Reliable Predictor of future Conduct With a Better Economy Comes More Cars on the Road .......................................................................................................................... 10

"There is no single solution that can reverse the growth in congestion" ......................................... 10

Past Behavior is a Reliable Predictor of future Conduct .................................................................... 10

The Cognitive Impact of Past Behavior: Influences on Brandywine ................................................. 10

WHY? Unrealized SPRAWL Contributes to Traffic Congestion ......................................................... 10

WHY? Unrealized SPRAWL building out unsustainable strip malls ..................................................... 10

Questions on CR-33 Reconsideration…We Ask? ............................................................................. 10

How is this to ensure that we get the roads built? ................................................................................... 10

The cost of contribution is based on the General Plan 1993 pay scale. ................................................ 10

What is the benefit? How does this affect the Quality of LIFE? ............................................................. 10

I4 is already the Zoning for the Medical Center and allowed usage by CR-33-2011 ................................. 10

What it is we receive: Unrealized SPRAWL building out unsustainable strip malls ....................... 11

Good development is building TOD, and urban sustainable commercial development with retail. Having the requirement of all three, 1) commercial first, 2) retail ad then 3) the residential for sustainability ............. 11

Instead we allow the Developers to pick and choose their plan and not the plan of Prince George’s County for which they have no stokehold living outside the County. .................................................. 11

As much as we welcome Bow-Tie it’s more Congestion with a 2,500 seats in addition to the Restaurant...... 11

Studies Commissioned .......................................................................................................................... 11

Coalition for Smart Growth— review current M-X-T CSP-09003 .................................................... 11
Traffic Congestion during at non-rush hour time frame 1.6 Miles from Brandywine Crossing back to TB Junction/Brandywine Road pass Moore’s Road / Earnshaw Dr., / Burch Hill Rd., to Southern MD Hospital. ..........................................................12

Actually where this M-X-T resides ..................................................................................................................12

Along Rt. MD5 Branch Avenue and Rt. 301Blue-Star-Memorial-Hwy .............................................................12

MD Department of Transportations Phase Map ..............................................................................................13

Improvements planned and needed if there is any relief of congestion to be realized not A-63 for which the County does not have the Right – a –Ways. .................................................................................13

Also we ask how much will this cost the County or does it matter ................................................................13

Brandywine Road Club....................................................................................................................................13

Alternative Strategies to Reduce Congestion and Improve Reliability— FOCUS ON OPERATIONS.........15

**NEXT STEPS:** BUILDING THE FOUNDATION FOR EFFECTIVE TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS ..................................................................................................................15

COORDINATION BETWEEN PLANNING AND OPERATIONS.......................................................................16

MARKING PROGRESS THROUGH PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT .................................................16

Closing Statement..............................................................................................................................................16

We are all for Economic Development in the County; ..................................................................................16

so if you are adding M-X-T for the purposes of Commercial but the M-X-T development is 2/3 residential this is this increasing our County commercial base how? ..................................................................................16
Meetings, Open Records, and Transparency in Government

Taxpayers, who fund every expenditure made by government, deserve to know exactly how government spends their tax dollars. After all, ethics is transparency and accountability— is a “process that requires us to disclose fully and truthfully our performance to those who are entitled to know,” our voters.

Brandywine/TB, Neighborhood Coalition, a Community Organization responsible for representing community and the economic development activities acting as a community development exchange referral source …2Bridge…Building Resourceful Initiatives Developing, Growing, & Empowering. A Community Development Exchange (CDX) supporting people who support communities and connecting people who care about projects that matter. Most importantly representing community— Many Neighborhoods as One Voice of Many, Keeping Community Informed being very active in the process in Prince George’s County.

The Greater Metropolitan Orthopedics Building has the necessary Zoning. DSP-09011 is an allowed usage of the Brandywine Road Club in CR-33-2011 and can use the Brandywine Road Club. The facts are this is no Medical Center. We have the Developers and others promises of a Medical Center focus something the Community would like to see happen but many promises where made at Brandywine Crossing then there came a new DSP with no iMax and upscale Commercial/Retail now Stephen’s Crossing pretending to be M-X-T.

CR-33-2011 is not a restriction or moratorium on Building Developers should have to provide for the quality of life such as public facilities other non-speculative Developers have.

Washington Post states erroneous facts as to Stephen’s Crossings Residential units being 450.

No one has contacted the Community but the Gazette

District 8 has a dog in this fight because such a facility will impact traffic on Routes 210 and 4, and all the connecting roads leading to 301 and Brandywine. We all share the goal of promoting commercial development in appropriate places, but once again adequate public facilities is a major issue. I suggest that a traffic study be done before making a judgment whether Stephen's Crossing would be smart growth or not-so-smart growth.

The County Council still treating the Districts as if they operate singularly "Council Courtesy" continues.

CR-61-2011 affects the Entire Southern Region Councilmatic Districts Transportation System.
Kamita Gray Bandywine representing the B/TB Coalition and League of Women Voters Board Chair Observing for reporting carding

The current resolution CR-33-2011 allows industrial and commercial zones, and the E-I-A zone, to continue using the Road Club as a means of fulfilling adequacy requirements. The amendment CR-61 you are currently considering would allow mixed-use zones additionally to use the Road Club funds. Pat Byrne, the developer of Hampton and Stephens Crossing, is trying to convince the County and the Councilman that allowing his developments to move forward will create a full new connection between MD 5, US 301, and MD 381 by allowing his Road Club payments to fund that connection.

The Washington Post Wednesday, October 12, 2011 there was a statement by Mr. Pat Byrne’s that and I quote, “They need to change the mind of Mel Franklin or find a site in Charles County”. It is my understanding that they already have in our researching this furthermore at the PZED hearing on October 11th, Councilwomen Harrison made reference that she does not take to idol threats of Developers if they are going to come to Prince George's County it's because they want to and not because they are controlling and getting the governance they want. We the ECCB Committee sees this as nothing more than a bullying tactic and we all take offence to this as everyone should to at this type of behavior furthermore the track record of this Developer especially as it relates to the Hamptons Development.

There are many issues with CR-61 but four prevalent ones that are widespread in the area such as;

1. All of the right-a-ways to make these connections are not in place. Is the County to pick up the tab, there has been no Study tracking how the transportation system is performing now or in the future.

2. The A-63 facility, which is on-site for these developments, was always supposed to be constructed directly on-site (by the developer), with Road Club payments to be held by the County for other off-site improvements.

3. This proposal would use existing Road Club funds paid by other developments to help build A-63 on-site within Stephens Crossing and Hamptons and all others. This was never the intent; other developers have built A-63 on-site with their own funds.

4. At this point, there is no assurance that A-63 can be connected to MD 5. Pat Byrne and the County can only guarantee construction up to the SHA property where the future interchange would be. SHA has not indicated that they can fund the interchange coincident with this development, and at this time they do not want A-63 to connect with an at-grade intersection.

Five M-X-T Zones for a total of 369.29 acres in the immediate area three of which Pat Brynes has 254.29 plus acres Dyson Road and Berry Road adding another 500+ acreage and 600 acres along Rt 373 Accokeek Road under zone change consideration to M-X-T if CR-61 passes. In addition other transportation improvements have not been completed such as the lead-in into the Villages of Savannah development and Brandywine Reserves.

10,000 plus cars a day that using MD5 Branch Avenue/Rt 301 every day and 60 percent of this traffic spills onto our back roadways and it is a fact that A-63 will not elevate this traffic by your own Transportation Surveys.

The Washington Post Wednesday, October 12, 2011 reported erroneous current total residents that Stephens Crossing would add being 450 residents the actual totals is 969 residential units at the same time they are requesting a reduction of 200,000 sqft of commercial of a M-X-T project that is 80% if not more residential.
We speak of add M-X-T as a means of the Commercial need in the County and this being a Focal point for Medical Services to attract other Medical services but the CSP -09003 Stephen’s Crossing is 2/3 residential with no shown Commercial for Expansion… so are we talking from both sides… we need M-X-T because we will loss the Greater Metropolitan Orthopedics. We need to be clear that these are two different pieces.

1. Mr. Taylor J. Watkins is purchasing the building from the Developer Pat Byrnes.
2. The Developer Pat Byrnes in this M-X-T Zone being the Development not adhering to the MNCPP-C Community Development Division and In addition at a January 2011 meeting said he wouldn’t abide by the Commercial piece all documented as part of the Record.

Why is it that the M-X-T is not in Compliance and adhering to the Sub Region V County Master Plan?

Repealing the CR-33 that the Cost is still based on a 1993 contribution pay scale; has there been NO increase in Costs since 1993?

Why isn't the language specific so the County will achieve the desired Economic Development?

How can you expand the Medical Center Focus with the land developed residential?

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that applications for development projects located entirely within a Mixed Use, Commercial, Industrial, or Employment and Institutional Area ("E-I-A") Zone, or combination thereof, may use the Brandywine Road Club as a means for satisfying the requirements of Section 24-124 of the Prince George's County Code; furthermore that is consistent with and in addition confirms with the recommendations of the sub regions master plan in effect as pursuant to mncpp-c and the community planning division and…"

How much these project cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG175_21</td>
<td>$7,681,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG175_52</td>
<td>$9,265,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG391_16</td>
<td>$13,089,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Costs:** $30,035,000.00

The Brandywine Road Club fund has collected $2.6 Million in twenty-one years. This is just the State cost we have no idea of the costs to this County.

Furthermore the improvements that have just taken place at the TB Junction cost with 2.6 million in the fund over the past twenty-one years with a fee that is calculated on a 1993 resolution and pay scale that CR-33 and/or CR-61 does not fix.

Improved FHWA’s efforts to improve and to develop and compile information for transportation agencies and the public on how improved operations by effectively managing congestion by addressing congestion by its root causes, both overall congestion levels and reliability are targeted. This should not be another pass to developers to contribute their part to “Public Facilities”. PG Atlas gives me 880 Projects within a 5-mile Radius that used the Brandywine Road Club as a means to satisfy adequate transportation but we have commissioned three Studies.
Brandywine Road Club Usage

I would sincerely that you consider the repercussions of CR-61 and not pass this out of committee especially since your where just asked to support and passed CR-33 in that nothing has changed since that time other than idol threats and unforeseen promises hoping that we buy into the dream.

Greater Metropolitan Orthopedics Institute Pays $2.5M to Settle Upcoding Allegations

by fraudblawg on January 12, 2011

We need to address the reputations of these Business as it’s relates to the Effects and Reputation of the County.

According to DOJ, Maryland-based Greater Metropolitan Orthopedics Institute will pay $2.5 million to avoid litigating claims that it “upcoding services rendered to higher levels to increase its reimbursement.” The resolved suit was filed under the federal False Claims Act and alleged that the group submitted fraudulent claims for “office visits that either never took place or were not documented in the patients’ medical records. Additionally, the suit alleges that Greater Metropolitan Orthopedics Institute billed Medicare, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program for “existing patient visits as consults, and submit[ed] duplicate claims for review and interpretation of X-rays.”.

Even with this we would accept the Greater Metropolitan Orthopedics but there is NO guarantee that we will or would obtain other services. In addition pursuant to the M-X-T plans to Expand this Medical Center Focus.
M-X-T Development

The appeal of the Subregion 5 Master Plan (MP)/Sectional Map Amendment (SMA) which approved the Hyde Field development is “and many other M-X-T Parcels of Land (see chart to follow) is on the move.” (CAL-09-31386).

Absolutely **NO** Protection of the Rural Character then further adding insult to injury with unacceptable M-X-T Development pretending to be Commercial is actually **2/3 residential**.

Pat Byrnes has the **single-most vested-interest** since he is the primary owner of M-X-T in this are. Special Petitions to the Council, Special Bills such as CB-61-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millville Quarry, Inc. (aka Aggregate, Bevard)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>R-R</td>
<td>R-R</td>
<td>Requested M-X-T rezoning, (Item # 29)</td>
<td>M-X-T (Amendment # 39)</td>
<td>M-X-T</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWT Invest. (Richman)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>Requested M-X-T or C-S-C rezoning (Item # 30)</td>
<td>M-X-T (Amendment # 40)</td>
<td>M-X-T</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Byrne, Stephen's Crossing, 301 Industrial/CPI Limited Partnership (CPI)</td>
<td>173+</td>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>M-X-T</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>M-X-T (Amendment # 15)</td>
<td>M-X-T (Amendment # 35)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facts of the M-X-T Stephen’s Crossing

Brandywine residents require good Economic Development but Stephen’s Crossing is not Smart Economic Growth.

We welcome the right development as pursuant to MNCPP-C Community Planning South Division.

Unfavorable Referral by Community Planning South Division—PLANNING ISSUES

The master plan describes the recommended land use plan for the subject property as follows: “(T)he Brandywine Business Park property is also envisioned as being a mix of commercial, employment, and light industrial uses. While these areas are beyond the community center edge, they would be tied to the community center by roads and complementary land uses.” (Plan, pg. 50). The District Council approved the M-X-T Zone for the subject property in the 2009

Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment and this proposal is not consistent with the master plan’s objectives for this area in that it substitutes residential development for the recommended light industrial component in the mixed-use recommendation. Residential land use was not included in the master plan’s mixed-use recommendation at this location. This would be more acceptable were the residential component minor in the context of the other proposed land uses. However, in this application the residential component is dominant; it appears to represent TWO-THIRDS of the land area. (Matching Timothy Branch CDP-0901/0902 Villages of Timothy Branch residential)

The revised Conceptual Site Plan, dated 11/12/10, clarified that commercial-retail rather than commercial-office, is the next most dominant land use (if we allow this there is no where to add more commercial space for a Medial Community). This further departs from the recommendations of the master plan that call for employment and light industrial uses at this location, along with commercial. Shopping center development on this site was not contemplated by the master plan. The predominance of residential land uses in this application and the CSP-09003 Stephen’s Crossing (Revised) relatively low amount of commercial-office proposed is generally inconsistent with the master plan recommendations.

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Zones</th>
<th>Mixed Use Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-2 (Residential Open Space)</td>
<td>M-X-T (Mux Use-Transportation Oriented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS (Open Space)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3A (Residential Agricultural)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2E (Residential)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3B (High Residential)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4 (One-Family Detached Residential)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3E (One-Family Detached Residential)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-7 (Townhouse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5 (Multifamily High-Density Residential)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comprehensive Design Zones

- R-1 (Residential Low)
- R-5 (Residential Suburban)
- EIA (Employment and Institutional Area)

Commercial Zones

- C-1 (Commercial Office)
- C-4C (Commercial Strip) (Low Density)
- C-4A (Commercial Strip) (Low Density)
- C-6 (Commercial Mixed)

Industrial Zones

- I-1 (Light Industrial)
- I-2 (Heavy Industrial)

Aviation Policy Areas

- Airport Policy Areas
- See Section 2.2 of M-X-T and the Prince Georges County Zoning Districts to reference a

Air Installation Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ)*

- Close Zone (CZ)
- Accident Potential Zone (APZ)

- Accident Potential Zone (APZ) 1 (APZ1)
- Day/Night Levels (DNL)

* See Section 2.2 of M-X-T and the Prince Georges County Zoning Districts to reference a
* AICUZ recommendations are intended during the development or planning, but do not form the
M-X-T (purple) is not the Key Component in making the Connections all right-of-ways are not in place.
2/3 Residential, only 181.1 sqft of Retail w/Commercial. 450,000 sqft of Commercial/Retail is what should be realized in this M-X-T Zone. Villages of Timothy Branch has 250,000 sqft of Commercial.
How does the County Council ignore SHA and MNCPPC as to the facts of A-63 and the much needed MD5/Rt 301 Improvements. See the referral by SHA dated September 2, 2010 (highlighted area).

The future relocation of the US301 mainline and the proposal half diamond interchange would be impact the conceptual site plan for Stephen’s Crossing at Brandywine. So then upon approval and review we would expected the County Council to abide by what is right in approving of this development and or basing our Legislation on such.

If we do not get our MD6/Rt 301 Improvement our traffic congestion will not be solved…understand it is not the local traffic for A-63 that will fix Brandywine and surrounding areas Clinton, Accokeek that includes Indian Head Highway. Approximately 20-45% of the traffic on MD5/Rt 301 is spilling onto and congesting our transportation system in South County as a whole.

What the Developer is stating and the facts are totally difference.

The US 301 Waldorf Area Project team has concluded that the proposed development is not directly impacted by any of the alternatives under study for the US 301 Waldorf Area Project. However, as part of the 1999 Access Management Plan for US 301, an interchange is proposed on US 301 at the future Spine Road connection/A-63 with US 301. The existing access to US 301 from MD 381 would then be prohibited. The proposed interchange would be a half diamond design, with ramps to and from the north only. The Access Management Plan also proposes a relocation of the mainline of US 301 that would follow the alignment of the existing northbound lanes.

The 1999 Access Management Plan for US 301 is consistent with the Prince George’s County, Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment 2009 that calls for a interchange at US 301 and A-63 and a upgrade of the existing US 301 roadway. There is no schedule for the implementation of the Access Management Plan at this time. An at-grade connection of A-63 with US 301 would not be permitted prior to the construction of an interchange at this location.
"There is no single solution that can reverse the growth in congestion"

The problems caused by increased traffic congestion are striking. Not only does it mean more time spent in the car and less time at work or with our families, it also means serious consequences for the environment, the national economy, and our own wallets. Some highlights from the data:

- Congested roads cost our economy $115 billion in 2009, up from $24 billion in 1982 (when adjusted for inflation).
- Congested roads were responsible for wasting 3.9 billion gallons of fuel, which, according to TTI, is equal to 130 days of flow in the Alaska Pipeline.
- Congested roads cost the average commuter $808 in 2009, up from $351 in 1982 (when adjusted for inflation).
- The average commuter spent about 34 hours sitting idly in their car in 2009, nearly a day and a half.

**Past Behavior is a Reliable Predictor of future Conduct**

**The Cognitive Impact of Past Behavior: Influences on Brandywine**

**WHY?** Unrealized SPRAWL Contributes to Traffic Congestion

**WHY?** Unrealized SPRAWL building out unsustainable strip malls

**Questions on CR-33 Reconsideration…We Ask?**

We where are promised versus what it is that we received. Brandywine Crossing perfect example this too is not what MNCPP-C Community Planning South recommended land use plan for the subject property and not consistent with Subregion V Master plan.

How is this to ensure that we get the roads built?

The cost of contribution is based on the General Plan 1993 pay scale.

What is the benefit? How does this affect the **Quality of LIFE**?

**I4 is already the Zoning for the Medical Center and allowed usage by CR-33-2011**
What it is we receive:
Unrealized SPRAWL Contributes to Traffic Congestion

What it is we receive:
Unrealized SPRAWL building out unsustainable strip malls

(Research shows that strip malls only have a 10-year life expectancy).

Good development is building TOD, and urban sustainable commercial development with retail. Having the requirement of all three, 1) commercial first, 2) retail ad then 3) the residential for sustainability

Instead we allow the Developers to pick and choose their plan and not the plan of Prince George’s County for which they have no stokehold living outside the County.

As much as we welcome Bow-Tie it’s more Congestion with a 2,500 seats in addition to the Restaurant

Studies Commissioned

Coalition for Smart Growth— review current M-X-T CSP-09003
Traffic Congestion during at non-rush hour time frame 1.6 Miles from Brandywine Crossing back to TB Junction/Brandywine Road pass Moore’s Road / Earnshaw Dr., / Burch Hill Rd., to Southern MD Hospital.

Actually where this M-X-T resides
Along Rt. MD5 Branch Avenue and Rt. 301Blue-Star-Memorial-Hwy

11AM— Weekday

12:30 PM— Saturday, September 10th
MD Department of Transportations Phase Map

Improvements planned and needed if there is any relief of congestion to be realized not A-63 for which the County does not have the Right – a Ways.

Also we ask how much will this cost the County or does it matter.

Brandywine Road Club

In over a twenty (20) year period the Brandywine Road Club has existed, NO Transportation Improvements have been constructed, despite the persistence of numerous transportation inadequacies in the area documented by the Planning Board since 1989 and the approval of numerous developments based on contributions to the Brandywine Road Club; and community has repeatedly raised concerns about the impact of the use of the Brandywine Road Club that needed transportation facilities to occur concurrently with development.

It is necessary to suspend the use of the Brandywine Road Club, as it has not proven viable or effective in accomplishing adequate transportation in the Brandywine Area.
**FINDINGS: Staff Reports:**

1. The Transportation and Public Facilities Planning Division finds that inadequate transportation facilities do exist for the area in which the Brandywine Business Park properties.
2. M-NCPPC findings are until the major State Roadways are improved congestion will not be relieved.
3. **90,000+** Cars a Day on MD 5
4. 3.) As required for orderly development in the area and the level of service (LOS) to be achieved this proportionate allocation shall be adequate based on the 4-90045 Preliminary Plan in addition Staff has found in it's findings that:

a.) The use of the Brandywine Road Club in approving a development poses an issue of concurrency. In other words, Section 24-124 of the Subdivision Ordinance (the section that governs findings of adequate transportation facilities) is intended to ensure that needed transportation facilities occur concurrently with development or within a reasonable time thereafter. However, transportation inadequacies in the area have been documented since 1989. Beginning in 2000, many properties have been approved with a condition to pay funds toward a Brandywine Road Club. But since those initial approvals, no improvements have been constructed. Furthermore, there is nothing in either the current county Capital Improvement Program or the state’s Consolidated Transportation Program that suggests that needed improvements are funded for construction.

b.) The traffic impact study prepared and submitted on behalf of the applicant to determine the adequacy of transportation facilities to serve this development analyzed the following intersections listed below. The analysis determined that the levels of service at the following locations with total traffic and including three recently approved or pending subdivisions will be inadequate during one or both peak hours with the applicant's improvements and any improvements included in conditions for approved developments in the area:

- U.S. 301/MD 5 and Cedarville/McKendree Roads
- MD 5 and Brandywine Road
- U.S. 301 and MD 381 (Brandywine Road)
- MD 5 and MD 373 (Accokeek Road)
- MD 381 and the planned Spine Road
- U.S. 301 and the planned Spine Road
- MD 5 and the planned Spine Road
- Planned Floral Parkway (C-194 on the Subregion V Master Plan) and the planned Spine Road

To construct all of the required off-site road improvements, it is recommended that a road club be created because of the tremendous financial obligation. **In order to guarantee** that the all property owners in a road club bear their fair share of the costs of future road improvements that a Road Club was needed in the study area, it should be the intent of the Planning Board to impose a similar condition on each Preliminary Plan Plat of Subdivision for each Applicant and properties in the Employment Area “C”, Brandywine Business Park, and applicable properties along U.S. 301/MD 5. A pro rata share of the improvements should be paid into the road club by all of those properties.

---

**For these reasons please ask that you pass CR-33-2011.**

In moving forward their needs to be strategies which I have referenced below:

---

**Can’t developers already pool their funds together to meet transportation adequacy requirements without the Road Club?**

- The transportation adequacy requirements in the Subdivision Code already allow developers/sub-dividers of property to pool their money together to jointly pay for road improvements. However, this pooling is actually tied to real improvements being made towards meeting adequacy. The fees paid into the Road Club do not actually have to result in the transportation adequacy requirements being met or any improvements being made at all. The Road Club’s use has basically resulted in the transportation adequacy requirements in the Subdivision Code becoming nonexistent for this portion of Brandywine.
Ultimately, why is the use of the Brandywine Road Club bad for the County?

- The Road Club allows the approval of development without requiring sufficient investment in infrastructure in an area where applicants seek, in some cases, to put over a thousand new residential units. Further, policies like the use of the Road Club create new public infrastructure shortfalls that come in conflict with other CTP and CIP priorities in the rest of the County in a time of limited taxpayer resources for the foreseeable future. This draws County and State infrastructure dollars away from reinvesting in our more established communities where we seek to stimulate economic redevelopment. In short, the use of the Brandywine Road Club is not “smart growth,” it is “dumb growth.”

-To date, no. No one has anyone in the development community offered a viable alternative or compromise proposal to address this situation?

Alternative Strategies to Reduce Congestion and Improve Reliability— FOCUS ON OPERATIONS

Transportation engineers and planners have developed a variety of strategies to deal with congestion. These fall into three general categories:

1.) Adding More Base Capacity – Increasing the number and size of highways and providing more transit and freight rail service. This can include expanding the base capacity (by adding additional lanes or building new highways) as well as redesigning specific bottlenecks such as interchanges and intersections to increase their capacity.

2.) Operating Existing Capacity More Efficiently – Getting more out of what we have.

3.) Encouraging Travel and Land Use Patterns that Use the System in Less Congestion Producing Ways – Travel Demand Management (TDM), non-automotive travel modes, and land use management.

All of these strategies can lead to a reduction in congestion, but it is operations strategies that have the most dramatic effect on reliability because they target the sources of unreliable travel directly. Operations strategies focus on the traffic-influencing events that both raise the general level of congestion and increase unreliable travel.

**NEXT STEPS:** BUILDING THE FOUNDATION FOR EFFECTIVE TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS

Transportation operations can reduce the growth of congestion and improve the reliability of travel conditions for highway users. By directly targeting the sources of unreliable travel through transportation operations, the chances of unexpected and extreme congestion are greatly reduced, enabling travelers to experience more consistent conditions from day-to-day. Maximizing the potential of transportation operations requires much more than just deploying advanced technology. Meeting customer expectations for safe, reliable, and secure transportation services also requires that planners and system operators coordinate better so that operations can be strategically planned and deployed; so that operations data and system information is routinely shared among system operators, service providers, and transportation planners; and so that performance is continuously monitored to provide the feedback necessary to adapt to changing conditions and properly plan for future demands. These important aspects of transportation operations are addressed below.
COORDINATION BETWEEN PLANNING AND OPERATIONS

The operation of the transportation system and planning for the transportation system are often two detached sets of activities with different requirements and different cultures. Management and operation of the transportation system typically involves a different set of practitioners with a short-term or real-time focus, often with little consideration of how activities relate to a regional transportation systems long-term goals and objectives. Transportation planning has traditionally relied upon long-range travel needs, goals for a region, and funding constraints with little consideration of short-term and ongoing operational issues. Transportation agencies, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and other stakeholders are increasingly recognizing the value of coordination and collaboration among planners and operators. Although they come from differing perspectives, transportation planning and operating agencies generally share the goal of enhancing system performance, and they can benefit from stronger linkages. The major point is that while each group has its own priorities, both planners and operators need to be involved in all phases of the project development timeline.

MARKING PROGRESS THROUGH PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

In the last few years, transportation operators have increasingly embraced the concept of performance measurement—tracking the trends of key indicators of how the transportation system is performing. Performance measurement has been widely used in the private sector as a way to improve delivery of goods and services to customers and ultimately, the success of the enterprise. Fundamentally, this is no different from providing improved transportation services to the public—public agencies are businesses "selling" transportation service and travelers are the consumers "buying" them.

Perhaps the most significant lesson from the review of performance measurement activities over the last two decades is that all performance measures and measurement systems have evolved. The changes have been the result of legislative interests, accountability efforts, new data sources, estimation procedures, changes in knowledge about traffic conditions, and, perhaps most importantly, growth in demand for the information once reports and data are used. Transportation staff and leaders should experiment with measures, data, and presentation techniques.

Closing Statement

Improved operations are a cornerstone of FHWA's efforts to improve travel conditions for highway travelers. FHWA continues to develop and compile information for transportation agencies and the public on how improved operations can effectively manage congestion. By addressing congestion by its root causes, both overall congestion levels and reliability are targeted. For more information on FHWA's congestion mitigation activities and to access the complete Traffic Congestion and Reliability Report, visit the FHWA Office of Operations website at http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov.

We are all for Economic Development in the County; so if you are adding M-X-T for the purposes of Commercial but the M-X-T development is 2/3 residential this is increasing our County commercial base how?