



Maryland DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

8/23/2024

John Toohey, Planning Commission Chair
Calvert County, Maryland
2nd Floor, 205 Main Street
Prince Frederick, MD 20678

Dear Mr. Toohey:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Prince Frederick Town Center Master Plan (Draft Plan). The Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) believes that good planning is important for efficient and responsible development that adequately addresses resource protection, adequate public facilities, housing, community character, and economic development. Please keep in mind that MDP's attached review comments reflect the agency's thoughts on ways to strengthen the Draft Plan, as well as satisfy the requirements of Maryland's Land Use Article.

The Department forwarded a copy of the Draft Plan to several state agencies for review, including the Maryland Historical Trust and the Departments of Transportation, Environment, Natural Resources, Commerce, and Housing & Community Development. To date, we have received comments from the Maryland Historical Trust and the Departments of Transportation, Natural Resources, and Housing and Community Development. These comments have been included with this letter. Any plan review comments received after the date of this letter will be forwarded upon receipt.

MDP respectfully requests that this letter and accompanying review comments be made part of the county's public hearing record. Furthermore, MDP also asks that the county consider state agency comments as revisions are made to the Draft Plan, and to any future plans, ordinances, and policy documents that are developed.

Please contact me at joseph.griffiths@maryland.gov or Korey Layman, Western Maryland Regional Planner at korey.layman@maryland.gov (443)-756-3933, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Joseph Griffiths, AICP
Director, Planning Best Practices

Enclosures: Comments on the Prince Frederick Town Center Master Plan Amendment

Cc: Mary Beth Cook, Director of Planning & Zoning, Calvert County Government

Felicia R. Harrod, Administrative Aide, Calvert County Government, Department of Planning & Zoning

David Cotton, Director, Western Maryland Regional Office, MDP



**Maryland Department of Planning
Review Comments
August 23rd, 2024**

Calvert County Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Updated Prince Frederick Master Plan

The Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) received the Updated Prince Frederick Master Plan (Draft Amendment) from Calvert County on June 27, 2024. These comments are offered as suggestions to improve the Draft Amendment and better address the statutory requirements of the Land Use Article. Other state agencies, as noted below, have contributed comments and others may submit comments separately. If comments are subsequently received by MDP, the department will forward them to Calvert County.

Conformance with Section 3-102 of the Land Use Article

The following analyzes whether the Draft Amendment meets the requirements of Non-Charter County/Municipal comprehensive plan elements, in accordance with the Land Use Article.

Development Regulations Element – Synopsis

The element is required to include the planning commission’s recommendations for land development regulations to implement the plan. Regulations are required to be flexible to promote innovative and cost saving site design, protect the environment and identify areas of growth. The areas identified for growth are required to encourage flexible regulations, which should further promote economic development using innovative techniques, streamlining the review of applications, including permit review and subdivision processing.

Plan Analysis

- The development regulations could be enhanced by including recommendations to improve the current standards to allow for creative reuse of properties in town. Site design standards could be developed or recommended to accommodate future zoning needs to encourage redevelopment of existing sites that may not conform with older zoning standards.

Housing Element - Synopsis

The housing element is required to address the need for housing within the jurisdiction that is affordable to low-income and workforce households. The housing element is required to also assess fair housing and ensure that a jurisdiction is affirmatively furthering fair housing through its housing urban development programs.

Plan Analysis

- MDP commends the town for its use of the 2020 Maryland Housing Needs Assessment & 10 Year Strategic Plan (Needs Assessment) in the development of the Draft Amendment’s housing element.
- MDP encourages the town to visit [MDP’s Housing Mapping and Data Dashboard](#) to ensure that the Draft Amendment uses the most current Area Median Income (AMI) levels for its analysis of affordable housing needs. Page 104 references the AMI unit deficiencies included in the Needs Assessment. Connecting these abstract AMI percentages to Calvert County’s actual 2024 AMI levels would better analyze the household incomes that need more affordable housing options. Such an analysis can make objectives, and thus plan implementation, more tangible and measurable.
- To ensure compliance with the housing element requirements of the Land Use Article, the jurisdiction should consider adding direct mentions of HB 1045 and HB 90, or their requirements, in the Draft Amendment’s Housing Chapter.
- The “Goals and Objectives” of the Housing Element on page 109-110 provide sound approaches that align with HB 90’s goal of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. MDP encourages the jurisdiction to visit our [HB 90 Resources Page](#) to access a variety of information, self-assessments, best practices, and more that can be helpful to a jurisdiction in its efforts to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing.
- MDP commends the town for allowing accessory dwelling units (ADUs). The Accessory Dwelling Unit Policy Task Force recently released its final [report](#), which Calvert County should review it desires more information and best practices about ADUs.
- In the Housing chapter, the Draft Amendment references Goal 4 of the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan’s Housing Chapter, which aims to support aging in place through universal house design housing units and supportive services, especially near health and support services. Strategy 7.4.2.2 on page 110 supports incentives for the construction of assisted living facilities and nursing facilities in the Town Center. The county should also consider zoning incentives and density bonuses to attract developers to the Prince Frederick Town center to undertake future affordable senior housing projects. Senior housing projects are on the rise throughout the state due to an overall aging population, so planning for and zoning areas accordingly can help attract developers. Floating zones could be used to redevelop existing infill sites that may fit the future needs of the town.

Sensitive Areas Element – Synopsis

The sensitive areas element is required to include the goals, objectives, principles, policies, and standards designed to protect sensitive areas from the adverse effects of development (more recently referred to as climate change impacts). The LUA also assigns sensitive areas element data provision and review responsibilities to the Maryland Departments of the Environment and Natural Resources.

Plan Analysis

- The county should encourage landowners to consider working with the Forest Service as part of its [Forest Conservation and Management Program](#) to preserve existing tree cover in the area and continue its work with DNR’s [Rural Legacy Program](#). Both programs will assist the county in preserving its existing tree canopy around the Prince Frederick Town Center, while the county

works towards Objective 1 – 5.1.1.3 of establishing a tree canopy goal for the Prince Frederick Town Center. More information regarding these programs, along with other funding opportunities offered by DNR can be found [here](#).

Transportation Element - Synopsis

The transportation element is required to reasonably project into the future the most appropriate and desirable location, character, and extent of transportation facilities to move individuals and goods, provide for bicycle and pedestrian access and travelways, and estimate the use of proposed improvements.

Plan Analysis

- MDP is glad to see the Draft Amendment address traffic congestion through “areas of concern” and we encourage the county to consider developing innovative strategies such as a flexible LOS in the Prince Frederick Town Center and in areas that are developed or planned to be developed in a compact, mixed-use manner.
 - Although level of service (LOS) and volume to capacity ratio are important methods used to measure traffic congestion (page 112), they tend to focus on automobile traffic and do not account for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized modes. Certain roadway designs and associated LOS standards should safely accommodate all users, which should consider a lower LOS for roads when striving for a balance of non-motorized users. For instance, in a compact/mixed-use environment with transit accessibility, LOS E rather than LOS D for intersections may be more appropriate.
- The county may want to consider developing policies to address a jobs-housing imbalance, such as incentivizing employment in areas located close to residential uses or within the town center to reduce long-distance commuting, congestion on MD-2/4, and wear and tear on local and state roadways.
 - The county should consider implementing transportation demand management strategies to encourage carpooling, for example.
 - The county may want to consider promoting information on commuter choice programs and alternative transportation to help reduce in-town and pass through traffic. There are [multiple incentive programs](#) to support alternative transportation, e.g., transit, ridesharing, and telework/flexible work, for commuters in Maryland. These programs are available for all Calvert County residents.
- The Draft Amendment’s desire to widen, extend, and build new roads (page 120) would likely increase vehicular traffic throughout the Town Center and may impact adjacent land use. Has the county developed a phasing or implementation strategy for future roadway construction?
- MDP applauds the Draft Amendment’s goal to develop the Baltimore and Drum Point railroad bed as a walking, biking, and jogging trail, which will provide additional transportation options for those without access to automobiles. This effort may be eligible for financial assistance under the [Kim Lamphier Bikeways Network Program](#). To learn more, please visit [that webpage](#) or contact MDOT’s Environment and Sustainable Transportation Program Deputy Director, Meg Young at Myoung7@mdot.maryland.gov

- MDP is pleased to see the Draft Amendment prioritize connecting neighborhoods with trails to enable more travel by walking and bicycling. To improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity within the Town Center, the state provides various funding and technical assistance programs to support local efforts to improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Learn more by visiting the [Maryland Department of Transportation \(MDOT\)'s active transportation programs](#) webpage. In addition, please see the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)'s report on "[Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks](#)," which provides best practice examples to enhance pedestrian and bicycle networks in rural communities and small towns.
- If the Town Center wishes to expand its EV charging infrastructure, technical and financial assistance programs are available. Please refer to Maryland's EV website at https://marylandev.org/local_ev_resources/.
- The Recommended Roadway Network Improvements map on page 123 may be easier to read if it were made larger or full-size and include contextual layers such as Priority Funding Areas, land use, zoning, and growth boundaries. This may provide readers with important context while reviewing roadway recommendations.
- The Illustrative Bikeways Network map on page 123 may benefit from being made larger or full-size and including contextual layers such as Priority Funding Areas, growth boundaries, locations of parks, shopping, schools and existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and/or trails.

Water Resources Element – Synopsis

The water resource element (WRE) is required to consider available data provided by the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to identify drinking water that will be adequate for the needs of existing and future development proposed in the plan, as well as suitable receiving waters and land areas to meet stormwater management and wastewater treatment and disposal needs. MDE and MDP are available to provide technical assistance to prepare the water resources element, ensuring consistency with MDE programs and goals. MDE and MDP jointly developed WRE guidance to demonstrate how local governments can ensure compliance with the WRE requirements. Local jurisdictions are expected to implement the most important aspects of the MDE/MDP WRE guidance.

Plan Analysis

- The Draft Amendment mentions facility retrofits as a possible way to address degraded waterways. State grants for stormwater retrofits are available for local governments and NGOs through the Maryland Chesapeake and Atlantic Coastal Bays Trust Fund. The grants can be in excess of \$1 million. For more information, visit: <https://dnr.maryland.gov/ccs/Pages/funding/trust-fund.aspx>
- The Calvert County Comprehensive Plan includes a WRE that describes the Prince Frederick water and wastewater capacity and demand through 2040. The Prince Frederick Master Plan Water Resources chapter also includes an analysis of the town's capacity and demand for water and wastewater through 2040. However, neither the Prince Frederick Master Plan Water Resources chapter nor the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan WRE includes a stormwater impact analysis to consider the stormwater pollution impact from the proposed land use plan.
- The Prince Frederick Master Plan Water Resources chapter does not discuss climate change impacts to water resources planning. The county should consider how it can incorporate climate change considerations into its water resources planning efforts.

- MDP included a checklist of best practices to identify and plan for suitable receiving waters within the [2022 WRE Guidance update](#). The state requests that local governments meet the best practices in the WRE Guidance Update as best as they can within the limitations of cost and time. The county conducted a Wastewater Assessment in the 2014 Update of its Water and Sewerage Plan, is actively working to achieve its TMDL target loads, and calls for assessments of creeks and tributaries within the town center. Some examples of best practices from the checklist that the town should consider implementing following the adoption of the amendment include explaining the Water Use Class and assessment status (including TMDLs) for waters within the town center’s development areas (if applicable); Pollution Risk Assessment; load reduction tracking; strategies for ensuring a higher-than-minimum-requirements-level of water quality restoration and protection; and identification of recurrent flooding areas and evaluation of whether climate change and planned development will worsen those conditions, along with changes to the land use plan where warranted.
- All local jurisdictions in Maryland are and will continue to experience climate change impacts on water resources and water infrastructure (water, sewer, and stormwater), as well as water impacts on communities. The Community Facilities water/sewer sections could be adjusted to include strategies focused on improving local understanding of current or expected water-related climate change impacts at the local level, and if sufficient information exists, the chapter climate change adaptation into the comprehensive plan are listed at <https://planning.maryland.gov/Pages/OurWork/envr-planning/waterresources-mg/2022/03/climatechange-checklist.aspx>.
- If the land use changes (if applicable) in the Draft Amendment are planned in a watershed(s) prone to riverine or urban flooding, then the Community Facilities water/sewer sections should be adjusted to incorporate the flooding-related components of the 2022 WRE guidance. See <https://planning.maryland.gov/Pages/OurWork/envr-planning/water-resources-mg/2022/02/framework-cwa-wqfloodmgmt.aspx>. At a minimum, the WRE should indicate the extent of current local knowledge concerning flood-prone areas and should discuss whether implementation of the land use plan (if applicable) will increase, decrease, or have no effect on those flood-prone areas. If the local government does not know what type of impact implementation of the land use plan will have on flood-prone areas, then the WRE should include a strategy to complete a study to determine this.

Goals and Objectives Element - Synopsis

This element requires that comprehensive plan goals, objectives, principles, policies, and standards guide the development, economic growth, and social well-being of the community.

Plan Analysis

- The county should continue to update their goals and outcomes as they become available or completed. MDP encourages the town to submit these updates during the five-year reporting update that is submitted to our department as per Land Use Article [Section 1-207\(c\)\(6\)](#)
- A goal for each element is detailed in the Draft Amendment, but hot topic areas or additional goals that arise should be expanded and included later in the implementation matrix during future updates.

- Maintaining and/or expanding partnerships and creating new partnerships should continue to be a Draft Amendment goal. Successful partnerships are key to accomplishing goals and outcomes. Partnership expansion should be explored during future planning cycles.

Land Use Element - Synopsis

The land use element is required to reasonably project into the future the most appropriate and desirable patterns for the general location, character, extent, and interrelationship of the uses of public and private land.

Plan Analysis

- The Land Use Element on page 48 states that one of the key goals is to focus energy and investment on key “nodes” or neighborhoods rather than planning every detail of the Prince Frederick Town Center. Grants are made available through Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) via the agency’s [Community Health and Safety Works \(CHSW\) – Community Placemaking Grant](#). Although the application window is currently closed, MDP encourages the County to monitor the grant page for when a new submission window opens.
- The county should consider creating and identifying short, moderate, and long-term goals geared toward future node/neighborhood growth for the nodes/neighborhoods. This would allow the town center to grow as the Draft Amendment ages and limit the need for future amendments to the Prince Frederick Master Plan.

Community Facilities Element - Synopsis

The community facilities element is required to propose, as far into the future as is reasonable, the most appropriate and desirable patterns for the general location, character, and extent of public and semipublic buildings, land, and facilities. These facilities may include, but are not limited to fire stations, libraries, cultural facilities, hospitals, places of worship, school and education facilities, and parks.

Plan Analysis

- In the Implementation Chapter on page 200, one of the approaches to be used to address Goal 3. Objective 1 is to increase the inventory of parks and recreation assets and programs to correspond with the county’s population growth. MDP staff recommends seeking funding through DNR’s [Community Parks and Playgrounds Program](#).

Areas of Critical Concern Element - Synopsis

The critical state concern element is required to include planning commission recommendations to determine, identify, and designate areas that are of critical state concern.

Plan Analysis

Areas of Critical State Concern (ACSC) are addressed on page 61 in the Sensitive Areas section of Chapter 5. The Draft Amendment correctly states that MDP identified Battle Creek Cypress Swamp as an ACSC because it is one of the northernmost sites of naturally occurring and last remaining bald cypress trees and is a vital habitat for a variety of species. The swamp was also designated a National Natural Landmark in 1965.

MDP commends Calvert County for referencing MDP's [1981 designation](#) of the swamp and for its dedication to preservation. The county should also consider accessing [Maryland Greenprint](#) for more current natural resource designations. MDP encourages Calvert County to review the list of designated areas, plans, studies, and programs in the State Development Plan, [A Better Maryland](#), and address any additional areas of critical state concern that may be relevant to future comprehensive/master planning efforts and their implementation.

Growth Tiers - Synopsis

Plan Analysis

- MDP recommends revisiting the county adopted growth tier map in conjunction with this Draft Amendment to ensure consistency with the 2022 amendment of the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan.

Prince Frederick Town Center is a Sustainable Community

Calvert County has designated the Prince Frederick Town Center as a Sustainable Community. As part of the Sustainable Community designation, quality of life, environment, economy, transportation, housing, planning and land use, and local capacity are all subjects of the action plan.

- MDP suggests the county review its action plan(s) for consistency with the Draft Amendment and consider how the action plan and the financial incentives provided in the Sustainable Communities designation can support plan implementation.
- Contact the [Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development, Sustainable Communities Program](#) for more information.

General Plan Comments/Recommendations

- It can be challenging to read a PDF document that is designed to be split over two pages in a flip-book layout. Will the final plan be available in PDF and flip book viewer?
- There appears to be missing text at the end of the second paragraph on page 124, "...impact fees per unit to ensure."
- There appears to be misplaced text at the end of the fourth paragraph on page 124, "...contiguous built environment, only 17 were registered in the zip code."

**Maryland Department of Planning Review Comments
Draft Plan**

STATE AGENCY COMMENTS

The following are state agency comments in support of MDP's review of the draft plan. Comments not included here may be submitted under separate cover, or via the State Clearinghouse. If comments from other agencies are received by MDP, the department will forward them to Calvert County as soon as possible.

Attachments

Page 9 Maryland Historical Trust

Page 11 Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development

Page 14 Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Page 16 Maryland State Highway Administration

Wes Moore, Governor
Aruna Miller, Lt. Governor



Rebecca L. Flora, AICP, LEED ND / BD+C, Secretary
Elizabeth Hughes, MHT Director and
State Historic Preservation Officer

Maryland

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

MARYLAND HISTORICAL TRUST

July 31, 2024

Mr. Korey Layman
Regional Planner
Maryland Department of Planning
301 West Preston Street, Room 1101
Baltimore, MD 21201

Dear Mr. Layman:

Thank you for the opportunity to review Calvert County's draft Town Center Master Plan for Prince Frederick and submit comments on behalf of the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT). Overall, we support the plan's inclusion of historic and cultural properties and the goals laid out for their protection and interpretation within the plan. We also note that, as a Certified Local Government, Calvert County may pursue competitive project grants to support some of the priorities outlined; please contact me at nell.ziehl@maryland.gov for more information. Specific comments follow below.

We encourage reconsideration of the language used (and possibly the approach) for *Objective 2: Encourage new construction projects to emulate architectural features found on existing historic structures* (p. 98). The [Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation](#), which serve as the primary guiding principles for historic preservation, include two standards relevant to this objective, which indicate that new construction should be compatible with historic properties but should be distinguished as a product of its time.

Standard 3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. **Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.** (emphasis mine)

Standard 9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. **The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.** (emphasis mine)

We recommend adjusting this objective and recommended actions to make clear that the approach and "best practices" promoted will be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

We also note that opportunities to leverage Prince Frederick's cultural assets include economic development through heritage tourism, and the [Southern Maryland National Heritage Area](#) is positioned to be an important partner in this effort. We recommend making a more prominent mention of the heritage area and these opportunities.

Finally, please ensure that "Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties" is the name used consistently for state inventory data. (For example, recommended action on p. 98 refers to the "Maryland Registry of Historic Places" and the map on p. 87 refers to the "Maryland Inventory of Historic Sites.")

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the plan. Please let me know if you have any questions or would like more information about our programs. I can be reached at nell.ziehl@maryland.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Nell Ziehl".

Nell Ziehl
Chief, Office of Planning, Education and Outreach

Cc Rita Pritchett, MDP

July 30, 2024

Korey Layman
Maryland Department of Planning
301 West Preston Street, 11th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21201

Dear Mr. Layman,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Town Center Master Plan for Prince Frederick (the “Plan”). When reviewing plans, the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (“DHCD”) comments on items for which political subdivisions can strategically leverage DHCD’s resources to accomplish their housing and community development goals. DHCD also reviews comprehensive plans for consistency with relevant statutes and, if appropriate, Sustainable Communities Plans.

Overall, DHCD staff were impressed with the quality of the Plan. Staff in the DHCD Division of Neighborhood Revitalization reviewed the Plan and provided the following comments, which are meant to help realize the Plan’s goals. We present the following in no particular order:

1. The housing and economic development components of the Plan are consistent with and build upon the Calvert County Sustainable Communities Plan.
2. The Plan identifies a need to revitalize the community for which the DHCD’s Community Legacy Program grants could assist. Planning staff can learn more about Community Legacy online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Communities/Pages/programs/CL.aspx> or contact Jean Cannon at jean.cannon@maryland.gov or at 410-209-5806.
3. The Plan identifies a goal to support the vitality of its downtown. DHCD’s Maryland Facade Improvement Program (MFIP) provides funding for aesthetic improvements to the exteriors of businesses located in Maryland’s Sustainable Communities in order to stimulate local economic activity and support community development. Planning staff can learn more about MFIP online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Communities/Pages/StateRevitalizationPrograms/MFIP.aspx> or by contacting Jean Cannon at jean.cannon@maryland.gov or at 410-209-5806.
4. The Plan identifies a goal to support sustainable housing that enables seniors to age in place. DHCD can assist with home repairs that improve comfort, livability, and accessibility for homeowners through its Special Loan Programs. Planning staff and

residents can learn more about these programs at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Residents/Pages/SpecialLoans.aspx> or contact the program directly at 301-429-7409 or DHCD.SpecialLoans@maryland.gov.

5. The Plan identifies a goal to support infill development for which DHCD's Strategic Demolition Fund (SDF) grants could assist. Planning staff can learn more about SDF online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Communities/Pages/programs/SDF.aspx> or by contacting Jean Cannon at jean.cannon@maryland.gov or at 410-209-5806.
6. The Plan does not show that Calvert County has conducted a point-in-time count in Prince Frederick to identify the total number of people experiencing homelessness, and the Plan does not identify goals or actions regarding services for people experiencing homelessness. For information on DHCD's programs addressing homelessness, please see more online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/HomelessServices/Pages/GrantFunding.aspx> or contact the Homelessness Solutions Program Manager, Suzanne Korff, at 410-209-5850 or Suzanne.Korff@maryland.gov. Persons experiencing homelessness who need assistance should call 443-550-6900.
7. The Plan identifies the community's needs with respect to income and poverty. Calvert County or non-profits active in Prince Frederick may be eligible to apply for discretionary Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) funds administered by DHCD in order to provide services for low-income individuals and families at or below 125% of poverty. Planning staff can learn more about CSBG programs online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Communities/Pages/programs/CSBG.aspx> or contact the Poverty Solutions Team at 301-429-7525 or csbg.dhcd@maryland.gov.
8. The Plan identifies a need for affordable housing, including workforce and low-income housing. If planning staff want to support further affordable housing development with LIHTC or other DHCD programs, information is available online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/HousingDevelopment/Pages/lihtc/default.aspx> or contact Edward Barnett, Director of Rental Lending, at 301-429-7740 or edward.barnett@maryland.gov.
9. The Plan identifies a need to support businesses in the town square. Info on DHCD's support for businesses can be found online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Business/Pages/SmallBusinesses.aspx> or by contacting Mike Haloskey, Director of Business Lending Programs, at 301-429-7523 or Michael.Haloskey@maryland.gov.
10. The Plan identifies a need for infrastructure improvements that increase overall safety. DHCD's Community Health and Safety Works program is a potential resource to support these projects. More information on the program can be found online at <https://dhcd.maryland.gov/Communities/Pages/csw/default.aspx> or by contacting Eric Borchers, Project Manager, at 410-209-5833 or eric.borchers@maryland.gov.



We in the Division of Neighborhood Revitalization look forward to continuing our productive partnership with Prince Frederick in its future initiatives. Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Plan. If you have any questions regarding the comments above, please contact me at carter.reitman@maryland.gov or 410-209-5849.

Sincerely,

Carter Reitman
Project Manager
State Revitalization Programs

Cc: Joseph Griffiths, Maryland Department of Planning
Jean Cannon, DHCD Division of Neighborhood Revitalization
John Papagni, DHCD Division of Neighborhood Revitalization





Wes Moore, Governor
Aruna Miller, Lt. Governor
Josh Kurtz, Secretary
David Goshorn, Deputy Secretary

Maryland Department of Planning
301 West Preston Street
Suite 1101
Baltimore, MD 21201

Memo: DNR comments on Calvert County Comprehensive Plan Amendment

To: Korey Layman
cc: Rita Pritchett

On behalf of the Department of Natural Resources, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Amendment to the Calvert County Comprehensive Plan. The draft document was distributed to appropriate contacts at the Maryland Department of Natural Resources and reviewed. DNR offers the following comments:

Chapter 5 (Environment and Natural Resources) describes Calvert County's focus on protecting the headwaters of Parkers, Battle, and Hunting creeks by improving stormwater management and continued protection of perennial streams and their buffers. Although the importance of riparian buffers is well-described in the plan, there are no specific action items associated with riparian buffer enhancement. Riparian buffers should be created or widened along streams that harbor important ecological and recreational resources to help protect and enhance the current habitat conditions. County and Prince Frederick planners should consider adopting a minimum 100ft buffer along each bank where possible and increasing buffer widths in areas with steep slopes along streams by 2 feet per 1% of slope (as prescribed by S. Wenger. A review of the scientific literature on riparian buffer width, extent, and vegetation. Office of Public Service and Outreach. Institute of Ecology. University of Georgia 1999). Long-term maintenance of planted buffers should be included in riparian reforestation plans to reduce impacts from invasive plant and animal species that could reduce tree survival and growth.

Additionally, city planners should seize opportunities to improve fish passage when replacing aging infrastructure at stream crossings. Bridge improvements or culvert replacements should be installed to accommodate high flow events and to minimize obstacles to the movement of both resident and migratory aquatic species.

There are three anadromous fish spawning streams that could be impacted: Parker Creek (drains into the Bay), Hunting Creek and Battle Creek (both of which drain into the Patuxent River). The non-tidal anadromous fish spawning map estimates impervious surface for these watersheds. Parker and Hunting Creeks are at 6% and Battle Creek is at 5%. This is a low level of development for a southern Maryland watershed and at or very close to what we consider a target level indicating good habitat. Parker Creek has White Perch spawning; Hunting Creek has Yellow Perch, White Perch, and Herring spawning; and Battle Creek has Herring and White Perch spawning. Conservation of these watersheds should be the priority.

There is a water quality station adjacent to Prince Frederick just below Benedict on the Patuxent River (Eyes on the Bay RET 1.1). Bottom dissolved oxygen is poor there in the summer. Development of the Patuxent River watershed above there is likely the main source, but Prince Frederick contributes to this.

The County adopted an updated Patuxent River Policy Plan in 2014. The original plan started in 1984 (impervious surface was around 7%) to deal with point and nonpoint nutrient and sediment pollution associated with development of the watershed of its largest native river. Impervious surface is now around 14% and the river has a variety of major fish and shellfish habitat issues. The policy plan by itself hasn't effectively dealt with these issues.

Culture Resources and Sustainable Fisheries – Commercial and recreational fishing are part of the county's heritage, but there is not much mentioned about them.

The plan adequately acknowledges urban management practices that impact stream biology.

Stream restoration projects should be resisted and focused on restoration of heavily developed urban streams.

Cluster Development (Chapter 2, Vision 3) – The idea of having all the development in one area is good, but intensifying development in an area requires the city to prepare for pulses of water during high rain events. Proper stormwater management practices should be used. The ideas suggested for stormwater management practices seem adequate.

Prioritizing Trail Access to Open Spaces (Chapter 6) - DNR supports the idea of providing more trail access to open spaces. Trails aren't a significant contributor to sediment and nutrients entering a waterway, but a trail through a steep, sandy/loamy area will lead to erosion and sediment entering the body of water if not built properly. The recommendation would be to use the best trail building practices and develop a plan to keep up with maintenance over time to limit erosion.

Wastewater Treatment (Chapter 10) - In Table 9-4, it looks like the planned capacity and 2040 demand will be close. The expected EDUs by 2040 are 4,120 compared to 3,062 in 2014, an increase of 1,058 EDUs or 35%. This seems rather high over a 26-year period. Hopefully this is mostly related to adding failing septic systems to the public wastewater treatment systems.

The plan will not permit public sewer service in rural and agricultural areas – more septic systems will be added with rural growth which will impact aquatic resources.

Toxic contaminants are mentioned in the plan numerous times, but is not well defined. Is this primarily road salts/contaminants or something else?

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. If you have any questions about these comments or would like further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 443-534-4151 or christine.burns1@maryland.gov.

Best,
Christine Burns

July 2024 Prince Frederick Town Center Master Plan – SHA Comments

General Comments

- This plan aligns with Calvert County’s most recent 2024 transportation priorities letter. For example, this plan notes the need to maintain MD 2, MD 4, MD 2/4, and MD 231 as the main transportation corridors in the County.
- There are two (2) background developments in the vicinity – Calvert Hills and Prince Frederick Apartments. These have planned access to local roadways and do not appear to have off-site improvements conditioned at this time. The Armory Square development on the NE quadrant of the MD 2-4/MD 402 intersection will have impacts to both roadways. Additionally, the MD 402 Magnolia Ridge development on the eastern side of MD 2-4, south of Fox Run Boulevard and north of MD 402 will have impacts to both roadways. RIPD recommends coordination with Jonathan Makhoulf, SHA District 5 Regional Engineer – Access Management, at 410-841-1084 or jmakhoulf2@mdot.maryland.gov
- For all sidewalk improvements to MDOT SHA roadway facilities, please provide for and maintain bicycle facilities as well as full ADA-compliant pedestrian facilities. Coordinate design with Sean Campion, Division Chief, SHA Innovative Contracting Division, at 410-545-8863 or scampion@mdot.maryland.gov .
- The first mention of SHA should read Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (SHA).

Concepts

MD 231

- The State’s fiscally unconstrained Highway Needs Inventory (HNI), the State’s long-range plan, includes projects that are critical to Maryland’s transportation needs. SHA’s Highway Needs Inventory, includes a multi-lane reconstruct along MD 231 from Barstow Road to MD 2-4. When these improvements proceed, they may affect right-of way.

- The concept along MD 231 (Hallowing Point Road) for the Shared Use Path in the WB direction overlaps SHA District 5's design project for MD 231 from Toy Lane to Mason Road. Currently, the concept is complete, and District 5 is waiting on funding for design to be approved. This SUP would be outside of the scope of their project but depending on when District 5's funding is approved and when the county anticipates moving forward with this concept, there could be opportunity to cost share and include in the District 5 project. Please coordinate with Chau Chiem, SHA District 5 Team Leader, Engineering Systems at 410-841-1000 or cchiem@mdot.maryland.gov.

Prince Frederick

- The State's fiscally unconstrained Highway Needs Inventory (HNI), the State's long-range plan, includes projects that are critical to Maryland's transportation needs. SHA's Highway Needs Inventory, includes a divided highway reconstruct with access control improvements on adjacent MD 4 from MD 2 to Anne Arundel County line. When these improvements proceed, they may affect right-of way. Coordination should be had regarding this concept and should be vetted by SHA District 5 and SHA's Office of
- Highway Development (OHD). Please coordinate with Chau Chiem and Lindsay Bobian at 410-545-8765 or lbobian@mdot.maryland.gov

MD 402

- The State's fiscally constrained Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) includes projects that are critical to Maryland's transportation needs. The CTP includes a project to upgrade and widen MD 2/4 to a six-lane divided highway from north of Stoakley Road/Hospital Road to south of MD 765A. If the widening recommended in the study were to proceed, right-of-way may be affected.
- The State's fiscally unconstrained Highway Needs Inventory (HNI), the State's long-range plan, includes projects that are critical to Maryland's transportation needs. SHA's Highway Needs Inventory, includes a divided highway reconstruct with access control improvements on adjacent MD 2, from MD 765A to north of Stoakley Road in Prince Frederick. When these improvements proceed, they may affect right-of way. Please coordinate with Nafiseh Bozorgi at 410-545-8896 or nbozorgi@mdot.maryland.gov.

Page 121 – Bicycle, Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvement The paragraph indicates an illustrative bikeway network is shown below to identify the key corridors for new and improved bicycle facilities, but no network map is shown. Please revise this sentence to read on Page 123.

Page 122 – Artistic bicycle racks, as encouraged on Page 122, are typically ineffective at providing a secure bike parking experience, especially within constrained sidewalk areas. Please consider removing unique bicycle racks as a recommendation and references to raceways.

Page 123 – Illustrative Bikeways Network - The text box notes that each corridor should be evaluated to specifically identify the most appropriate facility type. Please update this section to reference the Maryland Department of Transportation FY22 Kim Lamphier Bikeways Network Program award to Calvert County for the Dunkirk and Prince Frederick Bikeways Feasibility Study which evaluated Prince Frederick roadways for appropriate bicycle facilities. Please verify the source as Mead & Hunt was the engineering firm of record for the Bikeways Feasibility Study. The findings from the study were to be referenced in this document as part of the Bikeways grant closing conditions. Please consider adding the study as an appendix to this area plan.

July 2024 Prince Frederick Town Center Master Plan – TSO Comments

Commuters

- Commuter Choice Maryland is MDOT’s Travel Demand Management (TDM) program, and it could be incorporated into the plan as a strategy to support the plan. The program offers an extensive menu of commuter transportation services, such as ridesharing. Please visit www.CommuterChoiceMaryland.com for more information. For direct local commuter services and planning, please contact Ms. Stacey King sking8@mdot.maryland.gov.

Local Transit

- The MDOT supports continued improvements to expand and enhance transit options. Please continue to coordinate with the MDOT Maryland Transit Administration (MDOT MTA) for the ongoing expansion of regional transit and the coordination of MDOT supported locally-operated transit services (LOTS). The MDOT MTA also supports park and ride (with MDOT SHA), demand response services, paratransit, medical services, and

senior-center transportation options. For local transit service planning, please contact Mr. Bruce Hojnacki BHojnacki@mdot.maryland.gov , MDOT MTA Regional Planner.