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Background

Comments and Staff Responses
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- Public Testimony
- State of Maryland
- Staff

Remaining Schedule

Questions/Discussion

Planning Board Action
Staff Recommendation

Approval of the 2017 PROS Plan for transmittal to the State of Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) as the County’s Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan (LPPRP), with the following revisions:

- Include an Executive Summary (*Attachment 2*), and revise the Plan document to reflect it.
- Delete the Urban Buffer Park Type from the Park Classification System and rename Community Use Urban Recreational Park as Urban Recreational Parklet.
- Add inventory of lands and facilities on non-M-NCPPC parkland as requested by the State of Maryland.
- Adjust Park Proximity and Equity analyses to reflect the updated inventory as requested by the State of Maryland.
Background

The PROS Plan

- Helps deliver the “right parks in the right places”, using a data-driven approach
- Updates policies
- Identifies future facility needs and resource conservation priorities
- Guides priorities for park acquisition, renovation, development and preservation

What is New about this PROS Plan

- Outreach represents today’s population
- Independent needs assessment by nationally known experts
- Priorities based on independent results as well as staff analysis
- More sophisticated data-driven methodologies to better determine priorities
Comments and Staff Responses

Planning Board
- Perform additional demographic analysis – segment analysis
- Highlight clear and bold strategies in an Executive Summary
- Eliminate Urban Buffer Park type
- Encourage hiring more people from demographic groups found in our County

Public Testimony
- Natural Resources Stewardship, Tennis, Rugby
- Service delivery geographies, park types and sizes, and facility sizes

State of Maryland
- Revise inventory
- Clarify equity analysis
- Add water sports

Staff
- Revise park type name from Community Use Urban Recreational Park to Urban Recreational Parklet
Planning Board Comments

Additional Demographic Analysis

- Perform additional demographic analysis to see if there are any trends or patterns in preferences by subgroups of the population, such as by age, race, ethnicity, sex, income, geography, etc.

- PROS Consulting Inc. performed a Segment Analysis, according to:
  - Four geographic areas
  - Households with incomes under $70,000
  - Households with children
  - Age segments of 20-34, 35-54, and 55+
  - Race and ethnicity
Project Consultant Team

PROS Consulting
- National, full-service management consulting and planning firm specializing in government and not-for-profit agencies
- National experience: 1,000+ projects, 47 states, 7 countries with 100+ years combined experience in the public sector
- Clients have included: Fairfax County Parks, (Virginia), Metro Parks Tacoma (Washington), Miami-Dade County Regional Parks Strategy, (Florida), Dakota County Parks Visitor Services Plan (Minnesota)

ETC Institute
- Specialize in the design and administration of statistically valid surveys
- Conducts market research for more major U.S. cities than any other firm

Communities Connect
- Focus group facilitation with a specialization in outreach to minority communities typically underrepresented in public input process

Peak Democracy
- Online forum for collecting location-specific community input and feedback
Segment Analysis Consultant Team

PROS Consulting

- National, full-service management consulting and planning firm specializing in government and not-for-profit agencies
- National experience includes: 1,000+ projects, 47 states, 7 countries with 100+ years combined experience in the public sector
- Selected clients have included: Fairfax County Parks, (Virginia), Metro Parks Tacoma (Washington), Miami-Dade County Regional Parks Strategy, (Florida), Dakota County Parks Visitor Services Plan (Minnesota)

ETC Institute

- Specialize in the design and administration of statistically valid surveys
- Conducts market research for more major U.S. cities than any other firm
Segment Analysis

Outreach & Needs Assessment – Deeper Dive

- The Community Outreach and Needs Assessment is a part of:
  - 2017 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan,
  - Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan,
  - Capital Improvement Plan.
- Key findings are analyzed alongside and integrated with guidance from previous plans, including:
  - Vision 2030 and the 2012 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan
- Detailed analysis completed for several demographic segments:
  - Four geographic segments based on planning areas: Micounty East, I-270 Corridor, Downcounty, and Outer Ring
  - Households with income less than $70,000
  - Households with children
  - Age segments 20-34, 35-54, and 55+
  - Race and Ethnicity
Segment Analysis

Map of Survey Responses by Geographic Area
Segment Analysis

Survey Responses by Geographic Area vs. Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MIDCOUNTRY EAST</th>
<th>I-270 CORRIDOR</th>
<th>DOWNCOUNTRY</th>
<th>OUTER RING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Respondents</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Population Percentage Estimates</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

Midcounty East Segment - Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Segments</th>
<th>ETC Survey</th>
<th>2011-2015 ACS 5-Year Estimates</th>
<th>Age Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

Midcounty East Segment - Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $30K</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>Less than $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30K to $69,999</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>$30,000-$74,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70K to $99,999</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100K to $129,999</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$100,000-$124,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$130K+</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>$125,000 and up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

### Midcounty East Segment – Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>ETC Survey</th>
<th>2011-2015 ACS 5-Year Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic white</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic black/African Am.</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Other (Includes American Indian)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

MIDCOUNTY-EAST: Priority Investment Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

### I-270 Corridor Segment - Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Segments</th>
<th>ETC Survey</th>
<th>2011-2015 ACS 5-Year Estimates</th>
<th>Age Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>21.70%</td>
<td>20-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
<td>45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>11.30%</td>
<td>55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

I-270 Corridor Segment - Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $30K</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>Less than $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30K to $69,999</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>$30,000-$74,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70K to $99,999</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100K to $129,999</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>$100,000-$124,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$130K+</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>$125,000 and up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

### I-270 Corridor Segment – Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>ETC Survey</th>
<th>2011-2015 ACS 5-Year Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic white</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic black/African Am.</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Other (Includes American Indian)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

I-270 Corridor: Priority Investment Ratings
## Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

### Downcounty Segment - Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Segments</th>
<th>ETC Survey</th>
<th>2011-2015 ACS 5-Year Estimates</th>
<th>Age Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

#### Downcounty Segment - Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $30K</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>Less than $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30K to $69,999</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>$30,000-$74,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70K to $99,999</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100K to $129,999</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$100,000-$124,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$130K+</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>$125,000 and up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

### Downcounty Segment – Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>ETC Survey</th>
<th>2011-2015 ACS 5-Year Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic white</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic black/African Am.</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Other (Includes American Indian)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment Analysis -- Geographic Area Segments

Downcounty: Priority Investment Ratings

- Natural surface trails
- Natural areas & wildlife habitats
- Paved, multi-use trails
- Public gardens
- Community gardens
- Nature play spaces
- Nature center with outdoor educational areas
- Park shelters & picnic areas
- Rectangular sports fields
- Tennis courts
- Museums & History Centers
- Flexible lawn areas
- Dog parks
- Playgrounds
- Historic & cultural sites
- Basketball courts
- Rentable space (for formal events)
- Paved plazas
- Skate parks
- Volleyball courts
- Courts
- Diamond athletic fields
- Cricket fields

High Priority (100+)
Medium Priority (50-99)
Lower Priority (0-49)
## Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

### Outer Ring Segment - Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Segments</th>
<th>ETC Survey</th>
<th>2011-2015 ACS 5-Year Estimates</th>
<th>Age Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>20-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

### Outer Ring Segment - Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $30K</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>Less than $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30K to $69,999</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>$30,000-$74,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70K to $99,999</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100K to $129,999</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$100,000-$124,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$130K+</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>$125,000 and up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Segment Analysis – Geographic Area Segments

### Outer Ring Segment – Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>ETC Survey</th>
<th>2011-2015 ACS 5-Year Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic white</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic black/African Am.</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Other (Includes American Indian)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment Analysis -- Geographic Area Segments

Downcounty: Priority Investment Ratings

- Natural surface trails: High Priority (100+)
- Paved, multi-use trails: High Priority (100+)
- Natural areas & wildlife habitats: High Priority (100+)
- Public gardens: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Dog parks: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Historic & cultural sites: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Museums & History Centers: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Park shelters & picnic areas: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Community gardens: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Flexible lawn areas: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Nature center with outdoor educational areas: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Playgrounds: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Nature play spaces: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Rectangular sports fields: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Rentable space (for formal events): Lower Priority (0-49)
- Tennis courts: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Diamond athletic fields: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Basketball courts: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Volleyball courts: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Courts: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Paved plazas: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Skate parks: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Cricket fields: Lower Priority (0-49)
Top Priorities across Geographies

Top four are consistent

- Natural Surface Trails
- Paved, Multiuse Trails
- Natural Areas and Wildlife Habitats
- Public Gardens
Countywide Segment Analysis

Income
Age
Race and Ethnicity
Countywide Segment Analysis

Households with Income < $70,000

- **Key demographics**
  - 11.3% Hispanic
  - More likely to be female
  - More likely to be age 65+ or 18-34

- **Key characteristics from survey**
  - More likely than others to rank parks and recreation facilities as important
  - More likely than others to use walking or public transportation rather than cars to reach parks
  - More likely than others not to have visited a M-NCPPC facility, or did not know if they had
  - More likely than others to indicate that providing recreational opportunities for people of lower income households is important
  - Most are Very or Somewhat Satisfied with the value of parks
  - Slightly lower sense of pride in parks than those in higher income brackets
  - Programming priorities are toward children and teens
Countywide Segment Analysis

Households with Income < $70,000

- Most important services parks provide
  - Provide opportunities to improve physical health and fitness
  - Conserve natural resources & environment
  - Improve mental health & stress

- Reasons parks are not used
  - Too busy
  - Don’t know what programs are offered
  - Fees are too high

- Top media/channels for learning about park programs and activities
  - Word of mouth
  - Montgomery Parks website
  - Montgomery recreation website
  - Program Guide

- Most important park facilities
  - Natural surface trails
  - Paved, multi-use trails
  - Playgrounds
  - Natural areas and wildlife habitats
  - Historic and cultural sites
Countywide Segment Analysis

Households with Income < $70,000: Priority Investment Ratings

- Natural surface trails: High Priority (100+)
- Natural areas & wildlife habitats: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Paved, multi-use trails: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Museums & History Centers: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Historic & cultural sites: Medium Priority (50-99)
- Nature center with outdoor educational areas: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Park shelters & picnic areas: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Nature play spaces: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Community gardens: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Playgrounds: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Public gardens: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Dog parks: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Rectangular sports fields: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Flexible lawn areas: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Rentable space: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Tennis courts: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Skate parks: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Diamond athletic fields: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Basketball courts: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Volleyball courts: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Paved plazas: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Courts: Lower Priority (0-49)
- Cricket fields: Lower Priority (0-49)
Countywide Segment Analysis

Households with Children < age 10

- Key demographics
  - More likely to live in a multi-family home than those with older or no children
  - 75% speak English as a primary language

- Key characteristics from survey
  - More likely than others to rank parks and recreation facilities as Very Important
  - Just as likely as others to rate park facilities as Good or Excellent
  - More likely than others to walk to parks and facilities, but still prefer to drive
  - Most are Very or Somewhat Satisfied with the value of parks
  - Slightly higher sense of pride in parks than those with older or no children
  - Programming priorities are toward children and teens
Countywide Segment Analysis

Households with Children < age 10

- Most important services parks provide
  - Provide opportunities to improve physical health and fitness
  - Provide recreational facilities/programs for children and teens
  - Conserve natural resources & environment

- Reasons parks are not used
  - Too busy
  - Don’t know what programs are offered
  - Program times are not convenient
  - Rectangular sports fields
  - Nature play spaces

- Top media/channels for learning about activities
  - Montgomery Parks website
  - Montgomery recreation website
  - Word of mouth
  - Program Guide

- Most important park facilities
  - Playgrounds
  - Paved, multi-use trails
  - Natural surface trails
Countywide Segment Analysis

Households with Children < age 10: Priority Investment Ratings

- Playgrounds: 157
- Paved, multi-use trails: 142
- Natural surface trails: 140
- Nature play spaces: 136
- Nature center with outdoor educational areas: 106
- Natural areas & wildlife habitats: 100
- Park shelters & picnic areas: 100
- Public gardens: 94
- Rectangular sports fields: 91
- Flexible lawn areas: 89
- Community gardens: 85
- Museums & History Centers: 66
- Rentable space: 64
- Historic & cultural sites: 58
- Dog parks: 57
- Basketball courts: 45
- Diamond athletic fields: 37
- Tennis courts: 36
- Skate parks: 28
- Volleyball courts: 25
- Paved plazas: 24
- Courts: 18
- Cricket fields: 4

High Priority (100+)
Medium Priority (50-99)
Lower Priority (0-49)
Countywide Segment Analysis

Age Segments 20-34, 35-54, and 55+

- **Key demographics**
  - Ages 20-34 and 55+ are more likely than others to reside in a multi-family home
  - Ages 35-54 are more likely to reside in a townhome or duplex
  - Ages 35-54 represent the highest income bracket of the three age segments
  - 80% of all three age segments speak English as a primary language in the home

- **Key characteristics from survey**
  - All three age segments are likely to rank parks and recreation facilities as Very Important
  - Satisfaction with the physical condition of parks are higher in the 20-34 and 35-54 age segments than in the 55+ age segment
  - Ages 20-34 are most likely to walk to parks, and 35-54 are most likely to bicycle
  - Driving is preferred method of reaching parks of all age segments, though the 20-34 age segment is more likely than the others to drive
  - All three age segments tend to be Very or Somewhat Satisfied with the value of parks
  - All three age segments have a similar level of sense of pride in parks
Countywide Segment Analysis

Age Segments 20-34, 35-54, and 55+
All agree on the top two of the following, with the third being different:

- Most important services parks provide
  1. Provide opportunities to improve physical health and fitness
  2. Conserve natural resources & environment
  3. Provide recreational facilities/programs for children and teens (20-34 & 35-54 age segments)
  3. Make Montgomery County a more desirable place to live (55+ age segment)

- Reasons parks are not used
  1. Too busy
  2. Don’t know what programs are offered
  3. Program times are not convenient (35-54 age segment)
  3. Too far from residence (20-34 and 55+ age segments)
Countywide Segment Analysis

Age Segments 20-34, 35-54, and 55+

- Top media/channels for learning about park programs and activities (20-34 and 55+ age segments)
  1. Word of mouth
  2. Montgomery Parks website
  3. Montgomery Recreation website
  4. Flyers at facilities
Countywide Segment Analysis

Age Segments 20-34, 35-54, and 55+

- Top five most important park amenities/facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Ages 20-34</th>
<th>Ages 35-54</th>
<th>Ages 55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paved, multi-use trails</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural surface trails</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas &amp; wildlife habitat</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular sports fields</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park shelters &amp; picnic areas</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public gardens</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Countywide Segment Analysis

Age Segments 20-34: Priority Investment Ratings

- Natural surface trails: 192
- Paved, multi-use trails: 181
- Natural areas & wildlife habitats: 142
- Community gardens: 106
- Public gardens: 101
- Park shelters & picnic areas: 100
- Nature play spaces: 98
- Flexible lawn areas: 92
- Dog parks: 88
- Nature center with outdoor educational areas: 85
- Playgrounds: 85
- Rentable space: 75
- Historic & cultural sites: 72
- Museums & History Centers: 70
- Rectangular sports fields: 70
- Basketball courts: 46
- Tennis courts: 46
- Volleyball courts: 31
- Paved plazas: 27
- Diamond athletic fields: 25
- Skate parks: 24
- Cricket fields: 18
- Courts: 12
Countywide Segment Analysis

Age Segments 35-54: Priority Investment Ratings

- Paved, multi-use trails
- Natural surface trails
- Natural areas & wildlife habitats
- Public gardens
- Playgrounds
- Park shelters & picnic areas
- Museums & History Centers
- Nature center with outdoor educational areas
- Community gardens
- Rectangular sports fields
- Nature play spaces
- Historic & cultural sites
- Flexible lawn areas
- Dog parks
- Tennis courts
- Basketball courts
- Rentable space
- Courts
- Volleyball courts
- Skate parks
- Diamond athletic fields
- Paved plazas
- Cricket fields

Priority Ratings:
- High Priority (100+)
- Medium Priority (50-99)
- Lower Priority (0-49)
Countywide Segment Analysis

Age Segments 55+: Priority Investment Ratings
Countywide Segment Analysis

Race and Ethnicity

- **Key demographics**
  - Non-Hispanic African Americans or Black and Non-Hispanic Asians, Native Hawaiians, or Asian-Pacific Islanders, and Non-Hispanic Others are more likely to reside in a townhome or duplex
  - Income levels are fairly evenly distributed across the race and ethnicity segments
  - English is the primary language in the home for 96% of Non-Hispanic Whites,
    79.6% of Non-Hispanic African Americans or Blacks,
    56% of Non-Hispanic Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (90.3% of Non-Hispanic Other)
    54.1% of Hispanics

- **Key characteristics from survey**
  - All segments are likely to rank parks and recreation facilities as Very to Somewhat Important
  - Satisfaction with the physical condition of the parks are higher with Non-Hispanic Whites and Non-Hispanic African Americans
  - Non-Hispanic African Americans are more likely than others to take the bus; Non-Hispanic Asians are more likely than others to take the Metrorail
  - All race and ethnicity segments tend to be Very or Somewhat Satisfied with the value of parks
  - All race and ethnicity segments have a similar level of sense of pride in parks
Countywide Segment Analysis

Race and Ethnicity

- **Most important services parks provide**
- All race and ethnicity segments agree on the top two reasons for not using parks and facilities, with the third being different:
  1. Too busy
  2. Don’t know what programs are offered
  3. Program times are not convenient *(NH African American, NH Other, and Hispanic)*
  3. Too far from residence *(NH White, NH Asian, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOST IMPORTANT SERVICES</th>
<th>NH WHITE</th>
<th>NH AFRICAN AMERICAN</th>
<th>NH ASIAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN,</th>
<th>NH OTHER (INCL. AM. INDIAN)</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities to improve physical health &amp; fitness</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve natural resources &amp; environment</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Montgomery County a more desirable place to live</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide recreational facilities/programs for children &amp; teens</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Countywide Segment Analysis

Race and Ethnicity

- Top media/channels for learning about park programs and activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION METHOD</th>
<th>NH WHITE</th>
<th>NH AFRICAN AMERICAN</th>
<th>NH ASIAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN,</th>
<th>NH OTHER (INCL. AM. INDIAN)</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Parks Website</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Recreation Website</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Guide</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Montgomery</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Countywide Segment Analysis

Race and Ethnicity

- Top five most important park amenities/facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>NH WHITE</th>
<th>NH AFRICAN AMERICAN</th>
<th>NH ASIAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN,</th>
<th>NH OTHER (INCL. AM. INDIAN)</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paved, multi-use trails</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1 (tie)</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural surface trails</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#1 (tie)</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas &amp; wildlife habitat</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#4 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular sports fields</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#4 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park shelters &amp; picnic areas</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4 (tie)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>#4 (tie)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Countywide Segment Analysis

Race and Ethnicity: Non-Hispanic White Priority Investment Ratings

[Bar chart showing priority ratings for various segments such as natural surface trails, paved multi-use trails, natural areas & wildlife habitats, public gardens, dog parks, community gardens, museums & history centers, nature center with outdoor educational areas, nature play spaces, historic & cultural sites, park shelters & picnic areas, flexible lawn areas, playgrounds, rectangular sports fields, tennis courts, rentable space, courts, diamond athletic fields, basketball courts, skate parks, volleyball courts, paved plazas, cricket fields, and their respective priority ratings marked as High Priority (100+), Medium Priority (50-99), and Lower Priority (0-49).]
Countywide Segment Analysis

Race and Ethnicity: Non-Hispanic African American or Black Priority Investment Ratings
Countywide Segment Analysis

Race and Ethnicity: Non-Hispanic Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Island Priority Investment Ratings
Countywide Segment Analysis

Race and Ethnicity: Hispanic Priority Investment Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>High Priority (100+)</th>
<th>Medium Priority (50-99)</th>
<th>Lower Priority (0-49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural surface trails</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved, multi-use trails</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas &amp; wildlife habitats</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park shelters &amp; picnic areas</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic &amp; cultural sites</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public gardens</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums &amp; History Centers</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature center with outdoor educational areas</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular sports fields</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature play spaces</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog parks</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible lawn areas</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentable space</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved plazas</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond athletic fields</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate parks</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball courts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment Analysis – Conclusion

- Priorities of residents remain largely consistent across geographic areas and demographic segments
  - Natural surface and paved trails
  - Natural areas and wildlife habitats
  - Park shelters and picnic areas
  - Playgrounds
  - Public gardens

- While there are a few nuances in some segments, trails always rise to the top
  - Flexible lawn areas and park space in urban areas
  - Playgrounds
  - Nature play areas
  - Rectangular sports fields
Planning Board Comments

- Highlight clear and bold strategies for delivery of parks and recreation facilities and services in an Executive Summary.

- Address what is different about this PROS Plan that will head us in the right direction.

- Integrate community-building into the document more prominently, with a basis for providing adequate social gathering spaces and amenities.
Executive Summary

Strategy - Meet needs equitably

- Equitably provide activated, central community spaces, while meeting recreational needs and protecting and managing natural and cultural resources for future generations.
- Continue to provide strategies for service delivery within our areas of highest need throughout the County.
- Add a new Park Equity factor for the Capital Improvements Program
Park Equity Tool

- Identifies high concentrations of lower income households with low walkable access to park entrances and trailheads.
  - Based on population density, Median Household Income as a percent of Area Median Income (AMI), and walkable access to parks and trailheads.
- Data sets mapped at the Census Block Group scale.
- Each Census Block Group scored according to the three factors and the individual scores added together to create an overall score.
- All factors weighted equally.
- Scores range from 0 – 9, with zero being the areas of least concern and nine being the areas of highest concern.
Executive Summary

Three Overarching Themes and Goals

- Optimize Existing Parks and Facilities
  - GOAL: Utilize existing park and recreation facilities and lands more fully

- Create Great, Activated Parks to Equitably Serve the County
  - GOAL: Provide spaces and programs that bring people together

- Steward and Interpret our Natural and Cultural Resources
  - GOAL: Prioritize the management and protection of natural and cultural resources.
Optimize Existing Parks and Facilities

Goal: Utilize existing park and recreation facilities and lands more fully

- Create a robust trail system of natural and hard surface trails.
  - Commit to fully realizing the priority trail segments as identified in the Countywide Park Trails Plan for natural and hard surface trails.
  - Provide access to resource-based recreational opportunities associated with M-NCPPC’s trail network.
- Ensure signage at trailheads and at key trail intersections.
- Incorporate historical and cultural interpretive signage wherever opportunities arise at trailheads or along trails.
- Ensure that all trails are adequately monitored, maintained and policed.
Optimize Existing Parks and Facilities

Goal: Utilize existing park and recreation facilities and lands more fully

- Create an exceptional system of athletic fields to serve all areas of Montgomery County
  - Complete an Athletic Fields Strategic Plan to align the services and functions of athletic fields in the County with the needs and expectations of the community, and the mission, mandates and resources of Montgomery County Parks.
  - Identify existing parkland or potential new parkland to provide exceptional recreational facilities including athletic fields in higher density, downcounty areas.
  - Expand athletic field capacity through lighting, synthetic turf, conversions, developer-provided rectangles, and improved design and construction of public school fields.
  - Select a site for an adult-sized cricket field in the MD Route 29 corridor.
  - Ensure that fields are adequately monitored and maintained to industry standards.
Optimize Existing Parks and Facilities

Goal: Utilize existing park and recreation facilities and lands more fully

- Develop and incorporate standards for design and planning of new or renovated parks for ease of maintenance, cleanliness and security
- Continue to balance repurposing and renovation with development and acquisition
- Determine where there are underutilized sports courts for potential conversion to skate parks, dog parks, or futsal courts
  - Select a pilot site for pickleball courts by converting one tennis court to two pickleball courts.
  - Continue to seek sites for dog parks, skate parks, and futsal courts on underutilized tennis courts.
Create Great, Activated Parks to Equitably Serve the County

Goal: Provide spaces and programs that bring people together.

- Create a network of great, activated parks that facilitate social gathering to serve areas of the County with the highest population and employment.
  - Create “signature” energized public spaces that will become regional destinations in areas of highest density.
  - Systematically identify needs for social gathering, active recreation, and contemplative recreation across the areas of higher population density in the County, by applying the methodologies of the Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan (EPS FMP) for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Areas (EPS FMP), currently under development, and through those methodologies: *Prioritize acquisition, development, programming for parks in the areas of greatest identified need.* *Develop and apply a more robust urban design framework to create urban park recommendations for future planning and regulatory review.*
- Create two new urban park types in the Park Classification System, to respond to a need for smaller “pocket greens” and “plazas” to complement the larger parks in an urban network.
Create Great, Activated Parks to Equitably Serve the County

Goal: Provide spaces and programs that bring people together.

- Promote park and recreation equity for all citizens of the County
  - Provide parks in areas of higher concentrations of lower income households with low walkable access to parks, recreation and open spaces, as identified to the Park Equity tool and staff analysis.
  - Add Park Equity to the criteria for prioritization of the Capital Improvement Program to promote equitable access to parks for all.
  - Consider Park Equity as a priority when recommending new parks and open spaces in master plans.
Create Great, Activated Parks to Equitably Serve the County

**Goal: Provide spaces and programs that bring people together.**

- Provide platforms for community-building events that address the cultural character of each region
  - Identify existing parkland or potential new parkland to support large community events and festivals.
  - Retrofit existing parks to add enhanced picnic areas, large group picnic areas, spaces for food trucks, bus shelters, and other support amenities.
- Select a site for a group picnic area in Rock Creek Regional Park.
- Provide multilingual signage, special bus routes, and marketing via local and ethnic media.
- Hire multilingual staff across the park system to serve non-English speakers.
Create Great, Activated Parks to Equitably Serve the County

Goal: Provide spaces and programs that bring people together.

- Expand the park activation program to get more people into the parks during their leisure time, to interest in, and generate return visitation to parks across the County
- Provide regional recreation centers to create multipurpose centers that combine a broad spectrum of recreation and leisure options, aquatic features and community recreation functions
Steward and Interpret our Natural and Cultural Resources

**Goal: Prioritize the management and protection of natural and cultural resources**

- Expand ongoing natural resource management efforts
  - Ensure that public access into natural areas is accomplished utilizing standards of a sustainable and well-maintained system of natural surface trails.
  - Inventory, restore and maintain natural areas with a focus on those areas of highest natural value.
  - Interpret Best Natural Areas and Biodiversity Areas.
  - Ensure the Commission’s Environmental Guidelines are consistently applied to all development projects on M-NCPPC parkland.
- Add language to the section of the Policy for Parks that clarifies the Planning Board’s practice of avoiding, minimizing, mitigating, and compensating for the impacts of public projects to M-NCPPC parkland.
Steward and Interpret our Natural and Cultural Resources

Goal: Prioritize the management and protection of natural and cultural resources

- Create the next generation of environmental stewards by improving natural resource-based programs and facilities

  - Complete a Nature Centers Functional Plan with an objective and data-based analysis to determine if and where any new nature centers or renovations should be constructed in the park system.

- Expand efforts to educate citizens and staff about natural resources to reach more children and adults, through interpretive programs (e.g., environmental literacy, Children in Nature, engaging diverse communities), and staff training (e.g., water quality protection, sediment and erosion control, Integrated Pest Management).

- Educate the public about our success in establishing a network of Best Natural Areas that protects the best examples of natural community types thereby preserving long term our County’s native biodiversity.

- Grow park advocacy efforts for stewardship of natural resources.
Steward and Interpret our Natural and Cultural Resources

Goal: Prioritize the management and protection of natural and cultural resources

- Expand cultural resource programming so people have sense of identity and community
  - Increase cultural resource programming at all types of parks to include, but not be limited to living history events, music programs, cultural hikes, historic re-enactments, foodways, crafts demonstrations, archaeology programs for families, etc.
  - Increase the focus on the preservation, restoration and adaptive reuse of those sites deemed the highest priority on the Cultural Resources Asset Inventory.
  - Expand interpretive and educational opportunities in parks through historical and archaeological programs with interactive and innovative exhibits.
  - Create premier cultural learning experiences at heritage sites (i.e., Josiah Henson Special Park, Woodlawn Special Park).
Steward and Interpret our Natural and Cultural Resources

Goal: Prioritize the management and protection of natural and cultural resources

- Expand cultural resource programming so people have sense of identity and community (continued)

- Transform the existing Agricultural History Farm Park into a regional attraction consistent with the Planning Board-approved 2005 vision, which would involve additional staff, live animal demonstrations, and expansion of the existing activity center (e.g., additional office space, interpretive displays, public meeting space, and a large auditorium, and expansion of parking areas).

- Work to ensure archaeological sites are protected and/or interpreted wherever possible.
Steward and Interpret our Natural and Cultural Resources

Goal: Prioritize the management and protection of natural and cultural resources

- Continue to acquire areas of highest quality natural habitat
  - Improved access to natural resource-based recreation
  - Unique or critical habitats
  - Areas of benefit to Best Natural Areas or Biodiversity Areas
  - Areas essential to improvement of water or air quality

- Continue to support a functioning rural and agricultural community in the Agricultural Reserve
  - Explore alternative sources to fund agricultural easement programs, including new public funding mechanisms and tools to incentivize private sector purchase of easements.
  - Implement the New Farmer Project to promote the creation of new sustainable-practice farm businesses using mentoring, business training, and an innovative approach to pairing start-ups with landowners to speed the start-up process.
## Eliminate the Urban Buffer Park Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Minimum Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY USE PARKS - Parks in this category serve residents of surrounding communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Community Use Urban Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN BUFFER PARKS</strong></td>
<td>Serve as green buffers at the edges of urban, high density development adjacent to lower density residential areas. They provide a green space within which residents and workers of an urban area may relax and recreate.</td>
<td><strong>1/4 acre Minimum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBORHOOD GREENS</strong></td>
<td>Serve the residents and workers from the surrounding neighborhood or district, but may be designed for more activity than an urban buffer park. These formally planned, flexible open spaces serve as places for informal gathering, lunchtime relaxation, or small special event gatherings.</td>
<td><strong>1/4 acre Minimum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POCKET GREENS</strong></td>
<td>Serve residents and workers from nearby area, designed for relaxation, lunch breaks, small games, play area for children, and outdoor eating. Consider access to sunlight, important view corridors, connection to the network of public spaces, and protection from the wind, traffic and noise.</td>
<td><strong>1/10-1/4 ACRE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN RECREATIONAL PARKS</strong></td>
<td>These parks serve the residents and workers from the surrounding neighborhood or district, and are designed for more active recreation than an urban buffer park or a neighborhood green.</td>
<td><strong>1/10 ACRE MINIMUM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS</strong></td>
<td>Small parks providing informal recreation in residential areas. Play equipment, play field, sitting area, shelter, tennis and Multi-use courts. (Do not include regulation size ballfields).</td>
<td><strong>2.5 ACRE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL PARKS</strong></td>
<td>Larger parks that provide ballfields and both programmed and un-programmed recreation facilities.</td>
<td><strong>15 ACRE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION AREAS</strong></td>
<td>Small parcels of conservation oriented parkland in residential areas, generally dedicated at the time of subdivision.</td>
<td><strong>Varies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping, sitting/picnic areas, play equipment, courts, and shelters.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawn area, shaded seating and pathways. May include a play area, a skate spot, a community garden, or similar neighborhood facilities.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawn area, shaded seating and pathways. May include a play area, a skate spot, a community garden, or similar neighborhood facilities.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program and design should reflect the demographics and culture of its surrounding users. Sunlit small gathering areas, shaded seating, small children play areas. May include movable furniture, focal point public art, and small-scale green areas and trees.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport courts, skate spots, and may include lawn areas, playgrounds or similar neighborhood recreation facilities.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments from Public Testimony

Natural Resources Stewardship
Tennis and Pickleball
Service Delivery Strategies
Park Types
Facility Sizes
Public Testimony on Natural Resources Stewardship

One Third / Two Thirds Policy
Replacement and compensation ratio
Public Testimony on Tennis and Pickleball

Repurposing underutilized courts
Public Testimony on Service Delivery

Service Delivery Strategies

- Dog Parks Service Delivery Strategy
  - **Total Need by 2030:** 19 additional dog parks
  - **Geographic Distribution:** Facilities to be delivered in proportion to percent of County population in each subarea of the County
How PROS Guides Service Delivery

Dog Parks Site Selection

- In Areas of Highest Need
  - Identify parks within ½ mile of urban area
  - Rank according to site selection criteria
  - Analyze usage
  - Community input
  - Planning Board review
  - Prioritize for CIP
Other Public Testimony

Size and Types of Parks

- **Staff Response**

  - Countywide parks are those that serve both the local neighborhood and a larger area. This category allows us to use GO bonds, while Community Use parks cannot.

  - A pocket green is a much smaller space than a neighborhood green and was added so we can secure more of these spaces in our urbanizing areas.

  - Civic greens are commonly supported by the public at 1-2 acres as the main, central, event space, and serve a different purpose than a neighborhood green.

  - Urban recreational parks are different from local parks in that they do not have parking, because they are located in densely populated areas.

  - Urban greenway is envisioned in the more densely populated areas for the purpose of linking to other trail, whereas Neighborhood Conservation Areas are typically environmentally constrained and are therefore places where trail and park construction is difficult.
Comments from State of Maryland

- Revise Inventory to Include all Recreation Lands and Facilities in the County
- Clarify how the Analyses of Park Proximity and Park Equity will Guide Future Priorities
- Add Water Sports to the Parks and Recreation Chapter
Urban Recreational Park Type

- Change from Community Use Urban Recreational Park to Urban Recreational Parklet
# Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPRING</td>
<td>Preliminary Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMER</td>
<td>Planning Board review of Outline, Schedule and Outreach Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL</td>
<td>Focus group meetings, Surveys, Public events, Begin writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WINTER</td>
<td>Continued focus group meetings, Surveys, Public events, Continue writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MARCH 2017                | Transmit preliminary Draft to State March 1, 2017  
                             | Community meetings on preliminary content  
                             | Adjust document based on public input  
                             | Write Working (Staff) Draft |
| APRIL 27                  | Planning Board review of Working (Staff) Draft |

**MAY - JUNE**  
May 25, 2017 Public Hearing  
**June 22, 2017 Work Session and Approval of final document with revisions**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUGUST, 2017</th>
<th>Submittal of approved document to State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FALL</td>
<td>Council Briefing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions, Discussion and Approval

Approval of the 2017 PROS Plan for transmittal to the State of Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) as the County’s Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan (LPPRP), with the following revisions:

- Include an Executive Summary (Attachment 2), and revise the Plan document to reflect it.
- Delete the Urban Buffer Park Type from the Park Classification System and rename Community Use Urban Recreational Park as Urban Recreational Parklet.
- Add inventory of lands and facilities on non-M-NCPPC parkland as requested by the State of Maryland.
- Adjust Park Proximity and Equity analyses to reflect the updated inventory as requested by the State of Maryland.
Thank you.

ParkPlanning.org
Brooke.Farquhar@MontgomeryParks.org