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The purpose of the **Vision 2030 Strategic Plan** is to:

- Develop a shared vision for the parks and recreation system in Montgomery County.
- Articulate clear strategies to address current and future needs. Collaboratively provide parks and recreation facilities and services.
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INTRODUCTION & PLANNING CONTEXT

In January, 2010, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) Department of Parks and the Montgomery County Department of Recreation embarked on a process to develop a vision and strategic plan for park and recreation services in Montgomery County. While the two departments manage different aspects of parks, stewardship of natural and cultural resources, and recreation and leisure, the needs and values of customers transcend agency boundaries. The Montgomery County Parks and Recreation Vision 2030 Strategic Plan project provides an opportunity to develop a shared vision and a set of recommendations that will best serve the County for the next twenty years.

This project was guided by a staff Steering Committee and sub-committees, a series of Summits of community leaders and stakeholders, along with input from an extensive public process including focus groups and public meetings.

Purpose

The purpose of the Vision 2030 plan is to:

- Develop a shared vision for the parks and recreation system in Montgomery County.
- Articulate clear strategies to address current and future needs. Collaboratively provide parks and recreation facilities and services.

This Vision 2030 Plan focuses on future parks and recreation services and facilities and sets forth a long-term vision and strategic goals and objectives. The Plan is not intended to deal comprehensively with every aspect of the two agencies, but instead focuses on gaps in service and key strategic areas including policy, programming, facilities, operations and maintenance, management, and marketing.
Vision 2030 Documents

Vision 2030 includes the following documents:

- Vision 2030 Strategic Plan Executive
- Summary Volume 1: Needs & Resource Assessment
- Volume 2: Vision 2030
- Strategic Plan Volume 3: Implementation Plan

This document, Volume 2: Vision 2030 Strategic Plan, contains recommendations based on key issues identified through the needs assessment. Following is a brief description of each the Vision 2030 documents and how they relate to each other.

Volume 1: Needs & Resource Assessment
The Needs & Resource Assessment is a separate support document to Volume 2. The needs assessment identifies key parks and recreation issues and needs in Montgomery County based on analysis in the following areas:

- Trends and demographics.
- Community and stakeholder input including a statistically-valid survey, public meetings and summits, and external and internal focus groups.
- Programs and services.
- Inventory analysis of parks and recreation facilities including key alternative providers such as municipalities and schools.
- Administration and management.

Volume 2: Vision 2030 Strategic Plan
The Vision 2030 Strategic Plan provides a vision to guide the development of the parks and recreation system for 20 years to 2030. The Plan lays out recommended goals and objectives to achieve the 2030 vision and address the key issues identified in the Volume 1: Needs & Resource Assessment.

Volume 3: Implementation Plan
The Implementation Plan is a staff-level document or work plan that identifies action steps to achieve the strategic goals and objectives along with the timeframe and financial and staff resources needed to implement the plan recommendations.
Key Challenges and Opportunities

The Vision 2030 Inventory and Level of Service Analysis shows that Montgomery County has an extensive system of high quality parks and associated recreation programs. To maintain this high level of quality into the future, the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Montgomery County Department of Recreation will need to:

- Maintain and strengthen the current parks and recreation system.
- Prioritize tax resources on core services. Ensure operational sustainability.
- Balance new construction with maintenance and repair of existing facilities.
- Respond to emerging trends and changing priorities.
- Strengthen stewardship of natural and historical resources.
- Continue to “green” the park system – including facilities, equipment, and operational programs.
- Continue the current focus on customer service and public safety.
- Collaborate to efficiently deliver quality services. Plan for future growth.
- Respond to changing demographics.

Growing demands and shrinking resources will continue to be a challenge. With strong leadership and a guiding vision, both departments have a unique opportunity to maximize operational sustainability by promoting environmental quality, enhancing social benefits, and reducing operating costs.

Decision Making Tools

The Vision 2030 project has generated strong quantitative and qualitative analysis and decision making tools to guide future planning efforts that include the following.

- Updated demographic information overall and by sub-area.
- Understanding of recreation trends.
- Identification of community values, interests, and needs.
- Results from the statistically-valid survey by sub-area.
- Service Assessment with identified provision strategies.
- Cost recovery philosophy and service pricing strategies.
- Detailed inventory of all Department components by sub-area along with data on alternative providers.
The following vision and mission statements provide the foundation for the Vision 2030 project. First, the Vision 2030 project value and vision statement are highlighted; followed by the M-NCPPC Department of Parks vision, mission, and values statements; and the Montgomery County Department of Recreation mission and operating principles and objectives. These statements affirm the central role that the parks, recreation, open space, and trails system play in contributing to the quality of life in Montgomery County.

Organizational values, vision, and mission provide fundamental principles and create a logical philosophical framework that guide and direct decision-making efforts. They are the foundation for all organizational decisions and processes.

An organization’s values are comprised of leadership values, staff values, and community values. They direct an organization’s vision and help determine those community conditions the agency wishes to impact through the organizational mission. The agency mission helps guide management decisions, often substantiating difficult decisions making them justifiable and defensible.
1. Vision 2030: Values and Vision Statements

The following values and vision statements for the Vision 2030 project were developed based on input from community leaders and stakeholders that participated in a Vision 2030 Summit in February 24, 2010.

VALUES

The M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Montgomery County Department of Recreation serve the County to:

- Promote healthy living through diverse recreation and leisure activities.
- Protect natural, historical, and archaeological resources.
- Promote economic competitiveness of Montgomery County as a place for businesses to locate through a robust parks and recreation system that attracts knowledge workers and families.
- Promote sense of community and civic pride.
- Nurture an appreciation for our natural, cultural legacy.
- Provide lifelong learning opportunities.
- Shape healthy, safe, green communities.
- Collaborate with partners to provide sustainable, accessible, and diverse leisure opportunities.
- Engage a diverse community and protectively respond to changing demographics, needs, and trends.
- Acquire, maintain, and manage the parks and recreation built environment.

VISION 2030

Vision 2030 will guide the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Montgomery County Department of Recreation to provide:

- Stewardship of natural and historic resources.
- Opportunities for active life-long learning, leisure, and recreation.
2. M-NCPPC Department of Parks
Following are the vision, mission, and values statements for M-NCPPC Department of Parks.

VISION
“An enjoyable, accessible, safe, and green park system that promotes a strong sense of community through shared spaces and experiences and is treasured by the people it serves.”

MISSION
“Protect and interpret our valuable natural and cultural resources; balance the demand for recreation with the need for conservation; offer a variety of enjoyable recreational activities that encourage healthy lifestyles; and provide clean, safe, and accessible places for leisure-time activities.”

VALUES
• **Stewardship** – Manage the county park system so it best meets the needs of current and future generations.
• **Recreation** – Offer a range of leisure activities that strengthen the body, sharpen the mind, and renew the spirit.
• **Excellence** – Deliver the highest quality product, service, and experience possible.
• **Integrity** – Operate with an objective, honest, and balanced perspective.
• **Service** – Be courteous, helpful, and accessible to each other and the public we serve.
  • **Education** – Promote opportunities for continuous learning among staff and the public we serve.
• **Collaborations** – Work in cooperation with all stakeholders including residents, communities, public and private organizations, and policymakers, as well as interdepartmentally.
  • **Diversity** – Support and embrace the differences among our employees and the public we serve, and offer suitable programs, activities, and services.
• **Dedication** – Commit to getting the job done the right way, no matter what it takes.

3. Montgomery County Department of Recreation
Following are the mission and operating principles and objectives for the Montgomery County Department of Recreation.

MISSION
The mission of the Montgomery County Department of Recreation is to provide high quality, diverse, and accessible programs, services, and facilities that enhance the quality of life for all ages, cultures, and abilities.
Operating Principals: In support of the mission, the Department will readily serve the community by providing:

- Leisure activities that enhance skills, health, and self esteem.
- Activities that incorporate current leisure trends and population demographics.
- Ways to stimulate growth in knowledge through leisure experiences.
- Opportunities to build sense of community.
- A network of services linking the community through collaboration and partnerships. Safe havens where participants feel welcome.
- Fun for all.

Operating Objectives: The Department will continuously strive for optimal participant experiences.

- Teamwork: Essential to achieve success for our staff, our programs, our families, and our community.
- Objectivity: We will maintain a positive approach to all challenges we face.
- Growth: Change will be embraced, and used to expand our opportunities.
- Imagination: We will cultivate new ideas into exciting programs and services.
- Value: We will understand and appreciate the wealth of diversity of our community.
- Excellence: We will meet our participants’ expectations of quality and performance.

4. Montgomery County Values

M-NCPCC Department of Parks and the Montgomery County Department of Recreation complement five of the Montgomery County Executive’s eight “Essential Values.” Parks and recreation venues play a critical role in furthering the health and wellness of County citizens and contribute to a vibrant economy that benefits all residents.

County Executive’s Essential Values Related to Parks and Recreation:
- Children Prepared to Live and Learn
- Healthy and Sustainable Communities
- Safe Streets and Secure
- Neighborhoods A Strong and Vibrant Economy
- Vital Living for All of Our Residents
Parks & Recreation Benefits

Through the planning process for the Vision 2030 project, community members repeatedly voiced their support for the incredible value and benefits of the parks and recreation system in Montgomery County. The Trust for Public Land published a report titled, “The Benefits of Parks: Why America Needs More City Parks and Open Space,”¹ that makes the following observations about the health, economic, environmental, and social benefits of parks and open space:

- Physical activity makes people healthier and increases with access to parks.
- Contact with the natural world improves physical and physiological health.
- Residential and commercial property values increase.
- Value is added to community through economic development and tourism.
- Trees improve air quality, act as natural air conditioners, and assist with storm water control and erosion.
- Crime and juvenile delinquency are reduced.
- Stable neighborhoods and strong communities are created.

Related Planning Efforts

The Vision 2030 project responds to and builds on the following Montgomery County parks and recreation-related planning documents including:

- Countywide Park Trails Plan (M-NCPPC, as amended, September 2008)
- Joint Workgroup Report and Recommendations (M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Montgomery County Recreation Department, October 1, 2009)
- From Artifact to Attraction: A Strategic Plan for Cultural Resources in Parks (M-NCPPC Department of Parks, January 2006)
- Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan (M-NCPPC Department of Parks, 2005)
- Recreation Facility Development Plan, 2005 Update (Montgomery County Department of Recreation)
- Legacy Open Space Functional Master Plan (M-NCPPC Department of Parks, July 2001)

In addition to the documents listed above, many documents and studies were reviewed, including annual and program reports, past community surveys, and capital improvement plans.

Regional Context

The fifth largest County in Maryland, Montgomery County measures approximately 500 square miles and contains 324,000 acres (including water). The Potomac River forms the County’s southwest boundary, separating it from Loudon and Fairfax Counties in Virginia. The Patuxent River flows down the northeastern side of the County, forming a boundary with Howard County. Frederick County borders the northwest – which, except for the extreme northern tip of the County, is a straight line from the headwaters of the Patuxent to the Potomac at the mouth of the Monocacy River. Prince George’s County lies to the southeast. Adjacent to the southeastern corner of Montgomery County is the District of Columbia.

Montgomery County lies almost entirely in the Piedmont Plateau on the east bank of the Potomac River, just 30 miles west of the Chesapeake Bay and approximately 100 miles from the Atlantic Ocean. The County is characterized by gently sloping topography, interspersed with small streams in relatively narrow valleys.

The majority of the population lives in the southern part of the County, a short commute to the District of Columbia and along the I-270 transportation corridor. The population drops in the more rural northern and western areas of the County along the Frederick and Howard County borders.

(Note: Information in this section is taken from the Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan.)
The population of Montgomery County is forecasted to grow by 17 percent to a total of 1,134,400 over the next twenty years to 2030. Most of this growth will occur in the central part of the County in urbanized areas. Proactive planning to address the parks and recreation demands of these urban areas is a key focus area over the next two decades.

Due to the size and diversity of the County, the Vision 2030 project provides analysis in four sub-areas. The map in Figure 1 identifies each sub-area: Potomac/Rural, East Transit Corridor, South Central, and North Central.

**Figure 1: Montgomery County Sub-Areas**

The largest percentage of growth in the next twenty years is projected to be concentrated in the North Central sub-area (30.6%), followed by the South Central sub-area (22.5%) as shown in Table 1. It should be noted that the M-NCPPC adopted revised planning sub-areas at the end of the Vision 2030 planning process and more growth is anticipated in the Eastern part of the County than was envisioned in the previous planning areas and population forecasts. Periodic review of population forecasts and associated population-based Vision 2030 recommendations is advised. (Note: In addition to the larger sub-areas, the M-NCPPC also uses 28 smaller Planning Areas. For reference, a map and population projections by each of these Planning Areas are found in Appendix G.)
Table 1: Population Projections and Percent Change – County and Sub-Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>East Transit</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Potomac Rural</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>South Central</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>967,900</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>301,649</td>
<td>307,450</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>297,050</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>126,847</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>242,354</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,050,700</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>318,354</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>310,747</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>331,526</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>280,531</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1,134,400</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>318,354</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>310,747</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>387,890</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>296,795</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Population Forecast Round 8.0, Research and Technology Center, M-NCPPC Montgomery County Planning Department, June 2010

The demographic make-up of each of the County sub-areas varies as shown in Table 2. The North Central and East Transit Corridor sub-areas have the highest populations. The North Central has the highest percentage of foreign born residents (33.5%) and has the lowest average household income of the sub-areas.

Table 2: Sub-Area Demographic Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Age</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Foreign Born</th>
<th>% of County Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potomac/Rural</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>$144,705</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$87,785</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$101,820</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Transit</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$89,150</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Population Forecast Round 8.0, Research and Technology Center, M-NCPPC Montgomery County Planning Department

Montgomery County is among the wealthiest in the Nation. According to the 2008 U.S. Census Update, the estimated median household income for Montgomery County residents was $96,475. The County has a higher percentage of foreign born residents, when compared to the U.S. Increasing racial and ethnic diversity marks an area of growth and change for County. The aging population is a national trend that will also impact the County.
Planning Process & Timeline

The Vision 2030 project was guided by a Steering Committee and sub-committees made up of staff from M-NCPPC Department of Parks and the Montgomery County Department of Recreation. Extensive community input provided valuable direction to the project through a series of three Summits of community leaders and stakeholders numerous focus groups and public meetings. The project team met with consultants from the GreenPlay team and provided input throughout the planning process. This collaborative effort fully utilizes the consultant’s expertise and incorporates local knowledge and institutional history. The planning process and timeline follows.

PHASE I: INFORMATION GATHERING    DECEMBER 2009-MAY 2010

Strategic Kick-Off
- Began project
- Refined project goals and work plan

December 2009-January 2010

Community & Stakeholder Input Process
- Conducted public meetings and focus groups
- Held staff focus groups and interviews

February-May 2010

Inventory and Analysis of Existing Facilities
- Conducted inventory and analysis of County parks, open space, trails, and facilities

January-May 2010

Service Assessment and Resource Allocation Analysis
- Conducted staff assessment of all services
- *Began development of resource allocation assessment and philosophy

February-May 2010

Survey
- Conducted statistically-valid survey of random sample of County residents

March-May 2010

Demographic and Trends Analysis
- Analyzed County demographics and population projections
- Compiled parks and recreation-related trends

February-May 2010

(*Note: The resource allocation work continued through Phases II and III.)
PHASE II: FINDINGS AND VISIONING JUNE-SEPTEMBER 2010

Findings and Visioning Staff and Public Meetings July 2010
  • Presented and validated key findings of needs assessment
  • Held public meetings

Resource Allocation/Cost Recovery Philosophy Workshops September 2010
  • Held the following meetings the week of September 13th:
    - Summit #2
    - Two public meetings
    - Series of staff workshops

(The Volume 1: Needs & Resource Assessment document is a compilation of the findings and analysis from Phases I and II.)

PHASE III: PLAN DEVELOPMENT OCTOBER 2010-MAY 2011

Draft Plan Review
  • Draft Vision 2030 Strategic Plan October-November 2010
  • Summit #3 November 2010
  • Public meetings on Draft Plan January 2011
  • Public review of Plan January-February 2011
  • Staff review of plan November 2010-February 2011
  • Staff development of Implementation Plan January-May 2011

PLAN COMPLETION JUNE 2011

(Volume 2: Vision 2030 Strategic Plan and Volume 3: Implementation Plan are documents from Phase III based on key findings from Volume 1.)
The Vision 2030 Strategic Plan recommendations are organized by five broad vision themes.

**Vision 2030 Themes**

1. **Programs & Experiences**  
   *Strategically providing parks and recreation services for health and leisure*

2. **Planning & Development**  
   *Planning for recreational, natural, and cultural resources in an urbanizing County*

3. **Operations, Maintenance & Safety**  
   *Maintaining a safe, accessible, quality parks and recreation system*

4. **Management**  
   *Maximizing efficiencies and sustainability*

5. **Marketing & Outreach**  
   *Informing and engaging a diverse community*

The following five sections address each of these vision themes. Recommended goals and objectives follow highlights of key findings for each of the themes. The findings are summarized from the *Volume 1: Needs & Resource Assessment* document.

The recommendations focus on the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and also on the Montgomery County Department of Recreation. *Volume 3: Implementation Plan* is a companion document that identifies which agencies have lead responsibility for the implementation of various recommendations.
Key Findings
The following findings helped shape the Vision 2030 Programs & Experiences goals and objectives.

OVERVIEW
The parks and recreation programs and services provided in Montgomery County are vast and varied. The main providers of these services are the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and the Montgomery County Department of Recreation, but a multitude of alternative providers contribute to the mix of leisure services. (Key alternative providers were included in the Vision 2030 analysis including the inventory and Service Assessment. The Volume 1: Needs & Resource Assessment provides additional information and analysis.)

The M-NCPPC Department of Parks offers a multitude of programming opportunities focusing around the tennis, ice, nature, horticulture, and cultural/historic facilities and resources they manage. All ages can participate in programming that meets their abilities and interests.

The mission of the Montgomery County Department of Recreation is to provide high quality, diverse, and accessible programs, services, and facilities that enhance the quality of life for all ages, cultures, and abilities. The department offers hundreds of programming opportunities – in aquatics, camps, arts and crafts, martial arts, fitness, and wellness – for preschoolers, youth, adults, seniors, and special populations.

There is a need for ongoing strategic programming efforts to maximize available resources to expand popular programs (as identified through registration information and tools such as the Vision 2030 survey) and re-evaluate lower performing programs (e.g. program with lower participation rates, lower community interest, etc.).

COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND INPUT
The Vision 2030 survey results identified top priorities for improving and expanding the following program areas:

- Exercise and fitness
- Community events and festivals
- Aquatics instruction (non-competitive)
- Out-of-school programming (summer and after school)
- Senior programming

"Programs and facilities in Montgomery County are great – that's why we live here."

Comment from survey respondent

Other program areas that rated as high priorities to improve or expand include: health and wellness, outdoor nature programs, children and youth activities, community gardens, and youth league sports. (It is important to note, in another survey question cultural/art programs also rated high, but when respondents were asked to identify their top three priorities it did not remain in the top ten.)
Community input from the public meetings and focus groups demonstrated a high value for the variety of types of parks and recreation programs, facilities, and services offered and a desire to maintain this mix of opportunities throughout the County. Community members expressed the importance of these services in addressing community issues such as nature deficit disorder, physical inactivity, and social and physical isolation. Key areas of focus that emerged include: addressing accessibility, both physical access and affordability of services; serving populations that may be underserved or have greater needs (e.g., youth, seniors, people with disabilities, and immigrant communities).

DEMOGRAPHICS & TRENDS
Staying on top of evolving community needs and interests is important for parks and recreation service providers. Montgomery County is facing similar demographic and lifestyle shifts as are other communities across the country—an aging population, an increase in non-traditional families, growing ethnic and racial diversity, and a decline in participation for structured leisure activities due to busy lifestyles and schedules. Parks and recreation professionals need to tailor services to respond to these shifts to most effectively and efficiently meet community needs.

SERVICE ASSESSMENT
A Service Assessment is a tool used in the Vision 2030 project to help staff understand the market segment of services they provide and the strength or weakness of their position within that market. It also helps identify core services, alternative providers, and optional provision strategies. The Service Assessment process that was undertaken critically examined each service area of both departments based on:

- Fit with agency’s values and vision
- Financial capacity
- Alternative coverage
- Market position

The Service Assessment process, in which staff from both the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Montgomery County Department of Recreation participated, identifies potential service provision strategies that include:

- Grow services identified as “advance” or “affirm market position.”
- Work with alternative providers for complementary development of market.
- Identify services for collaboration and divestment strategies and re-allocate or re-purpose available resources.

Note: A Glossary of Terms used in this document is found in Appendix A.
Recommendations

Theme 1: Programs & Experiences
Strategically providing parks and recreation services for health and leisure

GOAL 1 – Provide a variety of high-quality programs that meet community needs and interests.

Objective 1.1
Enhance, expand, or add programs and services identified as high priorities by research and customer feedback.

The Vision 2030 survey identified ten top priorities for program improvement, expansion, or addition:

- Exercise and fitness
- Community events and festivals
- Aquatics instruction (non-competitive)
- Out-of-school programming (summer and after school)
- Senior programming
- Health and wellness
- Outdoor nature programs
- Children and youth activities (non-sport)
- Community gardens
- Youth league sports

This list should not be the sole focus of expanded or new programming. To determine additional potential programming opportunities, further review of the survey data should be conducted and used in conjunction with additional customer feedback on an ongoing basis.

Implementation: Develop strategic programs to address the top ten programs areas above. Continue the Joint Parks and Recreation Alliance staff work group to plan and develop programs based on specific criteria.

Customer feedback practices should be standard and consistent across all program areas. Information sought from participants should include:

- Satisfaction levels and supportive reasoning.
- Actual skill development or learning performance benchmarking against promised outcomes.
- Suggestions for program improvements.
- Suggestions for new programs.
- Suggestions for alternative days and times for desired programming.
Objective 1.2
Enhance parks and recreation program planning methods.

Implementation:
Develop service objectives to ensure that the program, activity, or event is needed or desired, and that it is measured to determine success and effectiveness. Participant evaluations and analysis should address participant satisfaction and future interest. Conduct an analysis of the Program Life Cycle at the conclusion of each program, activity, or event.

Once program evaluations are completed, a program, activity or event’s stage of existence should be considered as decisions are made relative to the future of any service. For example, if registrations continue to decline, staff may wish to evaluate the merits of attempting to re-vitalize a program with a new name, adjusting scheduling to another date or time, modifying a program’s format, or simply discontinuing the program reallocating resources elsewhere. A graphic representation of this Program Life Cycle and the stages in a program, activity, or event’s life can be found on the following page. Note: Continue to comply with Commission for Accreditation of Parks and Recreation Agencies or CAPRA program standards.

Figure 2: Program Life Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Maturation</th>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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</table>

Revitalization
Dead Weight
Elimination
Objective 1.3
Optimize program and facility utilization through balanced service provision.

*Implementation*: Create program utilization goals and implement target marketing strategies to boost program registration in key program areas.

Objective 1.4
Expand or develop tracking system capabilities to consistently monitor non-registered and drop-in visitation to account for the total impact and use of all M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Montgomery County Department of Recreation programs, services, and facilities where possible.

*Implementation*: Identify best methods of tracking visitation and implement at targeted sites.

GOAL 2 – Promote awareness, appreciation, and understanding of Montgomery County’s natural and historical resources.

Objective 2.1
Implement the cultural/historic interpretation plan based on *From Artifact to Attraction: A Strategic Plan for Cultural Resources in Parks* and the prioritization system in the Cultural Resources Asset Inventory.

*Implementation*: Prioritize Parks sites for exhibits and/or signage. Partner with the Horticulture, Forestry and Environmental Education Division on shared interpretive messages and resources. Open 8-10 public sites, with associated staff, that best tell Montgomery County’s historic story. Utilize volunteers and grants and partner with other agencies or jurisdictions. Develop a strategic marketing plan in coordination with the agency marketing plan.

Objective 2.2
Develop and implement interpretive master plans to guide educational and interpretive programs in order to improve the visitors’ experience and their understanding and appreciation of Parks’ natural resources.

*Implementation*: Develop the framework for a strategic and cutting edge interpretive plan. Prioritize park sites for implementation of interpretive messages. Secure resources to implement.

Objective 2.3
Develop an environmental literacy program for County residents of all ages that develops a fundamental understanding of the systems of the natural world, the relationships and interactions between the living and non-living environment, and the ability to deal sensibly with complex issues that involve weighing scientific evidence; uncertainty; and economic, aesthetic, and ethical considerations.

*Implementation*: Expand environmental stewardship training for all Parks staff, developing fluency in core Parks messages. In coordination with key partners develop environmental education programs that meet Montgomery County Public Schools and State environmental literacy curriculum standards.
GOAL 3 – Enhance health, wellness, and active living in Montgomery County.

Objective 3.1
Incorporate concepts of healthy and vital living into all facilities, programs, and services throughout the parks and recreation system.

Implementation: Identify the key concepts of this initiative and assess what programs and services are already available in the county. Develop a coordinated health, wellness, and active living countywide initiative between the M-NCPPC Department of Parks, Montgomery County Department of Recreation, the Health Department, and key alternative providers to promote facilities and programs available in Montgomery County.
Montgomery County represents rural, suburban, and growing dense urban areas made up of a diverse mix of residents in ethnicity, age, and income. Recognizing this diversity, it is important that parks and recreation facilities and services be tailored to meet the varied needs of the County. Agreed upon standards by which to fairly distribute parkland and facilities to meet these varied community needs and interests are critical to successfully reach the Vision 2030 goals.

Key Findings
The following findings helped shape the Planning & Development of Facilities goals and objectives.

COMMUNITY INPUT
The Vision 2030 survey demonstrated an overall high degree of satisfaction with the current parks and recreation system of parklands and facilities. The facilities that rated the highest in importance include:

- Trails
- Natural areas
- Playgrounds
- Recreation centers

While some other facilities (which fill a need for a more targeted or narrower population) rated as less important to the community as a whole, they are, nevertheless, very important to those certain segments of the population that have such a need, such as dog parks, indoor tennis, baseball and softball fields, and skateboard parks and spots.

The facilities that rated as top priorities to add, expand, or improve include the following:

- Community recreation centers
- Indoor aquatic centers
- Playgrounds
- Trails (natural and hard surface)
- Natural areas

LEVEL OF SERVICE
A parks and recreation inventory was conducted between January and June 2010 of parklands and facilities provided by three major provider groups: M-NCPPC Department of Parks, Montgomery County Department of Recreation, and major alternative providers such as municipalities, schools, and key non-profit agencies such as the YMCA. Based on the composite-value of the components of the overall parks and recreation system a series of Level of Service (LOS) analyses and mapping was conducted. The overall LOS findings include the following.

**Level of Service** (LOS) is the amount and type of parks and recreation service that is appropriate to the needs and desires of residents and is sustainable to operate. The Composite-Values Level of Service Methodology used in the Vision 2030 project, analyzes quantity, quality, and location information of physical components that make up the park and recreation system (e.g., playgrounds, trails, recreation centers, etc.). By analyzing the composite values of each component, it is possible to measure the service provided by the park and recreation system from a variety of perspectives for any given location.
• Montgomery County is well-served for parks and recreation overall. No matter where a resident lives in the County, he/she has adequate access to a basic set of facilities and components within a reasonable distance. (However, while residents overall enjoy proximity to some parks and recreation components, access to specialized facilities may be more limited.)

• Another finding is the difference between the rural and urban parts of the County. The overall or composite service coverage is 100 percent for the entire County. But when looking at specific types of service, such as indoor recreation, the coverage in the rural areas drops significantly below that of the urban areas. And where service is provided in the rural areas, the LOS is lower than in the urban areas. However, whenever service is measured in proportion to the population served, the rural areas emerge consistently higher than the urban areas.

• When population density is considered, the overall LOS per capita is lower in the South Central and North Central sub-areas (as shown by lighter shades in the upper left inset map in Perspective A: Access to All Components referenced below with an enlarged map found in Appendix C and described in Appendix B).

• An interesting finding is the difference between LOS for people who drive and who walk. While access to parks and recreation components is available across 100 percent of the County for someone who drives, only 58 percent of the County offers walkable access.

• Eighty percent of parks and recreation locations can be reached by some type of public transportation.

• Montgomery County is well-served for natural and cultural resources across the sub-areas.

• Gaps in service coverage for indoor recreation facilities exist in the North Central sub-area.

• This sub-area also has the lowest LOS based on population density. In addition, this part of the County is projected to see the largest percentage of growth out of the four sub-areas in the next twenty years to 2030. The high population growth projected for the South Central sub-area in the next twenty years will also create a demand for recreation facilities. (See Perspective B: Access to Indoor Facilities in Appendix C as well as additional indoor recreation and aquatic center analysis in Appendix F.)

Perspective A: Access to All Components shows an LOS analysis for the County when all components in the inventory are considered, including indoor and outdoor components, trails, and open space. Where darker shades occur, the LOS is higher. Purple areas on the lower inset map indicate areas that are at or above a threshold LOS and shows that Montgomery County is well-served by the components that make up the parks and recreation system. However, when population density is factored in the LOS per capita is lower in the South Central and North Central sub-areas. (See Appendix B for summary of LOS service findings.)

Access to Park and Recreation Facilities Make a Difference

Childhood obesity in the U.S. has tripled in the last thirty years according to the Centers for Disease Control. Recent studies have shown that proximity to parks and recreation facilities has been associated with less weight gain for children over time. Access to parks and recreation directly contributes to healthy communities.

(“Childhood Obesity and Proximity to Urban Parks and Recreational Resources: A Longitudinal Cohort Study,” Active Living Research, San Diego, CA, 2009.)
POPOPULATION DENSITY & FUTURE GROWTH
The County consists of highly populated urban areas to sparsely populated rural areas. It is important that density be considered when planning for the equitable distribution of parks and recreation facilities. Meeting the increasing demands of a growing population that will be concentrated in the urban areas of the central part of the County is a key planning focus area. Proactive planning to ensure adequate green space and parks and recreation amenities as the County becomes more urbanized is essential to maintaining the high quality of life that is enjoyed by residents in Montgomery County.

PLANNING & COORDINATION
Strategic Focus – Prioritized and focused planning efforts are needed to maximize the available resources and respond to changing needs and demographics. Future parks and recreation planning focus areas planning for dense urban areas and specialty facilities (e.g., dog parks, skate parks, etc.). Montgomery County is known for its proactive approach to preserving, protecting, and enhancing natural areas and should continue this commitment into the future.
**Sustainability** – There are opportunities for both departments to expand current efforts in sustainable design, development, management practices, and operations. Creating a comprehensive approach toward sustainability, training staff, and identifying needed resources to implement state-of-the-art “green” practices will help Montgomery County maintain its position as a national leader in public parks and recreation.

**Coordination** – Streamlining and enhancing planning coordination efforts among different and between the same public agencies is needed. For example, coordination between park planning and development divisions of the M-NCPPC Department of Parks is needed. Additionally, coordination between multiple agencies is important to effectively plan for future community recreation centers.
Recommendations

Theme 2: Planning & Development
Planning for recreational, natural, and cultural resources in an urbanizing County

GOAL 4 – Provide adequate and appropriate public lands and facilities that are equitably distributed across the County to meet the needs of residents.

Objective 4.1
Set standards for Level of Service (LOS) that take population density into account and are based on composite-values methodology which includes both the quantity and quality of parks and recreation facilities and services provided, and allows LOS to be derived from a mix of various facilities.

Implementation: Determine how to apply, in conjunction with other planning tools such as the Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan, target Level of Service for each sub-area. Develop guidelines for projecting future needs and meeting Level of Service goals in sector plan urban areas. Update the recreation guidelines in coordination with the urban park guidelines.

Objective 4.2
Prioritize projects to increase the Level of Service in the areas where data shows the highest needs. (The Level of Service analysis shows that when population density is considered, the overall LOS per capita is lower along the I-270 corridor in the South Central and North Central sub-areas. See Appendix B for additional information.)

Implementation: Develop strategies to increase the LOS in the North Central and South Central sub-areas, such as prioritizing these areas for CIP and Park Master Plans. Maintain updated inventory to include land acquisitions and new, improved or removed park and recreation facilities. Measure progress every six years at the time of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (PROS) update.

Objective 4.3
Refine and clarify priorities for planning and acquiring parklands.

Implementation: Periodically refine the criteria for prioritizing parkland acquisitions. (See Appendix D.) Analyze and strengthen, if needed, requirements for developers to provide public spaces with a focus on sector plan areas (dense urban areas). Identify and secure funding to purchase appropriate lands as they become available.

Objective 4.4
Provide an appropriate balance between stewardship and recreation.

Implementation: Using national and local benchmarks, apply a balance of stewardship and recreation to all plans for new or renovated parks. Assess, prioritize, and restore degraded natural areas on parkland.
GOAL 5 –Create a high-functioning system of parks, recreation, trails, and open space that is responsive to changing community needs and interests.

**Objective 5.1**
Prioritize planning and development projects and streamline associated processes.

**Implementation:** Prioritize sites for which to complete park master plans with a focus on the North Central and South Central sub-areas. Update standard design and construction details for typical park improvements. Coordinate work program scheduling of park master plans, Programs of Requirement, and park facility plans, and standardize their processes and products.

**Objective 5.2**
Provide for flexible spaces and “green” facility designs.

**Implementation:** Plan, design, and create more un-programmed, flexible parks and recreation spaces, and features that are multi-functional or adaptable for multiple purposes. Develop a process for evaluating whether existing or proposed components or features contribute adequately to goals of LEED®, SITES and other “green” policies.

**Objective 5.3**
Provide a variety of parks and recreation facilities that address current needs and emerging trends (e.g., dog parks, community gardens, cricket, ice facilities, tennis facilities, etc.).

**Implementation:** Formalize decision-making criteria and a process for specialty facility requests (e.g. dog parks, skate parks, cricket fields, etc.). Identify priorities and potential partnerships to respond more quickly to emerging facility trends. Provide a permanent adult-sized cricket field with supporting infrastructure. Address the growing demand for skateboarding facilities, dog parks and community gardens, especially in urban areas. Identify opportunities to add the following facilities with a focus on the areas of greatest need: volleyball, futsal, soccer tennis, etc. Identify strategic opportunities for larger groupings of tennis courts (indoor and/or outdoor), versus stand-alone courts. Conduct a feasibility study to determine if, when, and where an additional ice arena is needed in the future.

**RESPONDING TO TRENDS & VARIED INTERESTS**
Components that are missing from current inventory that could be considered to add include: frisbee golf, indoor or outdoor climbing wall, and a BMX facility. Splash pads (non-staffed) and skateboard parks could also be expanded. Due to the high percentage of foreign born residents currently in Montgomery County, and the projected growth of this segment of the population, internationally popular sports such as futsal (a version of soccer played on indoor and outdoor courts) and cricket should be considered when planning for new parks and recreation uses.
Objective 5.4
Ensure that the quantity and type of parks, programs, facilities, trails, and open space are adequate for the users being served.

**Implementation:** Apply composite-values approach to Level of Service in conjunction with other tools such as Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (PROS) to identify priorities. Update PROS plan to address needs for popular facilities and emerging trends identified in surveys, Vision 2030 findings, etc.

Objective 5.5
Improve the comfort and convenience of park and recreation users by providing adequate facilities such as accessible restrooms, drinking fountains, signage, parking, and other convenience features.

**Implementation:** Identify strategic locations to add comfort and convenience features (such as restrooms, drinking fountains, seating, shade, and safety features such as lighting, etc.) to existing facilities to increase the Level of Service of the components located there. (Focus initially on areas that scored low in comfort and convenience in the inventory.)

Objective 5.6
Re-balance the existing mix of athletic fields to better fit current needs for rectangle and diamond fields.

**Implementation:** Formalize an internal standing committee to continually formulate, implement, and evaluate options to deliver better-quality playing experiences for users of park athletic fields. Identify opportunities to increase the capacity of existing fields by adding irrigation and converting some to synthetic turf. Identify opportunities to increase the number of rectangle athletic fields. (Opportunities include more effective partnering with schools, conversion of diamonds to rectangles where feasible, and adding new fields.)
Objective 5.7
Provide adequate playgrounds throughout the County to meet the need for convenient access to healthy play opportunities.

Implementation: Incorporate nature/environmental education into the playground experience. Continue to prioritize playgrounds in highest need of replacement or renovation. Identify playgrounds for potential removal that are in an area where the need is met by other playgrounds or are in environmentally sensitive areas.

GOAL 6 – Expand and enhance opportunities for recreational trail experiences to promote health and wellness.

Objective 6.1
Expand the distribution of multi-use trails.

Implementation: Identify new multi-use natural and hard surface trails, with a priority on locating these in underserved areas and where population density is currently or projected to be high but existing trails are located more than ½ mile apart or when trail access is limited. (See Appendix H, Multi-Use Trail Table.)

Objective 6.2
Increase trail connectivity.

Implementation: Identify gaps in the regional trail system. Prioritize trail connections to create a linked series of loops of varying lengths in the trail system. As part of the update of the Countywide Park Trails Plan, re-examine the feasibility of proposed regional trail alignments as well as community connectors, and for those determined infeasible, identify alternatives as necessary.

Objective 6.3
Address need for specialty trail users, including hikers, bikers, and equestrians.

Implementation: As part of the update to the Countywide Parks Trails Plan, identify trails that should remain as limited-user trails, based on the characteristics of the terrain and environment rather than on the location and distribution. However, try to distribute these appropriately when possible.

Objective 6.4
Enhance the trail user experience through safety and comfort features, including informational kiosks at trail heads, uniform directional signage, interpretive signage, and appropriately placed restrooms.

Implementation: Continue to create downloadable on-line maps with distances marked as well as add distance markers, directional and wayfinding signage, and interpretive signage, per departmental standards. Add waysides, rest areas, and improve connections to parks and other public restroom facilities when feasible.
GOAL 7 – Expand park and recreation facility accessibility.

Objective 7.1
Enhance access to parks, recreation facilities and programs, trails, and open space by setting measurable standards for different areas of the County.

Implementation: Set target values for walkable access to parks and recreation lands and facilities in each sub-area. (Facilities accessible by public transportation – buses and metro stations – should be factored into walkable access.) Utilize these values as a planning tool to implement Objective 7.2.

Objective 7.2
Collaboratively work to provide safe and accessible facilities.

Implementation: Work with State Highway Administration and Department of Transportation and/or Department of General Services to ensure safe ADA pedestrian access to park and recreation facilities via sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, bikeshare programs, and safe crossings. (Coordinate with County Complete Streets efforts.) Incorporate multi-use trail linkages to park and recreation facilities when feasible as well as sidewalk and bike paths in public rights-of-way. Strategically provide conveniently located bike racks at park and recreation facilities.

Objective 7.3
Incorporate the 2010 Americans with Disabilities Act Standards for Accessible Design into planning and development of park and recreational facilities for both the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Montgomery County Department of Recreation.

Implementation: Conduct assessment of existing facilities subject to 2010 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards for recreational facilities. Incorporate draft ADA recommendations for Outdoor Developed Areas (including hard and natural surface trails, picnic facilities, and camping facilities). Develop work plan for upgrading facilities and implement.
Montgomery County Department of Recreation – Indoor Recreation and Aquatic Facilities
(Continuation of Planning & Development of Facilities Recommendations)

GOAL 8– Provide an equitable distribution of public indoor recreation spaces in Montgomery County that is sustainable.

REFINE RECREATION & AQUATIC SERVICE MODEL
- Incorporate flexibility into the level of service model to allow for larger centers to serve more residents when appropriate. Providing leisure services at larger regional centers is an industry best management practice and provides one-stop service, increased operational efficiencies, sustainability, and cost recovery, while promoting improved customer service.
- Incorporate indoor aquatics in new recreation centers to create operational efficiencies, broader appeal, and respond to high public interest in leisure and instructional (non-competitive) aquatics.
- Identify highly accessible locations for new recreation centers along multi-model transportation corridors (e.g., public transportation routes, trails, major roadways, etc.).
- Identify opportunities to partner and/or co-locate indoor recreation centers with other institutional facilities (e.g., schools, libraries, park facilities, or other leisure service providers etc.), when appropriate.

Objective 8.1
Refine the Level of Service model for indoor recreation and aquatic centers.

Implementation: Prioritize adding public indoor recreation centers in the North Central and South Central sub-areas where lower per capita LOS currently exists, and highest rates of growth are projected in the next 10 to 20 year (2010-2030). (See Appendix F for additional analysis.) Incorporate flexible spaces and industry trends into recreation/aquatic center designs.

Objective 8.2
Conduct feasibility studies, including public input, and operating/business plans prior to the design and development of new community recreation/aquatic facilities. Develop corresponding Program of Requirement (POR) descriptions.

Implementation: Include public process and current planning tools in feasibility studies. Develop Program of Requirement (POR) descriptions for combined community recreation and aquatic facilities. Use feasibility studies and POR for design and operating business plans.
Objective 8.3

Use the Service Assessment to assist the evaluation of renovations and modernization of recreation centers and potential consolidation/repurposing the older smaller community and neighborhood facilities as may be warranted.

Implementation: Identify which potential facilities should receive renovations and which should be considered for potential consolidation, repurposing, or divestiture. Incorporate all findings (service assessment and public vetting) into POR.

Objective 8.4

Consider an assessment of needs and opportunities for specialized countywide facilities (e.g., arena, event center, indoor sports complex) including public/private partnership opportunities.

Implementation: Establish a standing multi-agency review committee to evaluate unique recreation and parks opportunities (e.g., water park, arenas, sports complex, ropes course, paint ball, etc.).
Key Findings
The following findings helped shape the Operations, Maintenance & Safety goals and objectives.

BALANCE BETWEEN NEW AND OLD
Improving existing facilities ranked as the highest priority for future parks and recreation spending in the Vision 2030 survey. While new facilities will inevitably be needed to address the demands of a growing population in the next ten to twenty years, there is a need to balance the allocation of resources to maintain and improve existing facilities with adding new facilities.

APPROPRIATE MAINTENANCE LEVELS
There is a need for the public and decision-makers to understand the resources and subsidy needed for acceptable maintenance service levels (e.g., developed parks, natural and cultural resources, and community recreation centers). While the vast majority of parkland managed by the M-NCPPC Department of Parks is made up of undeveloped natural areas, the maintenance resources may not align to adequately preserve quality natural areas into the future. Reevaluating maintenance standards and realigning resources may be needed. Additionally, as recreation centers and park infrastructure age, ongoing investments will need to be made in lifecycle replacements, renovations, and improvements.

OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCIES
In a time of resource scarcity, identifying opportunities to improve operational efficiencies whenever possible is necessary. Strategies such as expanding “managed mowing” areas and partnerships with athletic field user groups could be explored. The Montgomery County Department of Recreation should explore the option of creating larger, multi-purpose regional centers which can help increase staffing operational efficiencies and cost recovery, promote retention, and encourage cross-use.
Recommendations

Theme 3: Operations, Maintenance & Safety
Maintaining a safe, accessible, quality parks and recreation system

GOAL 9 – Maintain quality park and recreation lands and facilities for efficiency, safety, attractiveness, and long-term sustainability.

Objective 9.1
Develop a comprehensive “green” operations and maintenance initiative. (This initiative would build on existing efforts and be part of an agency-wide comprehensive sustainability plan. Also see Goal 16.)

Implementation: Apply Sustainable Sites Initiative wherever possible. Develop and implement an employee training program for integrated “green” operations and maintenance, including LEED and SITES. Implement program to recycle and compost bio-degradable green material generated by Montgomery Parks.

Objective 9.2
Expand the Planned Lifecycle Asset Replacement (PLAR) program.

Implementation: M-NCPPC Department of Parks evaluate PLAR program and make adjustments as feasible. Montgomery County Department of Recreation evaluate PLAR program and make adjustments as feasible (e.g., areas of focus include developing cycles for standard replacement items, annual refurbishment task lists for each facility, etc.).

Objective 9.3
Implement the existing prioritized deferred maintenance plan.

Implementation: Develop a decision-making process to determine whether to repair, renovate, replace, repurpose, or remove a facility or piece of equipment. Continue to identify a list of smaller day-to-day deferred maintenance items (using tools including SMARTPARKS and the Facility Engineering Assessment).
**Objective 9.4**
Continue to refine current maintenance levels of service and standards based on industry best practices (e.g., maintenance, health, and safety standards) and update standards (e.g., mowing frequency for different park types, natural resources management, routines to maintain clean parks and recreation facilities, etc.).

*Implementation:* Review and, if necessary, revise current parks maintenance standards, facility maintenance standards, and building custodial standards. Continue to develop other critical standards such as tree maintenance and natural resources management. Use maintenance standards to communicate with policy-makers and the public regarding meeting community values and expectations if changes to maintenance routines are required due to resource limitations.

**Objective 9.5**
Continue to identify operating budget impact (OBI) needed for new capital improvement projects and acquisitions and allocate adequate resources (e.g., program staff, maintenance, supplies and materials, other services and charges, etc.).

*Implementation:* Improve collection and consistency of OBI data for new parks and park facilities approved in the CIP. (Also see **Objective 13.1** regarding staff use of cost-based budgeting.) Identify new operation funds or change maintenance frequency/practices to reflect reallocation of existing operational resources (endowments, volunteers, sponsorships).

**Objective 9.6**
Formalize the maintenance and management of athletic fields. (Also see **Objective 5.6**.)

*Implementation:* Update athletic field use and maintenance standards and procedures (e.g., field capacity and usage, field rest criteria, cancellation criteria, priority use policies, monitoring of field permits, user group partnerships, etc.).

**Objective 9.7**
Expand SMARTPARKS applications throughout the M-NCPPC Department of Parks (e.g., park planning, natural resources management, and historic resources management).

*Implementation:* Enhance SMARTPARKS capabilities and efficiency. Incorporate Maintenance and Operations Manual into SMARTPARKS.

**Objective 9.8**
Establish Furniture, Fixture, and Equipment (FFE) standards for park and recreation amenities (e.g., basketball hoops, restroom fixtures, etc.) to aid in parts inventories and enhance maintenance efficiency.

*Implementation:* Create standards for selected FFEs. Institute cross departmental purchasing to maximize efficiencies.
Objective 9.9
Incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles and guidelines into parks and recreation site design and ongoing maintenance practices.

Implementation: Institute staff training relating to ongoing maintenance requirements for CPTED principles. Include appropriate policy agency in review of facility design.

Objective 9.10
Evaluate and plan for maintenance functions by identifying operational and locational enhancements (e.g., maintenance yards) to efficiently meet future needs.

Implementation: Conduct a study to determine the distribution of maintenance yards or sites to most effectively and efficiently meet the maintenance needs of a growing park and recreation system. Consider a satellite facility for Facility Management to reduce drive times.

GOAL 10 – Provide for the protection, security, and safety of natural areas, historic resources, archeological sites, and park and recreation facilities, including playgrounds, athletic fields, pools, community centers, and trails.

Objectives 10.1
Ensure continued dedicated personnel and resources for the specialized requirements of both agencies.

Implementation: Develop and maintain the necessary staffing and resources to provide for the safety and security of parks and recreation facilities (both natural and built). Plan and allocate appropriate funding for special events and programs which are outside of the police agencies’ normal and routine role.

Objectives 10.2
Expand enforcement of unauthorized encroachments to preserve parkland for public use.

Implementation: Modify current park rules and regulations fine structure to allow for compounding fines for non-compliance. Develop a marketing and education campaign to increase community understanding of encroachment policies and reporting procedures.

Objectives 10.3
Expand and encourage participation by Police Agencies in youth programs, both in and out-of-school.

Implementation: Identify needs for police participation in youth programs. Develop a plan with performance measures. Identify and allocate resources. Track results and evaluate effectiveness.

Objectives 10.4
Expand the use of Park Rangers as appropriate for natural resource and interpretive duties.

Implementation: Relocate the Park Rangers from the Park Police to a program focused on stewardship and recreation. Develop a comprehensive training program to equip the Rangers to accomplish the additional duties.
GOAL 11 – Inventory, conserve, restore, and enhance ecologically healthy and biologically diverse natural areas with a focus on Park Best Natural Areas, Biodiversity Areas, and Environmentally Sensitive Areas as defined in the Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan (M-NCPCC, 2005).

Objective 11.1
Develop a protocol and schedule for the routine inventory and analysis of natural resources patterned after the Montgomery County Stream Protection Strategy.

Implementation: Standardize and schedule the inventory of parkland natural resources (e.g., terrestrial plant communities, birds, mammals, etc.). Develop and implement a program that utilizes staff and volunteers to inventory park natural areas. (Also see Objective 11.8 regarding the development of a volunteer program.) Update and maintain a GIS inventory database.

Objective 11.2
Develop a countywide natural resources management plan.

Implementation: Finalize current draft Natural Resources Management Plan which is based on existing documents (Vegetation Management Plan and Appendices; Plans and Guidelines for the management of white-tailed deer, beaver, and Canada geese; and Countywide Stream Protection Strategy).

Objective 11.3
Prioritize Best Natural Areas and Biodiversity Areas based on their ecological value and biological diversity.

Implementation: Develop criteria and prioritize management approach. Use the Cultural Resources Asset Priority Index as a model for prioritization.

Objective 11.4
Develop and implement natural resources management plans for all Best Natural Area and Biodiversity Areas by 2016 and a program to update each of them every five years.

Implementation: Develop structure of product and plan development schedule. Develop management plans and update process and schedule.

Objective 11.5
Develop comprehensive restoration plans for down-County stream valley parks including Rock Creek, Sligo Creek, Little Falls Branch, Cabin John Creek, and Northwest Branch.

Implementation: Use current Rock Creek study as pilot program. Conduct studies of select stream valley parks.

Objective 11.6
Consider expanding the current white-tailed deer management program into down-County areas consistent with public demand, natural resource management needs, and public safety concerns.

Implementation: Determine where additional management is required. Assess whether current staffing levels are adequate to conduct additional management.
Objective 11.7
Develop natural resources-based stewardship training for park staff.

*Implementation*: Develop and present training to staff (e.g., Natural Resources Management Plan, aquatic resources/buffer management, sustainable landscaping, etc.). Develop web-based training.

Objective 11.8
Develop new volunteer-based programs to assist with the inventory and management of natural resources in County parks (e.g., Forest Stewards).

*Implementation*: Develop new volunteer programs (e.g., Forest Stewards) to expand natural resource work done by volunteers. Review and update existing programs (e.g., Weed Warriors).

Objective 11.9
Determine staffing levels required to accomplish all objectives of **Goal 11**.

*Implementation*: Create codes for SMARTPARKS to use in tracking activities. Use SMARTPARKS to determine if staffing levels are adequate. Work toward achieving appropriate staffing levels.

Objective: 11.10
Expand efforts to control non-native invasive plants (NNIs) particularly in Best Natural Areas, Biodiversity Areas, and Environmentally sensitive areas of parkland.

*Implementation*: Expand efforts to identify, map, prioritize and monitor problem areas consistent with other natural resource priorities. Continue existing volunteer programs and expand them where possible to address NNI issues. Expand efforts to replant areas treated for NNIs with native vegetation that provides food and cover for wildlife.

Objective: 11.11
Review and revise Nuisance Wildlife Guidelines for Beaver and Canada Geese.

*Implementation*: Implement a program to annually assess status of nuisance wildlife including beaver and Canada geese. Continue to expand proactive management efforts where problems exist including egg addling for geese, retrofit of storm water management ponds for beaver.
GOAL 12 – Identify, stabilize, preserve, maintain, and interpret historic and archaeological resources on parkland.

Objective 12.1
Implement M-NCPPC Department of Parks’ existing plan *From Artifact to Attraction: A Strategic Plan for Cultural Resources in Parks* and use Cultural Resources Section’s Asset Inventory to prioritize the restoration and interpretation of the highest value historic and archaeological resources in County parks. (Also see Objective 2.1 regarding cultural resources interpretation.)

Implementation: Divest resources that do not qualify as significant on the Cultural Resources Asset Inventory and resist acquisitions of parkland that come with historic buildings without a maintenance endowment. Make archaeological investigation an integral component of park development and interpretation. Seek to identify adequate capital and maintenance funding to ensure the preservation of historic structures.

Objective 12.2
Propose a schedule for developing plans to restore the highest value historic resources and stabilize the highest value archaeological resources in County parks.

Implementation: Submit Major Maintenance historic building priorities as candidate projects. As new acquisitions are made and/or tenanted structures become vacant, incorporate these structures and resources into the schedule.

Objective 12.3
Develop cultural resources-based stewardship training for park staff.

Implementation: Use available training programs, including webinars, to train Parks staff in preservation and archaeology practices and regulations on an approved schedule.

Objective 12.4
Ensure adequate staffing to achieve goals and objectives associated with the restoration and interpretation of historic resources in County parks.

Implementation: Explore funding options for a preservation architect and general contractor specializing in historic structures to enable the rehabilitation of numerous failing historic structures in the park system.
Key Findings
The following findings helped shape the Management goals and objectives.

COMMUNITY INPUT
There is currently a high degree of satisfaction in the parks and recreation services in Montgomery County, as articulated through public input throughout the Vision 2030 planning process. A challenge into the future will be maintaining the current high level of service. This is demonstrated by the Vision 2030 survey results that show the highest financial priority of respondents is to make improvements to existing facilities. As shown through the level of service analysis, the County is well-served by parks and recreation facilities – so the management challenge is to balance the need to maintain and improve the existing expansive inventory of facilities, while responding to demands for expansion of the parks and recreation system in response to population growth.

FINANCIAL CHALLENGES
Parks and Recreation agencies across the country are confronted with similar challenges.

- Deteriorating parks and recreation infrastructure
- Declining parks and recreation budgets relative to costs
- Increasing competition for shrinking federal, state, and local tax resources
- Increased public demand for participation, accountability, and productivity in government Insufficient open spaces in urban areas

While Montgomery County has a long history of superior parks and recreation services, it is not immune to these same challenges. The Vision 2030 project positions the County to proactively confront these challenges with creative solutions.

Shrinking Tax Support – Due to financial constraints, increasing efficiencies and pursuing revenue generation and alternative funding opportunities are needed. As part of the Vision 2030 project a Cost Recovery Model and Resource Allocation Philosophy was developed using the Pyramid Model process (see Appendix I). In addition, at the M-NCPPC Department of Parks, efforts are currently underway to develop a non-profit Foundation to expand alternative funding support. Efforts to expand in-kind contributions from volunteer efforts are also strategies to continue to pursue in the future.

Transparency in Government – Transparency is needed to let the public see how their tax investment is utilized, along with what decisions are made and how they are made. It is vital to demonstrate trust and accountability, and gain credibility. Opportunities exist to more effectively “tell our story” and be accountable for and responsible with resources.

SUSTAINABLE OPERATIONS
There are opportunities for both departments to expand current efforts in sustainable design, development, management practices, and operations. Creating a comprehensive approach toward sustainability, training staff, and identifying needed resources to implement state-of-the-art “green” practices will help Montgomery County maintain its position as a national leader in public parks and
recreation. More importantly a comprehensive sustainability program will maximize environmental, social, and economic benefits and operational efficiencies.

Recommendations

**Theme 4: Management**

**Maximizing efficiencies and sustainability**

**GOAL 13** – Ensure long-term sustainability by focusing taxpayer funding on those services that produce the widest community benefit, using a cost recovery pyramid.
(See *Appendix I* for Cost Recovery Pyramid.)

**Objective 13.1**

Ensure that appropriate staff members are using cost-based or activity-based budgeting principles to determine the cost to provide a service.

*Implementation*: Develop and train staff in use of cost-based budgeting methods. Expand use of existing budgeting and project and time management tools to track actual costs and assist in budget preparation.

**Objective 13.2**

Increase cost recovery to meet cost recovery target goals through recommended pricing strategies and/or use of alternative funding sources as appropriate to specific service.

*Implementation*: Identify obstacles to increasing cost recovery and analyze how to overcome them. Identify efficiencies and create recommendations to implement them.

**Objective 13.3**

Review all rentals, Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs), and long-term lease agreements to ensure compliance with cost recovery goals in relation to the cost to provide the service and the category of service level on the cost recovery pyramid.

*Implementation*: Inform current renters, MOU partners, and long-term lease holders on a financial and service sustainability plan, the results of the cost recovery goals, and the service assessment and provision analysis. Develop specific and measureable action steps for each rental, MOU, and lease holder including alternative funding strategies.

**Objective 13.4**

Review all instructor agreements in relation to the agency costs and adjust to match the category of service level on the pyramid.

*Implementation*: Inform current instructor agreement holders on a financial and service sustainability plan, etc. Develop specific and measureable action steps for each rental, MOU, and lease holder including alternative funding strategies.
Objective 13.5
Identify funding sources or partnership/collaborations to continue the provision of social service type programming by the Montgomery County Department of Recreation as current funding is reduced and eliminated.

Implementation: Inform current social service providers or partners on a financial and service sustainability plan, etc. Discuss and develop strategies with providers or partners to continue to efficiently and effectively provide these services and comply with the plan.

Objective: 13.6
Pursue alternative funding for efficiency measures to reduce the costs to the tax payer of operations, maintenance, and safety.

Implementation: Research return on investment for investing in and converting to green practices. Explore opportunities for joint procurement of goods and services between the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Montgomery County Department of Recreation.

Objective: 13.7
Identify the cost of emergency services (e.g., providing shelter in an emergency, water main breaks, flooding, hurricanes and major storms, etc.) and pursue remuneration where appropriate or possible.

Implementation: Continue to track direct and indirect costs to provide these emergency services. Pursue reimbursement from FEMA and other agencies when possible.

Objective: 13.8
Identify selective opportunities for Montgomery County Department of Recreation to use or create self-sustaining funds.

Implementation: Identify self-sustaining programs and services (those that are revenue positive or neutral over direct costs) to convert to a self-sustaining fund.

Objective 13.9
Implement service provision strategies identified through the Service Assessment.

Note: The following actions were identified through a comprehensive staff Service Assessment in spring 2010. The Service Assessment tool should be used regularly to align services with evolving community needs, financial and market conditions, etc.

Implementation: Further refine the definition of “Partner” and re-categorize rentals or leases that do not fit this definition. Complete the transfer of the permitting and maintenance of Woodside Gym from M-NCPPC Department of Parks to Community Use of Public Facilities, CUPF, subject to Council approval. Divest responsibility for maintenance of old buildings which may loosely qualify as historic or cultural because of age, but are of no real historic or cultural value, or where the cost to restore, operate, and maintain exceeds the community’s return on investment. (Also see Objective 12.1.)
GOAL 14 – Ensure services are accessible for those who are socio-economically disadvantaged.

Objective 14.1
Review and refine scholarship and fee reduction/waiver policies and consider aligning them across both departments, M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Montgomery County Department of Recreation.

Focus on providing financial support for participation in those categories of service on the Mostly or Considerable Community Benefit levels of the Pyramid – thus ensuring access for all to those services providing the greatest community benefit. (See Appendix I.)

- Monitored Facility/Area Usage
- Classes, Workshops, and Clinics – Introductory/Beginning/Multi-level Recreational Camps/After School Care/Day Care
- Open Facility/Area Usage
- Community-wide Events
- Volunteer Program
- Inclusion services

Implementation: Develop a workgroup tasked with evaluating the alignment of the scholarship or fee reduction/waiver policies between the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and the Montgomery County Department of Recreation. Consider what other parks and recreation jurisdictions scholarship or fee reduction/waiver policies are within the region.

Objective 14.2
Seek funding sources for each agency, M-NCPPC Department of Parks and the Montgomery County Department of Recreation, to fund the scholarship or fee reduction/waiver program.

Implementation: Consider creation of a donation and/or an endowment program, a round-up program (e.g., giving program registrants the opportunity to voluntarily round-up their program or service fee to support the scholarship program or a designated program or service), and creating a “workreation” program (for individuals to use volunteer hours toward payment/credit for future programs in which they would like to participate).

Objective 14.3
Expand targeted efforts to reach socio-economically disadvantaged populations. (For example, outreach efforts could be targeted to socio-economically disadvantaged neighborhoods, lesser achieving school service areas, subsidized housing developments, high-density urban areas, senior housing developments and assisted living facilities, and areas not served by public transportation, etc.)

Implementation: Identify socio-economically disadvantaged populations and their locations using recent Census and other tools. Identify grant opportunities and collaborate with other agencies to reach the targeted populations.
GOAL 15 – Increase alternative funding sources.

Objective 15.1
Utilize non-profit 501(c)(3) funding organizations to help generate alternative funding.

Implementation: Analyze the roles of the Parks Foundation and Friends of Recreation for possible collaboration on funding park and recreation programs. Develop a framework for organization of Friends Groups. Partner with targeted non-profit organizations to meet specific funding gaps.

Objective 15.2
Expand sponsorships and naming rights opportunities.

Implementation: Determine or reaffirm each department’s philosophy on and eligibility for naming rights and sponsorships. Determine when the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and the Montgomery County Department of Recreation should work together or independently on sponsorships and naming rights. Identify opportunities for naming rights for facilities and programs. Develop sponsorship packages to bundle opportunities and market to targeted businesses.

Objective 15.3
Expand alternative funding through grants.

Implementation: Explore funding options for a grant writer position to pursue grants and bond bills for healthy and active living initiatives, trail development like Safe Routes to Schools, cultural resource projects, etc.

Objective 15.4
Seek to support programs and operations through volunteerism (where possible).

Implementation: Actively engage volunteers where appropriate as an alternative funding resource. Evaluate the use of mandated service programs and stipend service programs (i.e., AmeriCorp, Civic Justice Corps, etc.).

GOAL 16 – Be leaders in sustainable “green” practices.

Objective 16.1
Develop a coordinated cost-effective program to incorporate sustainable “green” planning, design, construction, and operational practices at all levels of the organizations, including education, administration and procurement in order to improve human health and reduce negative impacts on the natural environment.

Implementation: Create a Sustainability Plan, staffed by those with expertise in sustainable sites and green buildings, to establish centralized goals and objectives and assist with coordination, information gathering, and reporting. Develop a structure for “green teams” to coordinate existing efforts as well as new initiatives. Develop metrics for measuring success.
**Marketing & Outreach**

**Key Findings**

The following findings helped shape the goals and objectives for *Marketing & Outreach*.

**COMMUNITY INPUT**

The *Vision 2030* survey results identified the following findings relative to marketing and communication:

- **Importance of Marketing** – Overall, 42 percent of survey respondents indicated that the reason they do not use parks and recreation services is that they are not aware of programs or facilities offered. Effectively communicating and engaging a diverse audience is both a challenge and an opportunity as the County continues to grow and become even more diverse. Marketing is a good investment to ensure that the public is aware of the vast amount of facilities and services available.

- **Web-based Communication** – Approximately one-third of respondents said that e-mail is the best way to reach them with information on programs and facilities in Montgomery County; however, only 13 percent of respondents are currently getting their information through e-mail, representing an opportunity for further outreach to the community. Other methods of communication listed by respondents as the best way to reach them include the Internet/website (19 percent), program guides (17 percent), and flyers or brochures (14 percent). A large majority of respondents prefer to register for classes using the Internet (77 percent). However, varied methods of communication and outreach are critical to communicate effectively with different audiences.

Marketing and outreach issues that were raised at *Vision 2030* public meetings and focus groups include:

- **Outreach to Diverse Groups** – Outreach and communication to various ethnic communities is needed. Community liaisons, trained staff, and partnerships with ethnic groups would help bridge the gap. Representatives of the disabled community indicated a desire for alternative forms of communication including audio descriptions and Braille.

- **Electronic Communication** – Youth expressed that more visual communications, such as videos and Facebook, as well as text messaging are often more effective than flyers. There was also a desire to make the agency websites more user-friendly (e.g., online registration, etc.).

**COLLABORATION & CREATIVITY**

The M-NCPPC Department of Parks is working to enhance marketing and communication efforts through a variety of media tools, with a growing emphasis on web-based electronic communication. The challenge will be to find the right mix of marketing strategies as no one method is effective for all. Creative approaches with limited budgets will also continue to be a challenge.

The Montgomery County Department of Recreation’s marketing efforts are not coordinated under one main team. Instead, program staff and facility managers produce and distribute flyers and other
promotional materials for their own programs. The Montgomery County Office of Public Information provides assistance public service announcements, press releases, the Destination Recreation cable television show, and event publicity.

A strong, coordinated marketing program has a direct, positive impact on participation and revenue. Both departments should continue to collaborate on and expand strategic marketing efforts.
Recommendations

Theme 5: Marketing & Outreach
Informing and engaging a diverse community

GOAL 17 – Proactively market parks and recreation services and facilities and communicate the benefits to the community.

Objective 17.1
Develop and implement a countywide strategic marketing and outreach plan to expand awareness and usage of programs and services offered by the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and the Montgomery County Department of Recreation.

Implementation: Seek and secure funding to implement joint marketing and outreach plan.

Objective 17.2
Transition communications from printed to electronic media where feasible.

Implementation: Expand use of e-newsletters, text messaging, social media, and smart phone applications. Enhance websites to increase functionality and improve access to information. M-NCPPC Department of Parks - seek and secure funding to hire dedicated staff to manage electronic media marketing efforts.

GOAL 18 – Effectively communicate with and engage diverse groups.

Objective 18.1
Augment staff training in multi-cultural competency and outreach. (Utilize expertise and resources of the Gilchrist Center for Cultural Diversity and M-NCPPC Diversity Council.)

Implementation: Identify and expand use of existing training opportunities for multi-cultural competency and outreach. Promote opportunities for cultural competency assessments and trainings.

COMMUNICATE THE BENEFITS OF PARKS & RECREATION

Build support and participation in parks and recreation programs by strategically communicating positive individual and community benefits.

- Fitness, health, and wellness activities to promote active lifestyles for all ages and abilities.
- Outdoor and environmental education to foster stewardship of natural resources.
- Out-of-school youth programs to foster youth development and healthy lifestyles.
**Objective 18.2**  
Increase opportunities for engagement with diverse groups and those that serve these populations regarding parks and recreation.

*Implementation:* Collaborate with the County’s Office of Community Partnerships to identify opportunities to promote parks and recreation programs, activities, and services to targeted populations. Develop programming that celebrates multi-culturalism. Make information about ADA-compliant facilities and programs easily accessible on both websites. Expand volunteer opportunities that appeal to diverse groups.

**Objective 18.3**  
Strive to make parks and recreation advisory groups representative of the demographic diversity of Montgomery County (e.g., ethnic, age, physical disabilities, income, etc.).

*Implementation:* Develop diverse recruitment and retention campaign for existing recreation advisory boards with goal to attract representatives from all communities.

**Objective 18.4**  
Increase collaboration on communitywide events and festivals.

*Implementation:* Develop a calendar of all countywide community events and festivals. Identify opportunities to enhance or expand existing and develop new community events and festivals.

**GOAL 19 – Provide meaningful opportunities for public support, input, and engagement.**

**Objective 19.1**  
Provide a variety of input opportunities on parks and recreation service issues and concerns in Montgomery County.

*Implementation:* Pilot an online forum or blog for parks and recreation projects. Look at ways to automate on-line surveying tied to database systems (e.g., ParkPASS, RecWeb). Develop a Standard Operating Procedure for public notifications related to master planning or project development. Create an on-line suggestion box to collect parks and recreation ideas and innovations.

**Objective 19.2**  
Expand volunteer opportunities.

*Implementation:* Promote volunteer opportunities through all available methods, including online and promotional signage opportunities. M-NCPPC Department of Parks formalize Friends group program, including development of requirements, policies, and procedures. Montgomery County Department of Recreation to develop a fully functioning volunteer program.
**Objective 19.3**
Conduct a statistically-valid countywide survey every five years to determine community interests and needs.

**Implementation**: Evaluate opportunities to gather satisfaction and use data through existing survey opportunities. Consider investing in a statistically-valid community use and satisfaction survey for specific target markets.

**Objective 19.4**
Leverage relationships with existing “Friends Groups,” staff, and volunteers to promote parks and recreation in Montgomery County.

**Implementation**: Expand on existing communication opportunities (e.g., place parks and recreation information in existing groups’ newsletters and on websites). Develop training program to support outreach efforts.
The **Volume 2: Vision 2030 Strategic Plan** provides goals and objectives that will shape the parks and recreation system for many years to come. This plan positions the both the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Montgomery County Departments of Recreation to collaboratively meet the challenges and opportunities of a changing and diverse community.

**Volume 3: Implementation Plan** consists of detailed implementation matrices for each of the **Strategic Plan** objectives with specific action steps that include: timeline, budget impacts, and responsibility. This staff-level document should be reviewed and updated regularly to align with changing circumstances and evolving community issues, needs, and interests, and resources.
Activity-Based Costing – Identifies costs associated with providing a service or product. It is a tool to determine what a specific service or product costs, and also what the costs are to service a given customer, including those services that are non-revenue generating. Activity-based budgeting is also referred to as “Program Budgeting,” “Program-Based Budget,” or “Cost-Based Budgeting.”

Best Natural Areas – Large areas (generally more than 100 acres) of contiguous high quality forest, marsh or swamp with relatively little evidence of past land-use disturbance and the known presence of rare, threatened, endangered, or watch-list species. Best Natural Areas include the best examples of unique plant community types found in the Montgomery County park system (i.e., river-rock outcrops of the Potomac River Basin, plant communities influenced by serpentine, diabase, or limestone, plant communities on soils derived from Triassic shale, siltstone, sandstone, and conglomerate, central Maryland floodplain forest, central Maryland swamp forest, magnolia bog, mesic forest on acidic bedrock, and dry forest on acidic bedrock). Best Natural Areas may include high quality wetlands, including those of Special State Concern as noted in COMAR Title 26, aquatic communities rated as good or excellent in Montgomery County’s Countywide Stream Protection Strategy, Special Trout Management Areas as noted in COMAR Title 08, and parkland of exceptional scenic beauty.

Biodiversity Areas – Areas of contiguous high quality forest, marsh, or swamp with few or no exotic invasive plants and the known presence of rare, threatened, endangered, or watch-list species. Biodiversity Areas generally represent the best examples of unique plant community types found in the Montgomery County park system (i.e., river-rock outcrops of the Potomac River Basin, plant communities influenced by serpentine, diabase, or limestone, plant communities on soils derived from Triassic shale, siltstone, sandstone, and conglomerate, central Maryland floodplain forest, central Maryland swamp forest, mesic forest on acidic bedrock, and dry forest on acidic bedrock). Biodiversity Areas may also include parkland of exceptional scenic beauty.

Cost Recovery – The degree to which the cost (direct and/or indirect) of facilities, services, and programs is supported by user fees and/or other designated alternative funding mechanism such as grants, sponsorships, partnerships, use of volunteers, etc. versus tax subsidies.

Community Garden – Community gardens provide a location for a community to grow fresh produce and plants as well as satisfying labor, neighborhood improvement, sense of community, and connection to the environment. Community gardens are places tended to and planted by individuals; as such, each garden can be as diverse as its gardeners. Some grow only flowers, others only food plants, some are nurtured communally, and others have raised beds for ease of access.

Community gardens encourage an urban community’s food security, allowing citizens to grow their own food. They also support an improvement in the gardeners’ health through increased fresh vegetable consumption and providing a venue for exercise. The gardens also provide opportunities for social gatherings and social cohesiveness.
Core Services – The mission-led and vision-inspired primary service or businesses areas in which the Department focuses its efforts and energy. Core Services are meant to align with community values to achieve desired outcomes. Examples might include: recreation centers, youth and adult recreation programs, athletic fields, neighborhood parks, community and regional parks, aquatic centers and services, natural areas, and trails.

Cultural Resources – Physical evidence or place of past human activity: site, object, landscape, structure; or a site, structure, landscape, object, or natural feature of significance to a group of people traditionally associated with it. The types of cultural resources often found in parks include:

- Archeological resources – The remains of past human activity and records documenting the scientific analysis of these remains.
- Historic structures – Material assemblies that extend the limits of human capability.
- Cultural landscapes – Settings we have created in the natural world.
- Ethnographic resources – Sites, structures, landscapes, objects, or natural features of significance to a traditionally associated group of people.
- Museum objects – Manifestations of human behavior and ideas.
(Source: National Park Service)

Divest – To reduce or eliminate resources allocated to service provision, to transfer operations of a physical asset to a third party, or to remove the asset because it is of limited value to the organization. The service is either a poor fit with the agency’s values and vision, or the agency deems the service to be contrary to the agency’s interest in the responsible use of resources because they are in a weak market position. The alternative coverage of the service by other providers may be high or low, and the service may or may not be economically viable or financially feasible to sustain.

Environmentally Sensitive Areas – Include streams and stream buffers, 100-year floodplains, wetlands and wetland buffers, steep slopes, highly erodible soils, and habitats of rare, threatened, endangered, and watch-list species (see official listing of species at www.dnr.state.md.us).

Equitable – Dealing fairly and justly with all concerned. Equitable does not have to mean everyone has the exact same thing, but rather that they have things that are equivalent or similar in value. Equitable levels of service can be derived from a mix of various facilities and services, and the mix can be different but still equitable for different locations or groups of constituents. Equity can also be based on calculations that account for differences in population numbers or density, rather than on geographic distribution of amenities alone.

Facility – For the purposes of this document, the term facility is used broadly to include open space and natural areas in addition to the built environment such as parks, recreation centers, etc.

Goal – Broad based statements of intent. Goals are clear general statements about what the agency intends to accomplish. Goals must be connected to the mission, vision, and values of the agency.
**Level of Service** – A measurement of the value or rate at which a geographic location, constituent group, or other identified entity is receiving benefit from a system or its component parts. For parks and recreation this is derived from the amount, types, condition, and location of the facilities, programs, and other elements being provided. Levels of service can be determined for a particular element or combinations and groupings of components. The Composite-Values Level of Service Methodology used in the **Vision 2030** project analyzes quantity, quality, and location information of physical components that make up the park and recreation system (e.g., playgrounds, trails, recreation centers, etc.). By combining the values of individual components, it is possible to measure the service provided by the park and recreation system from a variety of perspectives for any given location or grouping of people. The Geo-referenced Amenities Standards Process (GRASP®) is the Composite-Values Level of Service Methodology that was used for the level of service analysis of parks and recreation components in Montgomery County. In some circumstances, it is necessary to additionally look at unique types of facilities or services individually to get a complete picture of the level of service being provided. This might include community recreation centers, aquatic facilities, special park facilities, etc.

**Loop Walk** – Any trail that is configured to make a complete loop around a park or feature and that is sizeable enough to use as an exercise route (minimum ¼ mile).

**Mission** – A concise statement of organizational purpose. Mission defines who you serve, what you do, how you do it, and why an organization exists.

**Natural Area** – The sum total of acres of land not developed for public use and encompassing those natural resources being preserved to maintain a diversity of native natural communities as a legacy for future generations. Within these communities, natural processes and desirable ecological changes should be allowed to take place. Management activities should be limited to those necessary to mitigate the influence of humans as well as non-native and undesirable species (e.g., gypsy moth, *Lymantria dispar*). (Source: **2005 Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan**, M-NCPPC Department of Parks)

**Objective** – A measurable or observable achievement and a subset of a goal. Objectives are specific operational statements that detail desired accomplishments and leads to the satisfaction of goals. Objectives should be specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and trackable (SMART). *Note: The Vision 2030 Volume 3: Implementation Plan provides more detail through action steps, etc. to make the objectives in Volume 2 meet the SMART guidelines.*

**Open Space** – Areas usually intended for recreational, agricultural, preservation or scenic purposes. (Source: **2005 Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan**, M-NCPPC Department of Parks)

**Partnership** – A cooperative venture between two or more parties with a common goal and compatible missions that combine complementary resources to establish a mutual direction or complete a mutually beneficial objective.

**Park or Parkland** – A publicly owned piece of land used for active or passive recreational use that may or may not be kept in its natural state. (Source: **2005 Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan**, M-NCPPC Department of Parks)
Public Garden – A place where a wide variety of plants is cultivated for scientific, educational, and ornamental purposes and may include exterior landscapes, conservatories, and greenhouses. Public gardens enhance environmental aesthetics; improve the quality of life through education, interpretation, display, and outreach; and promote environmental awareness through sustainable practices and conservation. Public garden professionals are skilled in the art and science of cultivating plants in spaces for public use and benefit.

Program – The activities and events offered by the agency at various locations with specific participant purposes such as education, play, fun, leisure, skill development, socialization, or health.

Services – Programs and experiences afforded the public through the use of park and recreation physical assets and lands. In some cases, specific programs are offered off-site (for example, staff may provide an environmental education program at a school). A service may also define a single or collection of tasks performed by the entity on behalf of the public to protect or enhance the resource, make the facility safe, useable, and accurate or allow other services or programs to continue (e.g., natural resource management, building maintenance, life guarding, etc.).

Service Assessment – An intensive review of organizational services including activities, facilities, and parklands that leads to the development of an agency Service Portfolio. The assessment indicates whether the service is “core to the organization’s values and vision,” and provides recommended strategies that can include, but are not limited to, enhancement of service, reduction of service, collaboration, and advancement or affirmation of market position. The process includes an analysis of the relevance of each service to organizational values and vision and market position, including an examination of economic viability and other competitive service availability.

SmartParks – A computerized maintenance management system (CMMS). Its primary function is to generate, track and report work orders, maintained assets, and inventory management. It serves as a decision support system for reporting and analysis of park operations conducted by the trades, arborists, and park maintenance staff. Organizationally, the SmartParks staff team provides systems support for the department and is part for the Management Services Division of the M-NCPPC Montgomery Department of Parks.

Stewardship – An ethic that embodies cooperative planning and management of the County park and recreation system – including its natural areas, historical resources, and built infrastructure – so that it best meets the needs of current and future generations.

Sub-Area – Four sub-areas of Montgomery County were used for demographic and level of service analysis for the Vision 2030 project. The sub-areas are identified as: North Central, South Central, Potomac/Rural, and the Eastern Transit Corridor. (These sub-areas were formerly the M-NCPPC Planning Department’s Vision Division Team areas.)

Sustainability – Meeting the needs of the present without endangering the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Operational sustainability promotes environmental quality, enhances social benefits, and incorporates economic efficiencies.

Target Market – The specific market of a service (e.g., age, sex, race/ethnicity, education level, ability level, residence, etc.).

Montgomery County, Maryland
Trails, Multi-use – Trails, paved or unpaved, that are separated from the road and provide recreational or transportation opportunities (e.g. biking, walking/jogging, rollerblading, etc.).

Values – A set of timeless, guiding principles that influence:
- What we strongly believe about who we are and what we do
- A set of core beliefs
- What’s important to the organization

Organizational values are a composite of the societal/community, member/staff, and leader/policy maker values. They are what we aspire to impart as park and recreation professionals within our community. Examples include environmental stewardship, financial sustainability, and active lifestyles.

Vision – A long-range over-arching goal describing what the organization seeks to become or how they plan to impact the community in the future.
INVENTORY OVERVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

The parks and recreation system can be thought of as an infrastructure that serves the health and well-being of people. This infrastructure is made up of parts that are combined in various ways to provide service. At the larger scale, a parks and facilities form the basic building blocks of the system. But each of these can be broken down into individual components, such as playing fields, interpretive features, or gyms. For this project, a very complete and thorough database of parks and recreation amenities in Montgomery County was developed. All of the individual components within the system were evaluated and recorded into the inventory dataset.

The Composite Values Level of Service (LOS) process used in the Vision 2030 records quantity, quality, and location information regarding the components that make up the parks and recreation system. The proprietary version of this type of LOS analysis used for this project is called GRASP® (Geo-Referenced Amenities Standards Process).

The inventory was conducted from January 2010 to June 2010 and included three major provider groups:

- M-NCPPC Department of Parks managed and owned properties
- Montgomery County Department of Recreation managed and owned properties
- Alternative providers

Alternative providers include schools (elementary, middle, and high schools); Montgomery Village Foundation recreation facilities; municipal indoor and outdoor recreational facilities, including, but not limited to, City of Rockville, Gaithersburg, and Tacoma Park; state and federal outdoor recreational facilities; Boys and Girls Club properties; YMCAs; and other alternative providers.

LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

Overview

The findings from the analysis show what the current levels of service are for a variety of parks and recreation needs. These include overall LOS provided by the system to all parts of the County, and specific LOS for particular needs such as indoor facilities, multi-purpose fields, etc. The analysis also allows for comparisons to be made in evaluating how equitably services are provided across different parts of the County. Details on the GRASP® Methodology are included in Volume 1: Needs & Resource Assessment.

While the methodology allows quantitative measurements to be made for levels of service, there are no established nationwide standards for what the resultant numbers should be. This is because every community is different. However, the community-specific GRASP® values can be used in conjunction with other findings, such as community surveys and public input, to determine whether current LOS is meeting needs and expectations, then used as a benchmark for creating targets and measuring results in the future. The numerical analyses provide a measurement for what the level of service is for a given location, but not necessarily what it should be. These
findings should be utilized in context with the other tools and methodologies used in the planning process as a basis for recommendations.

The following LOS analytical maps or Perspectives were prepared for the Vision 2030 project and can be found in *Volume 1: Needs & Resource Assessment.*

- **Perspective A:** Access to All Components
- **Perspective B:** Access to Indoor Facilities
- **Perspective C:** Access to Outdoor Components
- **Perspective D:** Access to Fields
- **Perspective E:** Walkable Access to All Components
- **Perspective F:** Access to Cultural Resources
- **Perspective G:** Trailshed Analysis
- **Perspective H:** Transportation
- **Perspective I:** Sector Plans

*Note: Appendix C of this document includes larger versions of Perspectives A, B, and E.*

**Summary of LOS Findings**

A key finding from the analysis is that Montgomery County is well-served for parks and recreation in the traditional sense. No matter where a resident lives in the County, he/she has adequate access to a basic set of facilities and components within a reasonable distance from home that in sum add up to a level of service that is on par with traditional models for service.

A second finding is the difference between the rural and urban parts of the County. The overall or composite service coverage is 100 percent for the entire County. But when looking at specific types of service, such as indoor recreation, the coverage in the rural areas drops significantly below that of the urban areas. And where service is provided in the rural areas, the GRASP® value of that service is also significantly lower than in the urban areas. However, whenever service is measured in proportion to the population served, the rural areas emerge consistently higher than the urban areas. This is because the population in the rural areas is so low compared to the urban areas that it takes relatively little amounts of “things” in the rural area to generate a much higher per-capita ratio than found in the urban areas. This pattern is to be expected in a County system versus a municipal one, and is not normally an area of concern.

If the Potomac/Rural sub-area is taken out of the equation, it appears in a very general sense that the East Transit Corridor shows well in most categories of analysis, while North Central comes in as the lowest of the three urbanized sub-areas in many categories. The degree of difference between these three sub-areas in terms of overall (composite) service as measured in **Perspective A** ranges from a factor of 1.2 for Average LOS Per Acre Served to 2.3 for Average LOS Per Acre Per Population Per Acre. In simpler terms, this means that the average value of the composite service for East Transit Corridor is 1.2 times what it is for North Central. When adjusted for population density the value of service in East Transit Corridor is 2.3 times that of South Central. In terms of raw per-capita value of the components in each sub-area as determined by the GRASP® Index, East Transit Corridor is 1.3 times that of North Central.
Whether or not the numeric spreads listed above translate into inequities in service may depend upon other factors, such as potential presence of additional alternative providers that were not included in the inventory, and the needs, desires, and expectations of the people that live within each sub-area. Underlying land uses may play a role as well, as different land uses generate different types of needs for parks and recreation. An area with a higher proportion of commercial, multi-family residential or other land uses may have different needs than an area that is strictly suburban homes. The numerical analyses provide a measurement for what the level of service is for a given location, but not what it should be. Threshold scores have been used to get a sense of where the service value falls above or below an assumed value, but in reality people in one part of the County might have a different threshold value than others. Other tools are used to determine what the value should be in specific cases such as surveys, focus groups, demographic composition, and others.

While the analyses used to determine LOS are very effective at putting numerical values on the physical assets that are offered, it does not measure how effectively the assets offered fit the desires of the public they are intended to serve. Again, this must be determined by other means as listed above. However, once certain types of assets are determined to be desired, the analyses can be used to determine what the value of those assets is (but not what they should be).

For example, Perspective D analyzes the provision of athletic fields. The results show that fields are well-distributed across the County, although a bit less so in the Potomac/Rural sub-area. It also shows what the current values of those fields are overall and by sub-area. It is possible to see that the values for the various indicators measured for fields in Perspective D (Average LOS Per Acre Served, etc.) are fairly consistent among the urban sub-areas. The spread from high to low scores among these is no more than a factor of 1.6 in the most extreme case. This suggests that, if a need for more fields countywide has been identified through participation numbers, surveys or other tools, and that the need is consistent across the County, then new fields should be added in a distributed manner across the County. If a greater inequity had shown up between the sub-areas, then it might have made more sense to add the new fields where the current LOS is low.

The value of trail connectivity is also indicated in the analysis. Based on the assumption that more connectivity creates better access to park and recreation components, connecting existing trails to each other could greatly increase the value of those trails. This finding assumes that the connected trails share user types. For example, the connection between two multi-user trails will increase the value of both trails; however, a connection between a single-use and a multi-use trail may not increase the value of both trails, since certain users may not benefit from the connection, such as a biker or a hiker. When developing recommendations, this finding should be weighed against other factors such as how far the average user is willing to go, environmental constraints in the areas where connectivity is desired, and limitations on user types.

Finally, one of the most useful findings might be the relationship between Perspective A: Access to All Components, and Perspective E: Walkable Access to All Components. Comparing the two shows how different the LOS picture looks from the standpoint of someone who drives and someone who does not. While access to parks and recreation components is available across 100 percent of the County for someone who drives, only 58 percent of the County offers walkable access, and only 6 percent of the County offers walkable access to a combination of components whose value meets the assumed threshold for adequate service. While providing walkable service for 100 percent of the County might not make sense as a goal, achieving a high coverage for walkability in the urbanized
parts of the County could. Currently, those sub-areas have walkability coverage that ranges from 46 percent to 81 percent. The percentages of each sub-area that meet the threshold scores are much lower, ranging from 4 percent to 15 percent. **Using these figures as baselines, it will be possible to set measurable targets for increasing the percentages of certain areas covered by walkable service**, along with desired targets for LOS scores within those walkable areas.

**Cultural resources** are relatively uniformly well-distributed across the County. No matter where a resident lives within the County, he/she is either within three or five miles of a cultural resource.

Another factor to consider from the findings is that some of the components considered in the LOS analysis do not belong to the Department of Parks and the Department of Recreation. The quality or even continued existence of these components is beyond the control of the departments. The components provided by Rockville, Gaithersburg, Montgomery Village Foundation, and Takoma Park can be considered reasonably permanent; however, should changes occur in these areas or any other areas beyond the knowledge or control of the departments, levels of service will change accordingly.

**A CLOSER LOOK – PERSPECTIVE A: ACCESS TO ALL COMPONENTS**

![Map of Montgomery County](image)

*Larger map is located in Appendix C.*

**Perspective A: Access to All Components** is analyzed below to provide an example of the level of service analysis and tools used for the Vision 2030 project. *Note: This level of analysis was also conducted for each of the other Perspectives listed above and can be found in Volume 1: Needs & Resource Assessment.*
Perspective A represents the service available from all components combined and shows higher levels of service in the Southern parts of the County, and lower levels in the Northern part. No gaps in service are apparent in this analysis. The entire County has at least some service.

**GRASP® Table A—Access to All Components** shows the statistics derived from **Perspective A—Access to All Components** for the County as a whole and by sub-area. For each column, the highest value is shaded in dark green and the lowest is shaded in light green.

### GRASP® Table A

#### Perspective A: Access to All Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-AREA</th>
<th>Percent of Area With LOS</th>
<th>Average LOS Per Acre Served</th>
<th>Percent Total Area Above Threshold Score (67.2)</th>
<th>Avg LOS Per Acre Per Pop</th>
<th>GRASP® Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac / Rural</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Transit Corridor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that 100% of the County is covered with at least some service, meaning that the GRASP® score for every location within the County according to this Perspective is greater than zero. Even the Potomac/Rural sub-area has 100% coverage. The average GRASP® LOS score per acre for all acres with service across the County is 710 points. This number represents the average GRASP® score for all of the area within the County. The scores by sub-area range from a high of 1,136 points in the East Transit Corridor to a low of 415 points in Potomac/Rural. This is a factor of 2.7 to one. It indicates that there is a greater concentration of components serving the East Transit Corridor than there is for the others. The East Transit Corridor has the highest population of all the sub-areas, so providing more components there makes sense.

The upper inset map for **Perspective PA-1: Average GRASP® LOS Per Population Density** shows the average GRASP® score per acre within each of the sub-areas divided by the sub-area’s average population density per acre. This was done to normalize the LOS for population. In some ways, the GRASP® analysis is a density analysis which measures the density of components and the service they provide. So comparing density of service to density of population can be a useful exercise. When analyzed this way, the highest LOS per population occurs in the Potomac/Rural sub-area and the lowest in the South Central sub-area. The Potomac/Rural sub-area has the lowest population density of all the sub-areas by a large margin, and the East Transit Corridor sub-area has the highest. In general, LOS as a function of population density is higher in those parts of the County that are more rural and less populated. It is inappropriate to say here what the “correct” value should be, or whether the values for all sub-areas should be the same. This information is simply provided to be used in conjunction with other findings to make recommendations for future actions.

Another way to look at LOS from this Perspective is shown on the lower inset map on **Perspective A, PA-2: GRASP® LOS Meeting Threshold Scores**. It shows where the cumulative LOS on Perspective A falls above or below the threshold score, as described earlier. The threshold score for this
Perspective is 67.2. This is equivalent to access to at least four components and a trail with appropriate modifiers in place, although this score might be achieved in other ways that do not guarantee a certain mix of components. Whether or not the mix is appropriate for all areas is determined through other tools, including the public input process.

Areas where service exists, but it falls below the threshold score would be shown in yellow on this map if there were any. For Montgomery County there are no areas falling below the threshold.

Purple areas on the inset map are those where scores are at or above the threshold. These areas are considered to have adequate levels of service, although this does not necessarily imply that the mix of features being offered is the one that residents currently desire. It may be that changes and/or improvements are needed within the purple-shaded areas to fit the specific mix of services to the needs and expectations of residents. Again, this is determined through the public process. The Vision 2030 survey findings show overall high levels of satisfaction with the parks and recreation facilities and services in Montgomery County.

Another way to look at the service within each sub-area is to consider the total GRASP® value of all of the components within it, regardless of where they are located. When this GRASP® number is divided by the population of the sub-area, in thousands, the result is called a GRASP® Index. (The GRASP® Index for Access to All Components is shown in the GRASP® Table A.) In this analysis, Potomac/Rural and the East Transit Corridor emerge with the highest values, and South Central and North Central have the lowest.

**USING COMPOSITE-VALUES LEVEL OF SERVICE METHODOLOGY**

The Vision 2030 Volume 1: Needs and Resource Assessment Chapter 5 analyzed the current inventory of park and recreation facilities in Montgomery County. One measurement of Level of Service is the Average LOS Per Acre Per Population Per Acre that can be found in GRASP® Table A above. The values for this indicator are 238 for the entire County, 592 for Potomac/Rural, 270 for East Transit Corridor, 117 for South Central, and 157 for North Central. A goal could be established for making this value equal for East Transit Corridor, South Central, and North Central by the year 2020. Potomac/Rural will continue to be an anomaly, which is acceptable due to the comparatively low population found there. To accomplish this, add or upgrade components within the South Central and North Central sub-areas. This could include adding components or upgrading modifiers such as comfort and convenience features (e.g. restrooms, shade, etc.). Components could be added within the East Transit Corridor when needed to keep pace with population growth, or components may be re-purposed there to keep them in sync with changing needs.

The GRASP® Indices can be used on an ongoing basis to measure relative LOS among the sub-areas. A goal could be set to maintain the GRASP® Index at the current level for the East Transit Corridor, and increase it for the South Central and North Central sub-areas. The GRASP® Index for the Potomac/Rural sub-area may be allowed to decrease since it is always likely to be higher than the others because of the low population found there. The GRASP® Index should be recalculated annually as an indicator of progress in equalizing service among the sub-areas. The GRASP® Perspectives, analytical LOS maps, can be run at less frequent intervals, such as every five years, if desired. It will be important to update the inventory regularly, on the same frequency that the GRASP® Indices are recalculated.
APPENDIX C: LEVEL OF SERVICE MAPS
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APPENDIX D: PRIORITIZING PARKLAND ACQUISITIONS

The *Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan, 2005* (LPPRP) identifies Montgomery County priorities for land acquisition and facility development and rehabilitation. Criteria for establishing these priorities as identified in LPPRP include:

- Consistency with the County’s comprehensive planning goals for recreation, parks, and open space and State goals established through these criteria
- Access to a variety of quality recreational environments and opportunities
- Convenience in location to population centers (e.g. areas with the most dense population receive the greatest needs)
- Access to public transportation, when possible
- Protection of most threatened natural resources

Questions the M-NCPPC Department of Parks, Land Acquisition Section staff ask when considering parkland acquisitions include:

1. *Is the proposed acquisition specifically shown on an adopted master plan?*
2. *Does the proposed acquisition, if not specifically shown on an adopted master plan, fall within the general guidelines for parkland acquisition?*
3. *Does the proposed acquisition represent a logical addition to or expansion of an existing park?*
4. *Is the proposed acquisition threatened by loss to development?*
5. *Is the proposed acquisition essential to accommodate the construction of a Capital Improvement (CIP) project?*
6. *Does the proposed acquisition lend itself to development with active recreation facilities that will eliminate or help to eliminate unmet needs in a given area?*
7. *Is there community support for the proposed acquisition?*
8. *Does the proposed acquisition represent an “opportunity” to acquire real estate that is clearly in the public’s interest?*

(Source: M-NCPPC Department of Parks, Land Acquisition Section)

There are four separate land acquisition programs used by the M-NCPPC in Montgomery County: the Non-Local Park Acquisition Program, the Local Park Acquisition Program, the Advance Land Acquisition Revolving Fund, and the Legacy Open Space Program.

The Legacy Open Space Program is a land acquisition program that began in 2001 with the adoption of the *Legacy Open Space Master Plan*. The plan identifies open space lands for acquisition due to their exceptional recreational, historic, natural or cultural value.

Ongoing refinements of the set of criteria for lands for parks, recreation, open space, and trails to assure that the balance of needs can be met are desired. The *Vision 2030* project provides additional analysis to identify target areas of current and future demand, including parklands that serve the increasingly urbanized North Central and South Central sub-areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility or Component (number of existing)</th>
<th>&quot;NRPA&quot; (per pop.)</th>
<th>Montgomery County (MC): 1 component per pop. (2010)</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th><strong>Survey Results Needs Being Met</strong></th>
<th>Service Assessment</th>
<th><strong>Trends (Nat’l)</strong></th>
<th>Recommendation (in next 5-10 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTDOOR AMENITIES</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Court, outdoor (196)</td>
<td>7,333</td>
<td>16,333</td>
<td>4,951 (high LOS relative to NRPA study)</td>
<td>Lower (37%)</td>
<td>Mid (56%)</td>
<td>Ranked as low priority countywide</td>
<td>Complementar y Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Field (185)</td>
<td>3,913</td>
<td>9,467</td>
<td>5,232 (mid LOS)</td>
<td>Lower (27%)</td>
<td>Mid (49-50%)</td>
<td>Ranked as low priority countywide</td>
<td>Advance Market Position (Regional/Recreational Parks) Core Service (Community Use Parks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardens (4)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>241,975 (GreenPlay benchmark comparison shows lower LOS in MC)</td>
<td>Mid (46%)</td>
<td>Mid (57%)</td>
<td>Higher demand in South and North Central</td>
<td>Advance Market Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park (5)</td>
<td>59,256</td>
<td>242,500</td>
<td>193,580 (mid LOS)</td>
<td>Lower (33%)</td>
<td>Lower (43%)</td>
<td>Higher demand in South and North Central</td>
<td>Core Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Field, all sizes (160)</td>
<td>4,946</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>6,049 (mid LOS)</td>
<td>Mid (45%)</td>
<td>High (62%)</td>
<td>Higher demand in East Transit Corridor and South Central</td>
<td>Advance Market Position (Regional/Recreational Parks) Core Service (Community Use Parks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters (47)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20,594 (GreenPlay benchmark comparison shows lower LOS in MC)</td>
<td>Higher (62%)</td>
<td>High (66%)</td>
<td>Higher demand in East Transit Corridor and South Central</td>
<td>Advance Market Position for Rentals – Shelters Core Service - Picnic Grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground, all sizes (258)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>3,752 (high LOS)</td>
<td>Higher (68%)</td>
<td>High (73%)</td>
<td>Higher demand in East Transit Corridor, South and North Central</td>
<td>Core Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park (7 – 2 M-NCPCC, 5 others)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>138,271 (GreenPlay benchmark comparison shows lower LOS in MC)</td>
<td>Lowest (16%)</td>
<td>Lowest (39%)</td>
<td>Ranked as low priority countywide</td>
<td>Offered by other providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis, outdoor (304)</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>15,779</td>
<td>3,184 (high LOS)</td>
<td>Mid (48%)</td>
<td>High (63%)</td>
<td>Higher demand in Potomac/Rural</td>
<td>Complementary Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility or Component (number of existing)</td>
<td><strong>NRPA (per pop.)</strong></td>
<td>Montgomery County (MC): 1 component per pop. (2010)</td>
<td><strong>Survey Results (2010)</strong></td>
<td>Service Assessment</td>
<td><em><strong>Trends (Nat’l)</strong></em></td>
<td>Recommendation (in next 5-10 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails, hard and natural surface (289 miles)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3,349 miles per person (GreenPlay benchmark comparison shows higher LOS in MC)</td>
<td>Highest (72-73%)</td>
<td>Highest demand for hard surface trails in East Transit Corridor; Higher demand for soft surface trail in Potomac/Rural</td>
<td>Core Service</td>
<td>Popular amenity nationwide; exercise walking ranks as the top sport by total participation nationwide; hiking, biking, and running/jogging also rank in the top 12 Expand distribution of multi-use trails with a focus on more densely populated areas, when feasible; increase trail connectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball, outdoor (24 – 17 M-NCPPC, 7 others)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>40,413 (GreenPlay benchmark comparison shows lower LOS in MC)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Core Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming ranks as the 4th sport by total participation nationwide; Vision 2030 survey identified indoor aquatics as one of the top five facilities to expand or improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor (4 large stand-alone centers, MC Dept. of Rec.)</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>172,000</td>
<td>****211,679 (MC Dept. of Rec. aquatic centers are larger than most jurisdictions)</td>
<td>Mid (59%)</td>
<td>Mid demand in North Central</td>
<td>Advance or Affirm Market Position at all sites</td>
<td>Consider developing future aquatic facilities in conjunction with larger multipurpose recreation centers whenever possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Center (4)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>241,975 (No comparison data available)</td>
<td>Mid (58%)</td>
<td>Higher demand in Potomac/Rural</td>
<td>Core Service – Drop-in Experience Other services vary within nature centers and are Advance, Affirm or are Complementary Development (e.g., Environmental Education Programs - On-Site, and Special Events)</td>
<td>No new stand-alone Nature Centers recommended; 78% of survey respondents prefer outdoor nature education over indoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Recreation Center (24)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>36,554</td>
<td>****35,280 (close LOS to other Boroughs/Counties)</td>
<td>Higher (67%)</td>
<td>Highest demand in the North &amp; South Central followed by the East Transit Corridor per survey and Level of Service analysis</td>
<td>Core Service – most Drop-in Experience Other services vary within recreation centers</td>
<td>Add fewer, larger regional recreation centers (with aquatics) focused in along central corridor growth areas; (63% of survey respondents prefer to fewer, larger multi-purpose regional rec centers as opposed to a greater number of smaller centers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: This chart is based on 2010 inventory data and 2010 population estimate of 967,900 (unless otherwise noted below).
*National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) Operating Ratio Study, 2009: “All” includes all jurisdiction respondent types (County/Borough, Municipal, and Special Districts) and “County” includes only the County jurisdiction respondents to this national benchmarking study. The numbers in columns 2-4 represent population per component. In cases where a component was not included in the NRPA study, benchmark data from other communities from the consultants’ database were used as comparisons.
**Survey: Vision 2030 Survey results are statistically-valid on a countywide basis; sub-area information is informational and not statistically-valid due to the smaller sample size. See Volume 1: Needs & Resource Assessment for the survey report. Survey analysis based on Figure 7 (importance) and on Figures 9 and 10 (needs) in the survey report. Sub-area analysis is based on Figure 22.
****Based on adjusted 2010 County population of 846,717 that excludes the populations of the Cities of Gaithersburg and Rockville. Ratio includes 24 centers (including Mid County, White Oak, and North Potomac senior centers) operated by the Montgomery County Department of Recreation.

EXAMPLE – BASKETBALL COURT ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Basketball Court
Analysis of data (from previous table): Montgomery County provides a high ratio of basketball courts per population (1 for every 4,951 people) as compared to a self-reported national operating ratio study conducted by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA). However, according the Vision 2030 statistically-valid survey results, basketball ranked lower in importance and in the mid-range in needs being met. The Service Assessment showed that in the North part of the County that there are other providers that have basketball courts. The M-NCPPC Department of Parks when planning will need to look to complement and not duplicate these other providers. However, in the South few other providers exist. National trends show a declining participation in organized basketball and increasing participation in pick-up games.

Recommendation: The M-NCPPC Department of Parks should review the use patterns of existing basketball courts and identify opportunities for multiple-uses of some courts (e.g., futsal, inline skating, etc.) and possible repurposing underutilized courts. The ratio of basketball courts per population could be re-evaluated and consideration should be given to lowering the existing ratio.

SERVICE PROVISION STRATEGIES (Based On Service Assessment)
Following are descriptions of the Service Provision Strategies identified for select parks and recreation services and amenities in the “Service Assessment” column in the preceding chart.

Affirm Market Position – a number of (or one significant) alternative provider(s) exists yet the service has financial capacity and the agency is in a strong market position to provide the service to customers or the community. Affirming market position includes efforts to capture more of the market and investigating the merits of competitive pricing strategies. This includes investment of resources to realize a financial return on investment. Typically, these services have the ability to generate excess revenue.
**Advance Market Position** – a smaller number or **no alternative providers** exist to provide the service, the service has **financial capacity** and the agency is in a **strong market position** to provide the service. Due primarily to the fact that there are fewer if any alternative providers, **advancing market position** of the service is a logical operational strategy. This includes efforts to capture more of the market, investigating the merits of market pricing, and various outreach efforts. Also, this service could generate excess revenue by increasing volume.

**Divestment** – the agency has determined that the service **does not fit** with the agency’s values and vision, and/or the agency has determined it is in a **weak market position** with little or no opportunity to strengthen its position. Further, the agency deems the service to be contrary to the agency’s interest in the responsible use of resources, therefore, the agency is positioned to consider **divestment** of the service.

**Investment** – **investment** of resources is the agency’s best course of action as the service is a **good fit** with values and vision, and an opportunity exists to strengthen the agency’s current **weak market position** in the marketplace.

**Complementary Development** – the service is a **good fit**, a number of or one significant **alternative provider(s)** exists which provide the service, the agency is in a **strong market position** to provide the service, yet it **does not have financial capacity**. “**Complementary development**” encourages planning efforts that lead to complementary service development rather than duplication, broadening the reach of all providers. Although there may be perceived market saturation for the service due to the number or like services of alternative providers, demand and need exists justifying the service’s continued place in the market.

**Collaboration** – the agency determines that the service can be enhanced or improved through the development of a collaborative effort as the agency’s current **market position is weak**. **Collaborations** (e.g., partnerships) with other service providers (internal or external) that minimize or eliminate duplication of services while most responsibly utilizing agency resources are recommended.

**Core Service** – these services **fit** with the agency’s values and vision, there are **few if any alternative providers**, yet the agency is in a **strong market position** to provide the service. However, the agency **does not have the financial capacity** to sustain the service outside of General Fund support and the service is deemed to not be economically viable. These services are “**core**” to **satisfying the agency’s values and vision** typically benefiting all community members, or are seen as essential to the lives of under-served populations.
APPENDIX F: RECREATION & AQUATIC CENTER ANALYSIS

RECREATION CENTERS

The table below provides an analysis of Montgomery County Department of Recreation (DOR) indoor recreation centers by sub-area. The blue shaded areas in the table indicate lower levels of service (LOS) and show that by far, the North Central sub-area has the lowest level of service for indoor recreation centers based on population density or per capita service. However, the Potomac/Rural sub-area, which has the lowest population but the largest geographic area, shows the lowest percentage LOS geographic coverage.

Table 3: Recreation Centers Analysis by Sub-Area (Dept. of Recreation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>2010 Population</th>
<th>SF &amp; Number of DOR Centers</th>
<th>Population per Center</th>
<th>*** SF per Population</th>
<th>**** Survey Ranking (Top 3)</th>
<th>*****% of Area with LOS</th>
<th>***** LOS Pop. Density</th>
<th>Populatio n Growth 2010-2030</th>
<th>Priority for New or Expanded Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Central (Total)</td>
<td>297,050</td>
<td>49,747 SF in 3 centers</td>
<td>99,016</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>9(lowest)</td>
<td>30.6%90,840</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Central</strong></td>
<td>175,867</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,622</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>57,329</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Transit Corridor</td>
<td>301,649</td>
<td>231,237 SF in 11 centers</td>
<td>27,422</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.5%29,846</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>242,354</td>
<td>89,610 SF in 5 centers</td>
<td>48,471</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.5%54,441</td>
<td>2nd Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac/ Rural</td>
<td>126,847</td>
<td>100,550 in 5 centers</td>
<td>25,369</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58(highest)</td>
<td>3.6%4514</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Population Forecast Round 8.0, Research & Technology Center, Montgomery County Planning Department, M-NCPPC June 2010. See Table 6 below for more detailed population projections of high growth parts of the sub-areas.

**North Central sub-area 2010 and 2030 population projections and analysis does not include the municipalities of Gaithersburg and Rockville because they provide their own recreation facilities and the Montgomery County Department of Recreation does not assume responsibility for recreation facility planning for these cities.

***Square Foot/2010 Population — include net square footage of recreation centers, neighborhood centers, and senior center (including new centers: Mid County, White Oak and North Potomac) per person based on 2010 County population.

****Percentage of survey respondents that ranked adding, improving, or expanding recreation centers as one of their top three priorities

*****Percentage of sub-area that has some service provided by indoor recreation centers – that shows coverage is fairly even with the exception of Potomac/Rural sub-area. The LOS analysis includes Recreation Centers, Senior Centers, open Park Activity Buildings as well as key alternative providers. See Vision 2030 Volume 1: Needs and Resource Assessment for further analysis in Chapter 5.

****** LOS score that shows when population density is factored in Potomac/Rural has the highest indoor center LOS per capita while the North Central has the lowest. (This measurement and the one above are two different ways of looking at LOS using composite-values methodology.)

The Montgomery County Department of Recreation level of service model of one center (approximately 33,000 net square feet) per 30,000 residents is detailed in the Recreation Facility Development Plan, 2005 Update. The East Transit Corridor and the Potomac/Rural sub-area exceed this target based on 2010 population figures. These two sub-areas also have the highest combined
center square footage per population. In contrast, the North Central has the lowest current LOS and is projected to have the highest rate of growth in the next twenty years to 2030.

**Table 4: Indoor Recreation and Aquatic Center Projections (Square Feet)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Current SF of Indoor Recreation &amp; Aquatic Centers (2010/CIP Gross SF*)</th>
<th>2010 Population (Adjusted***)</th>
<th>2010 SF/Person</th>
<th>2030 Population (Adjusted *** )</th>
<th>New SF of Indoor and Aquatic Space Needed to Reach Standard of 1.1 SF/person, 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>882,200 +/- SF** <em>(24 indoor recreation centers and 4 aquatic centers)</em></td>
<td>846,717</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>979,706</td>
<td>195,500 +/- SF****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated Gross Square Feet (SF) = 40% above Net Square Feet (NSF).
** Includes 3 Senior Centers serving unique + 55 populations only.
***Adjusted Montgomery County, MD population minus the populations of the Cities of Gaithersburg and Rockville.
****See Vision 2030 Goal 8 and Objectives.

A flexible approach to meeting the recreational needs of Montgomery County is desired – one that factors in equitable distribution of centers based on population density as well as operational efficiencies to best meet these needs. Due to the high interest in recreational aquatics, especially indoor facilities, and the operational efficiencies involved, it is the recommendation of the 2030 Vision project to incorporate indoor aquatics with recreation centers. This is common industry practice throughout the nation. However, Montgomery County has a history of larger, stand alone state-of-the art aquatic centers. Incorporating aquatics in recreation centers would require that the current Community Recreation Center Program of Requirements (POR) be modified and merged with an Aquatic Center POR for these new combined facilities.

The standard of 1.1 square feet for community recreation center space per one County resident (based on a 33,000 square foot recreation center per population of 30,000) is appropriate and no changes are being recommended in the Vision 2030 project. This standard is comparable to other similar agencies. For example, the Park Authority in Fairfax County, Virginia also has a recreation center standard of 1.1 SF/resident. (Source: Needs Assessment Final Report, Fairfax County Park Authority, February 2004)

A need for the equivalent of 195,500 +/- SF of additional indoor recreation space is projected based on the 2030 population forecast in order to achieve the 1.1 SF/resident standard. According to the Vision 2030 study, new or expanded recreation centers are the highest priority to serve the North Central sub-area due to current gaps in indoor recreation service and anticipated demands from projected population increases. The South Central sub-area is a second priority due to projected population demands. (See Perspective B: Access to Indoor Facilities in Appendix C.) Opportunities and current efforts to renovate and modernize existing community recreation centers should also be explored, when feasible, as an additional strategy for addressing increased demand as the County grows.
Guidelines for Prioritizing Capital Improvement Projects
The following development criteria and sequencing for DOR recreation centers is outlined in the Recreation Facility Development Plan, 2005 Update.

- Population density that is currently underserved by existing facilities.
- Population socio-economic make-up, with communities of more children, higher diversity and/or fewer leisure options, being given a priority. (North Central would qualify)
- Availability of time sensitive cost-saving opportunities, such as Federal grants, private sector donations or dedications, or efficiencies in construction costs (and/or operating costs) by joining projects.
- Expressed interest and support from specific communities.
- Geographically isolated communities with fewer leisure options.

The analysis from the Vision 2030 project clearly points to a gap in service in the North Central sub-area based on current and projected population densities. In addition to efficiencies in construction costs, it is important to also consider efficiencies in operating costs. The last item in the list should be further defined as it may not be operationally sustainable to add recreation centers to geographically isolated communities with very low populations.

Role of Alternative Providers
How do alternative providers currently contribute to the level of service for indoor recreation centers in Montgomery County? The inventory conducted as part of the Vision 2030 project shows that the denser, more developed sub-areas have the most number of a wide variety of alternative providers (recreation centers as well as indoor aquatic facilities, cultural centers) as show in table below. The East Transit Corridor sub-area has by far the highest number (12) of the smaller Park Activity Buildings (owned by the M-NCPPC Department of Parks) that generally consist of a large multi-purpose room, restrooms, and a small kitchen. The composite-values level of service analysis used in the Vision 2030 project factored in these other providers. Even with alternative providers factored in, the LOS is still lowest in the North Central followed by the South Central.

Table 5: Park Activity Buildings and Alternative Providers (by sub-area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>M-NCPPC Department of Parks – Park Activity Buildings (in operation as of 2010)</th>
<th>*Alternative Providers of Indoor Recreation Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Total SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Transit Corridor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac/Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alternative providers included recreation centers in Gaithersburg and Rockville, including aquatic facilities and cultural center, as well as providers such as the YMCA. While school spaces such gyms were factored into the LOS analysis, they are not included in these numbers.

The M-NCPPC Department of Parks also has an inventory of Park Activity Buildings that are not currently open. Further research into potential opportunities for adaptive re-use or replacing Park Activity Buildings to serve the North Central area in particular is recommended.
**Potential Areas for New or Expanded Recreation Centers**
The table below identifies target areas where concentrated growth is projected to 2030. New or expanded recreation centers are the highest priority to serve the North Central sub-area, followed by the South Central sub-area. Note: *More detailed population projections by the 28 Planning Areas used by the M-NCPPC are found in Appendix G.*

Table 6: Potential Areas for New or Expanded Recreation Centers by 2030
(Potential areas have lower current per capita service for indoor centers and high projected population growth.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>By 2020 (10 years)</th>
<th>By 2030 (20 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Highest Priority)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksburg area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(projected pop. increase of 23,614 by 2030 with 14,480 of this growth by 2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown/Gaithersburg Vicinity</td>
<td></td>
<td>(projected pop. increase of 35,235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary Priority)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spring area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(projected pop. increase of 12,278 by 2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or *North Bethesda area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(projected pop. increase of 26,241 by 2030 with 5,246 projected by 2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(projected pop. increase of 16,365 by 2030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Transit Corridor</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Kensington/Wheaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(projected pop. increase of 14,793)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Look at opportunities to expand existing centers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Population Forecast Round 8.0 by Planning Area, Research & Technology Center, Montgomery County Planning Department, M-NCPPC, June 2010.

*Planning efforts currently underway.

Note: Long-term planning efforts should address the Poolesville/Western County area because it has few facilities even though population numbers may not indicate it is warranted.
AQUATIC CENTERS

Survey and Inventory Analysis
Indoor aquatics rated in the top five as most in need of addition, expansion, or improvement (out of a list of 30 parks and recreation facility choices) across all four sub-areas, as shown by the following Vision 2030 survey rankings. Outdoor pools rated lower in comparison.

Table 7: Aquatics Survey Input by Sub-area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-area</th>
<th>Outdoor Aquatics</th>
<th>Indoor Aquatics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Transit Corridor</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac/Rural</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The following alternative providers have outdoor pools: municipalities – Rockville Municipal Swim Center, Gaithersburg Summit Hall Pool (both in North Central) and Silver Spring and Bethesda YMCA (in South Central). These are not counted in the total numbers above.

Aquatics – Recommendations
No new stand-alone indoor aquatic centers are recommended in this Vision 2030 study. Instead, it is recommended that these types of aquatic facilities be included as a component of new larger regional-serving recreation centers (see Vision 2030 Goal 8).

Montgomery County also appears to be well-served by outdoor aquatic facilities, both public and private. Therefore, future aquatic facility development should focus on indoor aquatic centers integrated with larger regional-serving community recreation centers.

Maintaining the quality of the current indoor and outdoor aquatic facilities with investments in ongoing maintenance and enhancements will continue to be equally important.
RECREATION AND AQUATIC FACILITIES BENCHMARKING – A NATIONAL LOOK

The table below looks at benchmarking ratios of the recreation centers and aquatics facilities operated by the Montgomery County Department of Recreation in comparison to averages from a self-reported nationwide study, *2009 Operating Ratio Report*, a report of the National Recreation and Park Association. For example, if an agency reported a jurisdiction population of 100,000, and the agency had two recreation centers, the population per center would be 50,000. *Note: it is difficult to accurately compare recreation and indoor facilities, because the size and quality are not factored in this type of analysis. In addition, many county agencies across the nation do not operate either aquatic facilities and/or recreation/community centers; the municipal jurisdiction or special district handles local level of service. This is not true of Montgomery County, so the better comparison is to the “All” column versus the “Borough/County” column. This information should be considered only in context with other more detailed analysis.*

Table 8: Recreation Center and Aquatic Facility Benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Population Per Facility</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*NRPA</td>
<td>**Montgomery County – Dept. of Recreation (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Borough/County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Community Center</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>36,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Aquatics/Swimming Pool</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>172,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Aquatics/Swimming Pool</td>
<td>34,187</td>
<td>105,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) Operating Ratio Study, 2009: “All” includes all jurisdiction respondent types – County/Borough, Municipal, and Special Districts.

**Based on the adjusted 2010 County population that excludes the populations of the Cities of Gaithersburg and Rockville of 846,717.
Planning Areas - Montgomery County, MD
### Appendix H: Multi-Use Trail Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Trail Surface Type</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Miles - M-NCPPC</th>
<th>*Miles - Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Pop 2010</th>
<th>% Pop w/Access to Trail 1/4 Mile</th>
<th>Sub-Area Pop 2010</th>
<th>1/4 Trail Catchment Area (acres)</th>
<th>Sub-Area Acreage</th>
<th>% Sub-Area Acreage w/in 1/4 Mile Trail Catchment Area</th>
<th>Sub-Area Pop 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potomac/Rural</td>
<td>Hard/Paved</td>
<td>Hiking/Biking</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac/Rural</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Shared by All</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac/Rural Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>39566</td>
<td>124,973</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23008</td>
<td>176825</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>131,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>Hard/Paved</td>
<td>Hiking/Biking</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Shared by All</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>89700</td>
<td>242,354</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8026</td>
<td>234623</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>296,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>Hard/Paved</td>
<td>Hiking/Biking</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Shared by All</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>25832</td>
<td>297,050</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5684</td>
<td>333913</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>387,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Hard/Paved</td>
<td>Hiking/Biking</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Shared by All</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Transit Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>70722</td>
<td>301,649</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9319</td>
<td>340616</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>318,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>193.2</td>
<td>225,820</td>
<td>966,026</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46,037</td>
<td>1,085,977</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,134,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Montgomery County, Dufief HOA, National Park Service (including C&O Towpath), State of MD
Montgomery County
Parks & Recreation

Vision 2030

Cost Recovery Pyramid - 2010
Based on Consensus
Recommended – Final Draft

* Notes: Consultant recommendation:
Recreational Camps/After School Care/Day Care – moved from level 3 to 2 due to slight weighting toward Public and Summit sorting results.

- Classes, Workshops and Clinics – Competitive
  - Private Lessons
  - Rentals – Private
  - Merchandise for Resale
  - Concession/Vending
  - Equipment Rentals
  - Trips
  - Organized Parties
  - Permitted Services

- Amusement Rides & Mini-Golf
- Classes, Workshops and Clinics – Advanced
- Rentals – Tenants
- Leased Services

- Classes, Workshops and Clinics – Intermediate
- Rentals – Non-Profit/Civic Groups
- Rentals – Inter-Governmental Agencies & Partners
- Tournaments/Leagues
- Work Study/Internships/Community Service
- Specialized Events/Activities/Camps
- Therapeutic Recreation
- Social Services

- Classes, Workshops and Clinics – Introductory/Beginning/Multi-Level
- Monitored Facility/Area Usage – Includes all maintenance, stewardship, conservation, preservation, and interpretive services to operate and maintain activities and spaces that are non-registered and non-instructed, and are monitored by agency staff/volunteer supervision. (Examples: drop-in swimming, gym, tennis, guided tours, nature centers, archeological digs, historic sites, gardens, skatepark, Splash Park, etc.)
- Recreational Camps/After School Care/Day Care

- Open Facility/Area Usage – Includes all maintenance, stewardship, conservation, preservation, and interpretive services to operate and maintain non-monitored access to facilities and spaces which do not include agency staff/volunteer supervision (Examples: parks, playgrounds, trails, outdoor sports courts, self-guided tours, gardens, historic sites, dog park, developed and undeveloped open space and natural areas, etc.)
- Community-wide Events
- Volunteer Program
- Inclusionary Services
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