



**MONTGOMERY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PARKS**  
THE MARYLAND - NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

MCPB: 2/14/08

Item #: \_10\_

February 7, 2008

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Montgomery County Planning Board

**VIA:** Mary Bradford, Director of Parks *M Bradford*  
Mike Riley, Deputy Director for Administration *MR*  
Dr. John E. Hench, Chief, Park Planning and Stewardship Division *J Hench*

**FROM:** Lyn Coleman, Park and Trail Planning Supervisor, PPS Division  
Mark Wallis, Senior Park Planner, PPS Division

**SUBJECT: BRIEFING ON STATUS OF PARK PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

---

**Staff Recommendation: BRIEFING (no public testimony)**

**Background**

During the Department of Parks Capital Improvement Program (CIP) discussions, the Planning Board requested staff to compile the status of all park related master plan recommendations. This document would allow the Board to know what additional park facilities are needed beyond those included in the CIP.

Staff has reviewed a total of 25 Area Master Plans and 17 Park Master Plans (see list in Attachment A).

Prior to finalizing the implementation status of all the recommendations from these plans, staff would like the Planning Board to review our suggested format for this evaluation. The proposed format is shown in Attachment B and Attachment C, using two examples: Black Hill Regional Park Master Plan and the Approved and Adopted Germantown Master Plan.

The key staff members who have helped on this project include:

**Mary Ellen Venzke**, CIP Manager, Park Development Division  
**Doug Alexander**, Acting Chief, Park Development Division  
**Patricia McManus**, Design Section Supervisor, Park Development Division  
**Tanya Schmieler**, Park Planning Supervisor, PPS Division

## **Overview of Methodology**

- Step 1.* Review all approved and adopted park master plans and community based master plans.
- Step 2.* Summarize from these documents all recommendations for construction of park facilities.
- Step 3.* Identify all facilities that belong to one of the following two categories:
- Completed
  - Programmed in the FY 09-14 CIP
- Step 4.* Describe the status of facilities not in either of the above categories. For example, further study subsequent to the master plan might have concluded the facility could not be built for environmental reasons or that recreational needs have changed. There are also cases where private developers will provide the facility so it is underway but not as part of the CIP.
- Step 5.* Evaluate and consider which facilities that are not part of the FY 09-14 CIP and/or not being provided by others should be considered as candidate projects for future CIP.

## **Initial Findings and Conclusions**

This project has proved worthwhile but is very time consuming. We will come back to the Planning Board in the fall with the final status report. However, based on preliminary staff review of the data, we have reached some initial conclusions that we would like to share with the Planning Board:

1. The relationship between park planning and implementation should be strengthened.

In general, we have been successful in implementing master plan recommendations and the two attached examples are fairly typical of our success. However, we need a more formalized process to link master plan recommendations to the CIP process. The elements of such a process should include:

- The recommendations from the plans should be entered into the central CIP database that captures plan recommendations by region, subarea and park that will help guide the CIP process.
- Recognition that condition and age of park facilities are important factors that
- Facility Management of buildings and park facilities play an important role in prioritizing projects in the CIP.

We will be exploring these ideas with the Planning Board as a prelude to preparing the next CIP.

2. Master plan implementation recommendations should be well-defined and in recommended priority order.

Many master plans meet this criterion but others (especially older plans) include recommendations that are difficult to understand or translate to the CIP. Staff will develop a standard format for implementation recommendations to guide future planning efforts.

3. Renovation of older parks needs greater emphasis in the park master plan process.

Our park and community master plans focus on new parks and new facilities but there is a growing need to give equal attention to renovation projects. Our existing parks are aging. In many instances, renovation should include new types of facilities to reflect changing recreation trends and demographics in an area and to provide environmental restoration and stormwater retrofit. Different futures for existing parks need to be included in the planning process.

4. The community master plan reassessment process must recognize the importance of park planning and park implementation.

The role of park planning in community master plans needs to be strengthened. Typically, park recommendations are a sub-set of the community facilities chapter. This approach fails to recognize that community master plans are also park master plans. If the future of the park system is to be framed through the community master plan process, more attention to this significant planning element is needed.

Park staff will coordinate with community planning staff to assure park planning is addressed in a uniform, comprehensive fashion in community based master plans.

5. The completion of park master plans needs to occur in an orderly, sequential manner.

We need to be more systematic in the timing and completion of park master plans for our largest parks: regional parks, recreational parks, community-use parks and conservation parks. For example, there is no master plan for one of our five regional parks: Cabin John. This is not a good situation as individual projects should not be occurring in our biggest parks without an overall vision.

To address this issue, the Park Planning Supervisor will prepare a six year schedule for completion and updates of park plans. This schedule will be reviewed with the Planning Board as part of the upcoming FY 09 work program. An internal work group, chaired by the Park Planning Supervisor, will guide this process.

**SUMMARY OF PARK PLANS REVIEWED BY STAFF**

Park Master Plans

- Agricultural History Farm Park: Program and Facility Development Master Plan
- Black Hill Regional Park Master Plan
- Blockhouse Point Conservation Park Master Plan
- Brookside Gardens Master Plan
- Fairland Recreational Park Master Plan
- Park and Trail Concept Plan for Kemp Mill Vicinity
- Little Bennett Regional Park Master Plan
- Lois Y. Green Conservation Park Master Plan
- Muddy Branch Trail Corridor Plan
- Olney Area Park and Trails Master Plan
- Ovid Hazen Wells Recreation Park Master Plan
- Rachel Carson Greenway Trail Corridor Plan
- Rock Creek Regional Park Master/Management Plan
- Proposed Management Plan for Sligo Creek PARK: Phase I University Blvd to Colesville Road
- South Germantown Recreational Park Master Plan
- Wheaton Regional Park Master Plan
- Woodstock Master Plan

Area Master Plans

- Silver Spring CBD Sector Plan
- North and West Silver Spring Master Plan
- East Silver Spring Master Plan
- Takoma Park Master Plan
- Four Corners Master Plan
- Bethesda/Chevy Chase Master Plan
- North Bethesda/Garrett Park Master Plan
- Bethesda CBD Sector Plan
- Westbard Sector Plan
- Friendship Heights Sector Plan
- Kemp Mill Master Plan
- Fairland Master Plan
- White Oak Master Plan
- Cloverly Master Plan
- Sandy Spring/Ashton Master Plan
- Olney Master Plan
- Kensington/Wheaton Master Plan
- Aspen Hill
- Glenmont Sector Plan
- Upper Rock Creek Area Master Plan
- Potomac Subregion Master Plan
- Shady Grove Sector Plan
- Gaithersburg Vicinity Master Plan
- Germantown Master Plan
- Clarksburg Master Plan
- Damascus Master Plan
- Boyds Master Plan
-

BLACK HILL REGIONAL PARK MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS  
 APPROVED: 2002

Recommendations	Completed	Programmed in CIP FY 09-14	Comments
1. New maintenance facility	√		Completed in June 2004.
2. Adaptive reuse of maintenance facility.	√		Storage
3. Visitor Center Expansion and Upgrades			Contingent on results from Nature Center Study
4. Little Seneca Lake Create a Concert Amphitheater.			Preferred location need addressed by Black Rock
5. Replace existing playground equipment with A Playground plus skipper	√		Relocated and completed at South Gate
6. Add two (2) new picnic shelters and associated Picnic Area		√	Proposed for facility planning in FY14 (2 shelters, 1 bath court and playground)
7. Safety improvements at entry from West Old Road			Branch development
8. Expansions of Park Police pasture area.	√		New Fencing. Third Pasture added in 1999
9. Construct new trail head parking lot and trail Mile Creek	√		
10. Construct small gravel parking lot at Cool Springs trailhead adjacent to Route 121			Further field work has raised safe access concerns
11. Hard surface trail along; railroad tracks on south of park			Requires park acquisitions.
12. Black Hill Trail Hard surface Trail Extension Path to Spinning Wheel Drive		√	Design programmed to be completed in FY08 with construction 10.
13. Renovate hard surface trail on Water's landing Black Hill Trail		√	Design programmed to be completed in FY08 with construction 10.

Recommendations	Completed	Programmed in CIPFY 09/14	Comments
14. Hard surface trail from Crystal Rock Drive to Wheel Drive	√		
15. Hard surface trail adjacent to Lake Ridge Drive			Included as candidate project in Facility Planning: NL
16. Hard surface trail from existing parking lot on Black Hill Road.			Included as candidate project in Facility Planning: N
17. Renovate natural surface trails system.	√		Cabin Branch and Hamilton Trails have been re-aligned re 2 bridges and signs installed
18. Realign Field Crest Trail Spur to accommodate Maintenance Facility	√		
19. Natural surface trail and trail head parking lot from House to Osprey Heights Loop			Need to program in future CIP
20. Little Seneca Lake upgrade boat rental facility			Enterprise Facility included as candidate project with Priority designation.
21. Little Seneca Lake add additional boating sites.			Need to program in future CIP
22. Little Seneca Lake add an additional boat ramp and accessible fishing pier.			Included as candidate project in Facility Planning: NL (boat pier, parking lot)

**GERMANTOWN AREA MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS**  
**APPROVED: 1989**

Recommendations	Completed	Programmed in C FY 0914	Comments
1. Develop Clear Spring Local Park	√		
2. Develop Gunners Lake Local Park	√		
3. Develop Clopper Local Park	√		Renamed Fountains Hill Local Park
4. Develop Old Germantown Local Park			Renamed Kingsview Local Park. Proposed for Facility # 13.
5. Develop Germantown Estates Local Park	√		Renamed Leaman Local Park
6. Develop Waring Station Local Park	√		
7. Develop Blunt Road Local Park			Included as candidate project for Facility Planning
8. Develop Germantown Square Urban Park	√		
9. Develop Millwood Local Park	√		Renamed Water House
10. Develop Waters Landing Local Park	√		
11. Develop Gunners Lake Local Park	√		Now Gunners Village NCA
12. Develop Germantown Town Center Urban Park		√	Facility plan is completed and programmed for design in FY0809 and construction in FY10
13. Develop Cedar Creek Local Park	√		
14. Develop Kingsview Local Park	√		Renamed Kings Crossing Local Park
15. Develop Schaffer Road Local Park	√		Renamed Hoyles Mill Local Park
16. Establish Middlebrook Hill NCA	√		
17. Establish Bellefields NCA	√		Renamed Gunners Branch Local Park
18. Acquire North Germantown Conservation Park	√		
19. Develop South Germantown Recreational Park	√		Opened
20. Develop Seneca Crossing Local Park		√	Developer dedicated and programmed for Design FY-109