



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

MCPB Agenda Item 12A
June 28, 2007

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 22, 2007

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

VIA: Mary Bradford, Director *M Bradford*
Mike Riley, Acting Deputy Director *M Riley*
Douglas Alexander, Acting Chief, Park Development Division (PDD) *DA*

FROM: Mary Ellen Venzke, CIP Manager, PDD *MEV*

SUBJECT: Update of Park Facility Condition Assessments

Background

The project of infrastructure condition assessment and inventory verification started in 2005 when Mike Riley, Chief, Park Development Division was asked to represent Parks as a member of an Interagency Infrastructure Maintenance Task Force initiated by the County Council. The task force includes staff from Department of Public Works and Transportation, Montgomery College and Montgomery County Public Schools. The Report of the Infrastructure Maintenance Task Force, March 2005, reported that M-NCPPC did not have a complete facility inventory and assessment of major infrastructure in its park system. Subsequently, \$150,000 was added to the FY06 budget to begin this effort. The funding for this effort was continued in FY07 and FY08.

In late FY06, the Department of Parks entered into a multi-year contract with Facility Engineering Associates (FEA), an engineering and consulting firm who specializes in facility condition assessments to assist the Department in verifying the current inventory and conduct a condition assessment of the inventory. The project will establish criteria for life-cycle replacement of infrastructure, provide enhanced planning tools for the CIP, and establish improved standards for preventative maintenance. The data accumulated from this effort will be captured in a new Capital Planning and Condition Assessment module of the Facility Focus (SmartParks) System.

A steering committee was formed to successfully guide the project. The members of the steering committee are as follows:

- 1) **Mary Ellen Venzke** – Park Development Division
- 2) **Mitra Pedooem** – Park Development Division
- 3) **Brian Woodward** – SmartParks (Acting Chief Horticultural Services)
- 4) **Al Astorga** – Central Maintenance Division
- 5) **Mark Wallis** – Park Planning and Stewardship Division
- 6) **Rajib Bhuiyan** – Park Development Division

We will likely add other members as expertise is needed to complete the remaining facility groups.

The first year of the contract included four out of sixteen facility groups from the RFP:

- 1) Recreation Buildings
- 2) Ancillary Buildings
- 3) Playgrounds
- 4) Hard Surface Trails

These facility groups were chosen due to the condition and age of the facilities and/or because these groups are widely used by the public. Additionally, the recreation and ancillary buildings were completed first to provide a basis for the Functional Plan for Recreation and Ancillary Buildings.

FEA has delivered the *Infrastructure Inventory and Assessment of Park Components* (M-NCPPC 2007) for recreation and ancillary buildings. The following were the tasks performed under this contract:

- **Verify the completeness and accuracy of the facility inventory**
- **Conduct comprehensive condition assessments**
- **Determine preventive maintenance methodology**
- **Determine repair and lifecycle replacement intervals**
- **Prioritize facility maintenance, repair and replacement needs**
- **Quantify deferred maintenance and replacement backlogs**

Summary of Findings for Recreation and Ancillary Buildings

Inspections were conducted on 43 buildings. Based on their assessment, **8** buildings or **19%** are considered in Good Comprehensive Stewardship Condition, **18** or **42%** are in Fair Managed Care Condition, **13** or **30%** are in Poor Reactive Management Condition, and **4** or **9%** were in Poor Crisis Response Condition.

In the next two years, it will cost approximately **\$2.5 million** in CIP and maintenance funding to bring these buildings to Good or Comprehensive Stewardship Condition and keep them well maintained. This information provides us with baseline information for making long-term decisions on the use of these buildings. Moreover, it provides a tool for making future capital investment decisions; given these buildings are only a small part of our overall park facility inventory.

Attached you will find the following information for recreation and ancillary buildings:

Attachment One – Summary of Findings

Attachment Two – Facility Condition Information

Attachment Three – Recreation and Ancillary Building Facility Condition Comparisons

FEA will present their findings and review this information in more detail at the Board meeting.

Status

We have the final report and data for the recreation and ancillary buildings. The team is currently reviewing the draft reports of the playgrounds and trails and should have final reports in early July. Concurrently, the SmartParks team is working with their consultant Maximus to test the CIP and maintenance data delivered as part of this contract with the new Capital Planning Module in Facility Focus.

The goal of this project is to have a complete inventory assessment of all park components and continuously keep the information updated. The steering committee, in conjunction with FEA, has developed a strategy for completing the remaining facility groups. The steering committee felt that priority should be given to facilities most widely used by the public and have the greatest need for capital investment. The next facility group chosen will be Enterprise buildings. These facilities are used by the public and have been neglected due to funding issues for quite some time. Moreover, Council has asked for an assessment of these facilities to determine the priority, cost, and scope of required renovations.

Concurrently, FEA will include a sampling of all our facility groups to set up the file structure in the new Facility Focus (SmartParks), Capital Planning Module. A sampling of all our facility groups covered under this contract would allow for ease of data integration as they move through the remaining facility groups.

Conclusion

This project is a valuable tool to assist the Department in verifying the park inventory in SmartParks, establishing baseline information for long-range planning and funding needs, and establishing uniform standards for maintaining park facilities. Moreover, the data accumulated from this project will provide baseline information for facility management—a new initiative and position approved in the FY08 Operating Budget. These are part of the continuous improvement initiatives for keeping our extensive park system safe and well maintained. FEA and the steering committee will be available to answer questions and provide further details on the process.

Summary of Findings

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

NUMBER OF PARK PROPERTIES ASSESSED	40
NUMBER OF BUILDINGS ASSESSED	43
TOTAL CURRENT REPLACEMENT VALUE (CRV)	\$11,524,351
TOTAL DEFERRED MAINTENANCE (DM) BACKLOG	\$ 815,675
TOTAL DEFERRED REPLACEMENT (DR) BACKLOG	\$ 1,086,732
AVERAGE FACILITY CONDITION INDEX (FCI)	0.1651

- 1 **Current Replacement Value (CRV)** is defined as the approximate value, in current dollars, to replace a building. The total CRV indicated is for all buildings assessed in Facility Groups 1 and 2. As required by M-NCPPC, CRVs for this scope of work reflect replacement of structures for their original use.
- 2 **Deferred Maintenance Backlog (DM)** is defined for this scope of work as the value of maintenance deficiencies that have not been corrected. DM has been projected in FY07, FY08 and FY09.
- 3 **Deferred Replacement Backlog (DR)** is defined for this scope of work as the value for replacement of components that have exceeded their Expected Useful Life (EUL) but had not been replaced. DR has been projected in FY07, FY08 and FY09.
- 4 **Facility Condition Index (FCI)** is defined for this scope of work as Total (DM + DR) divided by Total CRV.

Facility Conditions

$$FCI = \frac{DM + DR}{CRV}$$

The FCI was developed by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) and is a parametric tool used to relatively compare building conditions. FCI is calculated by dividing the Current Replacement Value of the building and its associated systems by the total cost of remedying maintenance deficiencies of those same systems.

The FCI is a ratio; thus, the higher the FCI, the worse the buildings condition. For example, a new building with no deficiencies, and 100% replacement value would have an FCI = 0.

	GOOD		FAIR	POOR	
Description	Showpiece Facility	Comprehensive Stewardship	Managed Care	Reactive Management	Crisis Response
Level	1	2	3	4	5
FCI (APPA)	<0.05	0.05-0.15	0.15-0.29	0.30-0.49	>0.50
FCI (Fac Group 1, 2)	<0.0100	0.0100-0.0490	0.0500-0.1490	0.1500-0.5000	>0.5000
No. of Buildings (43 total)	0	8	18	13	4
% in Category	0%	19%	42%	30%	9%

The Association of Higher Education Facility Officers (APPA) Maintenance Levels of Service (APPA's Maintenance Staffing Guidelines, 2002) defines one aspect of a facility's level of service by the computation of the FCI. According to APPA, a Level 1, or Showpiece Facility, would have a FCI of <0.05, and a Level 5 (or Crisis Response Facility) would have a FCI of >0.50.

Montgomery County Parks
Recreation and Ancillary Buildings
Facility Condition Comparison

Attachment 3
Recreation & Ancillary Building
Facility Condition Comparisons

Park Code	Park Name	FCI (TOTAL)	Maintenance
RECREATION BUILDINGS			
D57	KEMP MILL ESTATES LOCAL PARK	0.0166	Good
D78	NOLTE LOCAL PARK	0.0238	Good
D71	MAPLEWOOD-ALTA VISTA LOCAL PARK	0.0326	Good
L02	CAMP SENECA SPECIAL PARK	0.0406	Good
E07	STONEBROOK LOCAL PARK	0.0450	Good
E12	TILDEN WOODS LOCAL PARK	0.0477	Good
D79	NORTH CHEVY CHASE LOCAL PARK	0.0497	Fair
D88	PILGRIM HILL LOCAL PARK	0.0579	Fair
E13	VEIRS MILL LOCAL PARK	0.0586	Fair
D48	GLENMONT LOCAL PARK	0.0609	Fair
D69	LYNNBROOK LOCAL PARK	0.0664	Fair
E47	CLARKSBURG LOCAL PARK	0.0680	Fair
E01	SLIGO-DENNIS AVENUE LOCAL PARK	0.0785	Fair
D55	INDIAN SPRING TERRACE LOCAL PARK	0.0791	Fair
D86	OWENS LOCAL PARK	0.0869	Fair
B46	QUINCE ORCHARD VALLEY NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	0.0917	Fair
F08	MEADOWBROOK LOCAL PARK	0.0920	Fair
E04	SPENCERVILLE LOCAL PARK	0.0961	Fair
D30	COLESVILLE LOCAL PARK	0.1155	Fair
D21	CAPITAL VIEW-HOMEWOOD LOCAL PARK	0.1213	Fair
B51	SLIGO AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	0.1253	Fair
E19	WHEATON-CLARIDGE LOCAL PARK	0.1356	Fair
D04	ARGYLE LOCAL PARK	0.1528	Poor
D89	PINECREST LOCAL PARK	0.2407	Poor
D80	NORTH FOUR CORNERS LOCAL PARK	0.2694	Poor
B39	NORBECK-MUNCASTER MILL NEIGHBORHOOD PARK	0.3190	Poor
D54	HILLDALE LOCAL PARK (Recreation Building and Adult Education Center)	0.4043	Poor
D93	RANDOLPH HILLS LOCAL PARK	0.4152	Poor
D58	KEN-GAR PALISADES LOCAL PARK	0.5069	Poor
D07	NORWOOD LOCAL PARK	0.7454	Poor
ANCILLARY BUILDINGS			
D05	AYRLAWN -- SILO 1	0.0435	Good
D05	AYRLAWN -- SILO 2	0.0790	Fair
M15	WHEATON COMMUNITY CENTER	0.0947	Fair
S01	ADVENTURE CONSERVATION PARK	0.1308	Fair
M58	TAKOMA-LANGLY COMMUNITY CENTER	0.1915	Poor
E16	WESTMORELAND HILLS RECREATION CENTER	0.2123	Poor
D05	AYRLAWN LOCAL PARK ANCILLARY BUILDING	0.3109	Poor
D36	EDNOR LOCAL PARK	0.3134	Poor
D07	NORWOOD LOCAL PARK DAYCARE BUILDING	0.3727	Poor
D07	NORWOOD LOCAL PARK SENIOR CITIZEN BUILDING	0.3899	Poor
S04	MAYDALE CONSERVATION PARK	0.4064	Poor
D43	GARRETT ESTATES LOCAL PARK DAYCARE	0.6048	Poor
D43	GARRETT ESTATES LOCAL PARK LIBRARY	0.7466	Poor