



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

MCPB Agenda Item 17
September 6, 2007

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 31, 2007

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

VIA: Mary Bradford, Director, Department of Parks *W Bradford*
Mike Riley, Acting Deputy Director, Department of Parks *MR*
Doug Alexander, Acting Division Chief, Park Development Division (PDD) *DA*

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

SUBJECT: Proposed FY09-14 CIP Work Session #1

Staff Recommendation

Approve staff recommendations of projects for the FY09-14 Capital Improvements Program (CIP).

Work Session Schedule

Staff has scheduled three Planning Board work sessions on the proposed FY09-14 CIP. The first work session will provide the Board with follow-up information from the CIP strategy session held July 23, 2007. Staff will present all recommendations for funding levels for the level-of-effort projects for the FY09-14 CIP. We will seek the Board's approval of staff recommendations for inclusion of these projects in the proposed CIP.

The second work session, scheduled for September 20th, will focus on the projects that are continuing from the FY07-12 CIP. This will include projects with no changes and projects that may have changes in cost estimates or schedules. Staff will begin presenting recommendations for new projects and seek the Board's approval to include continuing and new projects in the proposed CIP.

The third and final work session is scheduled for October 4th. Staff will present recommendations for the remainder of the new projects and any other projects not covered in the first two sessions. The Board will receive a complete set of project description forms (PDFs), including operating budget impacts (OBI), for final approval.

①

The recommended FY09-14 CIP will be forwarded to the County Council by November 1st, as required by State Law and County Executive with a favorable recommendation.

The County Executive will recommend a proposed FY09-14 CIP by January 15, 2008. The County Council will hold public hearings on the proposed CIP for the entire County, inclusive of the Parks CIP, in early February and conduct work sessions in February and March. The CIP is scheduled for adoption in late May.

Outline of Work Session # 1

- 1) Follow-up issues from CIP Strategy Sessions
- 2) Staff recommendations for FY09-14 funding of level-of-effort projects with no changes
- 3) Facility Planning Priorities
- 4) Staff recommendations for FY09-14 funding of level-of-effort projects with modifications

1) Follow-Up Issues from CIP Strategy Sessions

The CIP Strategy Sessions were held on May 24th and July 23th. The Board approved criteria for ***Immediacy, Need, and Efficiency*** to evaluate project requests for the CIP. The Departmental CIP Evaluation Committee met on July 10th and July 31st to prioritize projects based on the approved criteria for inclusion in the six year CIP. The main focus of the group was to establish recommendations for future facility plans that will ultimately shape future capital improvement programs.

At the July 23th Strategy Session, Board members asked staff to provide further information on certain issues. The comments and staff responses are outlined below:

a) Establish a fund for developer contributions by Planning Area. Identify master planned urban parks in CBDs and have developers pay fee-in-lieu for acquisition/development. This should be a joint project for Park & Planning. Allow for developer contributions to be received and accrued.

Zoning Text Amendment No. 07-10, revising the CBD, TOMX, and RMZ zones, is primarily focused on loosening public use space provisions in the optional method in the CBD zones (for the first time since the overlay zones, which it replaces) allowing both required and optional public use space to be located off site, or payment of a fee-in-lieu, aimed at potentially combining public use space or amenity commitments from several developments.

Park staff will participate with Planning staff in working out detailed Board regulations for implementing the payment system. Park staff notes that developer proposals for fee-in-lieu must be consistent with the objectives of the sector plan, and while the definition of public use space now includes urban parks, the sector plans will be the primary vehicle for any future emphasis that may be placed on new parkland or renovation of existing park facilities.

The Countywide Urban Parks Plan (an amendment to PROS Plan) is underway. One of the objectives of the plan is "to explore innovative ways to finance the acquisition of urban parks when dedication is not an option and to explore development, maintenance and management strategies that are cost-effective and efficient." The issues and ideas raised by the Planning Board will all be evaluated as part of the plan process.

b) Master plans usually identify open spaces as part of development process, but don't always identify the specific area. Identify areas in master plans and amendments and use Advanced Land Acquisition Revolving Funds (ALARF) money if needed.

Park Planning and Stewardship staff are currently collaborating with Community Based Planning staff to compile a comprehensive list by planning area that identifies specific sites in ongoing and future master plans and amendments for parkland. ALARF can be used if park sites are identified on master plans if other land acquisition funding does not have sufficient resources.

c) Refer to Growth Policy to determine where open space deficits will be and determine which facility plans should move forward.

The May 2007 Final Draft 2007-2009 Growth Policy document recommends expanded, concurrent reviews with the CIP, leading to improved guidance and list of priority facilities for inclusion in the CIP. However, the provision of park and recreation facilities is not emphasized in the recommendation.

The report notes that while growth policy focuses on new growth with private provision of facilities, developed areas are served primarily through the CIP. The report references the LPPRP as providing the estimates of demand for park and recreation facilities and for where facilities are needed. The policy favors continued use of the subdivision ordinance in combination with revisions to the recreation guidelines as the method for "testing" the supply of facilities in developing areas. Existing areas would continue to be served by the public sector.

d) What is the status of King Dairy Barn Mooseum project? Has a green roof been considered for this project? Suggested asking for additional State bond funding for project if current funding is not adequate.

On April 11, 2007, construction bids were received for the King Dairy Barn Mooseum that were over budget and the solicitation was cancelled. In May and June, staff evaluated the project with the consultant for cost savings. In July, staff met with DPS to discuss modifications to the building permit and in August staff received a response. In August, staff negotiated with the consultant for additional services for modifications to the drawings. In September, staff is scheduled to meet with the Mooseum board to discuss the modifications. The architectural work and revised permit issuance will occur in early 2008, followed by construction in summer 2008.

Staff did not consider a green roof for the building based on preserving the historic vernacular, lack of heating or cooling, steep roof pitch, and cost. Regarding additional

funding for the project, the cumulative funding amount already exceeds \$740,000, including amounts spent on stabilization, design fees, chargebacks, and a \$150,000 bond bill. The previous council expressed a reluctance to increase County funding. The current estimate for construction is \$500,000.

e) Would green roofs be eligible for some sort of grant/conservation funds?

Yes. There are green roof grants that could be pursued.

f) Are we getting any Stateside POS? Can POS funding be used to offset bond-funded, private-use projects?

We have received more than \$7 million in Stateside POS for acquisitions since 1997. This funding is available at the discretion of Department of Natural Resources. Examples of land purchases funded with Stateside POS are Upper Paint Branch, property in the Patuxent Watershed Conservation Park, and property at Woodstock Equestrian Park. We pursue Stateside POS funding when other County or Commission land acquisition funds are not available.

POS funding can be used as a funding source for private-use projects for 100% of land acquisition costs assuming the long-term use of the property has been predetermined as a private-use property. On the development side, we generally use Montgomery County's POS allocation on local projects to the greatest extent possible to offset the need for Park and Planning Bonds. We can use POS funding to offset 75% of development projects that may have private-use if we can provide the 25% match in Current Revenue or another source other than tax-exempt bonds.

g) Consider land at Patuxent or adjacent to Seneca State Park to use Stateside POS.

If land acquisition opportunities present themselves in these areas, Stateside POS funds can be requested.

h) Germantown Town Center Urban Park is a very expensive project. Why not allow the area to become a lake and avoid the expense of underground SWM facilities?

A central wet pond with replacement of the existing wetlands was the initial recommendation of staff for this park. During the facility planning study, the US Army Corps of Engineers, the Maryland Department of the Environment, the MC Department of Environmental Protection, and the MC Department of Permitting Services were strongly opposed to this solution and would not approve this option, because it did not treat stormwater quality in upland areas and it eliminated the existing wetland and seed bank. This solution was brought up again with Executive Branch agency staff in 2006 when the stormwater management alternatives for the park were being re-evaluated, and the agencies continued to be opposed to this solution.

i) Ask Planning Dept. to look at master plan projects that are not in the 6-year CIP to see if there are items that should move forward. Review inventory of unbuilt / unacquired projects recommended by master plans.

Park Development staff will work with Community-Based Planning and Park Planning and Stewardship to prepare a list of any recommendations from master plans or park plans of land that has not been acquired or development projects that have not been implemented. The CIP Evaluation Committee prioritized candidate facility plans and new stand-alone projects based on recommendations from master plans and park plans. We have included a variety of projects resulting from recommendations from plans in Minor New Construction where applicable.

j) Look at areas identified in the Growth Policy that need adequate public facilities.

Park staff concludes that more should be done to include the provision for parkland and park facilities in the County's Growth Policy. Noting that the growth policy serves new growth, whereas developed areas are served primarily through the CIP, the May 2007 Final Draft 2007-2009 Growth Policy document includes as a primary objective of growth policy, concurrent biennial CIP review. However, it fails to explicitly include the Park CIP.

The report contains references to public parkland, but does not recommend adding it to the list of facilities tested under Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO). It offers instead suggestions for strengthening adequacy of park and recreation facilities through continued reliance on the 1992 recreation guidelines and through dedications of parkland during subdivision. As applied during the regulatory process for new development, the recreation guidelines are said to meet the need for neighborhood recreation facilities, while subdivision meets the need for countywide or community-based facilities, in combination with those provided by the public sector. The report concludes that revised recreation guidelines (requested in Planning's 2008 work program) may be all that is needed for an APFO test for parks. However, as the report readily acknowledges, relying on exaction through subdivision works in rapidly developing areas, such as in the recent past in Germantown or Clarksburg, but not in existing communities plagued by deficiencies or obsolete facilities. Focusing on impact taxes for financing infrastructure, but less so on district-wide taxing mechanisms, the report does not mention fee-in-lieu mechanisms tied to the zoning ordinance, such as proposed in ZTA 07-10.

The main growth management system enhancements recommended in the policy include "sustainability" (objectives for preservation of the environment), and "design excellence" (tools to achieve the objects). Element #7 in the report's overall recommendations for monitoring sustainability lists among the indicators of facility adequacy the accessibility of residences to public parkland as a measurable indicator and thus, of community quality or performance. However, recognition of parkland and park facilities is missing in the recommended actions to achieve sustainability. Even though the report looks to the County's CIP for such public facilities as urban open space, design excellence as a primary tool of the policy is silent on the role of the Park

CIP in particular, and although the regulatory tools for good design mention local parks, the recommended attributes for good design do not.

k) Major Renovations – Are all facilities identified in the FEA assessment as needing renovation, scheduled in the 6-year CIP?

All immediate recommendations resulting from the FEA Condition Assessment Study of Recreation and Ancillary Buildings are currently being addressed with current operating maintenance funding. We are requesting an increase in PLAR Local Parks to accommodate the cited capital renovations for all properties that appear in the Functional Plan of Recreation and Ancillary Buildings as recommendations to keep the properties. Major capital renovations for buildings where recommendations are to transfer, evaluate and market for three years, or possibly eliminate, will be deferred unless the renovation is deemed necessary or a safety issue.

Many of the recommendations from Infrastructure Condition Assessment reports recommend additional preventative and recurring maintenance in the operating fund. The operating maintenance budgets may also need adjustments to keep pace with recommended maintenance intervals to adequately preserve our assets and reduce the need for costly capital renovations prior to lifecycle replacements.

l) Research sinking fund for Capital Renovation / Repair. Explore innovative ways to finance infrastructure maintenance, such as reserve fund/sinking fund for capital renewal of parks, or calculate renewal into cost of park development.

The Inter-agency Task Force on Infrastructure Maintenance has provided the Park's CIP with additional funding for infrastructure replacements. As we continue to quantify our needs through the Infrastructure Condition Assessment effort, we will adjust our CIP request to match recommendations for capital renewal of our facility groups.

On August 14, 2007 staff met with Bruce Crawford and Patricia Barney to discuss options for infrastructure maintenance and replacement financing. Notes and options discussed at that meeting are provided as Attachment 1. As we add to our park system, we will plan for future planned lifecycle asset replacements as part of the Capital Planning Module in SmartParks.

2) Staff Recommendations for FY09-14 Funding of Level-of-Effort Projects – No Changes

Projects that are smaller in scope or where similar types of work at various sites can be easily lumped together are usually funded out of level-of-effort PDFs. Level-of-effort PDFs basically stay the same from year to year throughout the six year CIP program unless there is compelling reason to increase the level of funding based on cost changes or shifting priorities.

Staff is recommending essentially no change in certain level-of-effort PDFs. We are seeking Board approval of these PDFs at the following funding levels:

Project Name	Project Description	Annual Amount
Acquisition: Non-Local Parks	Purchase of land for future park uses.	\$3,135,000
Cost Sharing: Local Parks	Joint park projects with private sector or public agencies	\$75,000
Cost Sharing: Non-Local Parks	Joint park projects with private sector or public agencies	\$50,000
Energy Conservation	Facility modifications to control fuel and utilities consumption	\$100,000
Enterprise Facility Improvements	Improvements to enterprise-funded facilities	\$100,000
Facility Planning Local	Facility planning for local park facilities	\$300,000
Facility Planning Non-Local	Facility planning for non-local park facilities	\$300,000
Minor New Construction Local Parks	Construction of minor new projects under \$225,000.	\$150,000
Pollution Prevention Ponds & Lakes	Addresses environmental issues related to park properties	\$500,000
Resurfacing Parking Lots & Paths	Asphalt repairs at park facilities	\$475,000
Roof Replacement Local	Roof repairs on local park facilities	\$129,000
Roof Replacement Non-Local	Roof repairs on non-local park facilities	\$263,000
Small Grants and Donations	Grant and donation projects under \$100,000	\$600,000
Stream Protection - SVP	Erosion control	\$533,000
Trails: Hard Surface Design & Construction	Provides new asphalt trails	\$300,000
Trails: Hard Surface Renovation	Renovation of hard surface trails	\$168,000
Trails: Natural Surface Design & Construction	Renovation of existing natural surface trails	\$200,000

3) Facility Planning Priorities

As noted above, the Department CIP Evaluation Committee prioritized candidate facility plans and new stand-alone projects based on recommendations from master plans, park plans, and staff or citizen requests. The ultimate goal of the Evaluation Committee was to strike the right balance between new development and infrastructure maintenance for aging parks. Setting priorities for future facility plans are important as these projects will ultimately shape future capital improvement programs.

The CIP Evaluation Committee prioritized the candidate facility planning projects based on the evaluation criteria. Attachment ② provides a chart of the top priorities for facility planning, including those currently in process.

4) Staff Recommendations for FY09-14 Funding of Level-of-Effort projects - With Modifications

Based on new initiatives, cost increases, and additional maintenance needs in our park system, we are requesting additional funding levels in the following PDFs:

a) Acquisition: Local Parks

The Local Park Acquisition PDF identifies capital expenditures and appropriations for local parkland acquisitions, including related costs for surveys, appraisals and title reports. Local parks include urban, neighborhood and neighborhood conservation parks as defined by the Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan (LPPRP). Acquisitions during the next six-year program may include Piney Branch Road Urban Park, an addition to Fenton Street Urban Park, Piedmont Crossing Local Park, etc. The addition to Fenton Street Urban Park may be delayed because of required business relocations. Other unspecified sites and additions to existing sites may be pursued if opportunities arise and funding is available. To the extent possible, the Commission also acquires local parkland through dedication at time of subdivision; however, to meet all parkland needs, a direct land purchase program must supplement this method.

Recommended Funding

The current annual funding level for this project is \$1,035,000 consisting of \$1.0 million of POS funding and \$35,000 Park and Planning Bonds. Staff is recommending increasing the POS to \$2.0 million per year to accommodate the revised past six-year average in POS funding. If the actual annual POS allocations are below our estimates, the acquisition program would be adjusted accordingly. We ask the Board to approve a new annual funding level of \$2,035,000 for this project.

Note: The revised POS six-year average for land acquisition is approximately \$5.0 million per year. Acquisition Non-Local Parks is currently at \$3.0 million per year of POS with no change being recommended.

b) Legacy Open Space

The Legacy Open Space PDF is a level-of-effort program designed to protect open space lands of countywide significance. The PDF for the FY09-14 CIP is recommended to continue at approximately the same level as has been funded in previous years. Proposed funding sources include G.O. Bonds, Current Revenue, Park and Planning Bonds, and Contributions from partner municipalities.

The Legacy Open Space (LOS) program has been very successful over the past 7 years, protecting 3,200 acres of open space resources including over 2,000 acres added to the park system. Almost \$50 million have been committed to protect 30 different sites scattered across the County. The consistent level of funding for the LOS program through the PDF has allowed us to leverage an additional \$14.345 million in non-County funding, including State and municipal funds and the donation of three

properties to the park system. Over 391 acres of LOS resources have been donated or dedicated through the development review process to the park system. Nine heritage resources have been protected, including acquisition of five historic buildings on three sites.

Recommended Funding

Staff is recommending a change to increase the portion of the annual appropriation that may be used for one-time acquisition related costs. The current PDF allows up to \$50,000 per year in G.O. Bonds for acquisition-related costs such as removing attractive nuisances, posting properties, cleaning up dump sites, and securing properties with gates. Over the past 4 years, some of these funds have also been used for emergency stabilization of historic buildings acquired through the Legacy Open Space program. For example, funds have been used to stabilize the exterior and to repair fire code violations at the Red Door Store, and other funds have been used to repair leaking roofs at the Warner Property in Kensington. Without emergency stabilization funds quickly available as part of Legacy Open Space's large funding stream, those recently acquired resources would be at significant risk of deterioration, putting the Commission's initial investment to purchase the properties at risk. The current level of up to \$50,000 per year is not adequate to address current and anticipated future needs. Staff recommends up to \$250,000 in Current Revenue be allocated each year for one-time acquisition related costs, including site security, cleanup, and emergency stabilization of structures. This request is a reallocation of current funds within the PDF, not an increase in overall PDF funding.

Another aspect of this recommendation is to fund these one-time costs with Current Receipts instead of G.O. Bonds. Several historic buildings acquired through the Legacy Open Space program are potential sites for partnerships and curatorships. Sites with potential private-use generally should not use tax-exempt bonds as a funding source. Since any future historic acquisitions may also have the potential for partnerships, staff request that the acquisition related costs be funded with Current Revenue.

c) Ballfield Initiatives

This project addresses countywide ballfield needs by funding ballfield improvements on parkland, and other public sites or private properties, e.g. utility company rights-of-way. Improvements may include, but are not limited to, ballfield lighting, turf and infield renovations, synthetic turf applications, or other initiatives. M-NCPPC improvements on properties other than parkland shall be made pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding which details the responsibilities of all parties. Generally, ballfields to be constructed as part of new park construction or reconstruction will be shown in the individual new park construction or reconstruction PDFs.

Recommended Funding

The current annual funding level for this project is \$1,350,000. Staff is recommending a one-time increase of \$1,000,000 in FY09 to accommodate additional funding needed for synthetic turf fields and ballfield lighting at Olney Manor Park. Fairland and Blair are our first two synthetic turf projects. As such, we have contracted for additional consulting expertise in this area to assist us with design and management for these projects to ensure that we get the best results possible. Although, we are still in design stages of

our first synthetic turf field, we believe our initial estimates of \$750,000 per field are low. The actual cost per field is closer to \$1,000,000. We also have another large project in process to replace ballfield lights on fields 2-5 at Olney Manor Recreation Park. Although funding for this project was in the FY07-12 CIP, the County has approved new lighting standards and the project costs have been adjusted for inflation. These increases can be accommodated with POS funding, therefore, staff recommends an increase in funding for FY09 to \$2,350,000.

d) Minor New Construction: Non-Local

This project funds design and/or construction of minor new or reconstruction projects. Generally, these projects do not exceed \$225,000 and do not require facility planning. Non-local park projects include, but are not limited to, constructing a basketball court at Ridge Road Recreation Park; design and construct parking, school bus drop-off and trailhead kiosk at Green Farm Conservation Park per park master plan; extend boardwalk at Meadowside Nature Center; and design and construct trailhead parking and picnic shelters at Little Bennett Regional Park per park master plan.

Recommended Funding

The current annual funding for this project is \$75,000. This amount is inadequate to implement the candidate projects requested for this PDF. Staff recommends funding be increased to annual amount of \$225,000. This increase will allow us to implement smaller projects that do not require facility planning and move more expeditiously on recommendations from park plans, master plans or dog park studies.

e) Planned Lifecycle Asset Replacements: Local Parks

This project schedules renovation or replacement of aging, unsafe, or obsolete local park facilities or components of park facilities, e.g. playgrounds and tennis/multi-use courts, and renovation or replacement of major building components, e.g. HVAC systems, mechanical/plumbing equipment, and electrical systems. PLAR also funds renovations needed to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Local parks include local, neighborhood, urban, and neighborhood conservation area parks. We currently have 305 of these parks within our park system. As we work through our Infrastructure Condition Assessment process of the park facilities, it will likely be necessary to continue to increase funding for asset replacements.

Recommended Funding

The current scheduled lifecycle replacements and recommendations from the Infrastructure Inventory and Assessment of Park Components for Recreation and Ancillary Buildings identifies the need for an increase in funding for this project.

The current annual funding level for this project is \$1,545,000. Staff is recommending an increase of \$300,000 to accommodate the increase in capital projects associated with the aging local park facilities. The new annual funding level would be \$1,845,000.

f) Restoration of Historic Structures PDF

The Restoration of Historic Structures PDF is a level-of effort program designed to stabilize, preserve, and appropriately plan for and undertake capital improvements relating to historic structures and other cultural resource assets. The program requires

an increase in its overall level-of-effort in order to accommodate the Park Commission's publicly stated goals to raise the cultural resources programs in Parks to the next level. The stated goals of *From Artifact to Attraction: A Strategic Plan for Cultural Resources in Parks* cannot be accomplished without an increase in funding.

Over the first two years of the proposed CIP (FY09 and 10), projects within this PDF will focus on the planning, design, and capital work necessary to open more heritage sites to the public. Other projects scheduled for these first two years will bring vacant and/or underutilized buildings back to life and closer to the Department's mission. Projects include planning/design for the Riley Farm/ "Uncle Tom's Cabin" (with interpretation of Josiah Henson, slavery in Maryland, the Underground Railroad to Canada, and Harriett Beecher Stowe's novel); planning/design for the Seneca/Poole Store and House Complex (with interpretation focused on waterways of the Potomac, Seneca Creek, and the C& O Canal plus lodging and events tied to Canal biking and Potomac boating traffic); improvements to the Red Door Store and Joseph White House; stabilization of Meadowbrook Stables (to bring this building up to fire and life safety code); planning/design for long-term uses in the Brainard Warner House and the Bureau of Animal Industry; a study to restore or reconstruct the Jeremiah Norwood Barn in Little Bennett (the remains of which offer one of the County's few opportunities to visit a tobacco barn); design/construction for the interior fit out of the Oliver Watkins House at Ovid Hazen Wells for a use tied to arboriculture or horticulture. FY11-14 is estimated to cover the costs of an enhanced public experience at Hyattstown Mill, a new archaeological interpretive experience at the Valley Mill House, and necessary design and capital improvements to outstanding Commission properties such as Needwood Manor.

In order to justify the present request for an increase in the Restoration of Historic Structures PDF, the new Cultural Resources Section with the Department's Park Planning and Stewardship Division created a Cultural Resources Management Program, or blueprint, for how the program will work in a Power Point that it shared with the Planning Board on July 5, 2007. The Cultural Resources Management Program's primary objective is to open new cultural resource sites to the public and/or expand programming at currently open sites. A second, compelling task is to place tenants in vacant historic structures, whether these tenants be curators, partners, or Department of Parks staff. A third task is to better steward those properties for which we are the caretakers via proper maintenance. The challenge ahead is very large, and staff recognizes the urgent need not only to increase the funding to do the capital improvements and planning required, but also to increase staffing specifically devoted to cultural resources stewardship at the same time. If we cannot adequately manage the projects in our work program, we cannot undertake the work that is necessary and that the public expects.

Recommended Funding

At present, the level-of-effort of the Restoration of Historic Structures PDF is \$350,000. With 157 cultural resources in Parks (both built and archaeological), that figure is inadequate. The suggested increase in the level of effort is broken down into three specific needs: 1) more money for stabilization/preservation of buildings that already are owned by the Commission and exist in parks, 2) more money for planning/design,

and 3) more money for design/construction. The stabilization funding would apply to *existing* Commission-owned buildings that have structural deficiencies, deterioration, or preservation needs due to aging. A related request in this CIP is to establish funding in the Legacy Open Space PDF for emergency stabilization of *newly acquired* properties. Such "emergency stabilization" funding would be used for newly acquired Legacy Open Space properties to stabilize historic structures while awaiting a determination of use and commensurate restoration/rehabilitation, meeting a very different need than the stabilization as part of rehabilitation/reuse that is envisioned in this Restoration of Historic Structures PDF. The planning/design money requested in this Restoration of Historic Structures PDF would be used specifically to undertake the conceptual and preliminary design. That work is essential to putting these cultural resources to better use, especially vacant buildings. Finally, the design and construction money would be used to complete the projects to make the resources fully functional and, in most cases, open to the public.

Staff recommends a revised funding level of \$850,000, \$350,000 per year in GO Bonds and \$500,000 per year in Current Revenue. Current Revenue is being requested to support planning studies and to stabilize and renovate sites that may have the potential for private-use or partnerships, therefore, should not be funded with GO Bonds. The Secretary-Treasurer is working with the County to determine the feasibility of using taxable bonds for properties with the potential for private-use as an alternative to Current Revenue.

Conclusion

Staff seeks approval of the recommended funding levels for the level-of-effort projects for the proposed FY09-14 CIP.

N:\CIP\09-14 CIP\MCPB\MCPB CIP Work Session #1 9-6-07.docx
Attachments

Infrastructure Maintenance and Replacement Financing

Notes from Meeting August 14, 2007

Attendees: Bruce Crawford, Patti Barney and Mary Ellen Venzke

Background

The Board asked the Department to research alternatives to pre-fund infrastructure maintenance and replacements. More specifically, to explore innovative ways to finance infrastructure maintenance, such as a reserve fund/sinking fund for capital renewal of parks and calculate renewal costs into the cost of new park development. The following options were discussed:

1. Reserve Policy

Establish a Reserve Policy within the Park Fund to reserve a percentage or dollar amount of fund balance for infrastructure maintenance and renewal. ***Note: Not a preferred option because the County can reduce the fund balance as they see appropriate.***

2. Appropriate Pay-as-you-Go (PAYGO)

Budget a specific amount of PAYGO as a transfer from the Park Fund to the CIP each fiscal year. The PAYGO funds would sit in an undesignated PDF in the CIP until the funds are needed in another PDF for infrastructure replacements. ***Note: Not a preferred option because the County can reduce the PAYGO line item during the annual budget approval process.***

3. Increase Mandatory Tax Rate in Article 28

Currently, Article 28 established a mandatory tax rate for park operations at 8/10 of a cent real property and 2 cents personal property per \$100 of assessed property. Article 28 could be amended to increase the mandatory tax rate by 1/10 cent for infrastructure maintenance and replacements. This increase would generate approximately \$1.4 to \$1.5 million per year. ***Note: This is a good option as it provides a constant funding stream for local park projects. Capital renovations to countywide park facilities should be funded County bond or County Current Revenue. This option would require a change to Article 28 and approval of the General Assembly.***

4. **Increase Bonding Authority – Local and Non-Local**

The Inter-agency Infrastructure Maintenance Task Force and the Infrastructure Condition Assessment studies in PDD continue to quantify increases in infrastructure maintenance funding for the park system. The Park CIP for PLAR has received increases to better align funding with infrastructure needs. An option to ensure this trend is continued in the future would be to dedicate a portion of Park and Planning and County bonding authority for infrastructure replacements. This would secure funding for local and countywide infrastructure replacement projects over and above the approved CIP projects. ***Note: This would only cover CIP eligible projects, not major maintenance to local or countywide park facilities.***

5. **Developer Amenity Fund**

The Board can approve a Developer Amenity Fund that can be used to fund both new amenities and park renovations and improvements. Sector and Master Plans may recommend infrastructure renovations that could be funded with Developer's fee-in-lieu of providing amenities. ***Note: This option is a viable option, though it may take a few years to build up the funding for practical use. There may also be limitations on areas included in the current proposal for Developer Amenity Fund.***

N:\CIP\09-14 CIP\MCPB\MCPB Work session #1 9-6-07.Attachment 1.doc

Local Park Facility Planning Priorities

Property	Category	Area	Justification	Action Needed
Kemp Mill UP	Infrastructure Maintenance	Kemp Mill/F. Corners	Immediacy/need/efficiency. Renovation needed old park. Public testimony and Board priority in FY07.	Begin in FY08
Seneca Crossing LP	New/Expansion	Clarksburg	Efficiency/need. Park deeded by developer. 2005 LPPRP. May provide playground & lg. Rectangular field.	FY08
Hillandale LP	Infrastructure Maintenance	White Oak	Immediacy/need. Renovation of existing park to relocate playground and address park needs once rec. bldg. Is removed.	Finalize Functional Plan and remove recreation center PPS. FY09
Woodside UP (may be replaced by Takoma Park UP)	Infrastructure Maintenance	Silver Spring	Immediacy/need/efficiency. Renovation of older park near MRO.	FY09
Traville LP	New/Expansion	Travilah	Efficiency/need. Park deeded by developer. 2005 LPPRP & 2002 Potomac Master Plan. Will provide rec. field in greatest need area.	FY10
Burtonsville LP	New/Expansion	Fairland	Need. Opportunity for multi-use fields or cricket field. 2005 LPPRP & 1997 Fairland Master Plan	FY10

Non-Local Park Facility Planning Priorities

Property	Category	Area	Justification	Action Needed
Woodstock	New/Expansion	Poolesville	Immediacy. Project is partially funded by State Bond Bill and donations.	In process (FY08)
Llewellyn Fields	New/Expansion	Aspen Hill	Need/efficiency. Will add needed fields per LPPRP and leverages ICC funding.	In process (FY08)
Rock Creek Maintenance Yard	Infrastructure Maintenance	Rock Creek	Renovation needed of old facility to improve inadequate conditions.	Begin FY08
Muddy Branch Trail	New/Expansion	Travilah	Need. Trail Priority #1	Begin FY09
Ag. History Farm	New/Expansion	Rock Creek	Need/efficiency, immediacy. Relocate maintenance yard and plan other facilities for interpretation	FY09-10. Need completed program of requirements before FP can begin. FY09-10
Nature Center (SR TBD)	Infrastructure Maintenance Expansion	TBD	Need/efficiency. Relocate a nature center in the Southern Region to increase programming	Candidate project will come from Functional Plan of Nature Centers. FY10
Little Bennett Campground	New/Expansion	Damascus	Need/efficiency. Master Plan 2007. Relocate group camping, add improved bathhouses.	Determine efficiency by increase in usage and possible increase in revenue FY10 or FY11
Wheaton Regional Hard Surface Trail	New/Expansion	Kens/Wheaton	Need. Extend existing trail to Randolph Rd. (.7 miles) and to Indian Spring. Trail Priority #3	Complete other trail priorities.