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Dear Montgomery County Council Members:

I am pleased to transmit to you the semi-annual report of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The contents of this report have been discussed in detail by all of the Planning Board members in several public meetings.

This year, we took a fresh approach in preparing the report. The first section of the report focuses on the Department of Planning and the second section focuses on the Department of Parks.

As you know, the Planning Board made a strategic decision earlier this year to split the parks function and the planning function into two separate -- yet equally important -- departments each with its own director. This decision was made to strengthen our overall agency. Of course, we are still one unified organization dedicated to fostering the highest quality of life in the region.

The planning portion of the report briefly focuses on our numerous accomplishments over the past six months. But more importantly - we have included detailed project descriptions for each program in the planning area that we intend to work on over the next 12 months (and beyond.)

The parks portion focuses on the significant progress made on some of the most pressing issues facing our award-winning system. Intentionally, we have kept the parks portion of the report short and plan to place much greater emphasis on our parks system in our next semi-annual report.

Over the past six months, we have been through much transition, however I believe we are a stronger, wiser agency having faced and addressed our deficiencies.

My colleagues and I on the Planning Board are immensely proud of the progress our staff has made and look forward to our discussion at the end of the month.

Sincerely,

Derick Berlage
Chairman
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THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING


INTRODUCTION

The Montgomery County Planning Board is pleased to present the proposed work program for fiscal year 2007 for the Montgomery County Department of Planning. Our goals in proposing this work program to you are:

- To continue our progress in improving the transparency of public decision-making, rebuilding public confidence in the land-use regulatory process, and providing the management support that will allow our talented, hardworking staff to perform at their best.
- To apply sustained effort toward our core responsibilities of preparing for Montgomery County’s future through the master planning process, and reviewing proposed development for conformance with the County’s plans and policies.
- To enrich the planning and regulatory function by adding to our base of knowledge about the County’s residents and businesses, the County’s developed and undeveloped land, and the tools to respond to the many internal and external influences that will have an impact on our future.

As you know, the purpose of the Planning Board’s semi-annual report is to provide the County Council with the information it needs to conduct its oversight role and to allow the Council to review and possibly change the Board’s proposed work program.

This year, for the first time, the report follows adoption of our budget. In previous years, the report occurred just prior to the Council’s review of our budget. The scheduling this time means that if the Council decides to add new initiatives to the work program, they are limited in their ability to add resources to the adopted budget. On the plus side, however, we have the benefit of the Council’s discussion of the work program that occurred during the budget review.

The Council’s work program discussion was facilitated by the new format in which the Planning Board submitted its proposed FY07 budget. Our initial foray into a “program budget” allowed the Council to see each proposed project and the number of work years associated with that project. Our sense is that the Council appreciated that approach, and so we are expanding upon it in this document.

The report also departs from the format of similar reports in previous years. In previous years, the standard format was for each division to report in detail the accomplishments of the previous six months and to describe what was planned for the next six months.

We have departed from that format this time. Because of Clarksburg and related issues, the Council has been highly engaged in the activities and operations of the Department of Planning in the past year, through regular status reports, the Office of Legislative Oversight study, and other venues.

Additionally, the Council signaled during the budget process that they are looking forward to discussing the FY07 work program on June 27. Therefore, this report is heavily weighted toward providing details on each of the major work program projects for 2007. Forms describing each work program component follow. They are in the same order as the summary matrix, which is shown on page 17. In addition, the chart of the Master Plan schedule is on page 15.
Although we are not focusing on the recent past in detail, we do want to take this opportunity to review a few of the major issues and accomplishments of the past six to nine months.

**Progress in Clarksburg**

The controversy over the Clarksburg Town Center development has taken a more positive turn in recent months. In July of 2005, the Planning Board found numerous violations with respect to height and setbacks. In October, an additional violation was found with respect to the phasing of amenities. Although the Board was prepared to hear numerous other alleged violations, the parties to the dispute agreed in December of '05 to turn the matter over to mediation. The developers, builders and the Clarksburg Town Center Advisory Committee (CTCAC) met over a period of several months to work out a mediated agreement, which was presented to the Board and to the community in May. The Board is scheduled to review the agreement to determine if the Plan of Compliance mitigates the violations and is in the public interest. If the Board does so, the next steps will include full Board review of amendments to the project plan, preliminary plan and approved site plans, as well as a new site plan for the retail area.

**Implementation of the Management Improvement Plan (MIP).**

Since the beginning of January, 36 objectives have been achieved and 43 objectives are currently in process. Completed objectives focused on making development and Planning Board information more available to the public. Initiatives included holding a Hearing on Public Hearings resulting in allowing more opportunities for civic input; making Planning Board Agenda information available to the public earlier (at least 10 days before Planning Board meetings); posting development applications on the web; requiring developers to post notification of a development application on site, notice the community, and meet with residents before submitting an application; and creating a process and policy for recording, investigating and responding timely to all resident complaints.

Additional objectives focused on improving the development review process both internally and externally in collaboration with the public, development community and other government agencies. Initiatives include regular inter-agency meetings, establishing new protocols and procedures for development applications, and new streamlined recruiting processes. A nationally known consultant undertook a comprehensive review of the development review process, the results of which and other identified objectives will be incorporated into Phase II of the MIP, which will apply to the next fiscal year. Please see the appendix for the most recent version of the MIP.

**Commitment to Performance Management and Program Budgeting.**

This spring, the Planning Board recast its proposed fiscal year 2007 operating budget for the Department of Planning to improve the transparency, management, and accountability of the planning work program. The Planning Board is committed to moving ahead with the “program budget” approach for preparing the fiscal year 2008 proposed budget, supporting internal performance management, and as a basis for dialogue with the County Council about priorities and measuring results.

**Development Review**

Over the past six months, the Development Review staff has established numerous checklists to ensure that all development plans going before the Board have a consistent set of standards that
conform to the appropriate zone and to all prior approvals. Checklists have also been created for the review of certified site plans and record plats.

A new special revenue fund has been created for the Development Review Division. As a result, new fees were implemented to capture more of the costs associated with full regulatory review, as well as costs for space and overhead.

New procedures have been established to implement the legislation passed by the Council in the Spring of 2006. Properties going through site plan review must be posted within three days of application submission. Pre-submission meetings with affected property owners, homeowner associations and civic associations must be held no more than 90 days prior to an application being filed. Minutes from these meetings must be included as part of the application.

Staff has been actively pursuing all alleged violations uncovered as a result of the Site Plan Audit, which retroactively reexamined all projects approved since January, 2003. Although the great majority of projects had no violations, the Board has already resolved issues relating to Bethesda Crest (Goodwill property); Seaton Square (also known as Maple Ridge), and Germantown Professional Building. A corrective order was approved to release 63 building permits in Clarksburg Village and 32 building permits for Greenway Village. Allegations regarding violations, as well as site plan amendments to incorporate more complete development standards, will be heard by the Board during the month of June.

Site plan amendments, whether minor or major, must go back to the Board for approval. Development Review has worked closely with legal and the Department of Permitting Services to draft a Memorandum of Understanding that will transfer inspection of projects for compliance with site plan approvals to the Department of Permitting Services. MNCPPC inspectors will still be responsible for inspections relating to Forest Conservation laws.

An extensive recruiting effort has been undertaken to fill the positions obtained through the supplemental budget request approved by the Council.

A tech team is being established that will give reviewers more time to do actual plan review. The tech team will be responsible for: 1) establishing a new file protocol, 2) creating a single point of entry so that submissions do not get lost or misrouted, 3) preparing graphics needed for staff reports and presentations, and 4) thorough review of record plat applications.

**Centers and Boulevards**

During the past six months, we completed our outreach efforts designed to expand department and community understanding about the myriad of challenges and opportunities associated with the expected changes in our maturing county. In spring 2006, we convened two community sessions with local and national experts and community leaders to explore how we can best plan and manage growth in the future and how we can attain a greater degree of design excellence in our future communities and buildings.

The guidance gleaned from these sessions is helping the department to develop a planning program responsive to the community and business needs now and in the future. The Department is planning one last community session in September to focus on the development of alternative implementation strategies before reporting to the planning board in October.
Master Planning
The following master plans and sector plans were completed: Olney Sectional Map Amendment (SMA), adoption of the Shady Grove Sector Plan and introduction of the SMA, adoption of the Woodmont Triangle Sector Plan and introduction of the SMA, and adoption of the Damascus Master Plan and introduction of the SMA.

Regulatory Planning
Staff reviewed more than fifteen Mandatory Referrals and completed the controversial annexation for the Crown Farm. During the last several months, the Community-Based Planning Division has assumed the lead responsibility for several Project Plans, Site Plans, Zoning Cases, and Special Exceptions to assist the Planning Department in completing the significant regulatory planning program.
The challenges of the past year, as unfortunate as they were, would be even more troubling if they did not result in a strong commitment by this agency to strengthen our effectiveness in implementing county goals, plans and policies and responsiveness to our residents, business, and elected officials. Each day -- in a multitude of ways -- we are actively working to reinvigorate this department and its effectiveness. We have made continuous improvement an important feature of the proposed work program.

Members of the Montgomery County Planning Board have been engaged in a discussion of their role in planning for the future of Montgomery County and their priorities for the next fiscal year and beyond. The discussion has been lively and free-ranging with Board members exploring planning issues from community outreach, agriculture initiatives, the environment, quality design and growth management.

The Planning staff acknowledges and embraces these challenges. Of the innumerable issues that will play some role in shaping the future of the county, we have identified the following as worthy of focused attention in the next fiscal year and in the future:

- **Emphasis on Core Responsibilities**: In the business world it is common for corporations to identify their “core competencies” – activities that are fundamental to the company and industries within which the company is a leader. For the Department of Planning, our “core responsibilities” are master plans and development review. Although our natural tendency in the Semi-Annual Report is to highlight projects and studies that break new ground, add to our knowledge base, or otherwise enhance our vision for the County’s future, the plain truth is that much of the Staff and Planning Board’s work program will consist of master plans and development review. In many cases, this will involve not developing new policies or applying new tools, but instead furthering policies and using tools that have served us well in the past.

- **Organizational Effectiveness**: Without constant attention, even the highest-performing organization can lose its focus. Understanding and building on our strengths, such as the Commission’s independence, is an important aspect of continuous improvement. This work program allocates 5 percent of staff time (9 work years) to “continuous improvement,” which is concentrated in, but not limited to, our Management Improvement Plan. Effective management includes obtaining and allocating needed resources to frontline staff, ensuring that managers have the time and skills they need, and establishing and using a targeted set of performance measures that accurately reflect the Department’s progress. Particularly within the Development Review division, the Research & Technology Center, and the Director’s Office, there will be concerted effort toward increasing the transparency of the decision-making process, in providing lead staff with technical support, and in improving records management.

- **Aggressive, Effective Community Outreach**: Effective outreach to our diverse community has been a high priority of the Planning Board and through hard work and careful thought, we have had some notable successes. But we still have a long way to go before the Board
can be assured that the review of each plan, policy change, or development proposal has the full participation of the affected community.

*Outreach is a major component of most of the projects in this work program. Our objectives over the course of the next year include: first, to clarify expectations and goals for community outreach for each project; second, to share existing expertise among staff so that the techniques of outreach are more consistent and the results are improved; and to build the outreach skill set within our staff with additional training, a revised set of performance goals, and performance measurement.*

- **Quality of Design:** Clarksburg taught us a lesson that we already thought we knew: quality design matters, not just to us as planners, but more importantly to the community that will live, work or play in or near a development project. We need to be able to effectively communicate the community’s expectations of great design, and see to it that these elements are part of every project will bring to the Planning Board for approval.

  *The development review work program is where the staff and Board make week-to-week decisions about design quality. Both the Centers and Boulevards project and the Growth Policy project will allow the staff and the Board to consider design quality from a larger perspective. Centers and Boulevards will be identifying elements of design excellence that should be pursued, and tools to help ensure that they are delivered. Part of the Growth Policy project involves comparing examples of completed development projects to the expectations set forth in the master plan.*

- **Public Facilities:** The public’s demand for adequate roads, schools, and other public facilities is in no way new, but the challenge of providing them grows every year. Improved intergovernmental coordination and additional attention to design standards can result in greater efficiency, improved service delivery, and public facilities that are assets to the community in multiple ways.

  *Each master plan or sector plan is a fresh opportunity to improved intergovernmental coordination in planning for public facilities. This work program devotes 7.2 work years to “Private and Public Coordination” to engage in the implementation of plans by public agencies and private developers. The “Other Tools” project includes one-half work-year devoted to finding specific, implementable approaches that will result in improved intergovernmental coordination in planning, locating, designing, and constructing public facilities. A small portion of the 5.3 work years in the work program for mandatory referrals is reserved for identifying ways to make that process more productive for all participants and achieve better results for the public. The Growth Policy work program for FY07 will culminate in Planning Board recommendations for administering the adequate public facilities ordinance.*

- **Growth and Its Management:** The location and pace of growth has seemingly always been an issue of great interest and contention in Montgomery County, and nothing about our future suggests that the interest, or the contention, will diminish. Although the overall pace of growth in the County will slow, each new increment of growth affects a greater number of people and puts demands on a network of public facilities that is difficult to expand. Objective research and aggressive outreach provide paths to reach solutions that meet as many of the disparate objectives as possible.

  *This work program allocates 5.6 work years to growth management, including conducting assessments of the County’s past and planned growth to help clarify issues requiring*
attention, and the identification/evaluation of additional tools to implement the General Plan Refinement’s growth goals by more effectively directing, or even slowing, new growth in the County.

- **Agricultural Reserve:** Perhaps Montgomery County’s most notable planning achievement, the Agricultural Reserve is under increasing pressure on many fronts. Among the most critical for planners: ensuring that land use decisions support our range of goals for the Reserve, including continued viability of farming, preservation of rural character, and environmental protection.

This program allocates 3.3 work years to an “Agricultural Initiatives” project that includes much of the Department’s role in leading and/or supporting initiatives to strengthen the Agricultural Reserve and address threats to its continued success. Some of this work will be in support of the Council’s Ad Hoc Agricultural Issues Working Group. An additional temporary work year funded by the Council will conduct research to fill gaps in the data relating to the transfer of development rights program.

- **Expansion of Religious Institutions:** Religious institutions play a vital role in the daily lives of many County residents. They strengthen the County as places of worship and as community centers, offering a variety of services and meetings spaces to parishioners, neighbors, and community groups. The County’s land use planning responsibilities include ensuring that all land uses necessary to maintaining a high quality of life have an opportunity to continue to serve the County’s spiritual needs.

This work program allocates 2.1 work years to studying options for religious institutions that wish to expand. This issue has linkages to other work program projects, including Agricultural Initiatives, since there has been interest by some institutions to locate expanded facilities in the Agricultural Reserve.

**Centers and Boulevards: Tools for Infill and Redevelopment**

We have an ambitious master plan schedule included in this work program. All of the areas that will be the subject of new master plans contain centers or are centers themselves, which is why the goals of the “Centers, Boulevards, and Public Spaces” project are important for FY07 and beyond.

In FY07 we will continue and build on the efforts of the past year with a sharpened focus on the process and regulatory tools that the County needs to have in place as more and more of our future growth is infill and redevelopment. We’re calling Centers and Boulevards Phase II “Tools for Infill and Redevelopment” because we will investigate, evaluate, and propose: new approaches to amending land uses (within and along side the master plan process), ways for the zoning ordinance to work better in communities from urban centers to the rural wedge, and tools to encourage/require higher quality design, so that infill development “works” from everyone’s perspective (residents, workers, visitors, and the surrounding neighborhood) and adds to the area’s overall quality of life.

**In Conclusion**

The past fiscal year has been one of enormous challenge and change for the Department of Planning. There are new or reassigned staff in key positions at every level of the organization and we have committed ourselves to structural changes that only start with our return to separate-but-coordinated departments of parks and planning. We know these changes will and must continue for us to achieve the goals of excellence and effectiveness that we have set for ourselves.
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THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
Agricultural Initiatives

**Division:** Community-Based Planning and Research and Technology  
**Latest Edits:** June 6, 2006  
**Lead Planner:**  
Allocated work years: 3.3

**Project Description/Scope:** This project encompasses the Department of Planning’s roles in addressing issues associated with preserving agricultural activities and open space in Montgomery County’s Agricultural Reserve. It includes monitoring of the status of the TDR sending and receiving areas, recommending improvements to the Zoning Ordinance to implement the goals of the Master Plan for Agricultural and Rural Open Space, serving as a resource for the Agricultural Policy Working Group, and assisting in the implementation of recommendations. The Department of Planning also plays a role by identifying additional receiving areas for the transfer of TDRs.

**Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:** The General Plan, and more specifically, the Master Plan for Agricultural and Open Space, calls for preservation of an Agricultural Reserve and a sustained agricultural economy. The General Plan’s “wedges and corridors” vision is implemented through each master plan and sector plan, and through regulatory mechanisms such as the zoning ordinance.

**Project Benefits:**
Improving the preservation of agricultural and rural open space through the following:
- Timely review of potential Preliminary Plans in the Agricultural Reserve
- Assistance for the Agricultural Policy Working Group
- Provide support for the TDR program with better monitoring and locations for new TDR receiving areas
- Review of Agricultural District nominations
- Review of any Rural and Rustic Roads nominations

**Specific Objectives for FY 07:**
- Serve as a resource for the Agricultural Policy Working Group
- Implement the recommendations of the Agricultural Policy Working Group
- Staff assembly of latest information concerning TDRs and the status of sending and receiving areas
- Examining potential amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to implement the recommendations of the Master Plan and the Task Force

**Coordination and Linkages:**
**Agencies/Div:** MNCPPC: Research/Tech Div., County Wide Plan Div., Development Review Div.; MCG: DPWT, DHCD, DED, DEP  
**Work Program Projects:** Religious Institutions  
**Interest Groups: Others:** Farming interests, environmental interests
Green Infrastructure Functional Master Plan

**Lead Division:** Countywide Planning

**Lead Staff:** G. Wright

**Work year allocation:** 2

**Latest Edits:** 6/6/06

**Project Description/Scope:** This plan will identify and evaluate existing sensitive and important environmental features, and gaps between them, throughout Montgomery County, to provide a comprehensive interconnected system. It will include a map of interconnected natural areas of countywide significance, and implementation strategies and recommendations to make the vision a reality. This initiative will provide a countywide understanding of the relative importance of natural resources, and identifying opportunities for conservation, mitigation, restoration, and enhancement. Priorities will be established to assist development review, master planning, park acquisition, and budgeting.

**Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:** The Green Infrastructure Plan will set forth the important environmental policy choices for the Planning Board and implement the environmental objectives and strategies of the General Plan Refinement of 1993. The Plan will strengthen the development pattern of the General Plan and Smart Growth initiatives. It will implement recommendations of the recently approved Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation (LPPR) Plan. It will streamline the preparation of the Park, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Strategic Plan, and complement the Legacy Open Space (LOS) Plan by providing a broader understanding of the County’s natural resources, their relative significance, and how best to achieve a functional network of important green space. The Plan will also be an important component of meeting and maintaining State Water Quality Standards.

**Project Benefits:** The Plan will serve the regulatory process by:

- Facilitating a more streamlined and environmentally effective review and mitigation process for all public and private development projects;
- Enhancing the effectiveness of the Environmental Guidelines and the Forest Conservation Regulations by showing where to prioritize green space for maximum benefit; and
- Providing a comprehensive guide for developers and plan reviewers in identifying important areas for mitigation and potential preservation outside of the area normally protected by buffer regulations.

**Specific Objectives for FY 07:**

- a) hold stakeholder Focus Group meetings;
- b) refine and enhance natural resource GIS base layers;
- c) create a regulated area layer for the County;
- d) analyze natural resource data in light of public input and create alternative green infrastructure mapping scenarios;
- e) continue public outreach efforts.

**Coordination and Linkages:**

**Agencies/Div:** M-NCPPC: R/T Div., CBP Div., DR Div.; MCG: DEP, DPS, DPWT, MCSCD, MC Public Schools; Local Government: MWCOG, WSSC, ICPRB, WMATA, Local Municipalities; State: MDE, MDP, DNR, SHA; Federal: EPA, NPS, NOAA, USACOE, USFS, USF&W; Adjacent jurisdictions: Frederick, Howard, Prince George’s, Carroll, Loudon, and Fairfax Counties, and D.C.
Work Program Projects: Area and Sector Master Plans, Forest Conservation, Development Review, Growth Policy, Centers and Boulevards, Bikeways, Trails, Park Acquisition, Legacy Open Space Plan.

Interest Groups: Too numerous to list separately. Includes diverse representatives from various agencies, organizations, and interested individuals representing the areas of Environmental Advocacy, Interagency and Public Land Managers, Agriculture and Forestry Interests, Municipalities and Large Civic Organizations, Building Industry and Chambers of Commerce, and Natural Area Recreational Users.
Gaithersburg Vicinity Master Plan

**Lead Division:** Community-Based Planning

**Latest Edits:** June 6, 2006

**Lead Person:** N. Sturgeon

**Work year allocation:** 5.6

**Project Description/Scope:** This comprehensive Master Plan will amend two plans - the 1985 Gaithersburg Vicinity Master Plan and the 1990 Shady Grove Study Area Master Plan. Gaithersburg Vicinity occupies a large and significant area in the heart of the I-270 Corridor. The master plan straddles I-270 and will include recommendations on land use, zoning, transportation, environment, and community facilities on both sides. West of I-270, several transit stops for the Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT) are planned through the Shady Grove Life Sciences Center, the County’s premier location for biotechnology research, development, and education. East of I-270, the Plan includes Montgomery Village, the Airpark, and numerous other residential neighborhoods.

**Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:** The I-270 High Tech Corridor was established in the General Plan as an area of major economic growth for the County. The plans for I-270 are being amended sequentially, including the Shady Grove Sector Plan (completed), and the Twinbrook, Gaithersburg Vicinity, and Germantown master plans. The MD 355/I-270 Technology Corridor project will coordinate all of these efforts and provide a cohesive vision of the future. This Corridor project will coordinate planning issues that span master plan boundaries within the Corridor and ensure the implementation of land use, transportation, and community facilities that create desirable communities.

**Project Benefits:** The Gaithersburg Vicinity Master Plan update will provide a guide for future development and build-out of this important community within the I-270 Corridor. Plan recommendations will focus on building community, increasing housing opportunities, incorporating transit, expanding open space and parks, and improving connections and access. The Master Plan will help guide development of the Johns Hopkins University Belward Campus and the Metropolitan Grove site, both of which include stops along the Corridor Cities Transitway, as well as the Webb tract. M-83, the planned extension of Mid-County Highway, is a major issue under study on the east side of I-270.

**Specific Objectives for FY 07:** Continued community outreach, coordination with the City of Gaithersburg, detailed analysis of all master plan issues, preparation of Staff Draft Master Plan. In concert with the Centers and Boulevards Phase II project, this master plan effort provides opportunities to develop and apply new tools for planning and regulating infill and redevelopment.

**Coordination and Linkages:**

**Agencies/Div:** City of Gaithersburg, DPWT, OED, MCPS

**Work Program Projects:** MD 355/I-270 Tech Corridor, other I-270 Corridor master plans, Centers and Boulevards

**Interest Groups:** Montgomery Village Foundation, property owners, business owners, and residential communities
# Germantown Master Plan

**Lead Div:** Community-Based Planning  
**Lead Staff:** S. Edwards  
**Work years allocated:** 6.2  
**Latest Edits:** June 6, 2006

## Project Description/Scope:
The intent of the Germantown Master Plan update is to bring the employment future contained in the 1989 Germantown Master Plan into fruition and remove any obstacles that have inhibited non-residential development. Germantown is a maturing community of approximately 85,000 people that has nearly reached the build-out of residential units recommended in the 1989 Master Plan. The forthcoming Master Plan update will examine primarily non-residential uses and the potential for mixed-use development in existing office parks and commercial centers. The potential for mixed-use development will also consider needed transportation and transit, open space and community facility needs. Where new residential units are proposed, the future Master Plan will identify opportunities for affordable housing.

## Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:
The General Plan identifies Germantown as one of three Corridor Cities with common characteristics such as intensively developed downtowns, high-rise buildings containing housing, offices, shopping and cultural amenities. Each of the Corridor Cities was planned to support a population of up to 100,000 people.

## Project Benefits:
- Provides catalyst for employment development
- Recommends location for Corridor Cities Transitway including station areas and supporting facilities
- Addresses corridor-wide need for housing, especially affordable housing
- Integrates education, training and development proposed by Montgomery College
- Identifies community facility needs for a maturing community

## Specific Objectives for FY 07:
Staff will prepare a Purpose and Outreach Report by the fall of 2006 and begin work on a Staff Draft, scheduled for October 2007 delivery. In concert with the Centers and Boulevards Phase II project, this master plan effort provides opportunities to develop and apply new tools for planning and regulating infill and redevelopment.

## Coordination and Linkages:
Links with MD 355/I-270 Corridor Study; transportation recommendations link with Gaithersburg Vicinity Master Plan update  
**Agencies/Div:** Countywide Planning, RTC, Department of Parks, MCPS, DPW & T, DHCA, Department of Economic Development, Upcounty Regional Services Center.  
**Work Program Projects:**
**Interest Groups:** Germantown/Gaithersburg Chamber of Commerce, Germantown Alliance, Germantown Citizens Association, property owners, Montgomery College and its technology partners.
**Twinbrook Sector Plan**

**Lead Div:** Community-Based Planning  
**Latest Edits:**  
**Lead Staff:** C. Kousoulas  
**Workyears allocated:** 5.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description/Scope</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Twinbrook Sector Plan amends the 1992 North Bethesda/Garrett Park Master Plan. That Plan included Twinbrook within its boundaries, but defined it as a smaller area. This Sector Plan excludes sites recently annexed by the City of Rockville and includes the light industrial area between Parklawn Drive and the proposed Montrose Parkway. The Plan recognizes the area’s proximity to Metro and strives to create a mixed-use community with increased density and housing. Its urban design, environmental, park, transportation, and land use recommendations complement each other attention to creating a pedestrian-friendly and environmentally sustainable community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twinbrook is one of the Red Line communities in the I-270 Corridor. Development in the Corridor is focused on creating defined communities with a mix of residential and employment uses. The Twinbrook Sector Plan increases the potential for density, adds housing opportunities, and seeks to maintain the existing light industrial uses that provides useful services and are complementary to the area’s lab and office uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Benefits</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Plan’s recommendations are intended to make best use of existing transit infrastructure, offer housing options, and encourages detailed attention to create integrated land use, urban design, and environment designs to create a sustainable and pedestrian-friendly environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Objectives for FY 07</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Staff Draft and undertake Planning Board work sessions (Fall 2006), Planning Board Draft to the County Council (Spring 2007). In concert with the Centers and Boulevards Phase II project, this master plan effort provides opportunities to develop and apply new tools for planning and regulating infill and redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-270 Corridor Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agencies/Div:</strong> Countywide Planning, RTC, MCPS, DPWT, Bethesda Chevy Chase Regional Services Center, City of Rockville Planning and Community Development, North Bethesda Transportation Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Program Projects:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest Groups:</strong> Relevant citizen groups and environmental and transit advocacy groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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# White Flint Sector Plan

**Lead Div:** Community-Based Planning  
**Latest Edits:** June 6, 2006  
**Lead Staff:** J. Daniel  
**Work years allocated:** 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Description/Scope:</strong></th>
<th>The White Flint Sector Plan amends the North Bethesda-Garrett Park Master Plan (1992). Located in the heart of North Bethesda, White Flint lies within the Rockville Pike/MD 355 Corridor. The White Flint Metro station is located approximately one mile from the City of Rockville. Currently about 200 acres in size, the White Flint Sector Plan boundaries may expand with the update.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:</strong></th>
<th>Implement the County’s policies on transit-and pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods, affordable and workforce housing, environmental design (LEED) and other green building requirements. White Flint Mall and Mid-Pike Plaza may serve as case studies for CBP’s Centers and Boulevards initiative.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Benefits:</strong></th>
<th>Update the Master Plan to reflect current county policy and trends in development patterns near Metro Stations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Specific Objectives for FY 07:</strong></th>
<th>Begin community participation process and initiate Purpose and Outreach report for consideration by the Planning Board. In concert with the Centers and Boulevards Phase II project, this master plan effort provides opportunities to develop and apply new tools for planning and regulating infill and redevelopment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Coordination and Linkages:</strong></th>
<th>I-270 Corridor Framework, Public Schools (MCPS), Fire &amp; Rescue, Public Safety, Bethesda-Chevy Chase Regional Services Center, Department of Economic Development (DED), Department of Housing and Community Affairs (DHCA), City of Rockville Planning and Community Development, North Bethesda Transportation Center.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agencies/Div:</strong></th>
<th>Primary coordination with Transportation Planning, Environmental Planning, County Council staff, DPWT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Work Program Projects:</strong></th>
<th>Entire process is within work program for CBP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interest Groups:</strong></th>
<th>Community groups, property owners, developers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Other:** | |
Bi-County Transitway Study (Purple Line)

**Lead Division:** Countywide Planning  
**Latest Edits:** 6/02  
**Lead Staff:** T. Autrey  
**Work years allocated:** 1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Description/Scope:</strong> Staff to provide coordination with MTA public outreach, development review coordination, and Council/Board/MTA technical assistance and information during analysis of alternatives and selection of Locally Preferred Alternative for Bi-County Transitway Study. The FY 2007 effort will also include initiation of Functional Master Plan through the production of a Purpose and Outreach Strategy Report to coincide with the selection of Locally Preferred Alternative as well as initial data collection / parcel inventory by Research and Technology Center.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:</strong> Project scope is directly related to previously adopted Master Plans west of Silver Spring and Planning Board’s Transportation Policy Report. Certain alternatives under review further Council / Board established policies to enhance down-County east-west travel opportunities, increase transit mode split, promote joint and mixed use development, provide access to jobs, and protect existing and future infrastructure investment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Benefits:</strong> In addition to supporting established Council/Board policies as noted above, this project will establish the basis for the development of a Functional Master Plan to guide implementation of the Bi-County alignment. There is currently no adopted Master Plan alignment for the Bi-County Transitway east of Silver Spring. It will also provide the basis for future Transit Station Area Sector Plans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Specific Objectives for FY 07:</strong> Facilitate and participate in public outreach, coordinate and produce staff recommendations in support of Development Review Division work on applications in the corridor, provide technical analysis and recommendations for the Board and Council during alternative analysis and selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative, and begin the development of a functional Master Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Coordination and Linkages:**  
**Agencies/Div:** Community-Based Planning Division; Research and Technology Division, Development Review Division, City of Takoma Park, MTA, WMATA, MC DPW&T, PG DPW, MC Dept. of Parks  
**Work Program Projects:**  
**Interest Groups:** Purple Line Coalition; civic associations, chambers of commerce, WABA  
**Other:** Takoma/Langley Crossroads Community Development Corp. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kensington/University Blvd. Sector Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Div:</strong> Community-Based Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work years allocated:</strong> 3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Project Description/Scope:** | As a comprehensive amendment to 1978 Town of Kensington Sector Plan -- the oldest “active” master or sector plan -- the plan will include separate elements for land use, zoning, transportation, environment, community facilities and urban design and is likely to focus on redevelopment potential in the town’s business district. A special study of the University Boulevard corridor between Kensington and Wheaton may be included. |

| **Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:** | The sector plan implements the General Plan, stewardship of which is a key function of the District Council. It also furthers the Planning Department’s Community-Based Planning program for the Georgia Avenue Corridor, which manages the physical environment in Kensington, Wheaton, Aspen Hill, Upper Rock Creek and Olney. It also fulfils a responsibility to the Town of Kensington, which has delegated its land use planning function to this agency. |

| **Project Benefits:** | This project consists of a long-needed evaluation of land use policies in an area whose current plan is outdated and that has begun to experience pressure for redevelopment. It will provide a framework for the likely redevelopment of the business district and establish zoning and design controls for that process. It will evaluate the existing transportation network and make recommendations for improvements where needed. It may also evaluate land use policies for the University Boulevard corridor and make appropriate zoning recommendations. |

| **Specific Objectives for FY 07:** | Issue development and design of outreach program; community consultation, including forums and advisory committee development; detailed analysis of land use, design, zoning and transportation issues; development of recommendations in those areas; preparation of initial draft sector plan. In concert with the Centers and Boulevards Phase II project, this master plan effort provides opportunities to develop and apply new tools for planning and regulating infill and redevelopment. |

| **Coordination and Linkages:** | **Agencies/Div:** DPWT, DHCA, OED; Countywide Planning, Research and Technology, Strategic Planning, Development Review |
| **Interest Groups:** | Local residents, Kensington elected officials, property owners, business people |
Westbard Sector Plan

Lead Div: Community-Based Planning

Latest Edits: May 30, 2006
Lead Staff: K. O’Connor

Work years allocated: 2.5

Project Description/Scope: Update the 25 year-old Westbard Sector Plan (1982). Westbard lies in the southwestern part of the County, approximately one mile from the District of Columbia boundary line. Two highways serve the Westbard area: River Road and Mass. Avenue. Westbard is surrounded by well-established single-family neighborhoods. Over time, the residential uses were built around the commercial and industrial area which extends along River Road and Westbard Avenue. The Westbard Sector Plan is approximately 153 acres in size.

Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board: Implementation of the County’s policies on affordable and workforce housing, environmental design (LEED) and other green building requirements, and transit and transportation options. The 11.4-acre Westwood Shopping Center (C-1) will serve as a case study for the Centers and Boulevards initiative.

Project Benefits: The Plan will outline a policy for dealing with transportation capacity, pedestrian and bicycle access, and streets (i.e., reviewing the ROW for River Road). In addition, the Plan will identify redevelopment opportunities, neighborhood protection measures, and appropriate zoning for Westbard’s general commercial and light industrial areas. Recommendations will also be outlined for affordable housing, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, urban design, and zoning.

Specific Objectives for FY 07: Define the outreach method to be undertaken, catalogue the existing parcels, land uses, and zones. The Plan will examine the opportunities for mixed-use development including housing, environmental challenges, the character of River Road, and examine recreational opportunities. In concert with the Centers and Boulevards Phase II project, this master plan effort provides opportunities to develop and apply new tools for planning and regulating infill and redevelopment.

Coordination and Linkages:

Agencies/Div: Public Schools (MCPS), Fire & Rescue, Public Safety, County Executive (Western Montgomery Services Center), Department of Economic Development (DED), Department of Housing and Community Affairs (DHCA), M-NCPPC Staff including: Environmental Planning, Transportation Planning, Park Planning and Resource Analysis, Research and Technology Division, and Historic Preservation.

Work Program Projects: The Westbard vicinity Mandatory Referrals, Special Exceptions, and Site Plans.


Other: Friendship Heights Coordinating Committee, Town of Somerset, the Westbard Business Community, The Chamber of Commerce, Kenwood subdivision, Springfield neighborhood, Little Falls Library, and Little Flower Church and School.
MD 355/I-270 Tech Corridor

**Lead Division:** Community-Based Planning

**Lead Staff:** S. Tallant

**Work years allocated:** 2.4

**Latest Edits:** June 6, 2006

**Project Description/Scope:** The intent of the MD 355/I-270 Tech Corridor project is to describe a cohesive vision for the future, coordinate planning issues that span master plan boundaries within the corridor, and ensure the implementation of land use, and transportation and community facilities that create desirable communities. This effort will coordinate the MD 355/ I-270 plans (Twinbrook, White Flint, Gaithersburg and Germantown master plans). It will address land use impacts on the transportation system, address the zoning, review community facilities with the needs of future communities, identify opportunities for parks, recreation, and open space, and identify ways to incorporate environmentally sensitive development to the corridor.

**Relationship of Project to Policies of Council and Planning Board:** I-270 planning established in the General Plan, FY06 Community-Based Planning program for the next cycle of master and sector plans (Germantown, Gaithersburg Vicinity, Twinbrook, and White Flint), provides a unique opportunity to improve the physical environment of the corridor by creating a dynamic system of transit-oriented centers connected together by an integrated system of streets, a comprehensive transportation system, adequate schools and public facilities, and environmentally sustainable communities.

**Project Benefits:** Communicates a corridor-wide perspective at the same time individual master plans are updated; identifies land use patterns; locates planned transportation facilities and their sequencing; summarizes the status of CIP projects including transit, roads, schools and community facilities; fosters the coordination of public and private development before the master plans are completed; identifies the development capacity based on the adequacy of public facilities; addresses the needs of future employers including biotechnology and advanced technology employers in a competitive market places; identifies types of housing; identifies existing zoning; summarizes the balance of jobs and housing at the corridor level; fosters transit-oriented development; addresses community character; coordinates environmental themes.

**Specific Objectives for FY 07:** Phase 1: Complete by November 2006 in coordination with the Staff Draft for the Twinbrook Sector Plan. In concert with the Centers and Boulevards Phase II project, this master plan effort provides opportunities to develop and apply new tools for planning and regulating infill and redevelopment.

**Coordination and Linkages:**

**Agencies/Div:** Countywide Planning, Research and Technology, Strategic Planning Divisions, DPWT, DHCA, MCPS, Office of Economic Development

**Work Program Projects:** This project will coordinate with the next cycle of master and sector plans (Germantown, Gaithersburg Vicinity, Twinbrook, White Flint, and MD 355/I-270 Corridor)

**Interest Groups:** MD 355/1270 Land Owners, Businesses and Residential Communities

**Other:** High Technology and Advanced Technology Employers, Developers, Special Interest Groups such as environmental groups, the Cities of Rockville and Gaithersburg.
Battery Lane Housing

Lead Div: Community-Based Planning

Lead Staff: TBD

Work years allocated: 3.1

Latest Edits: May 30, 2006

Project Description/Scope: This project was originally included in the recently approved Woodmont Triangle Amendment to the Sector Plan for the Bethesda CBD. It includes an area of existing multi-family housing located on the northern edge of the Bethesda CBD.

Relationship of Project to Policies of Council and Planning Board: Implement polices to support affordable housing near transit stations especially in CBDs. Preserve the existing supply of affordable housing.

Project Benefits:
Provides a corridor-wide perspective for the following:
- Supports the provision of affordable housing in central business districts
- Identifies potential methods to preserve existing affordable housing
- Identifies the development capacity based on the adequacy of public facilities
- Coordinates with the potential additional jobs to be located on the Naval Medical Site
- Coordinates the zoning tools with housing policy
- Creates the opportunity to balance jobs and housing in a CBD
- Addresses community character

Specific Objectives for FY 07: Identify tools and begin work on the staff draft amendment. In concert with the Centers and Boulevards Phase II project, this master plan effort provides opportunities to develop and apply new tools for planning and regulating infill and redevelopment.

Coordination and Linkages:
Agencies/Div: Research and Technology and Countywide Planning divisions, DHCA, MCPS

Work Program Projects: This project will coordinate with the next cycle of master and sector plans (Germantown, Gaithersburg Vicinity, Twinbrook, White Flint, and MD 355/I-270 Corridor)

Interest Groups: Affordable housing groups

Other: Land Owners, Businesses and Residential Communities
Centers & Boulevards, Phase II
Toolbox for Infill and Redevelopment

Lead Div: Strategic Planning
Community-Based Planning

Lead Staff: Banach/Carter
Work years allocated: 3

Project Description/Scope: This project will identify and propose options for amending or augmenting the County’s primary land use planning and regulatory tools so that they are more useful toward achieving the goals of the General Plan. The results will provide the County with the tools needed to plan the future for, and regulate development of, a maturing suburb where an increasing share of planned growth is infill and redevelopment.

Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board: This project implements the land use policies expressed in the General Plan and reflects the County’s transition from a largely auto-dependent suburb into a more urban form with mixed-use transit-connected centers along major transportation routes.

Project Benefits: Most of the areas that are to be covered in the Department’s ambitious master plan schedule are either mature centers or contain one or more of the County’s commercial centers. Within these areas, and along the boulevards connecting these centers, meeting the challenges of infill and redevelopment is key to the plans’ success.

Specific Objectives for FY 07: (1) Zoning tools: review zoning ordinance for its suitability for application along the spectrum from areas planned for the most intensive development (CBDs) to areas planned for the least developed (the rural wedge). Particular attention will be paid to how the zoning ordinance can better address issues that result from redevelopment and infill development. (2) Tools for Amending Planned Land Uses: Master plans are intended to last 20 years, but the pace of change is now sufficiently rapid that plans cannot remain static for that period of time. However, the current master plan process cannot be made more nimble without changing some of its aspects. This project will identify options for addressing proposed changes in planned land use that are more responsive to both the needs of the community and landowners, both within and along side the master plan process. (3) Tools for Defining and Achieving Quality Design: Quality design matters everywhere but for infill and redevelopment to succeed at every level, and they must, quality design is essential. Urban design is all about making places “work” for residents, workers, visitors and neighbors. Over the next fiscal year, the staff will identify strategies for improving the quality of design of infill and redevelopment projects.

Coordination and Linkages:

Work Program Projects: Master Plans, Growth Policy, Private and Public Project Coordination
Interest Groups: The broad spectrum of civic, business, and other interest groups have been and must continue to be involved.

Other: Urban Land Institute, Smart Growth Alliance.
Master Plan for Historic Designations

Lead Div: Countywide Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest Edits: 5/25/06</th>
<th>Lead Staff: G. Wright</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work years allocated: 2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description/Scope:  Research and evaluate properties for designation on the Master Plan for Historic Preservation. Focus on evaluating the properties identified on the Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites that have never been reviewed and on evaluating properties that are nominated for historic designation by citizen groups and individuals. All designations take the form of amendments to the Master Plan for Historic Preservation, and include public hearings before the Historic Preservation Commission, the Planning Board, and the County Council.

Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:  The Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites was created by MNCPPC in 1976 and the Master Plan for Historic Preservation was adopted by the County Council in 1979. The Historic Preservation Ordinance provides nine criteria for historic designation. The Master Plan calls for review of all properties that were identified on the Locational Atlas and approximately ¾ of the original group of 1000 potential districts and sites have been evaluated. The Master Plan and ordinance also allow for additional nominations and additions to the Locational Atlas.

Project Benefits:  Designation of historic districts and sites allows significant portions of the county’s heritage to be protected and preserved for future generations. Historic designation on the Master Plan for Historic Preservation means that properties are protected by the provisions of Chapter 24A, the Historic Preservation Ordinance. All exterior changes, demolitions and new construction within designated historic districts and related to individually-designated historic sites, must be reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission through the Historic Area Work Permit process.

Specific Objectives for FY 07:
Complete Damascus/Goshen amendment, initiate amendment for Planning Areas 10 and 14.

Coordination and Linkages:
Agencies/Div: Community-based Planning, Development Review, Transportation Planning, Environmental Planning, DPS, DPWT, DHCA, County Attorney’s Office
Work Program Projects: Amendments to the Master Plan for Historic Preservation
Interest Groups: Montgomery Preservation Inc., Historic Takoma, Kensington Historical Society, City of Takoma Park, Town of Kensington, Chevy Chase Village, Town of Garrett Park, multiple other community groups.

III
### Information Services

**Lead Division:** Development Review  
**Lead Staff:** L. Rorie  
**Work years allocated:** 6.9

**Project Description/Scope:** The Public Information and Publications Office serves walk-in and telephone customers seeking land use, park, zoning, subdivision, site plan, forest conservation plan, special exception, and master plan information for specific parcels, including all development cases pending final decision by the Planning Board. Staff also inventories and sells relevant land use documents, assigns addresses and street names, and oversees the final stages of plat reproduction and recordation. Service is also provided to persons submitting applications for development review, including checking applications for completeness, the processing of application fees, and entering the pertinent information into the Hansen system. Additional public information staff in County-wide Planning provides information related to transportation issues.

**Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:** Public Information Services works to disseminate the most up-to-date information regarding the county’s and the Planning Board’s land use policies, including changes to the zoning code, subdivision regulations, forest conservation laws, and master plans.

**Project Benefits:** The processing of applications is an important first step for the entire regulatory review process. Providing accurate and timely land use information to the public is essential in a growing and diverse county.

**Specific Objectives for FY 07:**

- a) Establish a single, public information desk to provide an enhanced level of public service,
- b) provide a single point of intake for all submissions relating to any case under review and ensure the dissemination of these submissions to the appropriate staff,
- c) establish a file protocol to ensure consistency of case documentation,
- d) establish a more secure file management system.

**Coordination and Linkages:**

**Agencies/Div:** Close coordination with all divisions within MRO to ensure that information being disseminated is accurate and up to date.  
**Work Program Projects:** Continuous Improvement Initiatives  
**Interest Groups:** Responsiveness to inquiries is important to citizens as well as civic and homeowner associations, and those with an interest in a specific area such as the environment or historic preservation.
Special Projects

Lead Division: Strategic Planning

Lead Planner: TBD

Work years allocated: 2.4

Latest Edits: June 5, 2006

Project Description/Scope: This initiative provides analytic support throughout the Department to expeditiously respond to emerging issues having countywide significance to the Planning Board and/or the County Council.

Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board: In 1998, the Planning Board recognized the importance of creating resource capacity within the department to deliver priority projects in an integrated and expedited fashion. The capacity to prepare special studies or assessments, not envisioned or anticipated in the annual budget, was and is recognized as a Planning Board priority.


Specific Objectives for FY 07: These work years will be allocated to projects that have not yet been identified.

Coordination and Linkages:
Agencies/Div: Not applicable until projects selected.
## Shady Grove Sectional Map Amendment

**Lead Division:** Community-Based Planning  
**Lead Staff:** N. Yearwood  
**Work years allocated:** .3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Description/Scope:</strong></th>
<th>Shady Grove Sectional Map Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:</strong></td>
<td>Implements the recommendations in the recently approved and adopted Shady Grove Sector Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Benefits:</strong></td>
<td>Implements the recommendations in a sector plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Objectives for FY 07:</strong></td>
<td>Revise Zoning Maps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Woodmont Triangle Sectional Map Amendment**

**Lead Division:** Community-Based Planning

**Lead Staff:** K. O’Connor

**Work years allocated:** .2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Description/Scope:</strong></th>
<th>Woodmont Triangle Sectional Map Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:** Implements the recommendations in the recently approved and adopted Woodmont Triangle Amendment to the Sector Plan for the Bethesda CBD.

**Project Benefits:** Implements the recommendations in a sector plan.

**Specific Objectives for FY 07:** Revise Zoning Maps.

**Coordination and Linkages:**
- **Agencies/Div:** County Council
- **Work Program Projects:**
- **Interest Groups:**
- **Other:**

★★★★
### Damascus Sectional Map Amendment

**Lead Div:** Community-Based Planning  
**Lead Staff:** L. Saville  
**Work years allocated:** .4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Description/Scope:</strong></th>
<th>Sectional Map Amendment for the Damascus Master Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:</strong></td>
<td>Implements the recommendations in the recently approved and adopted Damascus Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Benefits:</strong></td>
<td>Implements the recommendations in a master plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Objectives for FY 07:</strong></td>
<td>Revise Zoning Maps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coordination and Linkages:**  
**Agencies/Div:** County Council  
**Work Program Projects:**  
**Interest Groups:**  
**Other:**
# Special Exceptions

**Lead Div:** Development Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest Edits:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Staff:</strong> C. Gilbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work years allocated:</strong> 10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Project Description/Scope:
This on-going work provides for staff review and a Planning Board recommendation for certain requested uses of property that are not permitted by right but may be allowed in a given zone. Such review must show that the proposed use will not have any inherent or non-inherent adverse effects with respect to issues such as traffic, noise or odors, will not be detrimental to the use, value and enjoyment of other properties, and will not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of residents, workers or visitors.

## Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:
Special Exceptions are examined by staff for conformity with public policy as set forth in the applicable Master Plans, the General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, the Forest Conservation Law, and other Planning Board policies.

## Project Benefits:
Allowing certain uses (doctors and dentists, veterinarians, telecommunication towers) in zones where they are not allowed by right often brings needed services closer to those who need them. This is beneficial as long as it can be shown that these uses meet certain prescribed standards that insure compatibility.

## Specific Objectives for FY 07:
1. Work closely with the Office of Zoning and Hearings (OZAH) to ensure that applications are not accepted unless all necessary materials have been provided,
2. Coordinate with other divisions internally to create a development review process to ensure that all applicable issues are raised in a timely manner,
3. Seek approval of a zoning text amendment that will allow the zoning division to receive more than one copy of a special exception application,
4. Establish more realistic parameters for the amount of time required to process a special exception case from the time of submittal to the date of the hearing at OZAH, and
5. Ensure the timely review of cases so as to reduce the number of postponements.

## Coordination and Linkages:
### Agencies/Divs
Numerous State and County government agencies (SHA, DPWT, DPS, DEP, DHCA, HOC) are involved of the review of special exceptions. In addition, staff reviews involve significant consultation with other divisions in the Planning Department.

### Work Program Projects
Continuous Improvement Initiatives

### Interest Groups
Adjoining property owners and relevant citizens and homeowner associations are kept apprised of Special Exception reviews and are invited to participate in staff reviews and Board decisions.
### Rezoning, Local Map Amendments

**Lead Div:** Development Review  
**Lead Staff:** C. Gilbert  
**Work years allocated:** 7.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest Edits:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Project Description/Scope
This ongoing work involves staff review and a Planning Board recommendation to the Hearing Examiner and the County Council. A local map amendment covers a single tract, all portions of which are proposed for classification in the same zone. Factors to be considered include the land use recommended for the tract in an adopted master plan or sector plan; the character of the neighborhood; traffic to be generated by the proposed rezoning, and the impact on adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood and public facilities. A change in the character of the neighborhood since the last comprehensive zoning must be found for a change to be recommended for approval in a Euclidean zone. To recommend approval of a floating zone application, compatibility must be found with existing and proposed development and it must be determined that the proposed zoning meets the standards and purposes of the zone as set forth in the zoning ordinance.

| Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board: | Each application is judged for conformance with the General Plan, area master plans and other planning policies, as well as its compliance with the applicable zoning criteria. |

| Project Benefits: | Given the time that may lapse between master plan rewrites, rezoning can allow developers to respond more creatively to market conditions and can be used to specifically address the need for additional housing. |

| Specific Objectives for FY 07: | Although the zoning code is frequently amended through the master plan process and/or the approval of zoning text amendments, the code has become unwieldy and different sections may conflict. The goal in the year ahead is to determine the best method for rewriting and streamlining the zoning code. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination and Linkages:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Agencies/Div:** Input from numerous county and state agencies is required to assess the desirability of local map amendments. In addition, review by other divisions within Park and Planning is also required. Enhance coordination with DPS to ensure consistent interpretation of the zoning ordinance.

**Work Program Projects:**

**Interest Groups:** Adjoining property, civic and homeowner associations are encouraged to provide input with respect to the impact a proposed local map amendment may have on the character of their neighborhood.
# Preliminary Plans/Subdivision Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Div:</th>
<th>Development Review</th>
<th>Lead Staff:</th>
<th>C. Conlon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work years allocated:</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description/Scope**: This on-going work involves staff review and a decision by the Board regarding a general scheme for a proposed development, including the location of the property and access to it; existing topography, utilities and rights-of-way, proposed layout of roads and streets, location of utilities, schools, parks and open spaces, and provisions for stormwater management. Plans are processed through the inter-agency Development Review Committee (DRC), and staff recommendations are submitted to the Board for consideration. Staff also reviews and the Board approves record plats which show all boundaries, street lines and lot lines, exact width and location of all streets, alleys, and crosswalks, easements or right-of-way for public services or utilities; and outlines of areas to be reserved for common use.

**Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board**: Pre-preliminary and preliminary plans are examined for conformity with the recommendations of area Master Plans, requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Regulations, Annual Growth Policy, the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance, Forest Conservation Law, and other Planning Department guidelines.

**Project Benefits**: Review of proposed subdivisions by the Division, coordinated with other agencies through the Development Review Committee, ensures that development of the county proceeds in an orderly fashion that reflects the overall General and Master Plan vision for the county, and is supported by all necessary infrastructure and amenities.

**Specific Objectives for FY 07**: a) Implement new process changes that will reduce the time required to conduct review of plans b) Reinstitute the position of record plat administrator to reduce backlog and improve quality and timeliness of plat review.

**Coordination and Linkages**:  
**Agencies/Div**: Membership on the DRC includes numerous State and County government agencies (SHA, DPWT, DPS, DEP, DHCA, HOC) plus public utilities (Pepco, WSSC, Washington Gas). In addition, staff reviews involve significant consultation with other divisions in the Planning Department.  
**Work Program Projects**: Continuous Improvement Initiatives, Revision of the Subdivision Regulations  
**Interest Groups**: Adjoining property owners and relevant citizens and homeowner associations, as well as special interest groups interested in issues such as historic preservation, the environment, and affordable housing are kept apprised of Site Plan reviews and are invited to participate in staff reviews and Board decisions.
## Project Plans

**Lead Division:** Development Review  
**Lead Staff:** M. Ma.  
**Work years allocated:** 3.6

### Project Description/Scope
This on-going work provides for staff review and Planning Board decisions on development in the CBD, RMX, and TOMX zones using the optional method of development. Project plans must ensure that the development will include the public facilities, amenities and other design features to create an environment that supports the greater densities and intensities permitted under the optional method. A project plan shows conceptual design of the proposed development, including natural features, buildings, public use areas, open space, parking, access, pedestrian pathways, streetscape, and other amenity features. Plans are processed through the inter-agency Development Review Committee (DRC), and staff recommendations are submitted to the Board for consideration. Plans are processed through the Inter-Agency Development Review Committee (DRC), and staff recommendations are submitted to the Board for consideration.

### Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board
Project plans are examined by staff for conformity with development regulations and public policy set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, Master Plans, the Forest Conservation Law, and other Planning Department guidelines.

### Project Benefits
Through the project plan review process, the optional method of development encourages more efficient use of land and requires public amenities, such as urban parks, plazas, and art works, for the general public to enjoy.

### Specific Objectives for FY 07
- a) Lessen the amount of time that elapses between the date of application to the time that the case is taken to the Board for a decision,
- b) Ensure all necessary development standards and phasing elements are established by the project plan to guide the future development,
- c) Promote peer review of project plan cases.

### Coordination and Linkages:
**Agencies/Div:** Membership on the DRC includes numerous State and County government agencies (SHA, DPWT, DPS, DEP, DHCA, HOC) plus public utilities (Pepco, WSSC, Washington Gas). In addition, staff reviews involve significant consultation with other divisions in the department.  
**Work Program Projects:** Continuous Improvement Initiatives and Guidelines for public amenity requirements.  
**Interest Groups:** Adjoining property owners and relevant citizens and homeowner associations, as well as special interest groups interested in issues such as historic preservation, the environment, and affordable housing are kept apprised of Site Plan reviews and are invited to participate in staff reviews and Board decisions.
Project Description/Scope: This on-going work provides for staff review and Planning Board decisions of land use plans showing all elements of certain proposed developments. Site Plan review is required in all floating zones, in Euclidian zones developed under the cluster, MPDU or TDR options, and in the CBD, RMX, and other specified zones when the Optional Method of Development is used. A site plan indicates natural features, such as topography, vegetation, flood plains, wetlands and waterways. Development details such as buildings, public spaces, vehicular circulation, parking areas, pathways, recreation/open space, landscaping and lighting are also shown. A development program identifies the phases of construction. Plans are processed through the inter-agency Development Review Committee (DRC), and staff recommendations are submitted to the Board for consideration. Significant time is also spent on the post-approval process, including the preparation of certified site plans and confirmation that approval conditions are being met before MNCPPC recommends to DPS that building permit(s) be released.

Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board: Site plans are examined by staff for conformity with public policy as set forth in Master Plans, the Zoning Ordinance, the Forest Conservation Law, Development Plans associated with Local Map Amendment approvals by the Council, Planning Board conditions established through Project and Preliminary Plan approvals, and other Planning Board policies.

Project Benefits: The site plan review process benefits the public because of the many protections and considerations of compatibility that it provides. Site plan review assures that a development meets the stated purposes and standards of a zone, provides for safe, adequate, and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and protects and preserves natural features, trees and adjacent properties through appropriate siting of structures, open space and landscaping.

Specific Objectives for FY 07: a) Lessen the amount of time that elapses between the date of application to the time that the case is taken to the Board for a decision, b) Ensure all necessary development standards have been set and are consistent with prior approvals, c) Increase the opportunity for peer review of more complex site plan cases in order to identify and resolve issues earlier in the review process. d) Reduce the length of time required to process post approval documents.

Coordination and Linkages:
Agencies/Div: Membership on the DRC includes numerous State and County government agencies (SHA, DPWT, DPS, DEP, DHCA, HOC) plus public utilities (Pepco, WSSC, Washington Gas). In addition, staff reviews involve significant consultation with other divisions in the department.
Work Program Projects: Continuous Improvement Initiatives, Landscaping and Lighting Manual
Interest Groups: Adjoining property owners and relevant citizens and homeowner associations, as well as special interest groups interested in issues such as historic preservation, the environment, and affordable housing are kept apprised of Site Plan reviews and are invited to participate in staff reviews and Board decisions.
Enforcement

Lead Div:  Development Review  
Lead Staff:  M. Ma  
Work years allocated: 2.1

Project Description/Scope:  Site plan inspections and enforcement of Planning Board conditions of approval are critical components of the post-approval process. Enforcement staff monitors and ensures compliance of all aspects of approved preliminary plans, site plans, and forest conservation plans, excluding public roads and storm water management facilities. Development sites are field checked at critical points throughout the construction process, from pre-construction meetings to final completion inspections. Enforcement staff investigates citizen complaints regarding site plan and forest conservation violations and enforces remedial actions.

Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:  Conformity with public policy is expressed in approved plans and conditions required by the Planning Board. Inspection and enforcement activity aims to ensure compliance with these conditions.

Project Benefits:  The enforcement function ensures orderly implementation of development proposal approved by the Planning Board. It also responds to citizen complaints regarding development activities and forest conservation violations to address community’s concerns.

Specific Objectives for FY 07: Pursuant to the MOU between the Department of Permitting Services (DPS) and M-NCPPC, DPS will be responsible for inspecting development sites to enforce the approved site plans in FY 07. The enforcement staff can devote more time to enforcement activities associated with Forest Conservation Plans and to investigation of citizen complaints. This change will allow enforcement staff to: 1) respond to citizen complaints in a timely manner; and 2) conduct pre-construction meetings with the developers in a timely manner, and 3) check the planting status of old forest conservation plans.

Coordination and Linkages:
Agencies/Div:  Coordinate inspection activities with DPS, DPWT, DEP, and SHA. Significant consultation with Environmental Planning and Park Planning staff.

Work Program Projects:  Continuous Improvement Initiatives, and Guidelines for forest conservation enforcement.

Interest Groups:  Adjoining property owners and relevant citizens and homeowner associations, as well as special interest groups interested in issues such as historic preservation and the environmental Protection.
### Historic Area Permits

**Lead Division:** Countywide Planning/Historic Preservation  
**Lead Staff:** G. Wright  
**Latest Edits:** 5/25/06  
**Work years allocated:** 4

| **Project Description/Scope:** | Provide staff support to the Montgomery County Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) by reviewing and processing Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) applications. HAWPs are required for any exterior alteration, demolition, or new construction within a designated historic district or involving an individually designated historic site. Historic Preservation Section staff pick up completed HAWP applications at DPS, carefully review the applications using Historic Preservation Ordinance criteria and district-specific guidelines, provide a written staff recommendation on each case to the HPC, present the cases at the HPC public meetings, process the applications after they have been acted on by the HPC, and assist in enforcement of the approved HAWPs as needed. |
| **Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:** | HAWPs are the key way in which the designated historic sites and districts in Montgomery County, which have been placed on the Master Plan for Historic Preservation by the County Council, are preserved and protected. This regulatory function is integral to the Historic Preservation Ordinance and is a major part of the Historic Preservation Commission’s work. |
| **Project Benefits:** | HAWPs provide for the preservation and protection of significant historic districts and sites in Montgomery County, while still allowing for compatible new changes that make these resources usable and viable. |
| **Specific Objectives for FY 07:** | Review and process all HAWP applications in a timely and efficient way, meeting the 45 day time limit for review of each application as called for in the Historic Preservation Ordinance. There are typically 200 HAWP applications per year. |

**Coordination and Linkages:**  
**Agencies/Div:** Community-based Planning, Development Review, Transportation Planning, Environmental Planning, DPS, DPWT, DHCA, County Attorney’s Office  
**Work Program Projects:** Historic Area Work Permits  
**Interest Groups:** Montgomery Preservation Inc., Historic Takoma, Kensington Historical Society, City of Takoma Park, Town of Kensington, Chevy Chase Village, Town of Garrett Park, multiple other community groups.
Housing Policy

Project Description/Scope: This project provides the research and analysis resources to support housing policy review and development. Analyzing County housing trends and issues helps the Department and Board advise the County Council on public actions that affect the County’s housing, especially affordable housing, and helps the Research & Technology Center advise fellow staff on the application of housing policies in master plans, proposed development projects, and proposed regulatory or policy changes.

Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board: The County has been a leader in implementing affordable housing policies for decades. In addition to the General Plan and individual master plans, the County adopted a housing policy, “A Place to Call Home,” in 2001. Housing policy, especially affordable housing policy, has been a high priority for the County Council and Planning Board. Both the Council and the Planning Board, through application of plans, laws and policies, regulate the construction of new housing.

Project Benefits: Up-to-date, objective and thorough analysis of housing data and trends provides public officials with the information needed for decision-making on housing-related issues.

Specific Objectives for FY 07: Staff will continue to support the Council’s consideration of workforce housing legislation and other housing-related issues in FY07. This project does not include routine collection of housing or land-use data, or the general monitoring of housing market conditions that is part of the core responsibilities of the Research & Technology Center.

Coordination and Linkages:
Other: Housing Opportunities Commission.
Growth Policy/Growth Audit

Lead Div: Research and Technology  
Lead Staff: K. Moritz  
Work years allocated: 5.6

**Project Description/Scope:** This project will conduct research to establish a body of knowledge about the amount, type, location and pace of development occurring in Montgomery County, compared with that suggested by the General Plan and more specifically guided by master plans and regulated by the zoning ordinance and adequate public facilities ordinance. The information gathered will directly support key questions in the Centers and Boulevards initiative, proposed changes to the zoning ordinance, and will set the stage for the Growth Policy discussions that will begin in the spring of 2007. This project also includes staff support for the County’s review of the Growth Policy through FY07.

**Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:** The Growth Policy implements the County’s adequate public facilities ordinance, which stages the development permitted by the General Plan and adopted master plans. Centers and Boulevards is a planning initiative aimed at developing the planning expertise, tools, and processes needed for a future where “growth,” when it occurs, will consist of infill and redevelopment rather than expansion. The major regulatory tool for implementing land use decisions is the zoning ordinance, which requires regular modification to meet changing realities and take advantage of new opportunities.

**Project Benefits:** Each plan, policy or regulatory change requires information and analysis. This goal of this project is to identify and conduct research that will serve as an information resource for upcoming discussions for changing the growth policy, zoning ordinance, master plan process, etc. This project will document expected growth in greater detail and inform how upcoming plans and policies might be changed to better welcome, accommodate, or divert that growth.

**Specific Objectives for FY 07:** The research will:
(a) review the amount, type, location and pace of development in the past and forecast for the future and compare to expectations in adopted plans and County polices; (b) compare the density and other attributes of development in the past 15 years in the County to what is permitted by the parcel’s zoning to allow us to better anticipate what will occur when a parcel is given a certain zone; (c) identify a representative sample of various types of completed development projects and compare to the expectations for the area as articulated in the master plan and General Plan. There is a major difference between what a project looks like on a plan and how it is experienced when it is built. This project will help planners and the Planning Board make decisions by examining the ground truth of the projects they approved (d) review the set of tools available to manage growth and its impact on nearby neighbors, the County and the region and identify which options merit further consideration; and (e) identify models for designing, locating, and/or improving public facilities in urban locations or other neighborhoods where space is limited.

**Coordination and Linkages**

**Agencies/Div:** Montgomery County Departments of Public Works and Transportation, Housing and Community Affairs,

**Work Program Projects:** Centers and Boulevards, Housing Policy, master plans, zoning-related programs.

**Interest Groups:** Many community groups are closely following growth-related issues.
Forest Resource and Conservation Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Division: Countywide Planning</th>
<th>Latest Edits: May 23, 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Staff: G. Wright</td>
<td>Work years allocated: 7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description/Scope:** Management and administration of the county Forest Conservation Law and Regulations. Implement forest related enforcement; detail violations; establish a county bank; prepare biennial reports for the state; review waiver and exemption requests; records management; liaison with state Department of Natural Resources forest program; manage forest conservation fund; establish and document fines and penalties; determine fee-in-lieu criteria; and related functions. Update the Department’s Tree Manual that guides development submissions.

**Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:** Implementation and enforcement of county law and regulation.

**Project Benefits:** Stewardship of county forest resources. Reduce loss of quality, existing forest stock. Provide forest mitigation and compensation for development activities. Establish a program for violations. Establish and administer a system of conservation easements.

**Specific Objectives for FY 07:** Update Tree Manual. Improve records management. Maintain and improve forest management program.

**Coordination and Linkages:** Development Review, Legal, CB Planning, R&T Agencies/Div: State Department of Natural Resources; County DEP; County DPS. Work Program Projects: Tree Manual; Preliminary Plans; Site Plans; Project Plans; Mandatory Referrals; Zoning and Special Exception Cases. Interest Groups: Natural Resource Groups; Citizen Activists; Environmental Groups
## Bikeways

**Lead Division:** County Wide Planning

**Lead Staff:** G.Wright/C.Kines

**Work years allocated:** .8

### Project Description/Scope:
Advocates, review and recommends, and supports implementation of master planned bikeways and trails, and related amenities like bike racks and lockers, as part of both: 1) review of private development proposals; and 2) review of state and local public transportation projects. Provides expertise and guidance on bicycle facility planning efforts, including providing support to Community Based Planning during Master and Sector Plan update as well as to the Department of Parks for park planning efforts. Supports Department of Parks with bicycle planning and facility design expertise as needed in their park planning and design efforts.

### Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:
A continuing priority of both the Council and Board is the encouragement of bicycle use as a commuter method and non-auto option for other trip. Bicycle and walking facilities is also a priority of Federal and State facility design and funds.

### Project Benefits:
1) Complements and enhances County’s transportation demand management activities; 2) Encourages Improves bicycle access and mobility to countywide and community destinations; 3) Improves bicycle safety along County roadways and trails.

### Specific Objectives for FY 07
Continue bikeway and trail implementation coordination with study review teams for state and local transportation projects; Participate in detailed review and analysis of major development projects; support master planning efforts; Support user counts for major county park trails; Create Beach Drive and Sligo Creek Parkway Bike Safety Campaign; Study bike safety at Capital Crescent Trail -Little Falls Parkway intersection; Examine other dangerous trail-road intersections in the county as requested.

### Coordination and Linkages:
DPTW; County Executive’s Office; Maryland Department of Transportation/State Highway Administration COG, DC Department of Transportation, Howard County DPZ, Frederick County Planning, M-NCPPC, Prince George’s County, Cities of Rockville, Gaithersburg and Takoma Park

**Agenies/Div:** Community Based Planning, Countywide Planning, Park Planning, Environmental Planning, Strategic Planning (Centers and Boulevards), Management Services

**Work Program Projects:** Metropolitan Branch Trail, Silver Spring Transit Center/bike station, Shady Grove Access Bike Path, Falls Road Bike Path, ICC Bike Path, MacArthur Boulevard Bikeway Improvements, Bethesda Bicycle and Pedestrian Project, Capital Crescent Trail/Little Falls Parkway intersection, Forest Glen Road bike path, Seven Locks Road bike path and sidewalk, BiCounty Transitway, Corridor Cities Transitway, Veirs Mill Road Bus Rapid Transit Project, Silver Spring Green Trail, North Bethesda Trolley Trail signage

**Interest Groups:** All bicycle advocacy groups in the region
Zoning Text Amendments (ZTAs)

**Lead Division:** Development Review  
**Lead Staff:** C. Gilbert  
**Work years allocated:** 3.9

**Project Description/Scope:** This on-going work involves the research, analysis, and preparation of both particular and comprehensive text amendments required by the County Council or Planning Board, or amendments identified by governmental agencies or Planning Department staff to address individual zoning or subdivision issues. Staff reviews each proposed amendment to determine its need and anticipated effect, and makes a recommendation to the Planning Board. The Planning Board, in turn, submits its recommendation to the County Council.

**Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:**

**Project Benefits:** Zoning Text Amendments (ZTAs) are often written to implement the policies set forth in a new or revised master or sector plan. In addition, ZTAs may allow developers to better respond to market conditions. ZTAs may also be implemented to restrict land use practices that are deemed undesirable or to achieve certain goals considered to be in the public interest.

**Specific Objectives for FY 07:** a) Work to ensure that all proposed ZTA’s are considered by the screening committee before introduction and b) Strive to keep the number of ZTA’s to a minimum, and 3) Improve the wording of ZTA’s to make interpretation easier.

**Coordination and Linkages:**

**Agencies/Div:** Community Based Planning is actively involved in the writing and review of text amendments that come about as a result of revisions to master plans. Input from legal helps to ensure the new language is clear and easy to interpret.

**Work Program Projects:**

**Interest Groups:** Citizens, civic associations and homeowner associations are often concerned with the impact of zoning text amendments and are encouraged to provide comments.
## Inventory of Religious Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Division:</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Planner:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work years allocated:</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Latest Edits: May 22, 2006

**Project Description/Scope:** This project would update the 1997 inventory of places of worship and other religious institutions; survey representatives of religious institutions about land use and related issues, with particular attention to the challenges facing churches with expansion plans; identify options for the siting of expanding or relocating religious institutions.

**Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board:** Religious institutions play a vital role in the daily lives of many County residents. They strengthen the County as places of worship and as community centers, offering a variety of services and meetings spaces to parishioners, neighbors, and community groups. The County’s land use planning responsibilities include ensuring that all land uses necessary to maintaining a high quality of life have an opportunity to continue to serve the County’s spiritual needs.

**Project Benefits:** The project will yield a solid base of information which decision-makers, including the Planning Board and County Council, can use in preparing master plans, reviewing amendments to the zoning ordinance, and evaluating other land use regulations that affect religious institutions.

**Specific Objectives for FY 07:**
- a) update of 1997 inventory of places of worship and religious institutions;
- b) survey of religious leaders about land use and related issues, particularly expansion;
- c) review local land use regulations affecting religious institutions, and
da) identify options/successful models for meeting the needs of expanding churches in urbanizing communities.

### Coordination and Linkages:

**Agencies/Div:** MNCPPC: Community-Based Planning, Countywide Planning, Research & Technology Center, Development Review Div.; Montgomery County Government: Department of Housing and Community Affairs, Department of Permitting Services, Department of Environmental Protection

**Work Program Projects:** Centers and Boulevards, Agricultural Initiatives.

**Interest Groups:** Religious institution leaders.

**Others:** Montgomery County Civic Federation
Private and Public Project Coordination

Lead Division: Community-Based Planning

Lead Staff: Team Leaders

Work years allocated: 7.2

Project Description/Scope:
This project is intended to address the coordination issues necessary to implement master plans prior to approval of regulatory cases.

Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board: This project implements the specific policies of the County Council as expressed in master plans, the CIP program, and other policies.

Project Benefits:
This project is intended to assist in the coordination of construction of public facilities – with private development and with other public facilities and in concert with adopted policies and plans. This project is also intended to implement the recommendations in master plans. The coordination often substantially reduces the cost and time to Montgomery County of providing for construction of roads, and dedication of sites for public facilities such as schools, recreation facilities and parks through the regulatory process. It is also intended to assist in developing Zoning text amendments necessary to implement master plans. This project includes the Department’s role in an interagency effort to improve coordination for planning public facilities that is being spearheaded by the Council’s MFP Committee.

Specific Objectives for FY 07: The following projects represent the major projects included in the coordination efforts: Input into regulatory cases to ensure the proper timing of public facilities and private development; Review needs for additional design guidelines and zoning text amendments for Sandy Spring Village Participation in the Ashton Charrette; Participation in the Task Force for Shady Grove, Damascus, Friendship Heights, and Woodmont Triangle areas; Olney Town Center implementation project; Silver Spring development coordination; North Bethesda TAP; Ongoing efforts to implement streetscape plans; Review and select strategies, including memoranda of understanding, to improve interagency coordination on the planning and implementation of public facilities. In concert with the Centers and Boulevards Phase II project, this effort provides opportunities to develop and apply new tools for planning and regulating infill and redevelopment.

Coordination and Linkages:

Agencies/Div: Countywide Planning, Research and Technology Center, DPWT, Recreation Department, DSPS

Work Program Projects:

Interest Groups: Residents, property owners, and business groups

Other: Federal and state governments
CIP Review

Lead Div: Community-Based Planning and Transportation

Lead Staff: All

Work years allocated: 3.3

Project Description/Scope:
Review and comment concerning the County Capital Improvement Program

Relationship of Project to Policies of Council or Planning Board: Implement the policies of the County Council expressed in master plans and other documents. Participate with the DPWT and the State in the preparation of priority transportation projects.

Project Benefits:
- Assist in the selection of projects to be included in the CIP
- Improve the coordination of public and private projects
- Coordinate with the regulatory planning process including review of Preliminary Plans

Specific Objectives for FY 07: This project is intended to improve coordination between public and private development and to accomplish the following:
- Foster the implementation of master plans in a timely manner
- Prepare a list of priority projects including roads to be included in the next CIP
- Provide comments on the projects already included in the recommended CIP
- Provide comments to the state concerning priority funding of transportation projects
- Review the status of recommendations for CIP projects in master plans
- Participate with Advisory Boards in the preparation of recommendations to the County Executive and County Council
- Reduce the costs of providing public infrastructure by improving the coordination of public and private development
- Provide input to the Research and Technology Division in monitoring development

Coordination and Linkages:
Agencies/Div: Countywide, Development Review, Research and Technology Divisions, DPWT, Recreation Department, DPS, State of Maryland

Work Program Projects: Staff reports and presentations to the Planning Board

Interest Groups: Residents, businesses and property owners

III
# Mandatory Referrals and Annexations

**Lead Div:** Community-Based Planning  
**Latest Edits:** May 30, 2006  
**Lead Staff:** All  
Estimated work years: 5.3

## Project Description/Scope:
This project is part of the regulatory planning efforts assigned to the Community-Based Planning Division. Mandatory Referrals provide the opportunity for the Planning Board and others to comment on federal, state and local projects. The review of annexations by the municipalities in Montgomery County also provides the opportunity for the Planning Board and others to comment.

## Relationship of Project to Policies of Council and Planning Board:
Mandatory Referrals and annexations provide the opportunity to coordinate the recommendations in master plans with public development.

## Project Benefits:
Provides a countywide perspective for the following:
- Supports the implementation of master plans
- Provides an opportunity for the community to comment on public facilities
- Provides an opportunity for the adjacent property owners to comment on compatibility features and the need for public facilities
- Offers the potential to coordinate between federal, state and local projects
- Assists in coordinating public and private development
- Assists in the implementation of County Council priorities
- Provides input into the Preliminary Plan process including reservation of land for future development by the public sector
- Provides the opportunity for the Planning Board to comment on annexations concerning master plan conformance

## Specific Objectives for FY 07:
Staff reports and Planning Board comment to all funding agencies

## Coordination and Linkages:
- **Agencies/Div:** Development Review, Research and Technology and Countywide Planning Divisions, DPWT, DHCA, MCPS, state and federal governments

## Work Program Projects:
- **Interest Groups:** Adjacent property owners
- **Other:** Land Owners, Businesses and Residential Communities
THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS
INTRODUCTION

At the direction of the Montgomery County Planning Board, the Department of Parks is currently being separated from the former Department of Park and Planning. We are preparing a new organization to focus on the operational aspects of managing approximately 400 large and small Montgomery County parks, as well as the natural, cultural, and recreational resources they contain.

During this changeover, we will continue to coordinate closely with the Planning Department, and many projects listed in the previous section include full participation by members of the Parks Department in all aspects of their development.

Furthermore, we have been directed by the County Council to come back in October 2006 with a review of parks issues. Therefore, while this June 2005 report emphasizes the Planning Department, we expect the October Semi-Annual Report will contain a strong focus on Parks.

In this section of the report, therefore, we are highlighting only a few parks items of major interest, as requested by Council staff, and we will expand or address other topics in October. Included in this report are updates regarding:

- The excellent progress the Central Maintenance Division is making with eliminating maintenance backlog
- The Enterprise Division;
- Transfer of the golf courses to the Revenue Authority;
- The new Soccerplex lease;
- Status of the Park Police Base Budget Review and County relationships;
- A summary of the Park Development Division Capital Improvement Program status;
- Volunteers and their contribution to overall maintenance of our parks.

As the newly-reconstituted Department of Parks gets up and running, a transition organization has begun several initiatives pending final organizational structure:

Begun more weekend scheduling of Park Managers in the parks during busy periods;
Reestablished "Parks Night" with the Planning Board once a month to review plans and policies;
Issued a biweekly director's report which is available to the community on the Internet;
Starting to refocus on a number of priority issues identified by the public, the Board, and our own staff (such as ballfields, publications, housing, and many more.)

III
We are pleased to report to the County Council the excellent progress we have made in addressing and reducing the Park maintenance backlog.

For fiscal year 2006, the Planning Board and the County Council made infrastructure, repairs and maintenance a top priority and added $268,900 to Central Maintenance’s operating budget to decrease the backlog of work orders and major maintenance projects. They also approved $150,000 for a Condition Assessment Study of Park Facilities and $100,000 for a Functional Plan of the Parks Recreation Buildings.

The purpose of these studies is to provide recommendations on necessary preventive maintenance, the needed repairs and remodeling work, and a schedule of needed capital improvements.

The Planning Board made investment in infrastructure its number one priority in parks to address the increasing deterioration of park infrastructure and increasing costs of maintaining parks. The Planning Board also believed that performance measures should be refined. The County Council concurred with the Planning Board’s priorities.

The Council’s Management and Fiscal Policy subcommittee asked for a study of the infrastructure of all facilities managed by each county agency. It requested information on the current condition of the facilities’ infrastructure through standardized assessment reports to detail repairs needed to bring the infrastructure back to an acceptable level.

Since receiving the additional appropriations from the County Council, the Central Maintenance Division has been working diligently to dramatically reduce the backlog in maintenance and work requests. Prior to fiscal year 2006, the division was recording very high levels of work that needed to be completed. The division has reduced the backlog to a more acceptable level based on the fiscal year 2006 operating budget increase.

Focusing on reducing the maintenance backlog was important to:

1) Stop the deterioration of park facilities due to excessive demands;
2) Establish Preventive Maintenance Standards and
3) Establish a life-cycle replacement program;
4) Provide qualitative and quantitative information related to the cost of maintaining facilities.

To improve services, Central Maintenance has changed its methodology of preventive maintenance by changing the intervals in which vehicles are inspected from every six months/5,000 miles to one year /5,000 miles. There is no need to perform inspections every six months on vehicles that accumulate low mileage. We are now including off-road vehicles as well as on-road vehicles in the Preventive Maintenance Program.

In fiscal year 2007, our goal is to maintain the backlog in trades to below five percent; hold the service work requests backlog to no more than 10 percent and perform a Condition Assessment Study to establish the work program for fiscal year 2008.
The Central Maintenance Division reports the following progress:

### Fiscal Year 2006 (nine months)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trades Preventive Maintenance Work Requests**</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Requests Scheduled</td>
<td>Work Requests Scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Requests Completed</td>
<td>Work Requests Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Requests Backlog</td>
<td>Work Requests Backlog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog Percentage</td>
<td>Backlog Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trades Preventive Maintenance Work Requests**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Requests Received</td>
<td>2569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Requests Completed</td>
<td>2315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Requests Backlog</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog Percentage</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Major Maintenance Projects

| Number of Projects as of 10/06 | 178 |
| Number of projects completed/scheduled | 166 |
| Current backlog                | 12  |

** Fleet (Preventive Maintenance)

| Work Requests Scheduled | 1771 |
| Work Requests Completed  | 1471 |
| Estimated Work Requests Backlog | 300 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Requests Received</td>
<td>5402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Requests completed</td>
<td>4233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Requests Backlog</td>
<td>1169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog percentage:</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior 3-year backlog average</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Prior to SmartParks, all maintenance work requests were lumped together. SmartParks permits breaking out preventive maintenance from other work requests.
ENTERPRISE DIVISION STRATEGIC PLANNING

With the exception of ballfields, the Enterprise Division includes many of the active recreation functions in the park system that charge fees for participation. The division provides great affordable active recreation for everyone; maintains a fiscally viable Enterprise Division and Fund; provides for the ongoing maintenance and stewardship of the built resources.

The Enterprise Fund facilities meet the critical goal of providing great recreation opportunities at affordable prices. The Enterprise Fund was established to receive the income from these facilities and pay the operating, maintenance, and capital costs of the facilities.

Since the reestablishment of the Enterprise Division in July of 2004, the Department has been evaluating the performance of the Enterprise Fund and identifying strategic initiatives to meet the goals of the division.

Those initiatives include:
1) Establishing a marketing program;
2) Identifying, and establishing a plan and funding strategy to address Enterprise Fund capital improvement needs;
3) Increasing efforts to improve customer service skills for all staff;
4) Re-examining the Enterprise Fund model as it has been applied;
5) Transferring the operational and management control of the golf courses to the Montgomery County Revenue Authority.

Continued efforts are needed to improve the financial reporting, forecasting, and analysis. Additional initiatives that build on the marketing plan that has been implemented are also a key part of the work program.

While the park system needs to ensure that the financial underpinning is solid, there are strategic issues that must be addressed in the near future. Very positive indicators show that marketing is increasing attendance and new programs are being well received. Marketing efforts alone on the two ice rinks have achieved an outstanding $700,000 plus (21%) increase over the past 10 months when compared with the same time frame in FY 05. Challenges still face the programs, however. The key challenge is how to maintain and improve the facilities and offerings.

Improving the financial viability of the Enterprise Fund will help ensure that the Department of Parks continues to deliver high quality active recreation to the community.

In fiscal year 2007, the Enterprise Division will enhance marketing plan, efforts and results; improved financial forecasting; increased attendance at facilities; compilation of deferred maintenance projects and costs and development of capital improvements plan.
Over the next several years, the Park Development Division along with the Office of the General Counsel will collaborate with a development partner to plan, design, and construct: a mixed-use development that includes workforce housing, public and neighborhood open spaces, and a new headquarters for the Montgomery side of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

While this is certainly a work program item that benefits both departments, the Park Development Division is taking the lead role because staff in our Department of Planning will have responsibility for reviewing the plans and ensuring appropriate compliance with land use regulations. Moving the project from the Planning Department to the Parks Department helps ensure there is no conflict of interest during the regulatory review process.

The development will be constructed on the Commission’s existing 3.24-acre site in downtown Silver Spring. When completed, the project will be model of how to create affordable/workforce housing in a thriving downtown area. We will advocate for building to the highest possible environmentally friendly “green building” standards.

In addition to affordable/workforce housing, county residents will be get a new, state-of-the-art exemplary facility that incorporates the most current technology to advance civic and business involvement and knowledge of parks and planning activities.

We have established the following timeline:

July 2006-October, 2006: 1) development of RFP evaluation criteria and preparation of detailed RFP process; 2) finalizing Scope of Services and contract to prepare detailed Program of Requirements for the Headquarter Facility, 3) provide RFP administrative support for the Development Partner selection process including public meetings; 4) participate on the RFP Selection Team; 5) prepare and present an Evaluation Report of the three proposals; and 6) select the Development Team.

October 2006-June 2007: 1) prepare of Pre-Formation Agreements, Development Service Agreements, and General Development Agreements; 2) prepare the Master Development Plan for the 8787 Georgia Avenue Mixed-Use site and/or an alternate site in the Silver Spring CBD; and ensure public and private funds are available to prepare Schematic Design for the headquarters facility.
TRANSFER OF GOLF OPERATIONS TO REVENUE AUTHORITY

The Enterprise Fund has experienced financial difficulty in recent years due to debt service costs, increasing expenditures, and operating declines in several facility operations. Analysis of golf operations identified flat demand, increased competition, debt service on existing capital expenditures and no capacity to undertake additional major maintenance and projects to improve the competitive position of the courses.

At the request of the County Council, the Planning Board began exploring the possibility of transferring golf operations to the Montgomery County Revenue Authority. The operations of the Revenue Authority’s golf courses were evaluated, and shown to have a much stronger operation and the ability to reinvest in the five courses that they operate while attracting a growing percentage of the golfing public.

As a result, the Planning Board made a determination to pursue a transfer of the golf operations to the Revenue Authority with the following major goals:

1) A successful single government golf operation
2) Continued access for First Tee, Schools, and low-income communities
3) Ownership of courses remains with M-NCPPC
4) Stop net cash flow losses
5) Master Plan for improvements
6) Maintain ability to manage parks and operations around courses
7) A fair revenue stream based on value of assets
8) Operations transfer “as is”

The goal of the transfer of golf operations was to establish a consistent high quality golf experience for the golfing public with a minimized risk that the taxpayers of Montgomery County will have to subsidize the operation or the capital investment in the courses.

An operating agreement was negotiated which met the above goals, and the Revenue Authority began operation of the courses on April 15, 2006 under a one season operating agreement. Currently, a long-term lease is being drafted which will incorporate the business terms agreed to in the operating agreement. The Planning Board and the County Council will review the lease in the fall of 2006. The public will have an opportunity to comment on the lease at both hearings.

The Enterprise Fund established within the Parks is, by policy, a self sustaining fund. The fund is required to generate revenues to sustain operations and capital expenditures for all of the facilities designated as Enterprise operations. This action is consistent with the Policy of providing high quality affordable services to the community as efficiently as possible.
Changes in the SoccerPlex lease between M-NCPPC and the Maryland Soccer Foundation (MSF) were proposed to create more capacity for games through expansion of facilities as envisioned in the original lease. The MSF was interested in incorporating artificial turf and lighting on new fields, changing the requirements for resting fields and altering times of operation. The Planning Board has proposed changes that strengthen the reporting and oversight provisions of the lease.

The purpose of the lease is to develop and maintain a premier facility to meet the needs of the Montgomery County and the Maryland soccer communities; to provide quality soccer fields that are accessible and affordable to the public, while assuring the financial viability of the facility. The new lease will help strengthen MSF; provide more game opportunities; increase oversight by the Planning Board; and improve information flow.

The substantive changes in the lease are in the following areas:

1) **Governance.** M-NCPPC will have a voting member of the MSF governing board.

2) **Allocation of games.** Allocation criteria are enumerated in the lease and the Board will review and approve the guidelines established by MSF to implement the criteria.

3) **Hours of operation.** The hours of operation for the fields has been expanded to begin at 7 a.m. and end at 11 p.m. subject to the impact on the surrounding community.

4) **Reserve Funds.** Reserve requirements were expanded to include Capital in the amount of $450,000, and Turf Replacement, and Operating reserves in amounts deemed sufficient by MSF.

5) **Costs.** The Board will review the fees, but will not approve them. The Board is able, should they so determine, to seek funds to lower the fees.

6) **Traffic and Parking Management Plan.** All tenants or other primary users of the Park, including the MSF and the Commission will enter into a Traffic and Parking Management Plan for the coordination of events and activities in the Park so that such use stays within the approved traffic standards.

7) **Additional Improvements to SoccerPlex.** MSF can use the proceeds from revenues earned at the SoccerPlex to construct additional improvements subject to and in accordance with County approval and permitting processes.

8) **Construction of Phase 2 Improvements.** All conditions precedent to the right of the MSF to commence Phase II construction have been met, except the amendment to public funding to shift responsibility to the Commission to relocate the Baseball Field C (which will be set off against Phase 3 infrastructure funding) and appropriation by the County Council.

9) **Park Maintenance Facility.** MSF shall have the right to use space in the Park Maintenance Facility without charge except for its proportionate share of the electricity.
10) **MSF Reporting to Commission.** In addition to standard financial reporting to the Commission, such as audited financial statements and operating projections, each year, MSF shall make a presentation to the Planning board of its operation of the SoccerPlex during the preceding calendar year.

11) **Default by Foundation.** Default provisions were expanded to include tightened requirements on MSF to meet the needs of the Montgomery County and the Maryland soccer communities by providing quality soccer fields that are accessible at reasonable fees to the public.

In fiscal year 2007, the following actions related to SoccerPlex will be undertaken:

- Review lease draft by the Montgomery County Council.
- First formal update to Planning Board under this lease conducted.
- Planning Board approval of the Allocation Guidelines.
- Review process (community meeting, public work session) conducted for lighting and artificial turf on new fields resulting in staff recommendation to Planning Board.
- Phase II PDF finalized and amendment to the CIP submitted to the Planning Board and if approved, to the County Council.

ⅢⅢⅢ
The goal of the Park Development Division is the acquisition of the parkland and the design, construction, and major renovation of park improvements through the preparation and implementation of the Parks Capital Improvements Program.

The Park Development Division is presently managing over 200 active projects. Accomplishments during the reporting period are grouped by stage of development, from completed projects to projects just beginning.

**COMPLETED PROJECTS:**

- Playground renovations at Upper Long Branch SVU, Aberdeen LP, Chase Avenue LP, Flower Avenue LP, Kemp Mill UP, Potomac Community Center, Takoma UP
- Structural Stabilization of Woodlawn Barn
- Equestrian Trails and Parking Lot at Woodstock Special Park
- Retrofit of Two Stormwater Management Ponds in Muddy Branch SVU#3
- Stabilization of Joseph White House at Rickman Farm Horse Park
- Jesup Blair LP Renovation
- Montgomery Village LP – Construction of New Park
- Meadowbrook Maintenance Yard Covered Storage Bins
- Tennis Court Renovations: Dewey LP, English Manor NP, Georgian Forest LP, Maplewood-Alta Vista LP, Redland LP, Ayrlawn LP, Longwood LP, North Gate LP, Good Hope LP, Beverly Farms LP, Darnestown LP, Fountain Hills LP, and Evans Parkway NP
- Kings Local Park – Construction of New Park Facilities

**CURRENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION:**

- Minor New Construction at Rock Creek Hills LP, Highland Stone LP, and Aberdeen LP
- National Capital Trolley Museum Sitework and Car Barn
- Ovid Hazen Wells Recreational Park – Construction of New Facilities
- Wheaton Regional Park - Shorefield Entrance Circulation Improvements
- Hoyles Mill Local Park – Construction of New Park
- Concord LP Renovation
- Olney Manor Skate Park
- Sligo Creek/Wayne Avenue Retaining Wall Replacement
- Winding Creek LP Reconstruction
- Becca Lilly NP Pedestrian Bridge Replacement
- Olney Maintenance Yard Stormwater Management Improvements
- Gunners Branch Trail and Pedestrian Bridge
DESIGN OR PERMITTING PHASE:

- Playground Renovations (6 local parks)
- Matthew Henson Trail
- Broad Acres LP Renovation
- Rock Creek Trail Pedestrian Bridge Replacement at Susanna Lane
- Rickman Horse Farm Park Parking Lot and Riding Ring
- Rock Creek Pedestrian Bridge over Veirs Mill Road
- East Norbeck LP Renovation
- Brookside Gardens Irrigation Upgrades
- Black Hill Trail Extension
- Structural Stabilization of Woodlawn Barn
- Pope Farm Nursery Utilities Upgrade
- Adventure Playground at Wheaton Regional Park
- Stormwater Management Retrofit at Hunters Woods LP and University Boulevard/Kemp Mill pond
- Lake Needwood Golf Course Irrigation System Replacement
- Sligo Creek Trail Renovations and Signage
- MRO Headquarters Short Term Renovations
- Norwood Recreation Center Roof Replacement

FACILITY PLANNING STUDIES UNDERWAY:

- Rock Creek Regional Park Water and Sewer System Rehabilitation
- Evans Parkway Neighborhood Park (NP) Renovation
- Magruder Branch SVU#2 Trail – Construction of New Trail
- Trail Connector Analysis
- Synthetic Turf Site Selection Study
- Darnestown Square Urban Park (UP) – Construction of New Park
- Brookside Gardens Master Plan Implementation – Initial Phases
- Wheaton Tennis Facility Improvements

FACILITY PLANNING STUDIES COMPLETED:

- North Four Corners Local Park (LP) Expansion and Renovation
- Greenbriar LP – Construction of New Park
Open space, parks and recreation are a cornerstone to the quality of life of Montgomery County residents.

The Parks Capital Improvements Program (CIP) funds parkland acquisition, park renovations, infrastructure maintenance, environmental stewardship projects, and construction of new park facilities.

The Parks CIP is driven by Council priorities such as environmental protection including preservation of the agricultural reserve, community revitalization, economic development, and education. The Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan, area master plans, park master plans and functional plans, and community input all drive the content of the Parks CIP.

The Park Development Division (PDD) worked on implementation of approved fiscal year 2006 projects during the reporting period, while also supporting the Council’s review and approval of the FY 2007 – 2012 CIP.

Throughout FY 2006, PDD particularly focused on implementation of infrastructure maintenance projects supported by significantly increased funding levels provided by the Council. The Division also provided project management services for several high profile public/private partnerships including Woodstock Equestrian Park and Rickman Horse Farm Park.

In fiscal year 2007, PDD will continue to focus on CIP implementation, particularly infrastructure maintenance. Major projects ahead include the renovation of the Wheaton Tennis Bubble, renovation of Winding Creek Local Park, the beginning of construction of the Mathew Henson Trail, the opening of the Olney Manor Skate Park and the completion of Ovid Hazen Wells Recreational Park.
The goal of the Volunteer Services Office (VSO) is to increase and improve the capabilities of paid staff through the effective utilization of community volunteers.

VSO provides a central coordinating point for effective volunteer management throughout the Department of Parks. It also provides technical assistance by: staff development in volunteer management skills; development of volunteer jobs and events; volunteer recruitment, screening, training and recognition. The office collects and manages data regarding volunteer contributions and provides data to staff and management.

In fiscal year 2006, we estimate that we will receive from our volunteers the equivalent of 24.04 work years at a value of $877,500. In fiscal year 2007, our target number of work years equivalents from volunteers is 25, with a value of $912,600.

We estimate that the annual rate of return of long-term volunteers (those who are actively participating for one or more years) is a net $519,791 (From: Proposed FY ‘07 budget, page 256).

Major Programs

**Weed Warriors:** Natural Resources staff is holding monthly trainings April through October 2006 accommodating up to 25 prospects, and most classes are filled. Natural Resources staff has added fieldwork days to augment the initial training. There were over 1,000 hours contributed by Weed Warriors for the first half of FY 06. To acknowledge the work of all these volunteers, an annual volunteer recognition program has been instituted. The Weed Warrior training program is currently being re-developed to include E-Learning (See below).

**Trails:** We have a new Trails Volunteer Coordinator, who is responsible for the development of an inspection and maintenance program throughout the park system. Three pilot trails have been identified, and groups are actively working on projects. A trail assessment form is being developed that will aid in the ongoing inspection of trails and the creation of a project needs work program. Trail construction volunteers continue to work with staff of Park Planning and Resource Analysis in the construction of new trails in CIP budget.

**E-Learning:** The Volunteer Services Office received funding in FY 05 and FY 06 to develop volunteers training programs to be delivered over the Internet. This E-Learning initiative has resulted in the development of training programs for Brookside Garden’s Butterfly Exhibit and Oakley Cabin Docent volunteers. Additional courses are under development for Weed Warrior and Nature Center Volunteers.
The recent Park Police Base Budget Review in the Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) Report released April 18, 2006 affirmed that the 32,950-acre park system is an extremely safe place for families to visit and enjoy. However, there are always ways to improve, and Park Police has already begun to address some of the issues raised in the OLO Report:

**Increased Patrol Coverage:** In response to this issue, Park Police has redeployed officers totaling 2.9 work years from the Special Services, and Accreditation and Professional Standards Units Patrol to meet the goal to provide coverage for all seven-patrol beats. OLO staff has met with Park Police to begin analyzing the effect of the additional 2.9 work years. We have developed a schedule to address the seasonal needs for patrolling the park system as has been identified; and discussion with the Fraternal Order of Police is pending. We have also increased the shift overlap to ensure adequate coverage when an officer is on sick leave.

**Park Check Definition:** Park Police has further defined and identified the minimum characteristic of a park check. We have determined that the minimum characteristics of a park check must be broad since the type of park, facility, and activity dictates how a park is patrolled. Once finalized, this definition will be included in the Divisional Directive governing duties and responsibilities.

**MOU with Montgomery County Department of Police (MCP):** The MOU is scheduled for a Public Safety Committee work session and the agencies continue to work to resolve the remaining issues.

**CAD and 911:** Park Police and MCP have begun designating formerly omitted park property in the MCP Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system. This has already resulted in an increase in the number of calls for park-related issues forwarded to the Park Police.

The benefit of focusing our attention to the issues in the OLO Report is to support the Council’s and Planning Board’s priority for providing the highest degree of safety in our parks in the most efficient manner, and providing effective coordination between Park Police and Montgomery County Police.

Our Park Police are committed in fiscal year 2007 and beyond to promoting continued safety and protection throughout the park system in the most resourceful manner through its ongoing work to address the OLO Report recommendations.
The Carry-In, Carry-Out Program that removed trashcans from the parks was a key recommendation of the 2003 Montgomery County Intensive Budget Review and was part of a larger program to improve the efficiency of the Department’s management of solid waste.

The results were mixed and because of the large number of citizen complaints, the County Council rescinded the program in the spring of 2005, and trashcans were strategically replaced throughout the park system by September 30, 2005.

Although trashcans were supposed to be returned to all but neighborhood or conservation type parks, many of the communities in the lower part of the county have requested the cans be returned to locations, including neighborhood parks, where they were prior to CICO.

Although fewer cans were reinstalled, only minimal efficiencies were gained because routes were not shortened and trucks still had to go to park locations to collect trash. Trashcans have been strategically placed throughout the parks, consolidated closer to the parking lots, in order to empty them in the most efficient manner. The greater benefit has been through the use of onsite roll off trash receptacles and savings realized with fewer smaller trucks not going to the transfer station, and in not having to pay tipping fees, which are included in the onsite collection part of leasing dumpsters.

Since the trashcans were replaced, fewer complaints have been received, but complaints are still received on trash in the more heavily used parks.

Our current objective for fiscal year 2007 is to monitor and adjust the placement of trashcans to insure efficient of collection, while fulfilling the need to keep the parks clean and safe.
APPE N D I X