



Approved and Adopted March 2018

ENERGIZED PUBLIC SPACES FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN

for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas



ABSTRACT

Title *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas*

Author The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), Department of Parks, Park Planning and Stewardship Division - MontgomeryParks.org

Date March 30, 2018

Agency M-NCPPC, Department of Parks, Montgomery County, MD

Source of Copies Website - ParkPlanning.org
Hard copies
The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20910

Number of Pages 94 including covers

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission is a bi-county agency created by the General Assembly of Maryland in 1927. The Commission's geographic authority extends to the great majority of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties; the Maryland-Washington Regional District (M-NCPPC planning jurisdiction) comprises 1,001 square miles, while the Metropolitan District (parks) comprises 919 square miles in the two counties.

The Commission is charged with preparing, adopting, and amending or extending *The General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors)* for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties. The Commission operates in each county through Planning Boards appointed by the county government. The Boards are responsible for preparing all local plans, zoning amendments, subdivision regulations, and administration of parks.

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission encourages the involvement and participation of all individuals in the community, including those with disabilities, in the planning and review processes. In accordance with the requirements of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) will not discriminate against individuals with disabilities on the basis of disability in its services, programs or activities. M-NCPPC works to make its facilities and materials accessible and to hold public meetings in locations that are, likewise, accessible. M-NCPPC will generally provide, upon request, appropriate aids and services and make reasonable modifications to policies and programs for persons with disabilities (e.g. large print materials, listening devices, sign language interpretation, etc.). For assistance with such requests, please contact the M-NCPPC Montgomery County Commissioner's Office, at least a week in advance, at (301) 495-4605 or at mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org. Maryland residents can also use the free Maryland Relay Service for assistance with calls to or from hearing or speech impaired persons; for information, go to www.mdrelay.org or call (866) 269-9006. Residents may also call the TTY number, (301) 495-1331, for assistance.



092600001

ENERGIZED PUBLIC SPACES FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN

for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas

Approved and Adopted March 2018

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Department of Parks, Montgomery County

Prepared by the M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks, Park Planning & Stewardship Division, Park and Trail Planning Section

CERTIFICATION OF APPROVAL AND ADOPTION

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas

This Comprehensive Amendment to all area master and sector plans countywide previously approved as of the date of the final adoption of this Plan, as amended; all functional master plans approved as of the date of the final adoption of this Plan, as amended; being also an amendment to the General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as amended; has been approved by the Montgomery County Council, sitting as the District Council, by Resolution Number 18-1036 on February 13, 2018, including amendment of the 2017 Montgomery County Planning Board Recreation Guidelines for Private Residential Development; and has been adopted by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission by Resolution Number 18-06 on March 30, 2018, after duly advertised public hearings pursuant to the Land Use Article – Division II, of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION



Casey Anderson
Chair



Elizabeth M. Hewlett
Vice-Chair



Joseph Zimmerman
Secretary-Treasurer



M-NCPPC No. 18-06

MCPB No. 18-020

RESOLUTION


WHEREAS, under the Maryland Land Use Article, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission is authorized to make, adopt, amend, extend and add to the *General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District Within Montgomery and Prince George's Counties*; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, under the procedures set forth in the Montgomery County Code, Chapter 33A, held a duly advertised public hearing on Thursday, July 27, 2017, on the Public Hearing Draft *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas*, being also an amendment to the *General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland Washington Regional District in Montgomery County and Prince George's Counties*, as amended; all area master and sector plans countywide previously approved as of the date of the final adoption of this Plan, to the extent that this Plan's methodology will designate additional sites that may be considered for park acquisition and facility renovation or redevelopment; all functional master plans approved as of the date of the final adoption of this Plan; and the 2017 *Montgomery County Planning Board Recreation Guidelines for Private Residential Development*; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board, after said public hearing and due deliberation and consideration, on September 18, 2017, approved the Planning Board Draft *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas*, recommended that it be approved by the District Council, and on October 2, 2017, forwarded it the County Executive for recommendations and analysis; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Executive reviewed and made recommendations on the Planning Board Draft *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas* and forwarded those recommendations and analysis to the District Council, and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Council, sitting as the District Council for the portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District lying within Montgomery County, held

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY


M-NCPPC LEGAL DEPARTMENT

a public hearing on January 16, 2018, wherein testimony was received concerning the Planning Board Draft *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas*; and

WHEREAS, the District Council, on February 13, 2018, approved the Planning Board Draft *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas* subject to the modifications and revisions set forth in County Council Resolution No. 18-1036; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board, on March 8, 2018, recommended that The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopt the *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas* as approved by the District Council.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that in accordance with Section 21-103 of the Maryland Land Use Article, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission does hereby adopt said *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas*, together with the *General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland Washington Regional District in Montgomery County and Prince George's Counties*, as amended; all area master and sector plans countywide previously approved as of the date of the final adoption of this Plan, as amended; all functional master plans approved as of the date of the final adoption of this Plan, as amended; and as approved by the District Council in the attached Resolution No. 18-1036, including amendment of the 2017 *Montgomery County Planning Board Recreation Guidelines for Private Residential Development*; and

BE IF FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of said Amendment must be certified by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and filed with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of each of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as required by law.

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Montgomery County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on motion of Commissioner Fani-González, seconded by Commissioner Cichy, with Chair Anderson, Vice Chair Dreyfuss, and Commissioners Fani-González, Cichy, and Patterson present and voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, March 8, 2018, in Silver Spring, Maryland.



Casey Anderson, Chair
Montgomery County Planning Board

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Montgomery County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on motion of Commissioner Fani-González, seconded by Commissioner Cichy, with Chair Anderson, Vice Chair Dreyfuss, and Commissioners Fani-González, Cichy, and Patterson present and voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, March 8, 2018, in Silver Spring, Maryland.



Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan



*Photos: Clockwise from top left - Downtown Silver Spring Spray Ground, reading a book on the lawn, lunch with a friend, making friends at the dog park.
Source: M-NCPPC.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Executive Summary			
Why? The Need for This Plan	1		
Vision	3		
Purpose and Scope	3		
Where? The EPS Study Area	4		
How? Methodology and New Tools	6		
Methodology Summary	6		
New Data Gathering and Analysis Tools	7		
What? Results	11		
What's Next? Implementation	12		
Application of Methodology to Pilot Area	13		
Chapter 2: Policy Overview			
National and Global Perspective	15		
Urban Parks as Economic Incubators	15		
Draw of Urban Neighborhoods	16		
County Perspective	17		
The Park System's Response to Societal Changes	17		
Today's Challenges	18		
Public Purpose	21		
Montgomery Parks Mission, Vision and Values	21		
Social Equity	21		
Alignment with Montgomery Parks Values	22		
Relationship to Master and Sector Plans	24		
Policy Framework	25		
Park Planning Policy	25		
Expanded Classification System for Urban Parks	26		
Implementing a Hierarchy of Park Types	26		
Chapter 3: Methodology			
The EPS Study Area	31		
Higher-Intensity Mixed Use: Commercial and Residential	32		
Higher Density Residential	32		
		Analyze Supply and Demand	32
		Collect Data	32
		Analyze Data: Identify Level of Service	41
		Analyze Data: Identify Opportunity Sites	44
		Chapter 4: Results	
		Organize by Strategies	49
		Activate	49
		Connect	50
		Renovate and Repurpose	50
		Develop	51
		Create	51
		Implementation Tools	51
		Screen for Feasibility	52
		Prioritize by Social Equity	53
		Chapter 5: Implementation	
		Apply Methodology to the EPS Study Area	55
		Prioritize Locations to Study Next	55
		Find Low Levels of Service and Potential Opportunities	55
		Planning Board Approval of Recommendations	56
		Update Quantitative and Qualitative Methodologies	56
		Prioritize Areas for Implementation Efforts	56
		Implement Recommendations	57
		Activate	57
		Connect	57
		Renovate and Repurpose	58
		Develop	58
		Create	58
		Implementation Tools	59
		Provide Funding Resources	59
		Proposed CIP Funding	59
		Alternate Funding Strategies	60

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan

Align Operations, Maintenance, and Policing 60

- Develop Urban Park Standards for Operations, Maintenance and Policing 60
- Create Necessary Support Infrastructure 61
- Add Staff and Operating Resources 62

Assess Progress 62

Appendix

Application to Pilot Area: Silver Spring CBD A - 1

- Pilot Area Selection A - 2
- Collect Data A - 2
- Analyze Data: Identify Level of Service A - 9
- Analyze Data: Identify Opportunity Sites A - 11
- Pilot Area Results A - 14
- Pilot Area Implementation A - 19

Acknowledgements

FIGURES

Figure 1 - Summary the of EPS Study Area Residents Compared to Non-EPS Study Area Residents.	4
Figure 2 - Map of the Energized Public Spaces Study Area and Pilot Area.	5
Figure 3 - The EPS Plan Methodology Process.	6
Figure 4 - Outdoor Experiences Classification: Active, Contemplative and Social Gathering.	8
Figure 5 - Sample 10-minute Walkshed and Supply of Facilities	8
Figure 6 - Supply Analysis: Walkable Access to Experiences.....	10
Figure 7 - Sample Supply and Demand Analysis with resulting Lower Level of Service Map.	10
Figure 8 - Opportunity Sites for Increasing Level of Service for Parks and Open Space, Pilot Area.	13
Figure 9 - Matrix of Opportunities Summary Map, Silver Spring Pilot Area.	14
Figure 10 - Montgomery Parks Timeline: 1930-2010s.....	17
Figure 11 - Historical Development Patterns in the CBDs.....	18
Figure 12 - Norfolk Avenue Shared Street Concept, Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan.....	19
Figure 13 - Proposed Woodside Urban Park Facility Plan, Silver Spring, MD.	20
Figure 14 - Proposed Stormwater Management Strategies for Woodside Urban Park.	20
Figure 15 - Relationship of the EPS Plan to Other Existing Plans.	25
Figure 16 - 2017 Park Recreation and Opens Space (PROS) Plan, Figure 7 - New Park Classification System.....	29
Figure 17 - Map of the Energized Public Spaces Study Area and Pilot Area (for reference only; identical to Figure 2).....	30
Figure 18 - Typical Development Patterns for Higher Intensity Mixed-use and Higher Density Residential Areas.	32
Figure 19 - Examples of Public Spaces in Different Ownership.....	34
Figure 20 - Outdoor Experiences Classification.....	35
Figure 21 - Sample Evaluation of Experiences Provided by a Park Facility – Playground.....	36
Figure 22 - Criteria for Each Experience Type	37
Figure 23 - Supply Scoring Illustration for Selected Park Facilities	37
Figure 24 - Sample 10-minute Walkshed and Supply of Facilities	39
Figure 25 - Sample Demand Score Calculation.	40
Figure 26 - Level of Service Methodology Concept Diagram.....	41
Figure 27 - Sample Relationship between Supply and Demand Scores.....	42
Figure 28 - Sample Supply and Demand Analysis with Resulting Lower Level of Services Mapping.	43
Figure 29 - Sample Parks and Open Space Hierarchy, Bethesda Downtown Plan Design Guidelines, July 2017	44
Figure 30 - Pilot Area with Existing Parks and Public Spaces.	A-3

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan

Figure 31 - Active Experiences Supply Location Map, Pilot Area.....	A -4
Figure 32 - Contemplative Experiences Supply Location Map, Pilot Area.....	A -5
Figure 33 - Social Gathering Experiences Supply Location Map, Pilot Area.....	A -6
Figure 34 - Comparison of Facilities Location Mapping, Pilot Area.....	A -7
Figure 35 - Total Supply Score Map, Pilot Area.....	A -8
Figure 36 - Total Demand Score Map, Pilot Area.....	A -9
Figure 37 - Low Level of Service Areas Map, Pilot Area.....	A -10
Figure 38 - Opportunity Sites for Increasing Level of Service for Parks and Open Space Map, Pilot Area.....	A -13
Figure 39 - Matrix of Opportunities to Increase Parks and Open Space Level of Service in the Pilot Area.....	A -17
Figure 40 - Matrix of Opportunities Summary Map, Silver Spring Pilot Area Implementation.....	A -18

Chapter 1: Executive Summary

The *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan (EPS Plan) for Parks in Mixed Use and Higher Density Areas* is a plan that applies an innovative methodology to identify areas with the highest need for parks and open spaces and recommends opportunities to increase the amount of parks and open space in those communities. This Plan promotes public spaces as platforms where people can share experiences and build a sense of community.

This Plan is a living document that establishes a systematic way to assess and deliver outdoor experiences to the public using a variety of implementation strategies and tools. As a Functional Master Plan, it describes a program that the Department of Parks will implement for the foreseeable future. This implementation program will strive to make better use of existing parkland, develop creative partnerships to add new parks and open space resources, and acquire new parkland to

provide the park experiences necessary to support our growing communities.

Cultures and climates differ all over the world, but people are the same. They'll gather in public if you give them a good place for it.

- Jan Gehl, Architect and Urban Designer

Why? The Need for This Plan

Around 80% of Americans live in cities (2010 Census). Montgomery County is a suburban community located in one of the major metropolitan area. Our rural and suburban roots are reflected in the



Photo: Klyde Warren Park, Dallas Art District. Source: elevatearchitecture.com

metropolitan areas of the United States, the Washington, D.C., County's current development pattern. However, decades of planning efforts, combined with national and international trends and economic forces, have succeeded in focusing recent population growth in areas that are well served by transportation and other infrastructure. The growth forecast for the County (2010-2045) shows the highest levels of growth concentrated along I-270 in an area representing only 14% of the County's land but 73% of the population growth and 82% of new employment. This concentration of population results in more efficient provision of public infrastructure and other benefits to support residents, but it also creates increasing and unique needs for certain public amenities including parks and open space.

Public spaces are key elements of individual and social well-being, the places of a community's collective life, expressions of the diversity of their common natural and cultural richness and a foundation of their identity.
- 2013 Charter of Public Space, UN Habitat

With the increase in density in the growing areas of the County, public parks and open space have become essential to creating livable and healthy communities. The recent trend in real estate development in these areas is to replace lower density residential or commercial development with higher density residential and mixed-use buildings where economically feasible and allowed by zoning. This significant increase in density makes parks and open space areas the "outdoor living rooms" for many of these communities. Without space for large private backyards, public parks and open spaces play an increasingly important role in improving public health and promoting social interaction and social equity. Access to urban parks is a critical and

necessary element of achieving one of the primary County's goals, to promote community welfare and quality of life.

*Without public space, we simply don't have cities and towns.
We have mere collections of buildings and vehicles.*

*- Joan Clos, Secretary-General of Habitat III, as cited by
Michael Mehaffy, CNU Public Square*

The Catch-22 of these trends is that a growing population creates increased demand for parks and open space, but that population also increases competition for land and thus creates a shortage of space to meet the park needs of that same expanding urban population. Over time, continuing growth will only exacerbate the lack of urban open spaces, giving an urgency to efforts to address the shortfall. The challenge that this Plan and its innovative, adaptive methodology are designed to solve is how to identify where the highest needs are located for parks and open space and how to use multiple strategies to fill those needs.

Vision

An innovative and creative countywide park plan for stronger, healthier and happier communities in the County. In the places where we have the most people, everyone can walk to a public space to enjoy the outdoors.



Pop-Up Beach in Campus Martius Park, Detroit. Example of creative activation space. Source: M-NCPPC

Purpose and Scope

The main purpose of the *EPS Plan* is to create outdoor spaces where people of all ages, ethnicity, incomes, and tenures can meet, play, relax, exercise and enjoy nature in areas where more people live and work. These parks and open spaces will integrate the public network of streets, transit and other infrastructure, creating a framework around which sustainable future development can occur.

In summary, the overarching goals of the *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan* are to:

- Identify where parks and open space are needed most to serve dense populations within walking distance.
- Prioritize parks and open spaces for implementation using social equity and other factors.
- Propose innovative tools and new funding sources to activate and connect parks, renovate and repurpose existing facilities, develop new facilities, and create new parks and open spaces.

To reach these goals, an innovative GIS-based methodology will be used to identify areas with low levels of service for parks and open space and to remedy the shortages in a systematic way. This methodology will be employed to prioritize and distribute parks and open spaces equitably across the EPS Study Area.

Where? The EPS Study Area

This plan will consider a range of parks and public spaces to serve the portions of Montgomery County with higher intensity mixed uses and with higher density residential.

The EPS Study Area (*Figure 2*) was determined using data from the Planning Department’s Round 9.0 Forecast and other geographically linked data on population and employment levels. The EPS Study Area includes the highest residential and mixed-use densities in the County, covering approximately 17% of the County’s land area but including over 40% of the County’s residents and over 60% of its jobs. As this functional master plan is implemented, the entire EPS Study Area will be evaluated using this new methodology to identify where parks and open space are most needed and prioritize where to focus implementation efforts.

To provide a glimpse into some of the factors that make the EPS Study Area appropriate for examining for park needs, we can look at a few pieces of data. Residents of the EPS Study Area reported the following information as compared to residents in the rest of the County in the *2017 PROS Plan Statistically Valid Survey (Figure 1)*:

- More EPS Study Area residents live in high-rise multi-family units: 11% of EPS Study Area residents compared to 1.4% of those outside the EPS Study Area.
- EPS residents are more likely to have a low household income: 8% of EPS residents have an annual income under \$30,000 compared to 4.3% outside.
- EPS residents are more reliant upon public transit to access parks and recreation: 18.5% of EPS residents use public transit to travel to parks, trails and recreation facilities, compared to 10.5% outside.

Another differentiation between the EPS Study Area and areas of the County outside of the Study Area is the amount of parkland in

proportion to population. The EPS Study Area has 10.9 acres per thousand residents of M-NCPPC parkland, compared to 59.2 acres per thousand residents outside the Study Area. When considering all public parkland (M-NCPPC, municipal and federal), the EPS Study Area has an even greater shortfall: 11.8 acres per thousand residents compared to 99.5 acres per thousand residents. This Plan does not set a target for the amount of parkland per resident, but instead uses a more sophisticated method to prioritize areas with higher parks and open space needs.

To test the new methodology proposed in this Plan, the Silver Spring Central Business District (CBD) was chosen as a Pilot Area within the larger EPS Study Area (*see Appendix*). The Silver Spring CBD met many Pilot Area selection criteria, including high demographic diversity, significant economic activity, good transit connectivity, and the lack of a recent area master plan. In addition, other recent reports (including the *Silver Spring CBD Green Space Guidelines (2010)* and *2017 PROS Plan*) indicated a high need for parks and open spaces in this CBD. The rest of the EPS Study Area will be analyzed using the EPS methodology during the implementation phase of this Plan.




	 apartments	 <\$30k	 transit
EPS Study Area	11%	8%	18.5%
Non-EPS Study Area	1.4%	4.3%	10.5%

Figure 1 - Summary the of EPS Study Area Residents Compared to Non-EPS Study Area Residents.

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan




Figure 2 - Map of the Energized Public Spaces Study Area and Pilot Area.

How? Methodology and New Tools

Methodology Summary

The methodology will identify areas within the EPS Study Area that have relatively low levels of parks and open space within walking distance, and then will propose opportunities to raise service in these locations. The major steps in applying this methodology are summarized below and illustrated in *Figure 3*. For more details, see *Chapters 3 - 5*.

Analysis – Chapter 3

- Collect Data
- Analyze Data: Identify Level of Service
- Analyze Data: Identify Opportunity Sites

Results – Chapter 4

- Organize by Strategies
- Screen for Feasibility
- Prioritize by Social Equity

Implementation – Chapter 5

- Apply Methodology to EPS Study Area
- Implement Recommendations
- Provide Funding Sources
- Align Operations, Maintenance, and Policing
- Assess Progress





Figure 3 - The EPS Plan Methodology Process.



Above: Top - Park staff at a local festival. Bottom - Community input during the Parks and Recreation of the Future Campaign and the EPS Plan Open House.

New Data Gathering and Analysis Tools

As part of the development of the methodology, a series of new analysis tools and resources were created for this Plan. These tools allowed Parks to collect, analyze and evaluate various data in a more

systematic and reproducible manner, resulting in a more robust and valid methodology overall. As the Plan gets implemented, these tools will be updated to keep up with advances in technology and the planning process.

Broaden Public Outreach Techniques

Montgomery Parks launched a multi-pronged outreach strategy in October 2016 to engage diverse communities for input about the future of parks and recreation. The initiative, titled *Parks and Recreation of the Future*, was aimed at soliciting public input to inform three separate but related park programs: the *2017 Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (PROS)*, the *Capital Improvement Program (CIP)*, and the *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan (EPS Plan)*. The outreach efforts targeted a vast array of audiences including but not limited to ethnically diverse communities, senior populations and people with disabilities. Outreach methods included a statistically valid survey, outreach surveys in three foreign languages, focus groups with traditionally underserved communities, and online comment and survey tools.

The outreach for this Plan also included a public meeting with an open house demonstration of an innovative online mapping survey tool using interactive monitors. Finally, the EPS Working Group, consisting of selected representatives from the public and private sectors, provided critical plan support and input through monthly meetings since January 2017. A list of the EPS Working Group members is detailed in the *Acknowledgments* section of this Plan.

Identify Experiences in Parks

This new portion of the EPS methodology evaluates the supply of public spaces based on how each facility within the open space network provides for three outdoor experiences - see *Figure 4* for illustration:

- **Active Experiences**
 - Play sports or games; run, walk, or bicycle; climb or mountain bike; other outdoor exercises.
 - Use trails, athletic fields, open spaces/lawns, sport courts, playgrounds, interactive elements, natural areas.
- **Contemplative Experiences**
 - Enjoy nature, read a book, or learn something; relax/meditate/reflect; escape chaos.
 - Use natural areas, historic sites, benches, shade trees, community open spaces, gardens, small green spaces, or trails.
- **Social Gathering Experiences**
 - Attend community festivals, concerts, outdoor movies, parades; visit farmer’s markets, historic sites; meet friends, have a picnic, see your neighbors.
 - Use plazas with seating, small sport courts, amphitheaters/stages, picnic tables, large community open spaces, dog parks.



Figure 4 - Outdoor Experiences Classification: Active, Contemplative and Social Gathering.

Individual facilities within a public or publicly accessible private open space are scored by how much benefit of each experience type the

facility can provide to potential users. Facilities that score higher are open to a larger number of people, and facilities that score lower are not open to all or require specific skills, equipment, or are limited by age. See *Chapter 3* for more information.

Map Walkable Networks of Parks and Open Space

This Plan brings to the site analysis process the creation of a walkable network Geographic Information Systems (GIS) tool. This GIS tool includes a map layer with digital information on neighborhood roads, trail systems, park, school, and private retail walkways, and any road with a sidewalk within the County. This GIS tool is used to calculate




Figure 5 - Sample 10-minute Walkshed and Supply of Facilities
A full-sized version of this graphic is shown as Figure 24 in Chapter 3.

accurate walksheds from a given point; in this case, all parks and public spaces within a 10-minute walk of any given point in the EPS Study Area. The consideration of highways, railroad tracks and other impassable barriers in the walkshed analysis brings a reality check in the accessibility of our public spaces network from the pedestrian experience level compared to prior analysis tools. See *Figure 5* for an illustration of the supply of facilities within a 10-min walkshed from a sample one-acre square. *Figure 6* illustrates the results of the supply analysis for each outdoor experience type: the darker the shading, the higher the walkable access to experiences from each square.

Use GIS to Analyze Park Service Levels

The methodology for the *EPS Plan* includes a new and more sophisticated tool to find and prioritize areas with low levels of access to parks within walking distance. The application of this quantitative analysis tool is an important step in the process to optimize the use and distribution of open space resources among different communities. At its root, this tool is a supply versus demand calculator for parks and public spaces. For an illustrative example of the Supply and Demand Analysis and the resulting identification of areas with a Lower Level of Service see *Figure 7*.

This data-driven approach will support both government and private decision-making with detailed information on where we need more parks and public spaces to meet what experience needs.

Apply New Planning Framework to Identify Opportunities

This Plan establishes a comprehensive approach to identifying opportunities to increase the amount of parkland and public space in an area. The EPS Planning Framework expands upon traditional urban design analysis to select preferred sites for additional parks and public spaces.

There are two main parts of the EPS Planning Framework:

- A Hierarchy of Park Types
- Urban Parks and Public Space Design Guidelines

The Hierarchy of Park Types has been used since the *2012 PROS Plan* to ensure a balance of the right urban park types across the various neighborhoods and blocks of an urban sector plan.

The *EPS Plan* improves upon this urban design tool by introducing a set of Urban Parks and Public Space Design Guidelines. These guidelines provide more detailed information about the parameters that will make each type of park and public space completer and more functional. These Guidelines will help Montgomery Parks and its existing and future partners deliver public spaces that are flexible and accommodate a variety of experiences within the network of public spaces. These Guidelines will be in a companion document to the *EPS Plan*.

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan




Figure 6 - Supply Analysis: Walkable Access to Experiences.




Figure 7 - Sample Supply and Demand Analysis with resulting Lower Level of Service Map.
A full-sized version of this graphic is shown as Figure 28 in Chapter 3.



Photo: Cozy Community Day at Wall Park, an example of activation through the Pop-Up in Montgomery Parks program. Source: M-NCPPC.



Photo: Movie Night at Woodside Urban Park, another example of a park activation strategy. Source: M-NCPPC.

What? Results

Use of these new data-driven tools combined with increased public outreach and a unique approach to urban design analysis results in recommendations that provide a range of opportunities to increase the level of parks and public space service. These opportunities are categorized into five implementation strategies that can increase the level of service for parks and public spaces in the Pilot Area:

- **Activate** - Provide programming and community events to bring more people into parks and public spaces, as an interim solution in spaces awaiting renovation, and to test community interest in potential future amenities.
- **Connect** - Improve connections between public spaces and an integrated network of streets, sidewalks and trails.
- **Renovate and Repurpose** - Rebuild or replace existing park and public spaces facilities to increase service and usage.
- **Develop** - Build new parks and new facilities on existing parkland and public spaces.
- **Create** - Create new parks and public space through dedication, purchase, and creation of privately owned public space (POPS) through the development process.

For all five implementation strategies, Parks will seek opportunities for collaborating with partners and alternate providers to improve service levels for parks and open space.

What's Next? Implementation

As a Functional Master Plan, this Plan defines the parameters of an ongoing program that will strive to meet the park and recreation needs of the County's most dense and mixed-use communities. The implementation of this Plan by the Department of Parks will take place over many years, even decades, to reach the overall goal of walkable access to a variety of park experiences for all residents.

The Energized Public Spaces Program does not replace existing policies and programs that create new parks and open spaces but supplements those programs with a new sophisticated analysis tool for guiding park and public space decisions in the highly populated areas of the County. The recommendations that result from this Plan will integrate with guidance from existing area master plans and the *PROS Plan* and *Vision 2030*. Results from this plan will supplement the existing park acquisition programs (State Program Open Space-funded and the Legacy Open Space programs) and help to prioritize the CIP program to target critical locations for park improvements. The Department of Parks will lead a collaborative effort with the Planning Department, other public agencies, property owners and the public to make these critical parks and public spaces a reality.

The most important next steps to implement this Plan are to:

- **Apply the Methodology to the entire EPS Study Area**
 - Prioritize locations to study next by Social Equity and other factors
 - Find low level of service areas and opportunities to increase service in those areas
 - Receive Planning Board approval of opportunity sites
 - Prioritize areas by Social Equity for implementation efforts

- **Implement Recommendations**
 - Use the five implementation strategies to create more parks and public space service in areas of highest need: Activate, Connect, Renovate and Repurpose, Develop, and Create
 - Use partnerships, innovative zoning, alternative ownership options, and other tools to expand pool of options for increasing park service
- **Provide Funding Resources**
 - Propose CIP Funding for acquisition, design, and construction
 - Pursue alternative funding strategies
- **Align Operations, Maintenance and Policing**
 - Develop new Urban Park Standards for Operations, Maintenance and Policing
 - Create the necessary support infrastructure for Urban Parks, including satellite facilities and the right transportation and equipment
 - Add staff and operating resources to meet the increased need for maintenance, daily operations, and security
- **Assess Progress and Report to Planning Board and County Council on a Regular Basis**
 - Provide progress reports to the Planning Board on a biennial basis
 - Provide updates to the County Council as needed through the Planning Board's semi-annual report to the Council

To make this plan a reality, one key focus of the implementation program will be to expand the pool of open space options by pursuing partnerships with other public agencies, non-profit organizations, community groups, the private sector, and universities and other institutions.

The *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan* will result in a more systematic, data-driven approach to identifying the locations where walk-to parks and public space are most in need and will result in prioritized and implemented recommendations through a collaborative process to meet the changing needs of communities across Montgomery County.

Application of Methodology to Pilot Area

The *EPS Plan* methodology will be applied across the EPS Study Area during the implementation of this Plan over the coming decades. To validate and illustrate the methodology analysis and results, it was tested in the Silver Spring Central Business District (CBD) as a Pilot Area. The methodology resulted in a menu of opportunities that provide many potential ways to add more park and public space services to the central areas of the Silver Spring CBD that currently have the lowest levels of service. These recommendations are the basis for proceeding with implementation of the Functional Master Plan over the coming years.

Figure 8 depicts the results of the quantitative analysis highlighting the locations with a lower level of service and the initial results of the qualitative analysis showing the sites that are opportunities for increasing the level of service.

Figure 9 illustrates the recommendations for the Pilot Area resulting from the application of this new methodology. For a description of the Pilot Area analysis and results, see the *Appendix*.




Figure 8 - Opportunity Sites for Increasing Level of Service for Parks and Open Space, Pilot Area.

A full-sized version of this graphic is shown as Figure 38 in the Appendix.

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan




Figure 9 - Matrix of Opportunities Summary Map, Silver Spring Pilot Area. A full-sized version of this graphic is shown as Figure 40 in the Appendix.

Chapter 2: Policy Overview

This Chapter includes an overview of the background and policies that guide the *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan*. The *EPS Plan* aligns with the policies included in the *2017 PROS Plan* and considers the global, national and local perspectives that affect parks and public space planning.

National and Global Perspective

Urban Parks as Economic Incubators

The importance of public spaces in urban areas in our country and abroad is rapidly increasing. Some parks and public spaces are key destinations not only for the local community but also as an attraction for tourists (nationally and internationally), many serving as the “face” of cities. Urban parks also can serve an important role as incubators that can spark other public investment and private redevelopment projects in a community. Recent examples of park development serving as an incubator include the High Line Park in New York City and The Yards Park in Washington, D.C.

In the case of the High Line Park, located in a former industrial area of the Chelsea neighborhood, this now-famous park along a former elevated railroad bed offers not only a park experience of walking along green areas with native vegetation and wildlife, but also unique views of the city. The High Line is a prime example of developing a park on an underutilized resource that then spurs economic rejuvenation and community redevelopment in adjacent areas. The surrounding neighborhood has undergone significant redevelopment and investment in the years since the High Line was constructed.

The Yards Park in Washington, D.C., located on the Anacostia River near the Washington Nationals’ stadium, is known as a place for community festivals and events gathering big crowds of people to the waterfront area. The early implementation of this urban park, prior to most of the commercial and residential development in the area, served to spur redevelopment and investment activity. These two examples of urban parks involved significant planning and partnerships among developers, government, non-profit organizations and the community. The key ingredient from these and other examples is to understand people’s desire for unique and great public spaces in higher density areas.




Photo: High Line Park, New York, NY. Source: M-NCPPC.

Draw of Urban Neighborhoods

Walkable mixed-use centers with public transit and an efficient street network are among the most desirable places to live, especially for the demographic groups of Millennials and Baby-Boomers that are two growing populations in Montgomery County. These demographic groups have shown a strong interest in being near public infrastructure and other resources within walking distance. Having a higher density of people and employees concentrated in one location is a great way to encourage economic development in certain areas. But this desirability also drives real estate prices higher making parkland acquisition a challenge.

Land located within livable and walkable neighborhoods is highly desirable, so competition increases land values to a premium. This scenario raises social equity challenges in our major urban areas as economic development of these areas can exclude affordable housing and parks and public spaces. Commercial or high-end residential developments that offer a short-term return on investment for developers and government can appear more desirable in such areas. As more people move to downtown areas, a long-term investment mindset for public infrastructure needs to be adopted to provide and maintain quality of life.

The more people, more diversity, and more cultures mix in the same location, the higher the chances of having face-to-face encounters within our community. Public spaces become the most welcoming places to meet people - a key component in this long-term community building approach to development and redevelopment. This functional master plan is bringing a new methodology to assess areas with highest needs for walkable access to many park experiences and its relationship to the concentration of people. In this way, new investment can be prioritized within a systematic approach.

The topic of public spaces was a key element of the discussion in the “New Urban Agenda” at the 2016 United Nation’s Habitat III Conference. The quote below summarizes the importance of having these places in the quality of our lives.

Increasingly, it appears that the healthy growth of economies will depend on well-connected networks of public space, accessible to all. It is critical, in this age of rapid urbanization, that we continue to curate and nurture this vital urban common, and continue to develop and disseminate the tools and strategies to do so.... There is much in the New Urban Agenda ...[to] applaud, including an emphasis on mixed use, walkable street networks, diversity, transportation choices - and the central importance of public space systems.

- Michael Mehaffy, Author and Consultant in Strategic Urban Development



Photo: Spring Creek, a successful public space in Silver Spring, MD. Source: M-NCPPC.

County Perspective

The Park System’s Response to Societal Changes

Since its inception, Montgomery County’s park system has been responding to the needs of its community with a variety of park experiences and services. Each phase of the development of the park system over time reflects the needs, lifestyle and predominant development pattern at that time. When the park system was created in the 1920s and 1930s, the emphasis was on water supply protection. After World War II and into the 1950s, organized recreation in park activity buildings, ballfields, and tennis courts were the priorities. The 1960s and 1970s brought a suburban growth pattern of larger lots of single-family homes with backyards grouped by residents with similar income and social structure. This development pattern encouraged the use and dependency on cars to access any destination.

In the late 1960s and into the 1970s, environmental policy started taking shape with a better understanding of the impact of suburban sprawl. Growth management policies started emerging. The *On Wedges and Corridors (1964) Plan* was adopted, concentrating development along corridors and centers in and around the Beltway (I-495) and the I-270 corridor. The 1980s saw the introduction of the Agricultural Reserve as a land conservation policy to preserve our farmland and rural open spaces and other policies that encouraged the shift toward “growing smarter”. See *Figure 10*.

Initially, urban parks were created as buffers to protect suburban residential development from commercial areas. Now that people are moving to the commercial centers, parks and public spaces are needed inside the more urban areas so that people have nearby places to gather, play, or be in touch with the outdoors.



Figure 10 - Montgomery Parks Timeline: 1930-2010s.

Today's Challenges

As housing moves inside the commercial centers, the biggest challenge is to provide adequate parks and public spaces where land is already developed and very expensive. Examples of the historical development patterns in the CBDs with buffer parks separating residential development from commercial areas are shown in *Figure 11*. The need to focus on urban parks in these growing areas was established in the *Vision 2030* and *2012 PROS* plans.

With the increase in competition for land, our parks and public spaces should accommodate multiple needs. Integrating parks and recreation areas with other services can reduce costs by providing local amenities within walking distance, reducing impervious surfaces, and recharging groundwater supply, and removing pollutants from water. Sustainability requires integration of efforts and preventive measures to avoid waste of resources. This is especially critical in urban areas where higher density puts a strain on failing infrastructure. The comprehensive integration of land uses, including parkland, will require a level of coordination among the different agencies including

alignment of objectives, development schedules, and dedicated funds. The comprehensive integration of parks and open space into the built environment is also key to supporting the County's efforts to address global climate change. The Montgomery County Council recently passed *Resolution 18-974, Emergency Climate Mobilization*, setting an ambitious target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2027. Climate resiliency and greenhouse gas reductions are addressed in area master/sector plans, development review recommendations, and park plans and projects through recommendations that include site context, landscaping, waste reduction/management, building materials, renewable energy, heating and cooling, and other means to reduce climate impact.

Parks and open space can play an important role in reducing climate impact, since their many benefits to local environmental quality also provide a larger benefit to the global climate. Adding more green spaces and tree canopy provides shade and comfortable places for people to relax and play, while also absorbing more carbon and heat than an impervious surface open space. By increasing the ease with which residents can walk or bicycle to parks, the subsequently fewer auto trips reduce particulate pollution and carbon emissions.



DOWNTOWN SILVER SPRING

GERMANTOWN

WHEATON

Figure 11 - Historical Development Patterns in the CBDs.

See *Figure 12* for a shared street concept proposed in the *Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan*.

By providing green spaces that help to cool the urban heat island effect, parks and open space contribute to a decrease in the energy necessary to make building interiors comfortable, thus reducing greenhouse gas emissions from energy producers. Future studies may be conducted to identify the best ways to site, build, and operate parks and open space so that these spaces contribute as much as possible to addressing the climate crisis. The creation of these open spaces as a part of sustainable and resilient communities plays a role in benefiting our country and the globe, not just Montgomery County.

In areas with more people and jobs, parks are now much more than a leisure amenity - they provide a platform for a diversity of community experiences. Urban parks provide many direct and indirect benefits to the lifestyle of residents, employees, and visitors.

See *Figure 13* and *Figure 14* for illustrations of the proposed Woodside Urban Park Facility Plan, including a new central lawn to serve as a community social gathering amenity and innovative stormwater strategies.




Figure 12 - Norfolk Avenue Shared Street Concept, Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan.



Figure 13 - Proposed Woodside Urban Park Facility Plan, Silver Spring, MD.




Figure 14 - Proposed Stormwater Management Strategies for Woodside Urban Park.

Public Purpose

Montgomery Parks Mission, Vision and Values

Montgomery Parks is one department within the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), a bi-county agency created by the General Assembly of Maryland in 1927.

Mission

Protect and interpret our valuable natural and cultural resources; balance demand for recreation with the need for conservation; offer various enjoyable recreational activities that encourage healthy lifestyles; and provide clean, safe, and accessible places.

Vision

An enjoyable, accessible, safe, and green park system that promotes community through shared spaces and treasured experiences.



Photo: Children volunteering at Brookside Gardens. Source: M-NCPPC.

Values

- **Stewardship:** Manage the county park system to meet needs of current and future generations.
- **Recreation:** Offer leisure activities that strengthen the body, sharpen the mind, and renew the spirit.
- **Excellence:** Deliver high quality products, services, and experiences.
- **Integrity:** Operate with an honest and balanced perspective.
- **Service:** Be courteous, helpful, and accessible internally and externally.
- **Education:** Promote learning opportunities.
- **Collaboration:** Work with residents, communities, public and private organizations, and policymakers.
- **Diversity:** Support and embrace cultural differences and offer suitable programs, activities, and services.
- **Dedication:** Commit to getting the job done the right way, no matter what it takes.

Social Equity

The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) has as its core mission to impact communities through three pillars of Conservation, Health and Wellness, and Social Equity (more information online at: <https://www.nrpa.org/our-work/Three-Pillars/>). These overarching themes are important in guiding the priorities of Montgomery Parks. Social Equity, defined by NRPA as “ensuring all people have access to the benefits of local parks and recreation,” is especially aligned with the public purpose of this functional master plan.

True to the very philosophy of public parks and recreation is the idea that all people - no matter the color of their skin, age, income level or ability - have access to programs, facilities, places and spaces that make their lives and communities great. Parks and recreation truly build communities - communities for all. - NRPA

Montgomery Parks supports Social Equity in several ways. The *Vision 2030 Strategic Plan* (2010) recommends that the Department of Parks address social equity by a pledge to “engage a diverse community and proactively respond to changing demographics, needs and trends” to create park experiences that are accessible to all neighborhoods and socio-economic groups within the County. The *Parks and Recreation of the Future* campaign combined outreach program, which gathered community input to the *2017 PROS Plan*, the CIP program, and this functional master plan, focused on populations in the County who have not traditionally participated in planning processes.

The *2017 PROS Plan* includes an analysis of Park Proximity and Park Equity as required by the State of Maryland for the first time (see the *2017 PROS Plan, Chapter 2 - Policy Framework and Plan Foundation, Implementation Strategies - Park Equity and Proximity Analyses*). The State defines park equity much as the NRPA defines social equity. The analysis required by the State is intended to “aid in identification of areas where underserved populations do not have easy access to parks close to home.” Montgomery Parks’ analysis of Park Equity in the *2017 PROS* identified lower park equity based on high concentrations of lower income households with low walkable access to park entrances and trailheads. The *2017 PROS Plan* also adds Park Equity to the prioritization criteria for the Capital Improvements Program (CIP), thus elevating the issue of social equity to influence some of the most important Parks spending decisions.

Throughout the *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan*, measures of Social Equity are used to identify communities needing study to determine park needs, to prioritize Plan recommendations, and to determine where to focus implementation efforts.

Alignment with Montgomery Parks Values

This Plan aligns with the Values of Montgomery Parks and the Three Pillars of NRPA, in particular the Social Equity pillar, by providing a unique way to identify and prioritize the provision of urban parks. Parks in areas of higher density can be incubators for health - physical, mental, and social. All public spaces provide some level of community benefit. Parks and open space are no longer only an amenity, but an essential element of what makes a community desirable, healthy, and wealthy in the broadest sense of the term. They become a platform for a diversity of community experiences. These places bring a list of many direct and indirect benefits to our community:

- Health and Wellness
- Happiness
- Connectivity
- Economic Development
- Increased Neighborhood Value
- Green Infrastructure
- Air Quality
- Nature or Historical Preservation and Access

Urban Parks especially provide opportunities to promote many of the values and strategies of the Department of Parks, including:

Healthy Living - Physical activity reduces and can prevent chronic health conditions such as heart disease, diabetes and obesity while reducing anxiety and depression. Having a system of parks within mixed use centers encourages people use parks more frequently for exercise. With a well-designed system of trails and sidewalks, people will tend to walk and bike rather than drive.

Stewardship and Recreation - with many families choosing to live in urban areas, the first contact with nature and outdoor play for many children is through their neighborhood parks. Urban Parks can help plant the seed for stewardship of nature for those who live in higher density developments with no backyards.

Natural, Historical and Archaeological Resources - Although much of the County's inventory of natural, historical, and archaeological resources are outside urban areas, urban parks can provide "pilot" places to experience and appreciate them.

Economic Competitiveness - Healthier communities attract businesses and residents, and access to parks is one critical element of a healthy community. Parks increase adjacent property values from 5% to 20%. Parks also lower the cost of infrastructure by managing stormwater and preventing flooding. By promoting walking to parks and maintaining a healthy weight, communities can save \$1,500 per person in healthcare costs a year.

Social Equity - Access to parks is critical to healthy living. In areas of higher density with little open space, proximity to parks is especially important. In lower income areas where residents depend on public transit to access park facilities, the public sector should prioritize parks within walking distance. Currently, one third of the County's population is foreign-born. This diversity should guide the services and facilities so that the parks provide public space that is inviting to all.

The balance between the built and unbuilt environments is important to our social and economic good health. The future wellbeing of Montgomery County citizens depends upon maintaining the quality and availability of parks and open space, especially in our most dense communities. This Functional Master Plan recognizes the important linkage between conservation, quality of life, economic vitality, and social equity. Adequate parks and open space to serve the residents

of the County are essential to enrich the lives of current residents and to pass along to future generations.



Photo: Archeological tour at Josiah Henson Park, North Bethesda. Source: M-NCPPC.

Relationship to Master and Sector Plans

The *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan (EPS Plan)* amends all area master and sector plans countywide approved as of the date of the final adoption of this Plan to the extent that this Plan's methodology will designate additional sites that may be considered for park acquisition and facility renovation or redevelopment.

This Plan does not alter zoning or other land use recommendations found in area master plans and does not alter any zoning requirements for open space or other development elements.

Specifically, this Plan does not increase the requirement for open space or recreation areas under the zoning ordinance or other master plans. All future sector and master plans will utilize the new methodology established in this plan to determine the priority areas with low levels of park and open space services and to recommend facilities and parkland to improve the level of service. *Figure 15* shows the relationship of the *EPS Plan* to other existing plans. Existing park policies such as the *Vision 2030 Strategic Plan* and PROS Plans inform the methodology and analysis of the *EPS Plan*. The results of the *EPS Plan* guide recommendations for existing and future community master and sector plans.

This Plan also amends the *2017 Recreation Guidelines for Private Residential Development* and other functional master plans. Opportunities to increase parks and open spaces identified through application of the *EPS* methodology may be added to the *Facilities Incentive List*. Private residential developments that implement these recommendations are eligible for recreation supply incentive bonuses.

Sites identified as opportunities for new or renovated parks from application of the *EPS* methodology across the *EPS Study Area* are not guaranteed to receive funds or to be fully acquired or implemented through the *EPS Plan*. The methodology established in this Plan will

identify preferred opportunity sites to address areas of the County with a relatively low level of park service by adding appropriate park and public space facilities. Implementation of these recommendations over the course of the Functional Plan will be flexible, allowing for the consideration of opportunity acquisition sites, unforeseen partnerships, and other new implementation tools to fill the identified service needs of each community.

As a functional master plan approved by the Planning Board and County Council, this Plan also will provide the ability to study priority areas of the County and make new park recommendations without being tied to the land use master plan schedule. In addition, this functional plan can be implemented using a wide variety of policy and regulatory tools, including dedication through the development process and the land acquisition process.



Figure 15 - Relationship of the EPS Plan to Other Existing Plans.

Policy Framework

Park Planning Policy

Several plans have guided the formation of the *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan* including the *Vision 2030 Strategic Plan for Parks and Recreation (Vision 2030, June 2011)* and the *2017 Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (PROS)*. *Vision 2030* confirmed that the highest needs for parks are now and will continue to be in areas of highest population density.

The *Park, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan* serves as the primary planning policy for parks and recreation in Montgomery County to the year 2030 and beyond. It assesses needs and recommends strategies for the delivery of park and recreation facilities, protection of natural resource areas, and preservation of historic/cultural areas and agricultural lands and is required by the State of Maryland every five years to be eligible for Program Open Space funding. The *2017 PROS Plan* includes a new chapter on parks to serve mixed use and higher density residential areas, providing policy guidance for the development of this Plan.

In addition to *Vision 2030* and *2017 PROS Plan*, other existing County policies, guidelines, and plans for open spaces, parks, and urban areas have guided the *EPS Plan*.

- *General Plan Refinement of the Goals and Objectives for Montgomery County (1993)*
- *Countywide Park Trails Plan (2016)*
- *2017 Recreation Guidelines for Private Residential Development*
- *Legacy Open Space (LOS) Functional Master Plan (2001)*
- *Silver Spring Central Business District Green Space Guidelines (2010)*

Over the past two decades, the adopted policies in these documents regarding urban parks have evolved to follow the many national and international trends in park planning. In June of 2010, the Planning Board approved objectives for *Urban Park Guidelines*. The goal of the *Urban Park Guidelines* was to re-examine and re-define the role of urban parks in community life. Building on this goal, the *2012* and *2017 PROS Plans* each developed more sophisticated approaches to urban park planning, resulting in the following two primary developments.

Expanded Classification System for Urban Parks

Prior to the *2012 PROS Plan*, all parks next to urban areas in the County were classified as Urban Buffer Parks, indicating their importance to separating residential and commercial zones. In response to the *2010 Urban Park Guidelines*, the *2012 PROS Plan* added six types of urban parks to the Park Classification System. The new categories and subcategories and their descriptions supported the vision and role of urban parks to serve mixed-use, densely developing communities. Several of these park types are found in all sector plans approved since 2012.

In the *2017 PROS Plan*, two new classifications of urban parks are added, and one was removed, resulting in a total of seven urban park types. The recently updated *PROS Plan* amended the urban parks typology to address distinctly different roles for certain park types (see *Figure 16* for the new Parks Classification System table).

The Plaza is a new type of Countywide Urban Park, aligning with and complementing the Civic Green park type. The Plaza generally will be allocated to areas with higher pedestrian traffic and flow usually associated with adjacency to transit stops and commercial building frontages and with higher concentration of paved surfaces. In

contrast, the Civic Green will provide a larger amount of green space area inclusive of a lawn area for social gatherings.

The Pocket Green is proposed as a new type of Community Use Urban Park. Pocket Greens will play an important role in the network of public spaces that is encouraged in each sector or district. The presence of these smaller park types will allow for “pauses” in a landscaped setting along the route between major and larger open spaces within the network. Pocket Greens may include a variety of green elements, including trees, landscaping, and lawn areas, depending on the specific location. These spaces are particularly important in busy commercial areas allowing workers to enjoy lunch or a coffee break in a contemplative environment. Research has suggested that smaller breaks during the work schedule increases productivity and health, especially mental health.

The final recent change to the classification system is the removal of the Urban Buffer Park from the Community Use category. The Parks system includes many parks that were originally created to serve as buffers between the commercial centers and residential communities. However, today such parks are seen as places to bring people together from both mixed use and residential communities, not to separate these communities. As such, this park type no longer fits within the modern urban park paradigm.

Implementing a Hierarchy of Park Types

Since 2010, adopted policy is that the amount of parkland alone will not guarantee “the right parks in the right places” in our urban areas. Urban park recommendations since 2012 have been based primarily on creating the right pattern and type of parks and open spaces for each master or sector plan area, rather than setting a target for the amount of parkland. To distribute parkland appropriately within an urban area, the recommendations for parks should meet needs identified in the *2012 PROS Plan*, including creating a hierarchy of

parks and open spaces to serve everything from an entire sector plan down to a single block. The hierarchy concept includes provision of new urban park facilities such as event spaces, skate spots, etc., and creation of a walkable open space system, using a standard maximum walking distance from residences and transit stops to parks. For more details, see *Chapter 3 - Analyze Data: Identify Opportunity Sites and Park Hierarchy*.

Building on these policies, urban park classifications and the hierarchy of parks, the *EPS Plan* creates a methodology to focus the distribution of facilities and resources in the areas of highest population density. This Plan's implementation strategies will guide the Department of Parks, partner agencies, and private entities to locate the right parks and open spaces in the right places, thus creating a network of public spaces to serve residents and employees. The Department of Parks will continue to play a major role in shaping Montgomery County's high quality of life, but it will not be doing so alone: partnerships with a diverse group of stakeholders will be key to implementing this Plan and promoting community identity and civic engagement.

A New Park Classification System

COUNTYWIDE PARKS - Parks in this category serve all residents of Montgomery County

- Recreational Oriented Parks

PARK TYPE	PARK TYPE DESCRIPTION	TYPICAL FACILITIES*	APPROX. SIZE
REGIONAL PARKS	Large Parks that provide a wide range of recreational opportunities but retain 2/3 of the acreage as conservation areas.	Picnic / playground areas, tennis courts, athletic fields, golf course, campgrounds, and water-oriented recreation areas.	200 ACRES OR MORE
RECREATIONAL PARKS	Parks larger than 50 acres in size that are more intensively developed than Regional Parks but may also contain natural areas.	Athletic fields, tennis courts, multi-use courts, picnic/playground areas, golf course, trails, and natural areas.	50 ACRES OR MORE
SPECIAL PARKS	These parks include areas that contain features of historic and cultural significance.	Vary, but may include agricultural centers, garden, small conference centers, and historic structures, etc.	VARIES

- Countywide Urban Parks

PARK TYPE	PARK TYPE DESCRIPTION	TYPICAL FACILITIES*	APPROX. SIZE
CIVIC GREENS	Formally planned, flexible, programmable open spaces that serve as places for informal gathering, quiet contemplation, or large special event gatherings. Depending on size, they may support activities including open air markets, concerts, festivals, and special events but are not often used for programmed recreational purposes.	A central lawn is often the main focus with adjacent spaces providing complementary uses. May include gardens, water features and shade structures.	1/2 ACRE MINIMUM 1.5 ACRE IDEAL
PLAZAS	Formally planned, predominantly hardscaped open spaces for pedestrian traffic from nearby transit stops and commercial and higher density residential uses. Depending on size, they may support activities including open air markets, concerts, festivals, and special events, but are not often used for active recreational purposes. Consider access to sunlight and connection to the network of public spaces, and protection from the wind, traffic and noise.	Central hardscaped gathering area with public art/water feature as focal point. May include special lighting, shaded areas, and benches and tables. Consider temporary closure of local streets to enlarge the size of the plaza for special events. Playful and interactive elements are encouraged.	1/2 ACRE MINIMUM 1 ACRE IDEAL
URBAN RECREATIONAL PARKS	Oriented to the recreational needs of a densely populated neighborhood and business district. They provide space for many activities.	May include athletic fields, playing courts, picnicking, dog parks, sitting areas and flexible grassy open space. Programming can include farmer's markets, outdoor exercise classes, and community yard sales. There is space for a safe drop-off area and nearby accessible parking for those who cannot walk to the park.	VARIES
URBAN GREENWAYS	Linear parks that provide trails or wide landscaped walkways and bikeways and may include other recreational and natural amenities. May occur along road rights of way or "paper" streets.	Trails, walkways and bikeways, with extra space for vegetative ground cover and trees. Should link other green spaces, trails and natural systems.	VARIES

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan

- Conservation Oriented Parks			
PARK TYPE	PARK TYPE DESCRIPTION	TYPICAL FACILITIES*	APPROX. SIZE
STREAM VALLEY PARKS	Interconnected linear parks along major stream valleys providing conservation and recreation areas.	Hiker-biker trails, fishing, picnicking, playground areas.	VARIES
CONSERVATION AREA PARKS	Large natural areas acquired to preserve specific natural archaeological or historic features. They also provide opportunities of compatible recreation activities.	Trails, fishing areas, nature study areas, and informal picnic areas.	VARIES

COMMUNITY USE PARKS - Parks in this category serve residents of surrounding communities

- Community Use Urban Parks			
PARK TYPE	PARK TYPE DESCRIPTION	TYPICAL FACILITIES*	APPROX. SIZE
NEIGHBORHOOD GREENS	Serve the residents and workers from the surrounding neighborhood or district but may be designed for more activity than an urban buffer park. These formally planned, flexible open spaces serve as places for informal gathering, lunchtime relaxation, or small special event gatherings.	Lawn area, shaded seating and pathways. May include a play area, a skate spot, a community garden, or similar neighborhood facilities.	1/4 ACRE MINIMUM
POCKET GREENS	Serve residents and workers from nearby area, designed for relaxation, lunch breaks, small games, play area for children, and outdoor eating. Consider access to sunlight, important view corridors, connection to the network of public spaces, and protection from the wind, traffic and noise.	Program and design should reflect the demographics and culture of its surrounding users. Sunlit small gathering areas, shaded seating, small children play areas. May include movable furniture, focal point public art, and small-scale green areas and trees.	1/10-1/4 ACRE
URBAN RECREATIONAL PARKLETS	These parks serve the residents and workers from the surrounding neighborhood or district and are designed for more active recreation than an urban buffer park or a neighborhood green.	Sport courts, skate spots, and may include lawn areas, playgrounds or similar neighborhood recreation facilities.	1/10 ACRE MINIMUM

- Community Use Parks			
PARK TYPE	PARK TYPE DESCRIPTION	TYPICAL FACILITIES*	APPROX. SIZE
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS	Small parks providing informal recreation in residential areas.	Play equipment, play field, sitting area, shelter, tennis and Multi-use courts. (Do not include regulation size ballfields).	2.5 ACRE
LOCAL PARKS	Larger parks that provide ballfields and both programmed and un-programmed recreation facilities.	Ballfields, play equipment, tennis and multi-use courts, sitting/picnic area, shelters, buildings and other facilities.	15 ACRE
NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION AREAS	Small parcels of conservation oriented parkland in residential areas, generally dedicated at the time of subdivision.	Generally undeveloped, may include a stormwater management pond and related facilities.	VARIES

**This list is not all inclusive but instead includes facilities typical of each park type.*

Figure 16 - 2017 Park Recreation and Opens Space (PROS) Plan, Figure 7 - New Park Classification System

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan




Figure 17 - Map of the Energized Public Spaces Study Area and Pilot Area (for reference only; identical to Figure 2).

Chapter 3: Methodology

This Plan presents a data-driven methodology for evaluating park needs that can be employed systematically to prioritize and distribute parks and open spaces across the higher population and mixed use areas of the County, identified here as the EPS Study Area (*Figure 17*). The Plan’s methodology will identify priorities for activation, connection, renovation and repurposing of facilities within existing parks, recommendations for creation and development of new parks, and opportunities for collaborating with other entities and stakeholders to provide public space and outdoor experiences. Further, this innovative, geographically based method will allow us to evaluate the relative supply and demand for parks and public spaces, test the sensitivity of the public space network to new facilities and new park users, and to prioritize the areas with the most urgent needs for additional open space in a measurable, equitable way.

To test the new methodology proposed in this Plan, a Pilot Area was selected from within the larger EPS Study Area - the Silver Spring Central Business District (CBD) (see results in the *Appendix*). The remainder of the EPS Study Area will be analyzed during the implementation phase of this Plan (*Chapter 5*).

The EPS methodology identifies low levels of service for parks and public space and proposes opportunities to raise the service in those areas. The analysis method is described in this chapter, the results are explained in Chapter 4 and implementation steps are discussed in *Chapter 5*.

Analysis - Chapter 3

- Collect Data
- Analyze Data: Identify Level of Service
- Analyze Data: Identify Opportunity Sites



Results - Chapter 4

- Organize by Strategies
- Screen for Feasibility
- Prioritize by Social Equity



Implementation - Chapter 5


- Apply Methodology to EPS Study Area
- Implement Recommendations
- Provide Funding Sources
- Align Operations, Maintenance, and Policing
- Assess Progress

The EPS Study Area

To identify a focused area upon which to apply the new methodology, portions of the County were selected that fall into two categories: higher intensity mixed use and higher density residential. Data from the Planning Department’s Round 9.0 Forecast was used to create the EPS Study Area and includes current (2010) and future (2045) conditions.


Higher intensity mixed-use*

(commercial and residential)



Example: Silver Spring

Higher Density Residential*



Example: White Oak

Higher-Intensity Mixed Use: Commercial and Residential

Areas that are “higher-intensity mixed use” are defined as being areas with both moderate residential density and that are also employment centers. These areas have a both a residential population density of 5,000 people per square mile and a ratio of employees to residents that is 1:1 or higher.

Higher Density Residential

To also provide greater service to areas in the County with the highest residential density, areas with over 10,000 residents per square mile were added to the Study Area.

See *Figure 18* for examples of areas that represent Higher-intensity mixed-use and Higher Density Residential areas.

In addition, the EPS Study Area also aligns with on-going regional and local planning efforts areas: activity centers as defined by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, public transit routes and stations (existing and proposed), and recent master and sector plans completed by the Planning Department.

Analyze Supply and Demand

To identify and prioritize opportunities to meet the park and recreation needs of County residents in the EPS Study Area, a significant amount of new data must be collected and analyzed using both innovative and traditional tools.

Collect Data

In this phase of the methodology, a significant amount of data is collected and sorted. Parameters on how to collect and analyze the data were critical to ensure the systematic approach this methodology

Figure 18 - Typical Development Patterns for Higher Intensity Mixed-use and Higher Density Residential Areas.

will bring to future project areas. Data necessary for the analysis phase will focus on identifying the supply of park facilities and the demand for park and open space use in the area under study.

Community Input and Demographic Data

During the development of the *Vision 2030 Strategic Plan* in 2010, the Department of Parks and the Montgomery County Recreation Department pledged to “engage a diverse community and proactively respond to changing demographics, needs, and trends”. Montgomery County demographic trends that influenced the outreach methods for the *EPS Plan* include:

- Increasing racial and ethnic diversity, with a projected growth in minority groups from 55 percent of the population in 2015 to 68 percent of the population in 2040
- Projected growth in the population of people over age 65 from 12 percent of the population in 2010 to 20 percent in 2040
- A large and widely diverse foreign-born population speaking a multitude of languages and varying English speaking proficiencies

To gather input from our diverse community, a great deal of input was collected through a variety of methods including the *Parks and Recreation of the Future* campaign and surveys, interviews, and focus groups conducted by a team of consultants. The process and results of these tools were reported in the *Montgomery County Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Report (April 2017)*.

Community input indicates a strong desire for providing parks and open spaces in higher density and mixed-use areas of the County. One theme that arose from stakeholder focus groups is the desire for community gathering spaces. The *Vision 2030 Needs Assessment Report* indicates that people want to “utilize parks as meeting points and vehicles for community building and gatherings. The parks should

function as a place for building community through social gatherings so that people can meet each other. Work in partnership with the community, through nonprofits to accomplish more cultural programming. Parks should be utilized as centers to promote cultural understanding and learning particularly through more ethnic programming and events.” These findings helped inform the development of the *EPS Plan* methodology that places increased importance on parks and public spaces as places to gather and interact with members of one’s community.

A second major finding of community outreach was that people highly value areas of natural character and beauty and want Parks to increase the amount of these spaces and the care of these areas. The value of natural areas is particularly important where the most people live and where there is the least amount of green space today, that is the *EPS Study Area*. This finding indicates community support for the research recommendations to increase access of all residents to green, natural spaces. As the implementation of the Energized Public Space Program proceeds, amenities that provide green spaces and small natural areas within our most highly developed communities will be promoted.



Figure 19 - Examples of Public Spaces in Different Ownership.

Supply of Publicly Accessible Facilities

Determining the supply of park and public spaces that a given person can access within a reasonable walking distance is the critical first step in this Plan’s methodology. The supply of facilities will be quantified by taking inventory of all open spaces, then evaluating the park experiences that can occur on those open spaces, and finally measuring how many of those experiences are accessible by walking from the area under study. In this methodology, Supply means access to available public space experiences, not a measure of current park usage.


Inventory All Parks and Public Spaces

Understanding that real estate within the EPS Study Area comes at a premium, this Plan expands its scope and inventory of resources to look beyond Montgomery Parks properties (see Figure 19). It will consider integrating the network of all publicly accessible open spaces and parks, independent of ownership. This collaboration and partnership with a diverse group of stakeholders will ultimately provide outdoor experiences delivered to the community in a more efficient and expedited way.

To include all publicly accessible open spaces within this methodology, such spaces need to be documented in GIS layers. In addition to existing Montgomery Parks sites, public spaces to be catalogued include other types of government land: County, public schools, municipal and federal. All Privately-Owned Public Spaces are also included in this inventory. Privately-Owned Public Spaces, or POPS, are created via the development review process for private residential or commercial buildings according to the *2017 Recreation Guidelines for Private Residential Development*.

Evaluate Park Experiences

Why do people go to parks and public spaces? The short answer is to experience the outdoors. This Plan recognizes the importance of a balance in these experiences, so facilities can be responsive to a wider demographic range of residents and employees. Public spaces are about people gathering and sharing a common place. As such, each space needs to provide experiences that will attract people to it. This Plan classifies outdoor experiences into three types that are not necessarily exclusive of each other (see Figure 20).



- **Active Experiences**
 - Play sports or games; run, walk, or bicycle; climb or mountain bike; other outdoor exercises.
 - Use trails, athletic fields, open spaces/lawns, sport courts, playgrounds, interactive elements, natural areas.
- **Contemplative Experiences**
 - Enjoy nature, read a book, or learn something; relax/meditate/reflect; escape chaos.
 - Use natural areas, historic sites, benches, shade trees, community open spaces, gardens, small green spaces, trails.
- **Social Gathering Experiences**
 - Attend community festivals, concerts, outdoor movies, parades; visit farmer's markets, historic sites; meet friends, have a picnic, see your neighbors.
 - Use plazas with seating, small sport courts, amphitheatres/stages, picnic tables, large community open spaces, dog parks.

Each facility within the inventoried park and public space system is scored based on how well it provides active, contemplative, and social gathering experiences.

The first step in evaluating the supply of park experiences is to determine whether a given facility provides each experience type. This step is a binary (yes/no) determination (see Figure 21). For example, a playground provides for both active recreation and social gathering, but not contemplative experiences.

The second step in evaluating park experiences is to determine how much benefit each facility provides for each experience type. Each facility gets a score depending on how well it provides each of the experiences to potential users of that park facility. The scoring criteria give a higher score to a facility that is open and welcoming to the most people (see Figure 22).

Figure 20 - Outdoor Experiences Classification.

For example, a playground has a higher score than a tennis court for the active recreation experience because it serves a larger number of people at one time and there are no specialized skills required to use a playground (see Figure 23). Trails get an even higher score than playgrounds for active recreation since they serve a larger demographic audience than playgrounds. However, for the social gathering experience, playgrounds score higher than trails since trails are narrow, linear facilities that mostly serve to move users from one location to another, not providing for significant levels of social gathering. Plazas and Civic Greens, on the other hand, accommodate large events and community festivals that are open to all and thus have high social gathering scores.



Figure 21 - Sample Evaluation of Experiences Provided by a Park Facility – Playground.

Facility Supply Scoring

EXPERIENCE BENEFIT LEVEL	DESCRIPTION	SUPPLY SCORE
Most Community Benefit	Facilities that serve the community as a whole	3
Individual and Community Benefit	Facilities that provide balanced benefits to individuals and larger groups	2
Mostly Individual Benefit	Facilities that provide benefits mostly to individuals and small groups	1
Minimal Benefit		0

Figure 22 - Criteria for Each Experience Type

For example, a playground has a higher score than a tennis court for the active recreation experience because it serves a larger number of people at one time and there are no specialized skills required to use a playground (see Figure 23). Trails get an even higher score than playgrounds for active recreation since they serve a larger demographic audience than playgrounds. However, for the social gathering experience, playgrounds score higher than trails since trails are narrow, linear facilities that mostly serve to move users from one location to another, not providing for significant levels of

social gathering. Plazas and Civic Greens, on the other hand, accommodate large events and community festivals that are open to all and thus have high social gathering scores.

Each facility type also receives a total supply score by adding the three experience scores together. In the case of a playground, supply scores are assigned for Active and Social Gathering experiences with no score for Contemplative (see Figure 23).



Figure 23 - Supply Scoring Illustration for Selected Park Facilities

Apply Walkable Network Model

A GIS-based model was created to calculate “walksheds” for the parks and public space within a 10-minute walk of all residents and employees. This Walkable Network Model considers neighborhood roads, trail systems and parks, walkways on schools and commercial land, and any road with a sidewalk within the County to calculate parks within walking distance. The ability to consider barriers such as highways and elevated rail tracks in the walkshed analysis brings a reality check in the accessibility to our public spaces network from the pedestrian experience.

In the final step of the supply analysis, this walkable network model is applied to calculate the supply of park experiences for each location within an analysis area. The area under study is divided into a grid of one-acre squares. Each square in the grid is assigned supply scores based on the park experiences within the walkshed of that square, including the total score and the component active, contemplative, and social gathering scores (*see Figure 24*).

The GIS model then aggregates the scoring results for all the individual grid squares to create a map of the supply of park experiences available to residents, employees and visitors to an area. Sample supply maps for each experience type and a combined total supply output map are located in the *Appendix, Figure 35, and Figure 36*

Demand for Parks and Open Spaces

The demand for park and open space facilities is calculated based on the number of residents and daytime users (employees, visitors, shoppers, etc.) in an analysis area. Demand data for this Plan’s methodology was gathered from a variety of sources, including U.S. Census data and future population projections, and Planning Department, State and County data on property parcels and the size of commercial and residential buildings. The demand data is a sum of

single-family residents, multi-family residents and daytime population estimates within each grid square.

Calculate Demand

Residential demand data is calculated based on population estimates per square foot of residential space (for multi-family units) or by population per single family unit (either attached or detached). The numbers of residents are assigned to either a point on a single-family unit or to the parcel that contains a multi-family unit.

For daytime users, estimates of employees, visitors, and shoppers are calculated by converting square feet of developed space to jobs using standard conversion factors. This methodology uses the accepted conversion factors that are used in transportation planning. Same as for residential demand, the daytime users are assigned to the property parcels that contain a given office or commercial building.

Assign Demand to Model Grid

Just as for supply, demand numbers are assigned to each acre square within an analysis area. The model apportions number of jobs and housing population based on the percentage of the grid square that overlaps parcels. The Total Demand Score is calculated from the combined demand sources. *Figure 25* illustrates how the Total Demand Score was calculated for one square that covers a portion of a multi-family apartment building and a smaller portion of an office building. The demand for this square consists of 18 jobs and 436 residents, for a Total Demand Score of 454.




Figure 24 - Sample 10-minute Walkshed and Supply of Facilities




Figure 25 - Sample Demand Score Calculation.

Analyze Data: Identify Level of Service

Once the supply and demand data necessary has been collected and entered in the GIS model, we can conduct a supply and demand analysis to identify the relative level of service for each type of open space experience. See *Figure 26* for an illustration of the concept of the methodology. This first major element of the data analysis is a primarily quantitative analysis to determine the location of areas with the lowest level of service parks and open space.

Combine Supply and Demand Data

The first step is to combine the data sets so that each grid square has assigned supply and demand scores. The sample illustration in *Figure 27* shows the combination of supply and demand scores assigned to each grid square. In this example, the highlighted grid shown has a Total Supply Score of 188 and a Total Demand Score of 454.

Determine Supply/Demand Comparison Factor

After each square is assigned a total supply score and a total demand, the final step is to compare the supply and demand across an area and determine the relative service surplus or shortfall. The critical element of this step in the methodology is that the Supply and Demand values are compared using a ratio called the Supply/Demand Comparison Factor. Since the Supply and Demand scores were calculated from different inputs - a point scale of relative access to park experiences versus estimated numbers of residents plus employees - they are not directly comparable at a 1:1 ratio. The Supply/Demand Comparison Factor will allow the model to set a threshold that will result in identifying areas with low levels of service within a given analysis area, and to compare the relative lack of service across large areas of the County.




Figure 26 - Level of Service Methodology Concept Diagram

In the implementation phase of this Plan, the first step will be to apply this methodology to the rest of the EPS Study Area. At that time, adjustments to the factor can be made to prioritize low service areas among different communities within the EPS Study Area. The Supply/Demand Comparison Factor allows for sensitivity analysis to be conducted on either the entire EPS Study Area or selected areas to identify the highest priority low-service areas in various formulations, thus providing data to support the decision-making process during the implementation phase of the *EPS Plan*.

Outcome: Level of Service Maps

The supply versus demand analysis will determine the relative level of service for the analysis area. *Figure 27* illustrates the concept of the methodology in identifying areas with less need and greater need for parks and open space. This level of service can then be mapped (see

Figure 28 for a sample Level of Service Map process). The grid squares where Total Demand outrips Total Supply can be highlighted in these level of service maps, indicating the location of the lowest level of service for parks and public space.




Figure 27 - Sample Relationship between Supply and Demand Scores.

By systematically identifying areas with a low level of service for parks and public space, Level of Service Maps such as this will provide critical information to the decision-making process for determining where and what type of parks and public space should be provided.




Figure 28 - Sample Supply and Demand Analysis with Resulting Lower Level of Services Mapping.

Analyze Data: Identify Opportunity Sites

Parallel to the level of service mapping using the quantitative method described above, a more traditional site analysis will take place to determine the best opportunity sites to apply a variety of implementation strategies to increase the level of service. This qualitative analysis will apply the principles of urban design and site assessment through a planning framework. The EPS Planning Framework includes two steps - first applying a Hierarchy of Park Types, then implementing the Urban Parks and Public Space Design Guidelines - to create the desired system of parks and open space to reduce service shortfalls in the EPS Study Area.

The type and pattern of parks and public spaces best suited to urban populations are different from the suburban model of large tracts of land filled with fixed, single-use facilities. PROS Plans in the past projected recreational needs by broad planning areas, rather than by small sub-areas such as the new transit-oriented neighborhoods being created in Montgomery County. The 2017 PROS Plan recognizes that we need to provide, build, and manage park and recreation resources differently in urban areas. There are distinct challenges as well as unique opportunities in creating a system of parks for mixed use and higher density residential areas.

This qualitative analysis of all the land, infrastructure, and properties within an area under analysis will provide an on-the-ground reality check of the level of service results from the quantitative analysis.




Figure 29 - Sample Parks and Open Space Hierarchy, Bethesda Downtown Plan Design Guidelines, July 2017

Further, this analysis will identify candidate opportunities to provide additional park and open space amenities to meet the needs of residents and daytime users of a study area. A sample output map showing candidate opportunities sites to increase open space and park service through application of this qualitative analysis is in the *Appendix, Figure 38*.

Park Hierarchy

The *2012 PROS Plan* recommended that for each urban area, a unique open space system should be planned to serve the projected demographics of residents, workers, and visitors through a combination of public and private efforts. The urban design vision developed during the master plan or sector plan process for these areas helps guide the amount, pattern, location, siting, and design of open spaces. This way of approaching park recommendations will be applied throughout the EPS Study Area.

The new open space system should support a vibrant and sustainable community by including open spaces that will be comfortable, attractive, easily accessible, safe, and provide a range of experiences, up to and including festival and outdoor event spaces. Those open spaces that rise to the level of serving as a focal point of community life for the planning area are typically recommended to be publicly owned and managed parks, while those open spaces serving a smaller district, neighborhood, or block are often recommended as public use spaces owned or managed by the private sector. The character, amount and size of open spaces within the EPS Study Area will vary from one community to the next based on density and existing community factors.

The following park and open space hierarchy and associated park types should be applied to each analysis area in the EPS Study Area.

For each Urban Sector/Master Plan Area

- Active Recreation Destinations
- Central Civic Green
- Interconnected System of Sidewalks and Trails
- Wooded Areas

For each Urban Neighborhood

- Neighborhood greens
- Walk-to recreational amenities

For each Urban Block

- Space for urban square, plaza, or green area

For each Building

- Space for outdoor recreation

For each Residence

- Private outdoor space

An example of an applied hierarchy for parks and open spaces from the approved and adopted *Bethesda Downtown Plan (2017)* is shown in *Figure 29*.

Urban Parks and Public Space Design Guidelines

In addition to the hierarchy of park types, the *EPS Plan* introduces a set of design guidelines to help Montgomery Parks and its partners deliver public spaces that are flexible and accommodate a variety of experiences within its network of outdoor spaces.

These guidelines are intended to provide developers and the public with a sense of the types of open spaces that the Planning Board might look for when reviewing projects in the EPS Study Area. The Plan considered three approved documents as references for the development of these guidelines: *Silver Spring CBD Green Space Guidelines (2010)*; *Formula 2040: Functional Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space (2013, Prince George’s County)*; and the *Bethesda Downtown Plan Design Guidelines* (approved July 2017).

The Urban Parks and Public Space Design Guidelines give more detailed guidance than the Park Classification System in PROS. These design guidelines will be published as a separate companion document to this Functional Master Plan to allow them to be revised and improved as the state of the art changes for urban parks and public spaces design. The guidelines will include information on the following main design elements that should be considered in the creation of new or renovated public open space to maximize the public benefits of each site.

Intent, Key Features and Size

These basic elements of a proposed park are described in the Park Classification System Chart from the *2017 PROS Plan* (see *Figure 16*).

Experiences and Mix of Uses

Public spaces should be great public destinations that are lively, secure, and distinct in character. The best city public spaces are multi-use destinations that can be catalysts for community development. Public spaces are about people gathering and sharing a common

place. As such, each space is associated with experiences that will attract people to it. These design guidelines classify the outdoor experiences into three types as described earlier in this chapter: Active, Contemplative and Social Gathering.

Relationship to Adjacent Uses

The primary task of architecture and landscape urban design is the physical definition of streets and public spaces with shared use. The land use and physical form of architecture and landscape surrounding each urban park is a critical element to its character, function and success. The scale and program of adjacent ground floors or spaces need to provide an active and welcoming pedestrian-scale relationship. Urban Parks should be viewed as framed spaces within neighborhoods or communities, much like a living room is the public space of a house. Location of park and building entrances facing a park can influence the sense of personal safety by providing “eyes on the place”.

The following design factors should be considered when creating new public spaces and parks:

- Interesting building elevations and maximization of building entrances facing the park
- Walkable street frontage
- Compatibility of land uses
- Public spaces as central community focal points
- Openness/welcoming spaces
- Interesting viewsheds
- Solid and void relationships
- Clear delineation between the public space and adjacent private realm
- Connectivity to other public spaces and transit

Site Access and Connectivity/ Social Equity

Successful public spaces are connected and easily accessible to all in an integrated network of streets and sidewalks, through-block connections, and proximity to transportation.

The following access, design, and equity factors should be considered when creating new open spaces and parks:

- Locations that accommodate and welcome diversity
- Meet ADA requirements
- Clear entries/gateways
- Safe pedestrian access/crossings for all ages, especially children
- Trail system connections
- Street grid continuity
- Public transit and bike system connections
- Servicing access and shared parking
- Direct connection to a street network
- Grade transitions
- Access to sunlight
- Wayfinding and signage
- Accessibility
- Multi-modal access

Special Features

In addition to the location and hierarchy of open spaces within the public spaces system, there can be geographical, landscape, or designed features that provide a unique setting and special identity for each public space. These features help the community to engage and learn in inviting, safe and beautiful open spaces.

The following special features should be considered when creating new open spaces and parks:

- Night lighting
- Signature main open space

- Signature element: interactive water, nature, or art feature as focal point
- Defined major pedestrian path
- Signage/wayfinding, interpretative features
- Large species shade trees
- Park furniture: fixed elements and degree of flexibility
- Accessible amenities
- Cultural features that create a sense of place

Frequency of Uses

The guidelines will describe the typical frequency of use for each park type and common facilities. For example, while all parks are available for everyday use, Neighborhood Greens are more likely to be used daily or weekly by the immediate neighborhood, and Civic Greens, as regional destinations, provide additional use for special and seasonal events.

Open space design should consider supporting various frequencies of use:

- Special events
- Seasonal events
- Monthly functions
- Weekly functions
- Daily functions

Community Benefits

Parks and public spaces are critical elements to be considered in the planning of a sustainable and resilient community. The presence of parks near neighborhoods promotes key community benefits. The following community benefits should be considered during creation of new parks and public spaces:

- Health and wellness
- Happiness
- Connectivity

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan

- Economic development and increased neighborhood value
- Green infrastructure
- Air quality
- Access to natural areas and historic sites
- Education
- Social benefit
- Sense of Place



Photo: ARTivity on the Green: Signature sculptures and special events support Winston-Salem's reputation as "The City of Arts and Innovation". Source: ForsythWoman.com.

Operations, Maintenance, and Policing

This new element will address the issues of operations, maintenance, and policing, factors that are critical to the success of new open spaces. As part of the future development of the Urban Parks Standards for Operations, Maintenance and Policing recommended in this Plan (see *Chapter 5*), specific guidance will be developed and incorporated into the *Urban Parks and Public Space Design Guidelines*. Strategies will be recommended to address operational issues unique to parks in the urban environment.



Photo: Picking up trash in Central Park using smaller vehicles and satellite locations. Source: Stephan Springer for the New York Times.

Chapter 4: Results

In the last chapter, quantitative and qualitative analyses resulted in maps of locations with low levels of parks and public space service and potential opportunity sites to increase services. Next, that information is used to develop recommendations and implementation strategies for each opportunity site. These results of the *EPS Plan* will guide future actions to create a world-class park and open space system to serve the County's growing population in its core.

The first step in creating actionable results from the analysis is to organize, evaluate and prioritize the identified opportunities for additional park and open space resources.

Organize by Strategies

There are five implementation strategies (Activate, Connect, Renovate and Repurpose, Develop, and Create) that can be used to increase the service provided by parks and public spaces. These strategies build on the theme of balancing renovation, development, and acquisition described in the *2017 PROS Plan* that is key to providing park services in an efficient manner. The first four strategies include ways to make the most of the current supply of parkland and open spaces, while the final strategy discusses ways of creating opportunities through new spaces. Candidate opportunity sites identified in the previous step will be organized according to these five strategies.

Activate

Through activation and programming of existing parks and public spaces, residents can have access to more park experiences in a short timeframe after needs are identified. Montgomery Parks has an Activating Parks Program to promote the parks as a place to relax,

recreate, and foster a sense of community. This program serves to reinvigorate existing urban parks, among others, many of which are heavily used and in need of renovation and development. The current Activating Parks Program is changing the way residents are using parks and challenging antiquated park rules. Activation programs can expand residents' perceptions regarding what is possible to do in parks and public spaces.



Photo: Montgomery Parks Pop-Up Program: Pump track. Source: M-NCPPC

Public spaces activation can include “pop up” events that bring temporary facilities to a site, such as a climbing wall or bicycle/skateboard pump track, or games such as corn hole and large-scale versions of scrabble, Jenga, or chess. Other activation events could include programming yoga or exercise classes, special events such as music, food or art festivals, and providing unique experiences such as outdoor movie nights. Activation events even can be scheduled year-round by including cold weather events such as evening fire circles with s’mores and hot chocolate.

Activation can serve as an interim solution for park spaces that are planned for new construction or redevelopment in the future. It plays a major role in engaging the community in a park that is awaiting improvements and helps to keep them involved as the planning and construction phases are underway. Activities and pop up features can be scheduled to promote a new use for a park, serving as a trial run for new facilities with input from actual park users. For parks where renovations and upgrades may be further off into the future, activation events encourage the community to continue using parks and allows them to discover new ways to use parks. These programs also raise awareness of the importance of public spaces through publicity for events, even with people who cannot take part in activation events.

Connect

A critical tool to increase the service provided by a given park or open space is to improve the community’s access to that site. Connectivity can be increased with upgrades to pedestrian and bicycle circulation in parks and road rights-of-way, including sidewalks, bikeways, and safe road crossings, and improvements to circulation on public spaces on private property. By improving walkable connections to the entire public space network, service levels can be increased at lower cost and

in shorter timeframes than necessary to renovate existing or build new parks.

Renovate and Repurpose

Existing parks can be updated and refocused to provide the needed amenities missing from a community. Some parks may not be providing the service a community wants either through out-of-date or poor condition facilities or through the wrong types of facilities. Renovation of facilities that have reached the end of their useful lifecycle is a major ongoing effort of the Department of Parks through targeting capital funding for renovation and replacement.



Photo: Dog Park repurposed from an underutilized courtyard plaza, Ellsworth Urban Park, Silver Spring. Source: M-NCPPC

One way to improve services often implemented as part of renovation projects is to repurpose a facility to another use. If countywide trends and detailed usage data for a specific park indicate that a facility is underutilized, then the facility platform may be considered for additional or alternate uses. In some instances, minor changes can allow more use of an existing facility; for example, adding pickle ball striping to existing tennis courts allows for participants in two racquet sports to make use of the same facility. In other cases, a facility may be removed or rebuilt to suit a different use entirely; for example, an underutilized diamond field could be rebuilt into a more in-demand dog park or rectangular field. Repurposing opportunities also may be identified on privately held open spaces where analysis indicates an open space with potential to provide greater service and may be implemented through voluntary partnerships.

Develop

Developing new outdoor park amenities in existing public parkland and public open space is one key way to add significantly to the supply of park experiences. In the EPS Study Area, making efficient use of existing parkland is especially important due to the high competition for land. Some opportunities for increasing park service rely upon developing new facilities on existing parkland. These sites may include existing developed parks with available space for new facilities and park sites that have yet to be developed to meet their service intent. Opportunities to develop new open space amenities also will be identified on private open space and on non-park public lands for implementation through voluntary partnerships.

Create

If the previous four tools are not adequate to expand the supply of parks and public spaces to meet a community's needs, then creation of new open spaces must be considered to provide a platform for outdoor experiences. Properties in a preferred location for future

open space are identified for potential addition to the public open space system. Identified sites can become public open space through multiple techniques. Privately-Owned Public Spaces (POPS) are often established through the development process in certain zones, creating publicly available resources that remain in private ownership.

New land is added to the public park system through two primary techniques: dedication to Parks through the land development process and direct purchase using public funds. When dedication or POPS do not create the needed recreation and open space facilities, purchase of parkland becomes necessary.

In the highly-developed portions of the County that make up the EPS Study Area, a third avenue to create public parkland is to consider land already owned by the public sector but used for something other than parks and open space. Some of these parcels may be the most likely candidates for creating additional parkland, especially for larger urban parks over one acre, and include surface parking lots, the roofs of underutilized parking garages and other public buildings, and unused areas of road rights-of-way, among others.

Implementation Tools

Multiple tools can be used to implement the five strategies to create new parks and public spaces. Here are just a few of the most important.

Partnerships for Operations and Activation

Partnerships between private and public entities can create significant opportunities to increase the level of service for parks and public space through joint activation and operations efforts. Partnerships can make use of private and public organizations that have staff on the ground near parks and open spaces to provide monitoring and certain maintenance tasks more efficiently. Parks staff could partner with

other organizations to do joint activation efforts in both public parks and privately-owned public space.



Photo: Yappy Hour temporary dog park with food and music, a partnership event held in Elm Street Urban Park, Bethesda. Source: M-NCPPC

Alternative Ownership Options: Public, Private and Partnership

This Plan analyzes the complete network of public open spaces to determine service levels, including alternate providers such as the public schools, privately-owned public spaces on development sites, and others. When seeking to implement opportunities to increase the level of service of parks and public space, alternate ownership options will continue to be considered. Alternate providers will continue to fill in experiences that cannot be met with additional parkland. Similarly, new and upgraded public parks will fill needs that cannot be met by POPS.

Innovative ownership options can play a key role in expanding parks and open spaces in our higher-density communities. Examples such as the pending park in the Chevy Chase Lake community, where a public

park is being constructed on top of a privately owned, underground parking garage, provide a model for moving forward with innovative options.

Zoning, Area Master Plans, and Development Review

A variety of tools related to master plan recommendations and the development review process can be used to support the creation of more parks and public space, and they are key element of implementation efforts. There are many ways that these regulatory and policy tools can support a better public space system. A few examples include: specific recommendations in land use master plans for parks and public space; zoning recommendations that encourage assembly of large blocks of redevelopment to create larger POPS or public parks; and zoning tools that can support additional funding for parks acquisition and development such as park impact payments.

Screen for Feasibility

Once the opportunities are categorized by strategy, they are evaluated to make a first pass at determining the feasibility of implementation. This initial evaluation looks at a variety of factors related to the feasibility of an opportunity coming into reality. This step may also look at potential benefits to the parks and public space system versus the potential costs.

For creation of new spaces, planning level information about a site is considered, including the current land use, zoning, and potential for future redevelopment or likelihood of availability for purchase. Opportunities in the other implementation strategies are evaluated by other factors to estimate feasibility, including condition of existing parks and public space, current use patterns, and options for pursuing the proposed strategy.

All candidate opportunities will be given an estimated feasibility ranking of low, medium or high. Opportunities that are not deemed

to have a reasonable chance of becoming reality, even during the long-term, may be screened out of the opportunity list during this step in the methodology.

Prioritize by Social Equity

After the results of the quantitative and qualitative analysis have been organized into strategies and screened for feasibility, they can be prioritized for implementation. This Plan proposes to use Social Equity as the primary criteria to determine which areas of the EPS Study Area should be targeted for implementation efforts. The EPS Plan methodology prioritizes the portions of the Study Area with the lowest level of service for walkable park experiences combined with neighborhoods with lower incomes. This prioritization will be used to compare opportunities across large areas of the EPS Study Area (or the entire study area) for relative needs and benefits.

As discussed in the policy overview (*Chapter 2*), national, state, and local policies support the use of equity as a key way to measure the success of park and recreation systems. The National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA), the American Planning Association (APA), Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MD DNR), and many of other agencies and non-profits have identified social equity as a major element in developing successful communities, and equitable distribution of parks is a critical element of the overall equity issue.



Teardrop Park, Battery Park City, NY. Maintained, operated and programmed by Battery Park City Authority. Source: ©Michael Van Valkenburg Landscape Architects, Inc.

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan



Clockwise from top left - Soma West Dog and Skate Park, source: Wescover.com. Indianapolis Cultural Trail, Indianapolis, IN, source: VisitIndiana.com. Rockville Town Square, source: M-NCPPC. Canal Park, Washington, DC, source: CapitolRiverfront.org.

Chapter 5: Implementation

As a Functional Master Plan, this Plan defines the parameters of an ongoing program that will strive to meet the park and recreation needs of the County’s most dense and mixed use communities. The implementation of this Plan will take place over many years, even decades, to reach the overall goal of walkable access to a variety of park experiences for all residents. As discussed above, the *EPS Plan* does not replace existing Parks policies and programs that create new parks and open spaces (including the State Program Open Space and the Legacy Open Space acquisition programs), but supplements those programs with a new sophisticated analysis tool for guiding park and open space decisions in the higher population areas of the County. The Department of Parks will lead a collaborative effort with the Planning Department, other public agencies, property owners and the public to make these critical parks and open spaces a reality. The most important next steps to implement this Plan are described in this chapter.

Apply Methodology to the EPS Study Area

Prioritize Locations to Study Next

After adoption of the *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan*, the entire EPS Study Area will be evaluated by the methodology over a period of time. Staff will determine the best method for doing this complete study and may analyze portions of the Study Area one at a time instead of the entire Study Area all at once.

Social Equity will be the primary criteria to prioritize which areas to analyze first. Additional criteria that will help to select the next study areas include:

- High level of identified park and open space needs in the *2017 PROS Plan*.
- Geographic parity between communities within the Study Area.
- Communities that have not recently gone through the land use master plan process.
- Areas with a low level of development activity that are not receiving privately generated open space and park amenities.
- Areas with Master Plans currently under revision, so EPS recommendations can be added directly into land use master plans.

After the first step of the EPS methodology (supply and demand analysis) is completed across the Study Area, communities with the lowest level of service can be prioritized for full analysis and identification of opportunities to increase park service.

Staff will present to the Planning Board the work program for study priorities in coordination with the Planning Department’s master plan schedule. Opportunities to create parks via development activity, public input, or new partnership options may also affect the selection of which parts of the Study Area should be analyzed first.

Find Low Levels of Service and Potential Opportunities

Park staff will apply the EPS methodology over time according to the established priorities for analysis. Once the quantitative and qualitative methodologies have been completed for one or more portions of the EPS Study Area, the recommended strategies will be vetted through Montgomery Parks, the Planning Department, other

public agencies and relevant community groups for review and comment, prior to seeking Planning Board approval.

Planning Board Approval of Recommendations

The *Legacy Open Space (LOS) Functional Master Plan (2001)*, the one functional master plan that directs Parks programs currently, uses a set of criteria to evaluate sites within six categories of open space. The criteria are used to determine if new sites are significant enough to add to the *LOS Functional Master Plan* as designated Legacy Open Space resources. Similarly, the *EPS Plan* uses quantitative and qualitative analysis tools to determine opportunity sites to improve parks and open space level of service through five implementation strategies.

This Plan recommends that the Planning Board review and approve the set of recommended opportunities for each portion of the Study Area to go through the complete methodology. Based on the approved method for amending the *Legacy Open Space Functional Master Plan*, EPS opportunity sites that are approved by the Planning Board will be added to the *Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan* for implementation through the regular land acquisition, park development, land development review, and master plan processes. The County Council will have general review over these changes to the implementation phase of the *EPS Plan* through the CIP review process.

Update Quantitative and Qualitative Methodologies

As the implementation program of the *EPS Plan* moves forward over the next several decades, new research, data sets and GIS programs will result in improvements to the quantitative GIS analysis tools. For instance, the walkshed analysis tool may become more refined allowing for analysis of varying types of walksheds, plus bike-sheds

and transit-sheds for parks and public space may become easier to calculate and integrate into the overall analysis.

To continue to meet the stated goals of this Functional Master Plan, the specific steps outlined in this methodology may be adapted to new data and technology. By remaining flexible enough to use new data, technology, and tools for more refined analysis while remaining consistent with the priorities, policies, and goals outlined in this Functional Master Plan, this methodology can evolve to better identify areas with a relatively low level of service for parks and public space.

Incremental improvements and refinements to the quantitative methodology over time will be presented to the Planning Board for public input, review and approval and may be incorporated into any new analysis of the geographic area covered by this Plan. If substantive changes to the methodology are proposed that would deviate from the priorities, policies and goals described in this document, a master plan amendment process may be necessary to implement those major changes.

Understanding of the best urban designs for parks also will evolve over the coming decades. The *Urban Parks and Public Spaces Design Guidelines* will be a separate document that will work in tandem with this functional plan to guide the quality of new and improved open space (see *Chapter 3 - Analyze Data: Identify Opportunity Sites - Urban Parks and Public Spaces Design Guidelines*). Improvements and updates for these design guidelines will be coordinated by Parks and Planning staff and brought to the Planning Board for review and approval.

Prioritize Areas for Implementation Efforts

Once service levels are quantified across the EPS Study Area, Social Equity factors will be used to prioritize locations for focused implementation efforts. To paraphrase the Social Equity Pillar of

NRPA, the main philosophical principle behind parks and recreation is to provide adequate open space, parks and recreation opportunities to all communities and citizens regardless of race, income, age or ability. This Plan will use two primary factors to prioritize implementation efforts by Social Equity: communities with the lowest level of service for parks and open space; and communities with lower levels of household income.

First, the supply and demand analysis will provide a map of locations within the EPS Study Area with a low level of service for parks and public space. That map will be used to identify the largest and deepest areas of low supply. The second prioritization factor is to identify communities with lower income levels. The EPS methodology will use the same data source used to calculate Park Equity in the *2017 PROS Plan*: Median Household Income as a percent of Area Median Income (AMI) based on U.S. Census Data.

These two factors will provide information to the Parks Department that will allow implementation funds and staff resources to be targeted to the communities most in need of additional parks and public space opportunities within a 10-minute walk of their residences and commercial establishments.

Implement Recommendations

This is a living document that establishes a systematic way to assess and deliver outdoor experiences to the public using a variety of implementation strategies and tools. As a Functional Master Plan, it describes a program that the Department of Parks will implement for the foreseeable future. This will be an ongoing implementation program to make better use of existing parkland, make creative partnerships to meet the needs, and purchase new parkland. Implementation to fill identified low service areas with solutions to increase park and public space service will take time and effort.

Activate

Increasing parks and public spaces level of service will occur through augmenting the existing Activating Parks Program for Montgomery Parks sites. Programs and activities will be developed for four seasons to promote park use year-round. The new Activating Parks Program Coordinator has initiated the development of these activities and implementation, and the results have been significant in terms of increasing use of targeted parks during the activation events. The ongoing Activating Parks Program will continue to develop new programs and assess their effectiveness at increasing users in the parks, both during and long after events have concluded.

A key element of activating parks and open spaces is to partner with providers of other public open space to do joint activation events on both public and privately-owned public spaces. Joint activation efforts will require appropriate staff and funding to implement with the private sector and non-profit entities.

Connect

Since most connections between communities and parks are not on parkland, most proposed connections need to be implemented through interagency and public-private collaboration. Montgomery County Department of Transportation and Maryland State Highway Administration are critical partners to achieve improvements to pedestrian and bicycle connectivity in road rights-of-way, including sidewalks, bikeways, and safe road crossings. Private property owners can partner with Parks and other agencies to provide connections from commercial and residential communities to privately and publicly-owned spaces. And, the Parks Department will evaluate park trails, paths, and community connectors to determine if changes to internal pedestrian circulation can expand the service watershed of existing park facilities.

Renovate and Repurpose

Park sites identified for renovation and repurposing efforts will be evaluated and prioritized for implementation through the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) process every two years. A large number of park assets, including those in the EPS Study Area, have a planned lifecycle where renovation becomes necessary at regular intervals. Limits on available capital funding creates the need to prioritize which parks and assets should be renovated first among a list of many that are at the end of their lifecycle. The use of the EPS methodology will be a useful tool to identify the most needed parks and facilities in prioritizing renovation and repurposing projects.

Develop

Parks

Just as for renovation and repurposing, parks identified for development of new facilities will be evaluated and prioritized for implementation through the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) process every two years. Park design is funded through two Facility Planning PDFs (Project Description Forms), and park construction is funded through either a stand-alone PDF for a large park project or through several level-of-effort PDFs for smaller new projects. The use of the EPS methodology will be a key tool to identify the most needed new parks and new facilities within parks during the CIP prioritization process.

Non-Parks

The EPS recommendations for facility development can also be implemented on non-Park property. Additional amenities could be provided on POPS (privately-owned public spaces) required as a condition of land development and could be pursued either during the development review process or negotiated during a later phase in the life of a development project on a voluntary basis. New amenities to

provide active, contemplative, or social gathering spaces can also be developed on existing public lands where appropriate, such as road rights-of-way, schools, or other public agency spaces.

Create

To increase the likelihood of creating new open spaces and receiving parks in dedication, innovative zoning tools are being developed in area master plans currently underway. These zoning tools provide incentives for property assembly, density transfer, and other means of creating park dedication. The development review process in higher density zones also results in many Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS) with a variety of active, contemplative, and social gathering benefits.

Innovative methods of creating parks can also be implemented during the development process on a case-by-case basis. Public parks can be created through easements and other legal agreements in unique locations, such as on top of underground or above ground parking garages. The first example of this innovative way to meet public and private needs is a new park to be constructed on top of an underground garage in the Chevy Chase Lakes development.

Opportunities to increase park level of service that are identified as potential acquisition sites will be added to the GIS database for parks as a proposed park location, just as for recommended parks in other master plans. Following this standard master plan implementation procedure will ensure that future planners and development reviewers, property owners, and community members will have access to the recommendations when researching land use.

For the highest priority sites that need to be purchased for public parkland, every effort will be made to acquire the sites using available tools and innovative options. The *2017 PROS Plan* describes the funding and tools available to the Department of Parks to implement

the direct acquisition of necessary parkland. For the most challenging proposed parks where alternative locations are not available, acquisition tools such as mediation and condemnation may be used to ensure the provision of the parks necessary for our growing communities.

Implementation Tools

Each of the five strategies to increase the level of service for parks can be approached with innovative ideas and tools. Some of the most important are identified here.

Partnerships for Operations and Activation

Partnerships can be pursued by the Department of Parks with private and non-profit entities to provide activation programs throughout the EPS Study Area. Partnerships may be appropriate with local non-profits, urban districts, and property owners. Additional partnerships may be appropriate to address some operations, maintenance and security services on parks and public spaces. Both of these types of partnerships will be developed to provide increased service to the community in the most efficient manner possible and will be negotiated with willing partners.

Alternative Ownership Options

As described in *Chapter 4*, different ownership patterns for parks and public space can provide a path to creating additional open space in land-constrained communities. New ownership tools include leasing underutilized space, adding parks above underground parking, and other alternatives.

Zoning, Area Master Plans, and Development Review

Recommendations to increase the level of service in the EPS Study Area can be supported in many ways through zoning, master plan recommendations, and the development review process, as

summarized in *Chapter 4*. The Department of Parks will play an active role in recommending innovative new zoning and master plan tools to increase the amount of park and open space provided through development review. Parks will partner with the Planning Department and other agencies to move these new tools forward wherever feasible.

Provide Funding Resources

Implementation of the strategies and opportunities identified through this Plan will require additional funding and other resources. As described through this Plan, a variety of implementation tools will be pursued to stretch the public dollar and bring new resources to the table. Increasing efficiencies in designing and operating new public parks will be a key element of this process. The Parks Department also will explore opportunities for alternative funding sources to support new and updated public parks. However, to achieve the Plan goals regarding certain significant new public parks and upgrading existing urban parks, some additional public funds will be required.

Proposed CIP Funding

New funding will be necessary to successfully implement the recommendations of this Plan via the five strategies. The Department of Parks will submit requests for additional funding in the *Capital Improvement Program (CIP)* review process for the FY19-24 CIP. Funds will be requested to support new parkland acquisition and design, engineering, and construction costs. This Plan recommends that additional funds be requested in several of the following five existing CIP projects (Project Description Forms, or PDFs) to provide the mix of funds necessary for the EPS program.

- **Acquisition: Local** - purchase of community use parkland
- **Acquisition: Non-Local** - purchase of countywide use parkland

- **Facility Planning: Local** - design and engineering for renovation, repurposing and new development on community use parks
- **Facility Planning: Non-Local** - design and engineering for renovation, repurposing and new development on countywide use parks
- **Urban Park Elements** - design and construction of quick-to-implement new facilities in urban areas

Acquisition funds are the most critical and largest amount necessary to implement the *EPS Plan*. To acquire necessary parkland in many of the most expensive areas of the County, additional acquisition funding dedicated to this purpose will be necessary to implement the goals of this new plan. Since the *EPS Plan* is not replacing existing park acquisition programs but supplementing them, it is critical to fund this program while also maintaining existing acquisition CIP funds to meet the goals of the other park acquisition programs (Program Open Space and Legacy Open Space).

Staff will use a variety of means to make expensive acquisitions more feasible, such as negotiating installment contracts to stretch current funding, seeking additional funding sources (see below), and requesting supplemental appropriations when necessary for significant acquisitions in the EPS Study Area.

Final design and construction funds for major park renovations and new construction of these important parks will be requested through the CIP as the design and initial engineering phases are completed, as is done for other major park projects.

Alternate Funding Strategies

Innovative and alternative funding strategies will be pursued throughout the implementation phase of the Functional Master Plan. New strategies may be developed via the zoning code during new master and sector plan development. For example, an overlay zone in

the *Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan* uses an innovative approach to funding parks through the process for allocating bonus density to development projects. Special taxing districts, fee-in-lieu payments from development projects, and increasing the required percentage of open space on development in certain zones may also be appropriate in certain areas of the EPS Study Area. The Department of Parks will collaborate with the Planning Department and other government agencies to develop any of these or other options that may work to support developing communities with the parks they need.

Align Operations, Maintenance, and Policing

To successfully implement the vision of this Plan, Parks operations, maintenance, and policing need to be aligned with the new types and locations of parks being added to the Park system. Many of the recommendations from this Plan will result in additional open space that will be taken care of by private or non-profit entities. However, some of the most important public spaces will be the signature public parks in the County's most dense mixed use neighborhoods, and they will require a higher level of operations, maintenance, and policing effort than the more suburban model parks in the rest of the County. The following three recommendations should be pursued in a timely manner to create the parks and open space network of the future in Montgomery County.

Develop Urban Park Standards for Operations, Maintenance and Policing

Usage levels will be high for many parks within the EPS Study Area, thus these parks need to be provided with consistent, high quality maintenance standards and service delivery. Ensuring these standards and delivery is one of the primary goals of park management, as they

are essential for protecting the long-term capital investment in these highly used spaces.

This Plan recommends that standards be developed for park operations, equipment and facility maintenance, and policing and security needs for the seven types of urban parks classified in the *2017 PROS Plan*. As the inventory of urban parks within the County grows, the increased usage, expanded hours, and new facility types in these parks result in a very different kind of park from the point of view of operations and safety. The current standards for operations, maintenance, and policing are based largely on a suburban park model and need to be updated for the new paradigm of parks being provided to the County.

A key element to consider in developing these park standards is how the standards of care directly affect the operating and capital budgets and influence citizen perceptions of safety and use patterns. For example, a maintenance plan in which all tasks are carried out at or above recommended best maintenance practices may create a pristine landscape but may ultimately prove to be unsustainable due to cost. Alternatively, a maintenance plan in which tasks and repairs are carried out at minimal levels may reduce annual budgets but will likely result in high capital costs required for replacement or repairs that could have been prevented with regular care. Low standards of care can also create an unsafe environment for users, thus reducing usage rates and causing increased monitoring and policing needs.

These new park standards should include a method for park management to regularly evaluate and track trends in the condition of these parks. Report cards could be created for each urban park type and for specific amenities that can be used during routine inspections. The standards should also address the issues of seasons of use to assist with creating the right structure for park maintenance work programs. Hours of usage in the most urban, mixed use areas also

need to be addressed in the new standards, since that will have a significant impact on park operations and policing requirements.

Create Necessary Support Infrastructure

Two elements are necessary to support existing and new urban parks: the right facilities and the right equipment to efficiently work in the densest communities in the County.

Plan and Develop Satellite Facilities for Staging, Maintenance and Police Operations

This Plan recommends creating a Program of Requirements (POR) for satellite maintenance facilities and then identifying potential locations based on recommendations for new and renovated urban parks through implementation of this Plan. Significant efficiencies can be had by eliminating the need for large trucks and equipment to drive long distances from regional maintenance yards through the most congested areas of the County. Recommendations for the design specifications and potential locations could include storage areas at individual park locations or small, efficient satellite maintenance yards to serve small clusters of parks.

New Equipment for Smaller Urban Parks

The second element of the necessary support infrastructure is to have the correct equipment for transportation and park maintenance. Different types of transportation should be considered to reach hard to access spaces due to lack of parking or other site limitations. Options can include smaller trucks, trailers, and various forms of utility carts, as the ones used in many urban park settings such as the National Mall in Washington, D.C. In addition to new transportation options, appropriately-sized equipment should be provided in close proximity to the parks they service, including smaller mowers, trash-hauling vehicles, and other equipment.

Add Staff and Operating Resources

Every one of the five implementation strategies to increase parks level of service will increase demands on the operating budget to keep parks clean, safe, and available to the community. Operating Budget Impact (OBI) will increase not just for new parks and facilities, but for activation, renovation, repurposing and developing new amenities.

There are four main reasons OBI will increase as these efforts are implemented. First, as facilities are updated or changed, new maintenance standards apply that occasionally reduce maintenance needs but more often increase the maintenance needs of a particular facility. Second, new and improved facilities attract more users, thus creating significantly more demand for regular maintenance. For example, when a new dog park is built, then overall park usage increases measurably and thus the maintenance need increases from twice per week to daily or even twice daily visits. Third, urban parks often have extended service hours, perhaps even 24 hours, compared to the traditional suburban model parks that operate from sunrise to sunset. These extended hours where park activity continues into the evenings on a daily basis have a much larger need for policing for safety and maintenance support. And finally, park activation programs require dedicated staff to implement.

Intensity of use and programming are key factors that impact the maintenance budget. In general, the greater number of visitors a park receives, the greater the maintenance load. Directly related is the fact that the level of maintenance impacts park usage. Simply stated, a well-maintained park attracts visitors whereas a poorly maintained site discourages positive park visitation and often invites misuse and vandalism. Given this relationship between maintenance and use, it is

important to ensure that the level of maintenance is adequate for the level of use and programming that is envisioned. Operations, maintenance and policing needs will adjust over time as the *EPS Plan* is implemented, and corresponding funds to pay for increased OBI will be requested through the annual operating budget process.

Assess Progress

The Department of Parks will assess progress toward the implementation steps in this Chapter and report to the Planning Board on a biennial basis. In addition to these comprehensive progress reports every two years; progress updates may be prepared for the Planning Board's semi-annual report to the County Council on work of the Planning and Parks Departments.

Over time as more of the EPS Study Area is evaluated using the methodology in this Plan, the cumulative body of information will be more complete and valuable. For instance, the supply and demand analysis can be used to evaluate improvements or reductions in the level of park and public space service to a community over time. The methodology will also allow for the prediction of future service levels after development and park and public space projects in the pipeline are completed.

One key element of assessing progress will be to continually update the GIS data necessary to track level of service. The changing status of public parks, facilities, and POPS as strategies are implemented needs to be tracked, along with changes in demographics, housing and commercial uses, to ensure that the model will continue to provide valid and useful data to decision-makers regarding providing the right parks and open spaces in the right places.

Appendix

Application to Pilot Area: Silver Spring CBD

The application of the EPS methodology to a real-world example is a critical step in the creation of this Functional Master Plan. It is necessary to test this proposed new method for using GIS technology and data and an innovative approach to urban design analysis to determine if the results of the method are appropriate for use in making recommendations to increase the level of service for parks and open space.

This new methodology will be used as part of future land use master and sector plans to better identify areas with relatively low levels of parks and public space compared to population, and to recommend ways to increase service in those areas, as described in *Chapters 3 - 5*. See the methodology process illustrated in *Figure 3* and described here. The methodology will also be used as a stand-alone analysis tool for areas of the EPS Study Area that are not likely to go through a Master Plan process in the near future, such as areas with higher residential density that are not identified for significant increases in commercial and residential density in the General Plan. The EPS methodology must be tested prior to either use to confirm the methodology provides valid and useful results. Equally important, the Pilot Area analysis illustrates the intent of the methodology and its possible outcomes to decision-makers, property owners, and citizens.

When a property is developed in Montgomery County, the zoning ordinance and applicable master and sector plans may require that a certain portion of the property is used for public open space or recreational amenities without changing the ownership of the

property. This functional plan does not increase the amount of open or recreational space otherwise required for a property's development, nor is it intended to modify requirements for the operation and maintenance of privately-owned public spaces established through existing regulatory approvals. However, if land identified through the EPS method is subsequently developed for private use, this Plan and the EPS method may provide recommendations on the type of open space or recreational amenities that would be beneficial to the community through the *2017 Recreation Guidelines for Private Residential Development*.

The major steps in applying this methodology summarized below are illustrated in *Figure 3*. For more details, see *Chapters 3 - 5*.

Analysis - Chapter 3

- Collect Data
- Analyze Data: Identify Level of Service
- Analyze Data: Identify Opportunity Sites

Results - Chapter 4

- Organize by Strategies
- Screen for Feasibility
- Prioritize by Social Equity

Implementation - Chapter 5

- Apply Methodology to EPS Study Area
- Implement Recommendations
- Provide Funding Sources
- Align Operations, Maintenance, and Policing
- Assess Progress

Pilot Area Selection

To test and refine the new methodology proposed in this Plan, the Silver Spring Central Business District (CBD) was selected for a pilot application of the methodology. The rest of the EPS Study Area will be analyzed during the implementation phase of this Plan as described in *Chapter 5*. The criteria used to select the Pilot Area include the following:

- **Demographic Diversity**
 - Presence of lower income Census Blocks (<62.2% Average Median Income, or AMI)
- **Significant Economic Activity Center**
 - Mixed commercial and residential land uses
 - Current zoning leaves room for future economic growth
- **Transit Connectivity**
 - Important bus and rail station that serves commuters from large portion of County
 - Major stops along future BRT routes and Purple Line light rail
- **Lack of Recent Area Master Plan**
 - Most recent sector plan completed in 2000
- **Existing planning reports that indicate a need for parks and open spaces**
 - *Silver Spring CBD Green Space Guidelines (2010)*
 - *Silver Spring Placemaking (2014)*

Downtown Silver Spring is an area that has a remarkable confluence of factors that meet these criteria, and thus was selected as the Pilot Area for the *EPS Plan*. The Silver Spring CBD is an ideal location to test this new methodology in an area with a diversity of challenges and opportunities.

Collect Data

The Pilot Area follows the boundary of the Silver Spring CBD. To analyze the parks and open spaces necessary to serve the residents and employees in the Pilot Area, the analysis area includes the CBD plus areas that are located within a 5-minute walking distance outside the CBD boundary (*see Figure 30*). Supply and demand information was gathered according to the methodology described in *Chapter 3*.

Supply of Publicly Accessible Facilities

As described in *Chapter 3*, the supply of open space available within a 10-minute walk of each location within the Pilot Area was identified using four steps. First, all existing public open spaces were inventoried in GIS, including public parkland, other public open spaces such as schools and civic centers, and privately-owned public spaces (POPS). *Figure 30* shows all current public open spaces in the Silver Spring CBD.

Second, as part of the inventory process, the individual facilities on each site also were identified and mapped. The location of the parks and open spaces that include facilities which supply each experience type (Active, Contemplative, and Social Gathering) in the Pilot Area are shown in *Figures 31, 32 and 33*.

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan



Figure 30 - Pilot Area with Existing Parks and Public Spaces.

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan




Figure 31 - Active Experiences Supply Location Map, Pilot Area.

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan




Figure 32 - Contemplative Experiences Supply Location Map, Pilot Area.

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan





Figure 33 - Social Gathering Experiences Supply Location Map, Pilot Area.


FACILITY LOCATIONS



Active

Contemplative

Social Gathering



PUBLIC ACCESS TO FACILITIES




Figure 34 - Comparison of Facilities Location Mapping, Pilot Area.




Figure 35 - Total Supply Score Map, Pilot Area.

Third, each facility within the inventoried park and public space system was scored based on how well it provides access to active, contemplative, and social gathering experiences.

Fourth and finally, the Walkable Network Model was run to create maps indicating the level of access to park experiences across the Silver Spring CBD. The relative supply of active, contemplative, and social gathering experiences varies across the Silver Spring CBD and between the different types of experiences (Figures 34). The Total Supply Score map (Figure 35) shows the amount of all types of park and public space experiences that are within a 10-minute walk of each location within the Silver Spring CBD.

The information in these six graphics together (Figures 30 - 35) lead to several conclusions about the supply of parks and open spaces across the Pilot Area.

- All areas of the CBD have some access to parks and open space within a reasonable walking distance, but the level varies significantly.
- The CBD contains a large number of small social gathering spaces but has no large site for events within the center of the CBD.
- The center and western portions of the Pilot Area have a low supply of active recreation amenities, the most significant shortfall among the three experience types.

Demand for Parks and Open Spaces

For the Pilot Area, the demand for park and public space facilities was calculated based on the number of residents and daytime users (employees, visitors, shoppers, etc.) in an analysis area, as described in Chapter 3. The demand data is the sum of single-family residents, multi-family residents and daytime population estimates within each grid square in the Silver Spring CBD.

The demand data for the Pilot Area is mapped in Figure 36.




Figure 36 - Total Demand Score Map, Pilot Area.

Analyze Data: Identify Level of Service

Combine and Analyze Supply and Demand Data

The first step in the analysis of the collected data as described in *Chapter 3* is to combine the supply and demand data sets so that each grid square in the Silver Spring Pilot Area has assigned supply and demand scores.

The next step is to determine the Supply/Demand Comparison Factor. Based on the analysis of the inventory of public spaces and the demand numbers in Silver Spring, the Supply/Demand Comparison Factor was established for the Pilot Area as a ratio of 2:1 Supply to Demand. The factor sets a threshold for where the supply is

adequate to meet the demand. For this Pilot Area analysis, wherever the demand score exceeds twice the supply score, it is considered a lower level of service.

Outcome: Level of Service Map for Pilot Area

The results of the supply versus demand level of service analysis for the Pilot Area are shown below in (*Figures 37*). The grid squares where Total Demand outstrips Total Supply are highlighted, indicating the location of the lowest level of service for parks and open space within the Silver Spring CBD.

This analysis indicates pockets of low service in many areas of the CBD, but all are concentrated near the core, not near the edges. This result is not unexpected due to the presence of so much supply of parks and open space at the edges of the CBD from the traditionally-located buffer parks. This Level of Service Map provides critical information for the next steps in the methodology to determine ideal locations for future open spaces.

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan



Figure 37 - Low Level of Service Areas Map, Pilot Area.

Analyze Data: Identify Opportunity Sites

Apply EPS Planning Framework to Pilot Area

After completion of the quantitative analysis that resulted in the Level of Service Map for the Silver Spring CBD, the EPS Planning Framework was applied to the Pilot Area. As described in *Chapter 3*, the EPS Planning Framework is composed of two new approaches to traditional urban design analysis: the Hierarchy of Park Types and the Urban Parks and Public Space Design Guidelines. The Department of Parks reviewed the Hierarchy of Park Types to identify needs for new public and private open spaces of various types in the Silver Spring CBD. The Urban Parks and Public Space Design Guidelines were also used to identify potential opportunities to increase level of service for open space and parks in the most needed areas of the CBD.

Open Space Findings

Applying the EPS Planning Framework to the Silver Spring Pilot Area resulted in the findings described below. These findings assist in identifying and prioritizing opportunities to raise the level of service in the Silver Spring CBD.

Missing Central Civic Green

The Silver Spring CBD has a large amount of paved open spaces, both public and private. It has a civic plaza in the northeast quadrant in the Veteran's Plaza. However, it does not have a central Civic Green to serve the unique functions that such a space provides.

Missing Active Recreation

The central and western portions of the CBD are significantly lacking in active recreation opportunities. This lack of service needs to be addressed through implementation efforts.

Lack of Green Space and Natural Areas

The analysis indicates many small, largely paved contemplative spaces that appear to provide adequate supply of contemplative experiences throughout the CBD. However, the value of these spaces is lower than it could be due to the lack of natural landscape features such as trees, plants, flowers or lawn, that are integral to a high-quality contemplative experience. Through the Pilot Area, there is a lack of green and nature-oriented spaces except on the boundary of the CBD. The provision of additional green space within small POPS, larger parks, and new green parks and open spaces in the center of the CBD is key to adding to the health benefits of the open space network in the CBD.

Fragmented Public Space Network

The Pilot Area includes many small POPS (privately-owned public spaces), but very few larger parks or POPS exist other than on the perimeter of the CBD to provide for events and active recreation.

Major Connectivity Hub in Center of CBD

The new Silver Spring transit center and the future Purple Line Station adjacent creates a significant hub of bus, auto, and transit connectivity. This core area is currently served by one large POPS (Discovery Green), two small public parks (one existing and one in design), and a future POPS in front of the Purple Line station, but there may be additional ways to increase service to the many commuters, residents, employees, and visitors to commercial establishments in this central location.

Barrier to Connectivity Across CBD

The elevated railroad and Metro tracks create a significant barrier between the southwest area and the rest of the CBD. This barrier slices across the pedestrian connectivity of the CBD with only two crossing points in the middle (Georgia Avenue and Colesville Road).

Identify Opportunity Sites

To identify potential opportunities to increase service to the Pilot Area and to address these findings, a planning level analysis was conducted by building upon the assessment done for the *2010 Silver Spring CBD Green Space Guidelines*. Sites identified in this 2010 plan along with additional sites based on current conditions and the findings from the quantitative and qualitative EPS methodologies were combined to create the initial list of opportunities for the Pilot Area.

The outcome of this two-stage analysis is a graphic illustration of the results of the quantitative level of service analysis combined with the results of the qualitative opportunity site analysis. See *Figure 38*.

shows the combined outcome of the analysis portion of the EPS methodology (low levels of service) on the same graphic with these potential sites to increase the level of service (opportunities) for the Pilot Area. This information is now ready to be evaluated and implemented in the next steps of the methodology.

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan



Figure 38 - Opportunity Sites for Increasing Level of Service for Parks and Open Space Map, Pilot Area.

Pilot Area Results

Once the level of service calculations and the EPS Planning Framework analysis have been completed, then areas with a low level of service and potential opportunity sites are mapped for the Pilot Area. That information was used to select specific opportunities for additional public space and parks and to develop recommendations and implementation strategies for each opportunity site, as described in *Chapter 4*.

To create actionable results from the analysis, the potential opportunity sites in the Pilot Area were organized into the five implementation strategies (Activate, Connect, Renovate and Repurpose, Develop, and Acquire). The potential opportunities were then screened for feasibility, as described in *Chapter 4*. The results of the application of the EPS methodology to the Silver Spring Pilot Area are summarized in the following matrix (*Figure 39*).

Since the Pilot Area covers a small portion of the entire EPS Study Area, these results have not been prioritized yet by Social Equity. The methodology has not been applied to other areas of the EPS Study Area so there is nothing to which the Silver Spring results can be compared. As additional portions of the EPS Study Area are evaluated with the methodology, the results from the Silver Spring pilot analysis will be compared and prioritized.

This matrix serves as a menu of options that can increase the amount of active, contemplative, and social gathering experiences in the Silver Spring CBD through the EPS implementation program. Many of these opportunities to increase parks and public space service build upon prior recommendations for parks and public spaces from earlier planning efforts, including the *Silver Spring CBD Green Space Guidelines* (2010) and the *Silver Spring CBD Sector Plan* (2000). Other

options include new opportunities to increase park service that have been identified by looking closely at on-the-ground conditions within the low service areas, and by considering the broad range of implementation strategies being used in this Plan. The recommended opportunity sites are illustrated in *Figure 40* showing the range of strategies spread across the Pilot Area, including key recommendations to add service to the core of the Silver Spring CBD.

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan

Matrix of Opportunities to Increase Parks and Open Space Level of Service in the Pilot Area

SITE	STRATEGY	DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED CREATION TECHNIQUE	PRIMARY EXPERIENCE BENEFITS	PROPOSED PARK NAME AND/OR TYPE	FEASIBILITY ESTIMATE
Woodside Urban Park	Activate	Activate existing public park as part of comprehensive, year-round park activation program	-	Active, Social Gathering	Urban Recreational	High
Fairview Local Park	Activate	Activate existing public park as part of comprehensive, year-round park activation program	-	Active, Social Gathering	Neighborhood Park	High
Ellsworth Urban Park	Activate	Activate existing public park as part of comprehensive, year-round park activation program	-	Active, Social Gathering	Urban Recreational	High
Gene Lynch Urban Park	Activate	Activate public park, possibly in partnership with nearby POPS	-	Active Social Gathering	Urban Plaza	Medium
Acorn Urban Park	Activate	Activate public park, possibly in partnership with nearby POPS	-	Active Social Gathering	Pocket Green	Medium
Fenton Street Urban Park	Activate	Activate existing public park as part of comprehensive, year-round park activation program	-	Active Social Gathering	Fenton Village Neighborhood Green	High
Jesup Blair Local Park	Activate	Activate existing public park as part of comprehensive, year-round park activation program	-	Active Social Gathering	-	High
New Railroad Row Crossing	Connect	Create new connection across major pedestrian/bicycle barrier to increase access to all open spaces on both sides of tracks. Locate between Colesville Road and Georgia Avenue crossings.	-	Active, Contemplative, Social Gathering	-	Medium
Other Connectivity Improvements	Connect	Improve connections to access public space network.	-	Active, Contemplative, Social Gathering	-	Medium
Woodside Urban Park	Renovate/ Repurpose	Major renovation underway. Construction to begin Summer 2017, estimated completion in 2019.	-	Active, Social Gathering	-	High
Ellsworth Urban Park	Renovate/ Repurpose	Renovate reclaimed space from brick house. Urban dog park recently added, successfully increasing park usage.	-	Active, Social Gathering	-	High
Silver Spring Intermediate Neighborhood Park	Renovate/ Repurpose	Improve service through renovation of current facilities.	-	Active, Contemplative	-	High

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan

SITE	STRATEGY	DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED CREATION TECHNIQUE	PRIMARY EXPERIENCE BENEFITS	PROPOSED PARK NAME AND/OR TYPE	FEASIBILITY ESTIMATE
Bullis Local Park	Renovate/ Repurpose	Improve service through renovation of current facilities.	-	Active, Contemplative	-	High
Acorn Urban Park	Renovate/ Repurpose	Renovation design underway to preserve and interpret historic resources and provide new open space and play amenities.	-	Active, Contemplative, Social Gathering	-	High
Fairview Local Park	Develop	Add new facilities to underutilized space to provide more service. Preserve or expand Urban Wooded Area to reinforce natural, contemplative setting.	-	Active, Contemplative, Social Gathering	-	High
Gene Lynch Urban Park	Develop	Develop new park on former road ROW at heart of Silver Spring CBD. Currently in Facility Design phase.	-	Social Gathering	-	High
Philadelphia Avenue Urban Park	Develop	Owned by Parks, but currently used for 14 public parking spaces (PLD Lot #18). Develop into an Urban Pocket Green.	-	Contemplative, Social Gathering	Pocket Green	High
Jesup Blair Local Park	Develop	Consider adding park amenities to underutilized space to provide more service. Respect historic setting and existing active uses.	-	Active, Contemplative, Social Gathering	-	High
Cameron-Second Garage #7, Silver Spring Parking Lot District (PlD) *	Create	Create park space on roof in current state or create open space or a park during redevelopment of site.	Partnership, Dedication, or Privately-Owned Public Space (POPS)	Active, Social Gathering	Countywide Urban Recreational	Low
Whole Foods Parking Lot *	Create	Create open space or park during any future significant redevelopment of site to meet open space requirements of the zoning code. Provide green space and/or recreational amenities to complement Veterans Plaza.	POPS or Dedication	Active, Social Gathering	POPS, Neighborhood Green, or Urban Recreational Parklet	Low
Bonifant-Dixon Garage #5, Silver Spring Pld *	Create	Create park space on roof in current state or create park during redevelopment of site. Site proposed for future arena to serve County needs.	Partnership, Dedication, or POPS	Active, Social Gathering	Countywide Urban Recreational	Low
Ripley District Civic Green *	Create	Create core Civic Green to serve southern portion of Silver Spring CBD. Priority Site in SS CBD Green Space Guidelines.	Dedication, POPS, or Purchase	Active, Contemplative, Social Gathering	Civic Green	Medium

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan

SITE	STRATEGY	DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED CREATION TECHNIQUE	PRIMARY EXPERIENCE BENEFITS	PROPOSED PARK NAME AND/OR TYPE	FEASIBILITY ESTIMATE
Fenton Street Village Garage #4, Silver Spring Pld *	Create	Create open space during redevelopment of site.	POPS	Active, Contemplative, Social Gathering	POPS or Neighborhood Green	Medium
Newell Street Self-Storage *	Create	Create a linear park connecting to existing POPS at Newell and Kennett Streets and Acorn Urban Park. Priority site in SS CBD Green Space Guidelines. Opportunity for significant recreational amenities.	Dedication, POPS, or Purchase	Active, Contemplative, Social Gathering	Countywide Urban Recreational	Medium
Lots Between Kennett Street And East-West Highway *	Create	Create park to serve multiple needs. Priority site in SS CBD Green Space Guidelines. Opportunity for significant recreational amenities.	Dedication, POPS, or Purchase	Active, Contemplative, Social Gathering	Countywide Urban Recreational	Medium
Fenton Street Urban Park Expansion *	Create	Purchase additional properties to complete the envisioned Park as identified in prior sector plan.	Purchase	Active, Contemplative, Social Gathering	Fenton Village Neighborhood Green	Medium

* Sites identified in the Matrix for possibly creating a new open space are preferred locations based on the quantitative and qualitative analysis; alternative locations within the vicinity of these sites may be appropriate to meet the identified needs and may substitute for the identified sites. If future analysis using the EPS methodology indicates changes to the level of service and preferred sites to meet the needs, a revised Matrix of Opportunities will be presented to the Planning Board for review and approval per the implementation process in *Chapter 5*.

Figure 39 - Matrix of Opportunities to Increase Parks and Open Space Level of Service in the Pilot Area

Energized Public Spaces Functional Master Plan




Figure 40 - Matrix of Opportunities Summary Map, Silver Spring Pilot Area Implementation.

Pilot Area Implementation

Turning potential opportunities into reality in the Silver Spring CBD will take place through implementation of the Energized Public Spaces program as described in *Chapter 5*. As a Functional Master Plan, this Plan describes the parameters of the EPS program that will function over many years using many tools to reach the goals of increased walkable access to parks and public spaces to serve the residents in the County's most dense communities.

Since the population, amount of parks and open space, zoning, and other variables will change over the implementation phase of this Functional Master Plan, the quantitative and qualitative methodology can be applied again to determine if different or alternative opportunities should be identified. Such re-analysis in the future may also result in the removal of opportunities from the list if the site is no longer needed to increase the level of service in the Silver Spring CBD. Any revisions to the Matrix of Opportunities will be taken to the Planning Board for approval to update the *EPS Plan* program, as described in *Chapter 5*. Such approval may be obtained via review and approval of a report including new analysis and recommendations, or during a future master or sector plan process.

As noted in *Chapter 2*, each identified opportunity for new or improved public spaces and parks in the Pilot Area is not guaranteed to result in additional public open space through implementation of the *EPS Plan*. The Matrix of Opportunities (*Figure 39*) serves as a menu of options that can increase the amount of active, contemplative, and social gathering experiences to which residents and employees of the Silver Spring CBD have access. For opportunities in the Create strategy, suggested implementation techniques are identified in the Matrix of Opportunities, including partnerships, POPS, dedication of parkland, and/or purchase of parkland. For the sites where Purchase is one of the potential tools, the site will be evaluated

for potential acquisition following the standard park acquisition process.

Limitations on funding for acquisition, development, and operation of parks; the level of interest of businesses, agencies, and non-profits in pursuing partnerships; and the timing of private and public development projects will be major factors in the implementation of selected opportunities from the matrix. Implementation of these recommendations over the course of the Functional Plan will be flexible, allowing for the consideration of opportunity acquisition sites in additional appropriate locations, pursuit of unforeseen partnerships with interested organizations, and use of new implementation tools to meet the identified service needs of each community.

Acknowledgements

Staff

M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks

Director's Office

Michael F. Riley, Director
 Mitra Pedoeem, Deputy Director,
 Administration
 John Nissel, Deputy Director, Operations

Park Planning and Stewardship Division

Dr. John E. Hench, Ph.D., Chief (*retired*)
 Jai Cole, Acting Chief

Park and Trail Planning Section

Brooke Farquhar, Supervisor (*retired*)
 Charles Kines, Acting Supervisor
 Cristina Sasaki, Lead Planner, Project
 Manager
 Rachel Newhouse, Planner Coordinator
 Susanne Paul, Planner Coordinator

Legacy Open Space Program

Brenda Sandberg, Program Manager

Public Affairs and Community Partnerships Division

Kristi Williams, Chief
 Melissa Chotiner, Public Affairs & Marketing
 Specialist
 Alex Girr-Borrayo, Public Information
 Specialist
 Marylin Sklar, Public Information Specialist

Montgomery County Planning Department

Director's Office

Paul Mortensen, Chief, Senior Urban Designer,
 Margaret K. Rifkin, Senior Urban Designer
 (*retired*)
 Carol Rubin, Principal Counsel (at time of Plan
 preparation)
 Nicholas Dumais, Associate General Counsel

Planning Area 1

John Marcolin, Planner Coordinator

Planning Area 2

Nancy Sturgeon, Master Planner/Supervisor

Planning Area 3

Marybeth O'Quinn, Planner Coordinator

Information Technology & Innovation, Division

Chris McGovern, Supervisor
 Jay Mukherjee, GIS Specialist

Research & Special Projects

Pamela Zorich, Planner Coordinator

EPS Working Group

Rick Ammirato, Director, Bethesda Urban
 Partnership

Joe Calaway, Director of Operations, Wheaton
 Urban District

Andrew Fisher, Silver Spring Urban District

Aida Flores; Non-profit sector consultant

Mary Flynn, Founder, Coalition of Bethesda
 Area Residents (CBAR); Mayor, Town of Chevy
 Chase (at time of Plan preparation)

Evan Goldman, Vice President Land
 Acquisition/Development, EYA

Eric Grosse, Friends of White Flint

Jack McLaurin, Vice President
 Planning/Design, EYA

Jill Ortman-Fouse, Member, Montgomery
County Board of Education

Chris Ruhlen, Land Use Attorney, Lerch, Early
and Brewer; ULI member

Elected and Appointed Officials

County Council

Roger Berliner, President
Hans Riemer, Vice President
Marc Elrich
Nancy Floreen
Tom Hucker
Sidney Katz
George Leventhal
Nancy Navarro
Craig Rice

County Executive

Isiah Leggett

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Casey Anderson, Chair
Elizabeth M. Hewlett, Vice Chair

Commissioners

Montgomery County Planning Board

Casey Anderson, Chair
Norman Dreyfuss, Vice Chair
Gerald R. Cichy
Natali Fani-Gonzalez
Tina Patterson
Marye Wells-Harley (*retired*)

Prince George's County Planning Board

Elizabeth M. Hewlett, Chair
Dorothy F. Bailey, Vice Chair
William M. Doerner
Manuel R. Geraldo
A. Shuanise Washington



092600001

ENERGIZED PUBLIC SPACES FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN
for Mixed Use and Higher Density Residential Areas

Approved and Adopted March 2018

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Department of Parks, Montgomery County