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(ABSTRACT)

This thesis investigates the role of open space planning within the context of a growth management planning philosophy. For contextual framing, the principles of growth management are presented followed by tools and techniques used in preserving open space. The literature review chapter concludes with a look at the development of an open space plan. To bound the scope of this paper, the focus is on open space preserved for passive and active recreation and natural conservation.

Montgomery County, Maryland is used as a case example. The qualitative data comes from interviews with planning personnel from the community and park planning departments. As part of the process, the relationship and roles between these two departments regarding open space preservation are explored. This case study helps us to understand what Montgomery County has learned from the past that is influencing the open space preservation for tomorrow.
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COULD WE HAVE SEEN AHEAD, AS WE CAN NOW
LOOK BACK, WE WOULD IMMEDIATELY HAVE
BEGUN THE SEGREGATION OF LANDS FOR PARK
PURPOSES IN ALL OUR SUBDIVISIONS, AND WOULD
NOT ONLY HAVE SERVED THE COMMUNITY BETTER,
BUT WOULD HAVE RECEIVED A RETURN . . . TO
REPAY AMPLY FOR EVERY FOOT OF GROUND SO
UTILIZED” WILLIAM A HARMON
INTRODUCTION

One may have the impression that the quotation of William A. Harmon was delivered within the past fifteen to twenty years. However, Harmon, a New York developer, spoke these words in 1909 to the American Civic Association. How often have similar statements been heard today? Just as frequent, we comment on the foresight required to preserve open space for public use in instances such as Central Park (New York), Fairmount Park (Philadelphia), and Rock Creek Park (Washington DC). While we treasure these sanctuaries, little has been done in some localities to promote the establishment of open space to meet the expanding population's future needs.

Although the United States population net change is decreasing slightly, the total population will continue to expand into the foreseeable future. The present birth rate is 14.66 per every 1000 people versus a death rate of 8.28 per

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>179,323,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>248,709,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>325,942,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

1000 people a year resulting in a net increase of 1,760,700 people annually. Coupled with a net migration into the United States of 879,400 a year, the total net population increase is approximately 2,640,100 annually and is expected to remain consistent for the remainder of the decade. (Dortch, 1994)

---

1 Source: P25-1104, "Population Projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1993 to 2050" and CPH-2-26, "Population and Housing Unit Counts," Maryland
Where will all these people choose to live? Additionally, what are the settlement trends of the existing populous? They have three choices: cities, suburbia, or beyond suburbia (rural living).² In 1990, the growth in non-metropolitan counties exceeded that of the neighboring metropolitan area (Dortch, 1994) and the trend continues. (Lapping, 1995) Not only are the suburbs making gains over adjacent metropolitan areas, but development pressures are “spilling” beyond the suburban fringe into rural areas. A majority of all rural counties are posting growth gains during the 1990’s and the primary source is attributed to migration of urbanites and suburbanites; not due to the birth of children. Calvin Beale, a United States Department of Agriculture demographer, states that “people want to get out [of big cities] because of high costs, the turmoil, the crime, the pollution, or even changing racial mix.” (O’Malley, 1994) Life in rural America is thought to be better than the congested alternatives. (O’Malley, 1994) With the changing means of conducting business from the home through personal computers and fax machines connected to the home office, suppliers, and customers, there is no longer a need for some people, who prefer to live in a rural setting, to live in urbanized areas. As a result, Arendt (1994) suggests we will witness the “fifth migration”³.

So, with an ever expanding human population and growth and development trending away from metropolitan centers, development of rural areas is at present a reality in our society. Wilson (1991) reports that about 500

²The suburbs; several names have been developed in recent years to redefine the suburban phenomena: exurbia, slurbia, ruburbia, edge city, technoburb, the countrified city, and the gentrified city to name a few. (Wilson, 1991) Some argue suburbia no longer exists. While there may be nuances that make pockets of territory “different” from other areas, in general, land can be categorized as city, suburb, or rural. Towns unto themselves are worthy of their own classification.

³First four migrations as described by Lewis Mumford are:
1. expansion westward from eastern shore colonies
2. settlement in industrial towns in 1830’s and 40’s
3. growth of major industrial cities post Civil War
4. movement to suburbia from urban areas
rural counties experienced a growth in population of two to three hundred percent over the past fifteen years yet no communities greater than three thousand people developed. This suggests the form of the development could be defined as “sprawling”. The nearest thing to suggest a sense of community is the closest mall which causes one to wonder: where do they hold their 4th of July parade?

Rural living on the suburban fringe is appealing to many Americans. The convenience of being “close enough” to shopping centers, professional services, and cultural activities yet able to escape the congestion of suburbia to return to the solitude of “rural living” has fueled this development. However, as suburbia continues to migrate outwards, property that once looked out over farmland now looks into a neighbor’s backyard. The qualities that enticed people to settle on or slightly beyond the suburban fringe erode slowly over time. What can be done to insure that those qualities that were desirable upon settlement will remain intact regardless of surrounding development? What will life be like in the developing rural areas?

Zoning and subdivision control are two techniques employed by planning offices to influence development. Zoning can be effective in directing the land use and density of development. However, zoning is often considered a reactive policy that is subject to frequent change. A zoning map is criticized as being no more than a snapshot of a fully developed municipality. Subdivision controls can ensure that certain infrastructure improvements are included in the developer’s program. Minimum or maximum guidelines are set so that the development will be in harmony with the community and community services. But, zoning and subdivision controls, utilized by most planning bodies, are limited in the scope of coverage and therefore the effectiveness of handling growth.
To ensure that future growth will not be a detriment to the existing infrastructure and the perceived image of a community, Eric Damian Kelly (1993) recommends the adoption of a growth management program. Growth management is a proactive strategy that influences the timing and location of development.

**DISCUSSION OF GROWTH MANAGEMENT**

In general, two views are held towards growth management. One sees it as exclusionary; as a means of limiting building and growth. Because of restrictions placed on development, growth management is criticized for inflating land and house values. This, it is argued, restricts who can settle in an area and is therefore discriminatory towards lower income housing. Growth management as defined may be favored by old-timers who resist change (Dyers, 1989) or by newcomers who want to raise the drawbridge behind themselves to limit who can move into a community. (DeGrove, 1989)

The second view takes more of a visionary approach. The objective is to keep services ahead of development with the goal of maintaining the quality of life and protecting the environment. The objective is not to limit growth but to direct it ensuring that it is synchronized with the government's plan for infrastructure improvements and community services. Brower and Godschalk (1989) define growth management as "a conscious government program to influence the rate, amount, type, location, and/or cost of development." This definition will be used as a framework for discussion throughout this paper.4

---

4 The pros and cons of growth management have been argued in the literature. The premise of this paper will assume that growth management as defined by Brower and Godschalk is a worthwhile objective. For negative arguments regarding growth management see Fischel (1989).
Fast, uncontrolled growth can have negative impacts on a community. Examples include overcrowded schools, congested roads, decreased water pressure, and disappearance of open space all while paying more in taxes. It is these negative impacts stigmatized with growth that force many communities to establish no growth policies. Burrows (1978) suggests that most municipalities are ill equipped to project future population. Because of this inexpertness, the municipalities are uncomfortable with growth prospects and it is therefore easier to maintain status quo and to discourage growth. This suggests that small jurisdictions who do not envision their community 5 to 25 years into the future are not prepared for growth. If they are not prepared to receive growth, they will probably be disappointed with the effects of growth and therefore take a stand against future growth. As previously discussed, growth pressures are probable on the suburban fringe and beyond. Recognizing and managing development pressures serves the long term interests of the community.

**Open Space**

This paper focuses on one facet of growth management: open space planning and preservation. Open space can be defined in a variety of ways. In its basic form, open space is undeveloped land. In some cases, the land has been preserved as undeveloped for a particular reason such as recreational opportunities or environmental protection. Conversely, the land may be open "waiting" for future development. The scale of open space ranges from small urban parks less than a block in size to large swaths of land consuming square miles. Just as the scale of the open space varies, so does the intended use. While the scale of a piece of land is often correlated with its use, the use need not be determined based on size. Land may be preserved for passive or active recreation, for environmental considerations, to preserve viewsheds, to maintain rural character, and to preserve agricultural production. To limit the scope of this paper, the focus is on open space preserved for passive and active recreation.
and natural conservation. More specifically, land that constitutes a park, recreation, and open space system and is referred to as PROS. The issues that surround the preservation of agricultural lands and rural lands are often quite diverse and worthy of individual attention.

Why is it important to preserve open space? For one reason, it is a commodity of limited supply that diminishes proportionately to population gains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPEN SPACE⁵</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Acres/ person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>179,323,175</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>248,709,873</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>325,942,000</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2

The 1960 census reports 12.6 acres/person of open space in the US. Today, it is 9.1 and in 2020 it is projected to be 6.9. Open space has value. This value is sometimes easy to define and at other instances very difficult to quantify. Physical benefits provided by open space include aquifer recharge, removal of suspended solids from runoff, retention of stormwater reducing flood damage, cooler temperatures, and air cleaning properties. Psychological values of open space include the reduction of stress and reduction of the perception of crowding. The personal intrinsic values that people hold for open space are difficult to measure. Often times, the value of these lands is not realized until someone tries to take it away. A study of college students reports that 80-90%

⁵ Source: P25-1104, "Population Projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1993 to 2050" and CPH-2-26, "Population and Housing Unit Counts," Maryland
selected "wild and leftover places" as the favorite childhood place. These places were seldom designed areas but more like empty lots within a development. "Whether appreciated for their aesthetic, recreational, or sporting benefits, [natural] areas often hold deep meaning for long-term residents." (Arendt, 1994) The point is that the benefit of open lands may not easily be described, even by the user, but open spaces are an integral component of our landscape.

While the above physical and psychological benefits can in some instances be represented economically, open space reportedly increases property values on adjacent lands with economic benefits to homeowners and the tax collector. Homeowners witness higher property appreciation while the municipality can realize higher property taxes through increases in assessed value. The benefits of open space will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2: Literature Review. (Mantell, 1990; Francis, 1984; Arendt, 1994)

**PROBLEM STATEMENT**

Establishing that growth is expected to continue on the suburban fringe and beyond and that there is value in preserving open lands, this study will examine the process of open space preservation. Specifically, the thesis question to be answered by this work is: **Within the context of a growth management planning philosophy, how is the preservation of land for parks, recreation, and open space being accomplished?**

This work examines the practical application of open space planning theory in Montgomery County, Maryland. Montgomery County has a long history of park, recreation, and open space planning; this qualitative analysis contributes insights from their efforts identifying where specific strategies have successfully preserved open lands. Of particular interest, this thesis strives to
understand what Montgomery County has learned from the past that is influencing how they plan for parks, recreation, and open space today. The case study helps us to realize the considerations and factors that guide the planning process. This analysis is important in order to understand the role of open space planning within the context of growth management which has received little attention in the literature. This thesis will not address the operational issues of open space planning such as how individual parcels are identified, financed, acquired, and developed.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This section begins with background information on growth management. After establishing a foundation, tools and techniques effective in open space preservation are presented. A brief discussion of private initiatives follows. Issues concerning open space planning and preservation are addressed before completion of the literature review section with a detailed look at plan development.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT: FOUNDATION BUILDING

 Defined

As defined by Scott (1975), managed growth is “the utilization by government of a variety of traditional and evolving techniques, tools, plans and activities to purposefully guide local patterns of land use, including the manner, location, rate, and nature of development.” The definition offered by Brower and Godschalk (1989) states that growth management impacts the cost of development as well. A growth management plan is typically developed by a planning commission who reports to the governing body. The governing body approves, disapproves or amends the plan prior to adoption.

The premise of growth management is to maintain adequate services even during periods of rapid growth. It could therefore be argued that the purpose of growth management is to ensure that the quality of life in a community does not deteriorate during periods of active growth; further, the potential exists to use the ensuing growth to improve the quality of life. Myers (1989) says “the long-term interests of both citizens and developers require that the local quality of life be managed as an asset that is in danger of degradation through over exploitation” and “with good planning, economic development and
a sustained quality of life can coexist.” The reason we are concerned with growth management is because we are concerned with the quality of life.

I feel it is important to clarify growth management planning efforts versus traditional planning efforts. Levy (1994) puts it in perspective:

In general, growth management plans or systems are made up of elements that have been well known to planners for years. In that sense, there is nothing unique about them. Growth management systems differ from traditional comprehensive planning not in the elements that compose them but in the synthesis of those elements. Specifically, growth management systems are generally characterized by very close and long-term coordination between land-use controls on the one hand and capital investment on the other. They are often also characterized by the use of more modern approaches to land-use control and often by a great sensitivity to environmental issues. In that all of these points are to be found in planning efforts that are not specifically labeled as growth management, it must be admitted that no absolutely hard line separates growth management from more traditional planning.

Infrastructure

One of the biggest impacts on the quality of life is the level of services provided within a community. A plan that identifies the need for infrastructure expenditures on services such as new highways, water and sewer lines, and schools is known as the Capital Improvements Program or CIP. The Capital Improvements Program identifies the projects that will take place over the next five to ten years. Infrastructure expenditures are the single most important factor that stimulates growth. In fact, CIP expenditures can "shape" growth. (Kelly, 1993) By controlling where and when infrastructure improvements are made, Brower (1984) states that CIP effectively impacts the location, timing, and cost of growth. Commonly however, the CIP is developed individually by the governing body or chief administrator and is not coordinated with growth management planning. Kelly (1993) suggests that the two programs should be developed simultaneously.

Sprawl
"Where no vision for growth exists, sprawl results." (Porterfield, 1995) The reduction of sprawl is often cited as an objective of growth management. One advantage of coordinating the capital improvements program with the growth management program is the reduction of sprawl. Without coordination, communities will inadvertently subsidize sprawl by putting in new roads and sewer lines. As described by Kelly (1993), "[sprawl] is bad for everybody" because of the costs associated with infrastructure improvements located further and further away from schools, water, sewer and roads. While once considered "an engine for growth", sprawl is now recognized as "potentially crippling" and degrading to the quality of life. Left unchecked, sprawl will consume land and degrade valuable natural assets. Additionally, sprawl is recognized as an economic detriment. ("Beyond", 1995)

Research by Frank (1989) identifies the costs borne by a community from new development and highlights the importance of reducing sprawl. For low density housing (3 units per acre), the capital costs borne by the public are $35,000 per dwelling unit. Capital costs includes both site development related costs such as water and sewer lines, traffic lights, and roadways; and community costs such as schools and water and sewer treatment facilities. These expenses escalate to $92,000 under large lot zoning if the same services are provided. For developments that are located more than 10 miles from sewer treatment plants or employment centers, costs increase by $15,000 per unit. (Frank, 1989) Property tax revenues from the newcomers will not cover these costs for a number of years if ever which suggests development is being funded in part by

---

*6 Calculated using 1987 dollars.

*7 On-site septic systems and water wells will significantly reduce the cost of large lot zoning.
the existing residents. The end result is a decreased amount of monies to meet existing services under the scenario above as presented by Frank.

Financing Growth

With the federal government reducing its role in financing local and state governments since 1972, many localities are feeling a pinch for revenues. Communities without growth feel the decline of revenues and either the need to reduce services or acquire additional funds. Communities undergoing growth and thereby increasing revenues are finding that those increased funds are not adequate to meet the increased demand of services and infrastructure improvements. Often times, local governments must resort to tax increases for funds. This, however, has caused a revolt among constituents. Nicholas (1993) has found that more people will demand more services causing a net increase in cost of services. The end result of the disparity between fiscal demands and revenues is a deterioration of the quality of life. This deterioration is seen as congested roads, poorly maintained parks, or inadequate water pressure in the short term. The longer term result may be ruptured sewer lines, inadequate police, fire, and rescue, or over-crowded schools. (Nicholas, 1993)

State’s Role

Federal and state legislation may be an asset or a liability to local objectives. An awareness of existing and pending programs and the associated consequences is an important foundation for a local strategy. (Brower, 1984) States may or may not be supportive of growth management objectives set at the local level. Supportive states may provide goals and guidelines to help localities develop a personal program. State legislation may encourage the use of certain growth management tools and techniques. Maine, through a bond issue, provides funds to local governments for land acquisition. (DeGrove, 1989) Some
state governments facilitate coordination between adjacent counties. This is particularly important for infrastructure improvements such as new highways.

**Federal Impact**

Like states, legislation from the federal government impacts the growth management process from two fronts: regulating and spending. Past regulation includes the 1970 Clean Water Act, 1970 National Environmental Policy Act, the 1973 Clean Water Act, the 1973 Endangered Species Act, and the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act. (General, 1993) In general, these regulations can be used locally to limit or direct development. The commitment of federal funds for projects can often stimulate growth in a particular area. For example, the construction of interstate highways spawns growth along the corridor and especially at interchanges.

In regards to park, recreation, and open space, federal spending in real dollars has declined since 1972 (Zyontz, 1995). A component of a recent piece of legislation, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act 1991 (ISTEA), provides federal support of people places. Three billion dollars of the legislation is designated for a "transportation enhancement program". The intention is to provide scenic, environmental, and historic preservation activities within the nations transportation corridors. (Kelly, 1993; Common, 1993) ISTEA requires local governmental sponsorship and provides 20% matching funds from the federal government paid upon completion. Typical projects include rails to trails, greenways, river walks, and bike trails.

**Legal Issues**

Local governments derive their authority to regulate land through the police powers granted to them by the state. Police powers allow them to protect the health, safety, and welfare of residents. However, states must approve a
regulatory action through legislation prior to use by localities. The exception is home rule states where localities are permitted to develop regulations. (Brower, 1984; Common, 1993)

There have been several rulings on the practice of growth management. "Where city services and facilities are in short supply in the face of a rapidly expanding population, courts have recognized a legitimate need for planned, orderly urban growth." Continuing, "yet at the same time any regulation with the purpose of simply excluding additional population without providing for planned growth would likely be held unconstitutional on the ground that it impinges upon the right to travel and move freely from town to town and from state to state." (Wright, 1985) In general, the court has found that if a government uses growth management policy and states that adequate public facility requirements are required for approval of development, then they must have a plan to meet future infrastructure needs. (Nicholas, 1993) This was established in Golden vs. Planning Board of Town of Ramapo, 1972 and subsequent appeals. Additionally, courts have found that if a comprehensive plan is in place, down-zoning is not considered a taking even if property values decline.

Open space has been accepted as an infrastructure need. (Wright, 1985) Further, localities have the right to: acquire the benefits of open space, to use eminent domain to restrict land use by private owners as long as the owner is justly compensated, and the power to obtain the benefits of open space by form of subsidy such as tax relief. (Dunham, 1966)

The US Supreme Court ruling on City of Euclid vs. Ambler Realty Company enabled the continuance of zoning as a regulating practice in the United States. (Common, 1993) Since the 1926 ruling, various derivations of zoning have been adopted by local and state planning bodies; many have been
challenged in court. The rules may be challenged from various fronts as described below:

Local regulations are thus subject to several types of legal challenge: 1) constitutional challenges – based on state or federal constitutional provisions – to the validity of the substance or effects of a regulation 2) challenges based on inadequate authority or ultra vires challenges, declaring that the local government’s application of the authorized power is outside the authority the enabling legislation gives the locality 3) challenges that claim the regulating body has not adhered to the requirements of procedural fairness found in the enabling legislation, in constitutional guarantees, or in specific state legislation establishing minimum procedural requirements for all agency or municipal activity; and 4) challenges based on conflict with state law. (Burrows, 1984)

Evaluating the challenges will be based upon interpretation of due process, equal protection, takings, right to travel, adequate standards and in particular the fifth and fourteenth amendments. The fifth amendment prohibits government from taking private property for public use without compensation to the landowner in an equitable manner. Regulations must leave the landowner with economical use of the land. (Common, 1993) The fourteenth amendment states no state shall “deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law” thereby requiring government regulation of land use issues to be “justified”. In general, courts find justification if regulation satisfy three criteria:

1. action seeks an objective authorized through the police power
2. they use reasonable means to achieve objective
3. these means do not cause excessive harm to the individual (Common, 1993)
The rulings on future cases will continue to shape the planning powers and rights of owners. In particular, the awaited ruling of the Court dealing with the endangered species act with regards to limiting land use of private residents will have a significant impact with long term ramifications.

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT: TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES**

This section discusses the tools and techniques that can be utilized within the context of a growth management program for the preservation of open space as defined in Chapter 1. The tools are grouped into two basic categories: the first deals with public spending for land and land rights while the second group addresses regulatory techniques.

The purpose of a particular tool varies depending on the local situation. Brower (1984) provides a list of seven attributes associated with growth that are impacted by the use of growth management tools and techniques. A given tool may affect only one or several of these attributes. They are:

1. the quantity of development,
2. the type of development
3. the cost of growth, including the economic costs, the manner in which these costs are distributed, and the environmental costs,
4. the location of development: both the geographical direction of growth and the types of development that can take place on a particular parcel of land
5. the timing or rate of growth
6. the quality of development,
7. the density of development.” (Brower, 1984)

Because a jurisdiction utilizes a growth management technique does not necessarily imply that they have a growth management program. For example, zoning is a growth management technique but most localities employ some form

---

8 For an exhaustive listing of growth management tools and techniques, see Mantell, 1990.
of zoning. Exactions (to be discussed later in this section) are another example. Many more communities use exactions than have a growth management program. (Kelly, 1993) Also, there can be significant overlap between techniques. For example, greenbelts may be obtained through dedication, fee simple acquisition, easements, a combination of techniques, and more. This section presents the tools individually with following sections discussing the selection and application of tools and techniques.

Fee Simple Acquisition

Under fee simple acquisition, the local government takes full title to land through direct purchase. "Public land acquisition is based on the theory that the government has the greatest opportunity to manage and direct growth when the land is publicly held." (Burrows, 1978) With full title to the land and the associated rights that accompany full title, the locality has great flexibility with the land use of a given parcel and can effectively protect valuable resources. While from a legal viewpoint, fee simple acquisition is one of the easiest techniques to employ; financially, it is one of the most expensive.

While fee simple acquisition yields total control of land and ownership of an asset, there are negatives associated with this tool as well. One problem of fee simple acquisition is governing bodies, who have a comprehensive, coordinated open space plan, are faced with limited funds to purchase land in any given year. With a coordinated plan, land identified in the plan will become artificially inflated; or, some owners may not be willing to sell. This forces the jurisdiction to abandon the acquisition or to pursue acquisition of the land through condemnation. Condemnation can result in an expensive and time
consuming legal battle. If the governing body waits for growth pressure before pursuing land acquisition, they will be forced to pay inflated prices. Another criticism of fee simple acquisition is it reduces the supply of available developable land and therefore forces remaining land to be more expensive. This will restrict development and/or force house values higher limiting low income housing opportunities, a common argument against growth management. Also, acquisition removes land from the tax base and the land becomes the government's responsibility to maintain. (Brower, 1984; Burrows, 1978; Mantell, 1990)

There are several examples where fee simple acquisition was an economically viable alternative to preserve the resource of open land. Boca Raton, FL purchased land along the beach front in order to control development. (Burrows, 1978) A study in Palo Alto, CA revealed that it was cheaper for the city to purchase the adjacent foothills versus allowing the land to develop. The tax revenues would not offset the infrastructure expenses the city would incur delivering services to the foothills. (Common, 1993) A similar initiative is underway in Scottsdale, Arizona. Leaders of the movement feel that developing on the mountains that overlook the city would adversely impact the tourism business and deprive the people of Scottsdale of an irreplaceable natural resource. The people will be voting in the summer of 1995 on a sales tax for funding the acquisition of the mountain range.

The people of Boulder, Colorado faced the same issue in 1967. The mountains that form a backdrop to the city were facing development pressures.

---

9 The US Supreme Court ruled in Berman v. Parker (1954) that the condemnation of property for aesthetic or open space purposes shall be allowed. In general, states have followed this ruling. (Brower, 1984) This ruling does not preclude the locality from legal challenges of their actions.
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They voted to permit a sales tax for the purchase of open space land. By 1992, 59 million dollars were spent accumulating 22,000 acres. The result is a greenbelt around the city that buffers development encroaching from Denver and protects views of the mountains to the west. Spaces are linked together with varying uses ranging from agriculture to recreational facilities. To address long term pressures to develop, Boulder has passed a law forbidding sale of the land. (Burrows, 1978) This program is credited with benefiting Boulder economically as well as environmentally. Recently, while much of Colorado was suffering economically, Boulder continued to thrive. Businesses and residents were willing to pay the appreciated real estate prices and higher taxes to be in Boulder. This willingness to reside in Boulder is attributed to the community’s “quality of life, its trees, open spaces, and general livability.” (Arendt, 1994)

**Easements**

Easements represent an alternative to outright purchase. They provide certain rights to the holder or limit the use by others. Easements are useful when "regulation will not do the job and fee simple acquisition is not necessary or desirable." (Brower, 1984) The holder of the property has free use of the land to the extent that it does not interfere with the function of the easement. Easements can be “affirmative” or “negative”. Affirmative easements allow others the right to use one’s property. For example, an affirmative easement may allow a hiking trail to pass through an owner’s woods. A negative easement restricts the use of the land. An example is the county’s purchase of an easement to restrict development on a portion of the property. The title remains with the original owner and therefore so does the tax burden. Most states have accepted land preservation through easements and have developed legislation to facilitate the process. The advantage to the owner may be in the form of reduced property taxes or estate taxes if donated. Also, the owner may be able to keep land in its
present state (perhaps agricultural production or open land) while ownership is maintained. The Internal Revenue Service recognizes conservation easements as a gift and has established guidelines for tax deduction. Since the easement is attached to the title, the easement remains in effect when ownership changes. This may adversely affect the value of the land. Reassessing property values with consideration of the easement will reduce the tax liability. (Brower, 1984; Burrows, 1978; Common, 1993; Kelly, 1993; Mantell, 1990)

Use of easements to protect viewsheds, often referred to as scenic easements, are easier to acquire when the land is not facing pressure to develop, the existing land use will not be adversely impacted, and the easement is seen as a positive governmental undertaking by the landowners. (Burrows, 1978) Brower (1984) states that the viability of easements is similar to fee simple acquisition; but, the public’s lack of understanding of easements limits their acceptance. Where land is already under development pressure, easements may either be expensive to obtain or unacceptable to the land owner.

Boulder used easements to supplement their fee simple acquisition program. Ramapo, New York, a pioneer in growth management, developed a ten year master plan for delivery of services such as water and sewer lines. Easements were used as a form of compensation to landowners who were prohibited from developing their land as a result of the master plan. (Kelly, 1993)

Exactions and Impact fees
Frank and Rhodes (1987) developed a definition of exactions that follows this logic: if a condition of development requires a transfer of property to the public, then an exaction is being used. The property could be in the form of land, money, buildings, roads, sewer lines, et cetera. Public refers to the government body or a “common maintenance entity” such as a home owners association.
Requirements of construction such as a bike path or a vegetated buffer do not constitute a transfer of property and should be viewed as subdivision requirements not as exactions.

Exactions are not new to development in America. In fact, their history in the United States is traced to the colonial era. (Listokin, 1990) During the 1940’s and 1950’s, exactions began to evolve and were no longer limited to the transfer of land. Governing bodies found that land dedication was not satisfying their needs to support new growth because the site was inappropriate or land just was not needed. Additionally, the impact of development away from the site creates a burden on services. As a result, governments demanded fees be paid in lieu of land donation. This “donation” became known as “in lieu fee”. As time past, exactions broadened the scope of reimbursable government expenses associated with development. Examples include new traffic lights that serve the development or surrounding area, sewer and water lines in the development, streets to meet more stringent codes. Communities began to realize that new development caused an impact further away from the development’s physical boundaries burdening schools, water and waste facilities, fire, rescue, and police, and other services. Fees were collected to help offset the expense of support facilities. (Frank, 1987; Listokin, 1990)

Today, exactions have been used to help fund almost every government service from transit systems, parks, airports, libraries, to stormwater drainage systems. While the actual use of the funds differs from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, it is important to remember that “development exactions are imposed as a means of providing community facilities necessitated by new development.” (Frank, 1987) The purpose is to keep services at a consistent level for all residents without increasing the financial burden to existing residents. Therefore,
Exactions are favored by local citizens who feel growth should “pay its own way”. (Kelly, 1993)

Municipal officials must find a balance between financing growth through the development process without adversely affecting the quantity and quality of development. (Burrows, 1978) It is reasonable to expect financial support from new growth areas but the burden should not be prohibitive nor excessive such that growth is discouraged. It is unfair for new growth to pay twice, once through exactions then again through property taxes. Additionally, exactions should not cover existing shortcomings or upgrading of existing standards. The purpose of exactions, in my opinion, should not be to control the amount of growth but to ensure services are available in conjunction with completion of new development. Frequently, new development must wait years for services to catch up thereby impacting the quality of life.

Thousands of jurisdictions use exactions. Some bodies may have a rigid, well defined system where each developer “pays” the same per unit expense. For example, charges may derive per dwelling unit, per bedroom, or per acre of land. The alternative to the fixed schedule system is a policy that is best described as negotiated. Each case is evaluated individually and the resulting exaction may be negotiated with the developer. There may be no correlation between one agreement and subsequent exactions. The factors that determine the exaction may include a comparison to similar developments, political connections, negotiation skills, and the size of the developers organization. (Frank, 1987)

As mentioned, exactions can be levied for on-site or off-site improvements. On-site charges are easily defined since they are intended for the benefit of the development's residents. Off-site improvements are more
difficult to expense since the cost must be apportioned over a number of developments. The number of units that will ultimately utilize an improvement and the timing of construction of said units is difficult to forecast. (Weschler, 1987) For example, a recreation facility is constructed to address the needs of new residents. Equitable per unit fees must be calculated based on the ultimate number of users serviced by the facility.

Some of the literature discerns a difference between “exactions” and “impact fees”. However, using the definition of exactions provided by Frank and Rhodes (1987) at the beginning of this section, impact fees would fall under the jurisdiction of exactions. Listokin (1990) supports this premise stating “impact fees are a recent derivative of exactions.” In general, impact fees are charged for off-site improvements and have a fixed schedule. Since the amount of the impact fee can be calculated, the developer will either discount the land price or increase the purchase price of improvements to offset the expense. (Weschler, 1987)

Requiring developers to pay for capital improvements has generally been upheld in court. (Nicholas, 1989) Quoting James Nicholas, “there must be a reasonable connection between the need for additional facilities and the growth resulting from new development. The fees charged must not exceed a proportionate share of the cost incurred or to be incurred in accommodating the development paying the fee, and there must be a reasonable connection between the expenditure of the fees collected and the benefits received by the development paying the fees.” (Listokin, 1990) The barometer used to evaluate the legality of an exaction is the “rational nexus test” which states the ones who pay are the ones who benefit. The rational nexus test for exactions considers: “1) will occupants of this development use the service, 2) is this a service the
government has a legitimate authority to provide, 3) is there likely to be a shortage of this service in the future unless steps are taken to prevent it?" (Bosselman, 1987)

**Conventional Zoning**

As previously mentioned, the landmark US Supreme Court ruling of *City of Euclid vs. Ambler Realty Company* 1926 paved the way for land use zoning in the United States. Zoning is the most commonly used tool for regulating development. Its purpose is to regulate land-use with the objective of separating incompatible uses. Zoning can also be used to help define the character of a place by restricting heights of buildings and by establishing setbacks, lot sizes, and densities. More recently, architectural and landscaping features such as exterior building materials, awnings, signage, parking have been controlled by zoning. The protection of property values and environmentally sensitive areas are cited as benefits of zoning. (Brower, 1984; Mantell, 1990)

**Performance Zoning**

While traditional zoning does little in the context of preserving open space, it does form the foundation for derivatives that are effective in open space preservation. Performance zoning is one such technique. Under performance zoning, certain criteria are selected as a basis for controlling development. The likely impact caused by development within the “zone” is evaluated in relation to its impact on the selected criteria. When first developed, performance zoning was commonly used in industrial areas to limit noise, dust, pollution, vibration, discharge, et cetera. The use of performance zoning has since been expanded to control such criteria as sewage runoff, stormwater runoff, quantity of open space, density, amount of impervious service, and on. The intention of performance zoning is to extend protection in a particular area
to a specific resource. Since the objective is to fall into the boundaries of a selected criteria, developers are given greater flexibility in the layout and design of a site. Implementing and administering a plan, however, can be difficult. Depending on the criteria used, experts may be needed to evaluate the proposed impacts of development. (Brower, 1984; Common, 1993; Mantell, 1990)

Bucks County, Pennsylvania adopted a plan in 1973 that utilized performance zoning. The county was divided into grids and subsequent development was evaluated based on its impact within that grid. The criteria used by Bucks County are the percentage of open space, the amount of impervious surface per acre, and the maximum density feasible within a grid. Another example, Sanibel Island, Florida requires developers to prove that a proposed project will not have an adverse effect on the island’s ecosystem. This is accomplished by monitoring impacts on the following criteria: geology, hydrology, wildlife, and vegetation. (Arendt, 1994; Brower, 1984; Mantell, 1990)

**Overlay Zoning**

The intention of overlay zoning is to place additional restrictions onto the underlying base zoning for the protection of a feature not covered in existing regulations. The added restrictions may be defined by an area whose boundaries have no connection to the base zones and may span parts of several different zones. The purpose of the restriction may be to protect a natural, cultural, or historical resource. Overlay zones are commonly used to restrict development in floodplains of streams and rivers in the interest of reducing potential flood damage. (Common, 1993; Mantell, 1990)
Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

With ownership of land comes the right to develop. The value to develop is the essence of the transfer of development rights tool. Typically found in rural, agricultural settings, owners are paid to relinquish the development rights associated with their open land by developers who then use the purchased development rights to build in an area identified by the jurisdiction.

There is a sending zone and a receiving zone each which benefit from the program. The sending zone may be established to preserve farmland, rural character, historical sites, open space, or timberland. The receiving zone has been identified as an area suitable for development. The benefit to the government is it does not have to spend the money to preserve the identified land in the sending zone and it encourages development where it is cheaper to provide services such as schools, water, sewer, and fire protection. The program can either be mandatory or voluntary. If mandatory, development in the sending area will be prohibited and/or building in the receiving area can only occur with purchased development rights. The probability of a successful program is said to be more likely if there are growth pressures within the jurisdiction; the need for additional housing. The program requires extensive administration by government to ensure that it is equitable to all and economically worthwhile. If a jurisdiction determines that they want to discourage development from occurring in a particular area, a transfer of development rights program is an incentive that can be effective in controlling where growth occurs. (DeGrove, 1991; Mantell, 1990; Burns, 1993)

Open Space Development Design (OSDD)

Building upon performance zoning is a tool named Open Space Development Design (OSDD). Described by Arendt (1994), OSDD provides for...
density increases based on the number of criteria met. For example if six of twelve criteria are met, then a three percent increase in density is allowed. Nine of twelve results in a five percent density bonus and twelve of twelve yields a seven percent bonus. The criteria could include preserving natural buffers along stream banks, preserving scenic vistas, providing trails, maintaining mature hardwoods, and other amenities. The purpose of OSDD approaches that of clustered development: condensing development to one section of a parcel in the interest of creating large open spaces (clustering will be discussed later in this section). Comparing full development under existing zoning regulations versus an OSDD scenario typically results in a preference for the compactly designed development with large open spaces. (Arendt, 1994) The acceptance and critique of open space development design is undocumented at this time.

Official Map Act

Since acquisition of land is expensive and to carry out a program of open space preservation could take years, Kelly (1993) suggests one technique at the disposal of planners is to utilize the Official Map Act. The Official Map Act was a component of the Standard City Planning Enabling Act of 1928. Acting as a blueprint for long range plans, the official map reserves land for future acquisition; in this case a plan for open space preservation would be developed. If the land has not been purchased by the time development proposals are filed for the reserved parcels, a flag goes up notifying authorities of ensuing development pressure. At this point, the authorities must determine if they still intend to exercise their option to purchase the parcel. If the local government foregoes purchase of the land, the owner is allowed to proceed with development. In addition to advocating comprehensive planning, the official map can reduce the expenditures for land acquisition because improvements made
on land identified for future public use will not be reimbursed thereby making condemnation cheaper. (Brower, 1984; Burrows, 1978; Kelly, 1993)

Two disadvantages to this tool have been identified by Kelly. (1993) If land is not purchased in advance of development pressures, the value and cost will be escalated. Two, if proposals for development are filed and the municipality delays its decision whether or not to exercise its purchase right and ultimately foregoes the acquisition, the U. S. Supreme Court has determined that the municipality is responsible for reimbursement of monies lost by others as result of the delayed development.

West Manchester Township in York County, PA uses a variation on the official map producing a map that shows areas where development is appropriate and where lands should be conserved. What is unique about their map is it is overlaid on a tax map and therefore reveals how individual parcels can be divided into land appropriate for development and land to be preserved. Another benefit of the map is linkages of open space between properties become clearly identified. (Arendt, 1994)

**Clustering**

Arendt writes of the need to preserve developable land for recreation and agriculture, not just for environmentally sensitive lands where development should not occur. Clustering is a zoning technique that concentrates development to a portion of the parcel. Under typical present day zoning, the maximum density and the minimum spacing between units encourages the builder to develop the entire site. With developments under this scenario backing on to each other, the result is a puzzle of “planned sprawl”. (Arendt, 1991) Instead of having fifty one acre lots evenly spaced, a cluster scenario may use fifteen to twenty acres for development leaving the rest as open space. In
theory, equal amounts of open space result from either scenario. However, the character and function of the open lands is vastly different. With a "typical" suburban subdivision, each yard is highly maintained with a majority in turfgrass. With a cluster design, individual lots are often one third the size resulting in large common grounds. Use of the commons is flexible; either for active recreation such as athletic fields or allowed to return to a natural state providing passive recreation such as hiking and nature viewing. Maintenance will be handled by either a housing association or responsibility turned over to the local government. (Arendt, 1991)

Brower (1984) says clustering is appropriate for larger scale development on tracts of vast open space usually found in fringe areas. With good design, cluster developments can maintain the rural vernacular while minimizing the environmental impact. Yaro (1991), a proponent of cluster design, states that the compact design results in lower infrastructure costs. Less roads are needed and shorter runs for utilities result. These savings can be passed on to the consumer in reduced home price or contribute to the developer's return. Yaro also encourages a rethinking of the typical layout requirements for subdivisions in everything from road widths to circles to sidewalks; all of which can contribute to open space. (See Yaro 1991, Arendt 1994, for more detail)

Traditional Subdivision Regulations

Like zoning, subdivision regulations are a popular tool of planning authorities. Subdivision regulations are guidelines for dividing large parcels into individual units. Many of the requirements are character forming issues such as setbacks, heights, widths, densities, and road widths. With review of proposed site plans, the authority has an opportunity to address linkages to adjacent lands whether it be for services or open lands. Land dedication for park use is common
in subdivision requirements. Although the amount of land varies, it is typically between three and twelve percent of the gross acreage. (Brower, 1984; Burrows, 1978)

**Land Preservation District**

An innovative technique developed by Montgomery County, PA encourages large swaths of open space. Called a Land Preservation District (LPD), their system results in the preservation of up to 75 percent of the site. Similar in concept to clustering, the land preservation district allows construction of the same number of units that would be allowed under traditional zoning. No bonus densities or other incentives are provided. The significant difference of the LPD to clustering is to build a conventional development, the developer must receive permission from the authority. The criteria evaluated for conventional approval includes 1. land is not suitable for compact design and 2. land is not suitable for agricultural production. If approved, visual impact from the road must be minimized. Some of the features encouraged within the LPD include small lot size (10,000 square feet to as small as 6000 square feet), small setbacks, (15-20 feet), narrow frontage (80-100 feet), limit groups of dwellings to twenty-five units, separate groups with buffers, and any group with 10 units or more requires 1000 square feet of open space per dwelling. Large lot zoning is also allowed in the LPD to “maintain the rural character” while shifting the burden for maintaining open tracts to the homeowner. Restrictions dictate that house, improvements, driveway, and lawn be limited to one acre and conservation easements ensure the remainder cannot be subdivided in the future. (Arendt, 1994)
PRIVATE INITIATIVES

Private not for profit groups can assist the local authority in meeting their open space objectives. When public open space preservation suffers due to financial limitations or legal restrictions, private initiatives can sometimes succeed where public efforts do not. Although it is generally accepted that an open space preservation program should not rely solely on private initiatives, it is important to understand the role groups can play in supplementing a plan or “rescuing” a plan in time of need.

Fee Simple Acquisition

As previously discussed, fee simple acquisition is also available to non-profit organizations as a means of influencing community open space. Obtaining full title, the private entity has the same options regarding the land: hold, sell, restrict future use, and donate. A public body can benefit from private purchase of land particularly when funds are not available. Establishing a partnership, transfer of the land can occur in the future when funds are appropriated. (Mantell, 1990)

Bargain Sale

As a bargain sale, the owner sells property at a discount versus donating the parcel and receives a favorable tax break for the amount below the appraised value. The tax benefit may be greater for a “loss” versus a donation. Transfer, usually to a nonprofit conservation group such as the Nature Conservancy or a local land trust, can occur in pieces over time. (Common, 1993)

Easements

Conservation easements do not have to be initiated by the public authority to be effective. The existing land owners can ease their own property to
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preserve the land in its natural state in perpetuity. Or, non-profit groups can purchase conservation easements limiting development of open land. Owners are reimbursed by the purchase of the easement for the loss of market value that would occur because of the limitations on future development. (Kelly, 1993)

**Land Trust**

Private not for profit groups purchase land to be held. Typical land uses include recreation, nature preserve, historic site, wildlife habitat, et cetera. As a non-profit land trust, taxes are not paid on the land. Mantell recommends purchase of land by national or regional non-profit organization with transfer to a local land trust when funds are available. (Common, 1993; Mantell, 1990)

**Open Space Preservation Issues**

"An essential ingredient in the livability of compactly built neighborhoods is the provision of open spaces, both formal and informal, within easy walking distance. Without parks, squares, greens, commons, or protected natural areas nearby, neighborhoods would not meet some very basic ‘quality of life’ criteria.” (Arendt, 1994)

Remembering that open space preservation is a component of a larger growth management program, this section will look at some of the reasons open lands have value to our society and issues of maintenance.

**Environmental**

The existing natural systems are the most cost effective way of dealing with societies wastes. (Common, 1993) Undeveloped lands in a natural state have been documented to have the following benefits: facilitates aquifer recharge, removes suspended solids from runoff, retains and slows velocity of stormwater reducing flood damage, cools temperatures, reduces noise, provides habitats for wildlife, and cleanses the air by consuming carbon dioxide and
producing oxygen. (Arendt, 1994; Burns, 1993; Common, 1993; Fox, 1990; NPS, 1990) But once these systems are overloaded, the natural function breaks down and is not easily restored. (Common, 1993) Therefore, an adequate amount of land must be preserved if environmental benefits are the objective.

**Economic Issues**

Several studies document the economic benefits of open space. Beginning with the construction of Central Park in New York City in the 1850’s, Frederick Law Olmsted demonstrated that the values of surrounding parcels of land increased. This appreciation resulted in higher tax revenues and, therefore, in a matter of years paid for the construction of the park. This technique was used to justify future projects. Brabec (Arendt, 1994) argues that this technique is valid today and gives municipalities a reason to actively set aside open lands. Also, “since one of a municipality’s prime sources of funds is the real estate property tax, and because protected open space increases the value of the surrounding land (while creating little new demand for costly government services), it is in the public’s best economic interest to preserve open space.” (Arendt, 1994)

Similar findings are reported by Gilliam (Arendt, 1994) in California and the National Park Service (1990) in Seattle. One hundred million dollars per year of tax revenues are realized from a $330 million bond investment in parks and open space in California. The increased tax revenue is generated from appreciated property values and the startup of businesses adjacent to the open space. The Burke-Gilman trail in Seattle is responsible for a six percent increase in home values adjacent to the trail versus similar homes removed from the trail.
Brabec dedicates a section in *Rural by Design* (Arendt, 1994) on the economic benefits of open space that represents a consolidation of other studies. Some of the findings include:

- When open space is provided along a sensitive feature such as a river, lake, or ocean in lieu of extending property lines to the natural feature, the marketability of the property is not adversely affected and in some cases is enhanced.

- One study shows people are willing to pay a premium for property less affected by air pollution.

- A report from the Governor's Committee on the Environment in 1988 stated that open space in five New England states enhanced the quality of life and is instrumental in fueling the multi-billion dollar tourist industry.  

**Maintaining Open Space**

So, once a system of open lands is provided through development exactions, easements, fee simple acquisition, et cetera, who is responsible for maintenance? In some cases, home owners associations are formed. All owners are required to pay monthly or annual dues for maintenance, improvements, and insurance. With a home owner association required for maintenance, work days that get everyone involved in spring cleaning, field preparation, or construction projects promote a community atmosphere and instills a sense of pride in the development. In West Vincent Township, Chester County, PA, homeowners lease open lands back to local farmers resulting in a source of revenue and preserving the rural character. (Arendt, 1994)

An alternative is to transfer responsibility to the local government. If lands are part of a network of connected spaces, having one body responsible for upkeep makes sense. If the public authority has the capacity (employees,  

---

10 For other work that addresses the economic benefits of open space, see: Correll, Lillydahl, and Singel, 1978; More, Stevens, and Allen, 1982; Weicker and Zerbst, 1973; Kimmel, 1985; Fox, 1990; NPS, 1990; and Hammon, Coughlin, and Horn, 1974.
equipment, and money), it will readily accept land if it fits in with the master recreation open space plan.

With estate lots, the owners are generally responsible for upkeep. Estate lots are typically very large in size and are characterized by the fact that they limit development to a small portion of the lot. For example, a parcel of fifty acres may be allocated as follows: development of structures concentrated on no more than five contiguous acres with the remaining 45 acres in agriculture or naturally preserved. The function of estate land is generally to provide rural character so land is farmed or allowed to return to natural state and requires minimal maintenance. Sometimes land is held by a nonprofit land trust and they are responsible for upkeep. Like the estate lots, land held by trusts is generally more natural in demeanor and requires little maintenance. (Arendt, 1994)

**How Much Open Space**

How much open space per individual is appropriate? The literature raises the question but fails to quantify a response. There are many factors that make quantification difficult. If land is preserved in a natural state for aquifer recharge, how large an area is needed? The recreational needs of a community will vary with the demographics of the community and is likely to change over time. Also, does the open space serve only the residents of a community or does it attract outsiders such as tourists and recreationists? The quality of park, recreation and open space land is of issue; not the quantity. (Gold, 1980) Therefore, using comparisons of “enough” open space of one community versus another community is unfounded.

**DEVELOPING AN OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION PLAN**

In the words of Robert Yaro (1991):
"We don't have to make stark choices between development and open space. We also don't need to hobble our economy or make it too expensive to live and work [in a region] as the price of preserving the character of the region. And we don't have to accept the destruction of the character of the region and its communities. Rather we need to create new patterns of development which meet public needs while respecting and perpetuating those attributes of our communities that give them their sense of place."

How do we do this? By using the tools presented earlier in this section. However, tools alone will not accomplish the end as identified by Yaro. Plans are developed to give guidance in accomplishing a system of parks, recreation, and open space. Gold (1980) says “the purpose of [park, recreation, and open space] planning is to meet events we expect to happen, accomplish things we want to happen, and prevent things we do not want to happen.” There is no one right method or formula to guide one from the idea of developing a plan through to implementation. We must rely on “precedent and practice” to help formulate a plan. (Gold, 1980) This section presents the components that are found in most plans. The actual order of occurrence and the relevance of each component should be determined on a case by case basis.

Gold (1980) elaborates on the purpose of planning. “the planning task is to inventory, analyze, and project information that relates people (behavior), time (leisure), and activity (recreation) to space (resources) and a geographic area (planning unit), using criteria or measures (performance standards/social indicators) that are sensitive to the changing physical character, social needs, and political priorities of a community.” How this is accomplished is presented below.
Determination of Goals and Objectives

Gold (1980) states that this component has received the least amount of attention in the planning process but is essential. Goals and objectives are "broad declarations of desirable end states." (Brower, 1984) A goal represents an "orientation" and is "universal and lasting" while an objective is an end that can be measured and can change or be adjusted over time. Goals represent the values of a community. Because of that, goals often remain constant year after year. Modifications occur only as the community values change. From the objectives, policies and programs are developed which when implemented endeavor to satisfy the goals and objectives. (Gold, 1980)

If the goals express the values of a community, can the formulation of goals and objectives occur prior to the collection of data? This is subject to debate with the two views 1. how can you form goals and objectives without a knowledge base to ground them versus 2. you need goals and objectives to determine what data needs to be collected. The answer may be that broad goals are determined at the outset with revision and objective formulation occurring after the data has been digested.

Besides guiding the planning process, Gold (1980) sees the value in developing well thought out goals. Administrators determine the allocation of funds based in part on the end means that will be achieved: what will they get for their money. To answer this question, they look at the goals of the individual departments vying for funds.

Public Participation

Receiving community feedback and interaction is an integral part of goal and objective formulation. In fact, public participation, evaluation, and interaction should occur during each component of the plan development process. Planners
are facilitators who implement citizenry wants and needs. (Brower, 1984; Gold, 1980)

The importance of interaction with the community is stressed by Brower (1984): "many rural residents view planning and development management as either wasteful government activity or a threat to individual property rights - or both." Communication can overcome these feelings while facilitating a means to understand the communities wants and needs and helping to educate the citizens on the need to plan for open space and/or growth.

Roger Wells agrees and stresses that a bottoms-up approach is imperative for a successful program. In a study of Chester County’s (PA) open space and recreation areas, a questionnaire was developed that required local feedback with the purpose of identifying local resources or the lack thereof. A survey “acknowledges community participation as the key to inexpensive assistance, and engages communities in planning their own areas.” (Findlay, 1986) Additionally, this approach can facilitate a relationship between the county and local governments, an asset that will be valuable for future interaction should implementation of new policies occur. (Findlay, 1986)

Summarizing, "planning will be effective only to the extent it is understood and supported by citizens who have been realistically involved in every step of the process.” (Gold, 1980)

Data Inventory and Analysis

In order to make sound decisions, the planner must be informed. This section considers the multitude of information needed to make informed decisions regarding the preservation of land for parks, recreation, and open space. Data must be “collected, organized, analyzed, interpreted, and
presented” before a plan can be developed. “This requires an understanding of
1. what information is needed, 2. why it is important, 3. where it can be obtained,
4. how it can be analyzed and presented, and 5. where it fits in the planning
process.” (Gold, 1980)

At the macro level, three main categories of data are offered for
consideration: social, economic, and physical. (Gold, 1980) Social includes the
following: demographic data such as existing and forecasted population and the
characteristics of the population by race, age, sex, special needs, and income;
family structure (two parents/single parent households, family size); health
issues; crime rates and categories; housing; employment; and drug use.
Economic data includes: inflation, fiscal spending (state and federal), wages,
interest rates, tax rates, and economic trends. Physical issues relate to: land
use, density, environmental concerns (endangered species, wetlands, steep
slopes, fault lines, etcetera) noise, pollution, circulation, and safety. (Gold,
1980)

Concerning the usage of parks, recreation, and open space, data of
interest includes participation rates (and associated demographics), activities,
trends, leisure time, needed improvements, and unmet demand. (Hudson, 1988)

While the above lists may seem overwhelming and unnecessary, consider
by example how a given issue can impact PROS planning:

rampant inflation: when rapid increases in consumer
products occur, wage increases lag. The result is a
decrease in disposable income which in relation to PROS
planning may result in a shift from more expensive activities
such as skiing and boating to low cost activities close to
home such as walking, biking, swimming, and basketball.
With the associated change in activities, the long run effect can result in an increased need for local facilities. Additionally, inflation will likely affect funding of the PROS plan since less real dollars will be available to fund all county needs and cause changes in the way the pie is divided == basic services such as trash and water will have to be provided at whatever cost.

In a nutshell, considering the impacts from social, economic, and physical issues places PROS planning "in the broader context of a human service and environmental management system. They recognize the relationship of leisure spaces and services to the social and physical environment. . . In a planning context, these changes imply it is necessary to move beyond a narrow focus on recreation activities, buildings, and parks toward improving the quality of life and environment." (Gold, 1980)

The effort of data collection may not be as difficult as the long list above suggests. Much of the information is probably already available (or is needed) from formulation of the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan. Methods of collecting data include mail surveys, telephone interviews, personal interviews, focus groups, public meetings, and observation. Public input is essential. (Gold, 1980; Hudson, 1988)

The planning body needs to be informed of policies (pending and existing) from bodies within the jurisdiction's boundaries, neighboring jurisdictions, the state, and the federal government. Brower (1984) states that an understanding of existing and potential legislation at the state and federal levels serves as foundation for a developing local plan.
Needs Analysis

Once available, the data can be evaluated in order to determine the needs for parks, recreation, and open space. "Need is the difference between current recreation demand and the existing supply of opportunities expressed in terms of land, facilities, or program." (Gold, 1980) It involves the usage levels, satisfaction levels, user preference, causes for non-use, and identifies the needs of various user groups.

Needs assessment is carried out for a variety of reasons. Gold suggests that needs analysis is needed in order to justify budgetary positions, discover new trends, evaluate present status, and is a means to inform the public and public officials about the community resources.¹¹

Plan Formulation and Implementation

This component of the process develops programs, policies, and strategies that when implemented will satisfy the goals and objectives. For context, Gold (1980) clarifies the role of the comprehensive plan versus the PROS plan: "the comprehensive plan focuses on the relationship of open space and leisure services to land use and the quality of . . life and environment. The parks and recreation plan details these relationships and translates them into system-wide and site-specific proposals or projects to acquire or develop over time. It also details policies, practices, or criteria related to the design and management of these leisure spaces and services." The planning horizon for each of the plans should be congruent. (Gold, 1980)

¹¹ Gold (1980) devotes an entire section entitled "Supply and Demand Analysis" which discusses how to collect data, measure demand, and determine need.
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Brower (1984) suggests that plan development begin with an internal look of existing policies and procedures. The purpose is to develop an understanding of what is working, what is not working, and what can be retained to work with the new goals, objectives, and policies. From an inventory of tools and techniques that will preserve open land and are at the disposal of the planners, what works from the local perspective? Does the use of a particular tool complement or contradict other techniques and policies?

Additional considerations in developing a plan offered by Brower (1984) in his book *Managing Development in Small Towns* are:

1. the technical and administrative expertise available to the locality,
2. the local political situation,
3. the legal status of [a program]
4. the community’s growth situation,
5. the community’s fiscal resources.

1. *the technical and administrative expertise available to the locality.* Some programs require significant office staff to manage. For example, the Land Preservation District used in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania requires a lengthy review of each development proposal; or, charging an exaction based on the environmental impact of development requires a certain expertise to evaluate.

2. *the local political situation:* Is an open space program wanted by the people? The introduction of a new policy is often viewed with a wary eye by constituents. If a new program is seen as a restriction of property rights with no benefits to the land owner, it will be viewed negatively. Additionally, officials that are ill equipped to understand and explain a growth management policy augments this negative perspective. (Brower, 1984) This reemphasizes the importance of community education and feedback.
3. **the legal status a program**: Programs that have been accepted by the courts (and have survived the appeals process) will better suit a young growing community. Avoidance of techniques that are untested and broach the gray area in takings is suggested. Small communities generally cannot afford costly litigation expenses and the time that a trial may take away from overseeing other projects. Fighting a contested policy in court could freeze land that was targeted to be part of the communities open space program. (Brower, 1984)

4. **the community’s growth situation**: The public will be more receptive to growth management objectives if they are experiencing development pressures. Consideration of the policies and growth pressures beyond the jurisdiction’s borders is important. If development is encouraged without restriction only miles away, development will migrate to neighboring communities. The end result will be an adverse impact on the jurisdiction without any control over the timing, quantity, or location of neighboring development. Known as “leapfrogging”, this situation occurred around Boulder, CO. (Kelly, 1993)

5. **the community’s fiscal resources**: What good is a program if the community cannot afford it? Beyond financial expense, the cost of resources required to administer a particular policy must be considered. (Brower, 1984) There are a myriad of options for financing the program. The list includes: bond act, general fund appropriation, real estate transfer tax, land gains tax, tax return check-off, other fund tax such as gasoline or cigarette, sale or transfer of tax default property, exaction fees, and special assessment district. (See Mantell, 1990 for description) Again, the legality and public reception of a financing option should be determining factors.

Since priorities for action will have to be established, Gold (1980) recommends the following action: “1. identify problems, 2. present information on the social and physical implications of these problems in measurable human
terms, 3. develop problem solving alternatives, 4. describe the expected results of each alternative in terms of environmental and social impact on the planning area, and 5. rank or recommend alternatives in terms of economic, social, and political feasibility."

Monitor and Update

First, the jurisdiction must establish how success will be measured. What information will be needed to monitor the system? Has the program resulted in the desired effect? Have the goals and objectives been met or is progress being made towards those goals and objectives? To stay current with trends, the economy, technology, and resources, the plan should undergo periodic revisions (every five years for example). Once the performance of the plan has been evaluated, adjustments and changes can be made as deemed necessary. (Brower, 1984; Gold, 1980)

Although the plan is reviewed periodically, Gold (1980) emphasizes that planning is a continuous process that must constantly monitor changing "social values, life-style patterns, technology, legislation, and the availability of resources."
METHODOLOGY

This section discusses how the study of Montgomery County, MD’s Park, Recreation, and Open Space planning process was conceived and conducted.

RESEARCH CLASSIFICATION

This project involves a focused study on one planning body: The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The commission is made up of two counties, Montgomery and Prince George, who for the purpose of this work function independently. Montgomery County is the focus of this research and specifically the influences that impact the master planning of Park, Recreation, and Open Space referred to as PROS. The rationale for a single case is justified by Yin (1989). He states that case studies “are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. In this sense, the case study does not represent a ‘sample’ and the investigation goal is to expand and generalize theories and not to numerate frequencies.” (Yin, 1989)

The data for the research comes from interviews conducted with various planning personnel. While there was a list of topics to cover, the structure was open-ended allowing the interviewees to help determine how the interview progressed. This technique is referred to as “interactionism.” Silverman (1993) says that “interactionism” is unstructured open-ended interviews used to gain authentic experiences and knowledge. Three reasons are offered for the open-ended technique:

1. “it allows respondents to use their unique ways of defining the world
2. it assumes that no fixed sequence of questions is suitable to all respondents
3. it allows respondents to raise important issues not contained in the schedule.” (Silverman, 1993)
CASE STUDY SELECTION: MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD

One of the objectives was to find a jurisdiction that encompassed urban, suburban, and rural areas. Since this work is interested in jurisdictions on or beyond the suburban fringe, the intent was to find an area that was once rural and experienced rapid growth but had not reached a stage of full development. Thereby, the planning authority can apply what they have learned from past development to impact the future of suburban and rural reaches. Bordered by Washington DC to the southeast and rural Frederick County to the northeast, Montgomery County satisfied this objective. Growth extends radially from DC with highly urbanized centers just beyond the DC border.

Montgomery County was discovered during the literature review process. Several sources cite growth management techniques employed by the county. In fact, Godschalk of the University of North Carolina found of 80 growth management techniques, Montgomery County was using more than any other jurisdiction. (Zyontz, 1995) Kelly (1993) mentions throughout his work that Montgomery County has seen growth through the eighties and into the nineties and can therefore see direct results good and bad of growth management practices. Having the experience of trying innovative planning techniques makes the county a desirable subject to study.

Additionally, Montgomery County offered accessible personnel and documentation and is a reasonable proximity to the writer’s location.

Personnel with varying responsibility in the planning process were interviewed. From the Park Planning and Development staff, the planning supervisor who will be referred to as PP1 and a park planner, PP2, were interviewed. From the Planning Department, a coordinator of community plans known as CP1 and a lead planner, CP2, were interviewed. The purpose of finding personnel with varying responsibilities was to capture unique, similar,
and divergent perspectives of the park, recreation, and open space planning process.

**Supportive Research at Fairfax County, VA**

To gain understanding of the practice of park planning and to gain experience in conducting an open-ended interview, a park planner, known as PP3, was interviewed. Fairfax County was selected since it’s geographical characteristics in relation to DC are similar to those of Montgomery County, MD. The data from the Fairfax County experience is included in the results section.

**Analysis of Interview Data**

The process for analysis of the interview data was adapted from methods suggested by Ely (1991) and Patton (1990) and is as follows:

1. Read verbatim transcripts several times.
2. Identify labels, descriptors.
3. Derive and assign labels to tentative categories.
4. Return to verbatim transcripts and review repeating steps 2 & 3.
5. Finalize categories.
6. Note initial impressions from grouping of labels in the categories.
7. Develop sub-questions from main question that is category specific.
8. Select verbatim narrative to define character of the categories.
9. Review county documentation to support or refute interview data.

Elaborating on the process, after reading the transcripts several times, I returned to the transcripts and highlighted key words (labels). Using a fresh
transcript, the process was repeated. The first forty labels were evaluated to derive tentative categories. I then returned to a fresh set of transcripts to scan for labels again. Labels were then posted using spreadsheet software; duplicates were deleted. Labels were "dressed up" to ensure derivations of words would be found in the main interview document using the search function of word processing software. For example, searching for "donat" will capture donate, donates, donated, donation, and donations. The labels were assigned to categories.\textsuperscript{12} On a first pass, it was difficult to determine the proper classification of some labels. To resolve; labels were either put into multiple categories, new categories created as needed, or returned to the text to determine the context with which the label was used. Using the database function of spreadsheet software, the labels were grouped by category. Initial impressions from grouping of labels were stated. After studying the initial impressions, an attempt was made to create groups of categories. But, I determined that this effort began to pigeonhole the data when in fact the categories crossed boundaries and covered broader topics. Therefore, the grouping effort was used merely as a means of developing an order for presenting the categories in the results section so that linkages between categories could be discussed when they occur. Sub-questions were derived for each category from my main question. This serves two purposes: 1. establishes a criteria for selection of narrative text; 2. helps the reader understand the context of the category. For example, the question for the Private category is "What role do private initiatives play in the development of the PROS plan?" Working by category, I returned to the interview text in an attempt to explore and describe the facts and opinions that relate to a given sub-question. This was done by reviewing each occurrence of each keyword.

\textsuperscript{12}For a complete list of labels and corresponding categories, see Appendix III.

Analysis of Interview Data
Commission supplemented the interview process and is referenced to support or refute interview data. A cross case analysis was used to analyze the data which Patton describes as a "grouping together [of] answers from different people to common questions or analyzing different perspectives or central issues." (Patton, 1990) Findings are reported in the results section.

I determined that the frequency with which a label occurs has no bearing as to the significance of that label. A word that occurs only once is equally important as a word occurring fifty times.

Initially, a third party was used to transcribe the interview data. However, mistakes were made while transcribing due to unfamiliarity with the subject and the difficulty in hearing the taped conversations. Therefore, I transcribed the data and found this to be an extremely valuable exercise albeit time consuming. This exercise returns the researcher to the interview scene and forces the researcher to hear, listen, and transcribe the interview word for word. Valuable information can be discovered from revisiting the interview by catching voice inflections, emotion, and emphasis that would be overlooked or could be misinterpreted by looking at the written transcripts.
RESULTS

This section begins with background information on Montgomery County, Maryland’s history in planning. A discussion of the planning procedures for park and community planning follows. Valuable information on the process of PROS planning is provided by means of verbatim text from interviews with Montgomery County planning personnel.

BACKGROUND

Situated in the Piedmont Plateau, Montgomery County encompasses approximately 500 square miles. The Potomac River creates the southwest border separating Maryland from Virginia. Impacted significantly by its southern neighbor the District of Columbia, no point in the county is further than 35 miles from Capitol Hill. (Park, 1988)

Montgomery County, MD has a history rich in planning efforts. In 1920, President Theodore Roosevelt called for the preservation of Rock Creek which flows from Montgomery County through the District. This spurred an interest in stream valley preservation throughout Montgomery County. In 1927, the state of Maryland initiated a body known as The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCP&PC) to oversee the preservation of Rock Creek and its tributaries. The M-NCP&PC consists of Montgomery and Prince George’s counties and encompasses 1001 square miles. Building upon the recommendation of President Roosevelt, Congress passed the Capper-Cramton Act in 1930 which allocated federal funds for the purchase of land for a “comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system.” 13 The intention of the act was to preserve the natural setting that surrounded the nation’s capital from the development that was certain to occur. Since Montgomery County is the

13 Public No. 284, 71st Congress
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northern neighbor of the capital and it's tributaries directly impact the waters that pass through DC, Montgomery County was a significant beneficiary of this legislation. The Capper-Cramton Act provided funding for the purchase of stream valleys and parkland throughout the lower portions of the county until 1955 when congress elected to discontinue funding. Over the years, the M-NCP&PC's focus broadened tackling issues such as development patterns, transportation, schools, and parks. In 1957, separate planning boards were created for Montgomery and Prince George's counties resulting in basically independent planning efforts. (Hamblen, 1991; On Wedges, 1964; General, 1993; Park, 1988)

Originally a bedroom community, Montgomery County had rapid development post World War II. 1964 saw the initiation of the M-NCP&PC's On

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Statistics</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Montgomery County, MD</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>179,323,175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>340,928</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>248,709,873</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>757,027</td>
<td>122.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>325,942,000</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3

Wedges and Corridors master plan. The basis of the idea is that DC is the hub of a large wheel. Spokes extend from the hub creating "corridors" for travel. The corridors would be highly developed urban centers serviced by interstate highways. Between the spokes are "wedges" of less developed land resulting in open space, residential neighborhoods, and farming. Montgomery County

---

adopted the “On Wedges and Corridors” concept in 1970 and has continued to allow those principles to guide its planning decisions. The county recognized that they were part of a metropolitan region and like other surrounding DC jurisdictions had a responsibility to accommodate growth pressures. The county’s goal was to oversee organized development so as to not adversely affect the existing and future residents of the county. In 1974 with the publishing of Framework for Action, First Annual Growth Policy Report of Montgomery County Planning Board, the county began pursuit of a growth management strategy. This first publication noted that an effective management policy must address three key issues: location, timing, and cost and that existing methods of zoning and subdivision controls did not influence timing and cost. The county’s original intentions for growth management were to follow a general plan “to provide for consolidated development with the least amount of sprawl, the most coordinated form of transportation, and the most accessible open space. (Framework, 1974) In 1991, the county revisited the “On Wedges and Corridors” concept with the objective of refining and amending the plan to meet the changing needs of the county. The “Refinement” was adopted in December, 1993 and reaffirmed the wedge and corridor concept. Over the decades, a significant economic base has been built to the point that more people now commute into the county for employment than out. (Christeller, 1986; General, 1993; Hamblen, 1991; Park, 1988)

While the “On Wedges and Corridors” philosophy forms the conceptual framework for planning in the county, the commission relies on the General Plan to more clearly indicate the goals, objectives, and strategies of the M-NCP&PC. The General Plan (1993) “is a comprehensive framework for guiding physical development and managing limited resources in Montgomery County, Maryland.” This document expresses the vision for how the county will look in the future. With the longest time horizon of any county publication, the concepts

Background
are “general in nature”. The intention is to keep objectives broad enough so that the document is flexible to adapt to the unknown. Writing about Montgomery County, Christeller (1986) seconded this sentiment stating “slack” needs to be built into the system; rigid boundaries do not work to the benefit of anyone. The General Plan (1993) is “an evolving and dynamic document that provides the basis for more specific area master plans, functional plans, and sector plans.” The county is divided into subareas for which master plans are developed. The proposed life of the master plan is dependent on the anticipated rate of growth. Areas of rapid growth will have to be revisited more frequently. Master plans are drafted by the planning department and approved (or disapproved) by the nine member county council. Separately, functional plans are developed that deal with land use issues such as stormwater management, highways, and parks. Parks master planning is referred to as Park, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan or PROS. (Hamblen, 1991; General, 1993)

The General Plan (1993) includes objectives that deal with parks, recreation, and open space. These objectives serve to unite master planning and park planning efforts. The Montgomery County Department of Parks drafts the PROS plan which includes the goals and objectives for park planning and is “compatible with” the General Plan. (Park, 1993) (See Appendix I for Goals, Objectives, and Strategies of both the General Plan and PROS Plan.)

OPEN SPACE PLANNING IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Most jurisdictions are not as fortunate as Montgomery County was to have had federally funded support for the purchase of park, recreation, and open space lands. After funding from the federal government ceased, the chart below signifies the continued effort made by the county to acquire parklands. The Capper-Cramton Act, however, provided the impetus for the M-NCP&PC. And, “[68] years has past since the Commission convened its first meeting on May
16, 1927 and laid the framework for what has become one of the most extensive, most envied urban park systems in the United States." (Park, 1988) Former Planning Director Richard Tustian once likened the county to a giant organism with the roads as arteries and the parks acting as lungs. (Hamblen, 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PRCS Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>3855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>6518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>8477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>11644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>18082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>26397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>27621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4

Open Space Defined

Montgomery County defines and classifies open space into three categories: active, passive, and natural conservation. “Active” supports recreational activities such as baseball, soccer, and tennis. “Passive” open space provides for less strenuous activities such as walking and nature viewing. The stream valley parks typify the passive category. Natural conservation areas are intended to be extremely light-use where the purpose of open land has an environmental benefit such as stormwater infiltration or wildlife habitat.

---

MacMaster, 1976; Park, 1988; Park, 1993

Open Space Planning in Montgomery County

---
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Parks come under one of two broad classifications: county-wide or community-wide parks. County-wide parks are characterized by large land area that typically involve an excursion to use them (with the exception of stream valley parks which are readily accessible from adjacent neighborhoods). Includes stream valley parks, regional parks, recreational parks, conservation areas, and special parks. Community-wide parks are designed to serve the needs of the surrounding residents and businesses. These include urban parks, neighborhood parks, local parks, and neighborhood conservation areas. (Park, 1988) Parkland and facilities under the control of the Department of Parks are held as a public trust. (Park, 1993)

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Recalling the question of this study: within the context of a growth management planning philosophy, how is the preservation of land for parks, recreation, and open space being accomplished? This section will explore and describe the influences and techniques that impact Montgomery County’s efforts in PROS planning. Analysis of the data resulted in the identification of 237 labels. These labels were placed into 15 categories. The categories are discussed individually below. Working from the thesis question, sub-questions were created particular to each category to guide the analysis of the that category. Since the categories do not function independently, key linkages to other categories as discovered in the interviews or county documentation are identified (the category is underlined).

A preview of the sub-questions for each category is listed below:

How do participant activities affect open space planning?

How do design decisions and open space planning issues interrelate?

What role does the public (People) play in the PROS planning process?
Are **surveys** an effective management tool in the PROS planning process?

How do you **evaluate** your success?

How **visionary** is today’s planning process?

What are the **political** impacts on the planning process?

Describe how **fiscal** restraints impact the planning process?

Are there **economic** benefits of open space?

How do **environmental** issues affect PROS planning?

**Regulatory:** How do state & federal governments impact your open space planning efforts?

What **tools** are you using to preserve open space?

How do you use **zoning** to influence PROS planning?

What role do **private** initiatives play in the development of the PROS plan?

What would your **strategy** be for developing an open space preservation program?

Verbatim text from the transcribed interviews is provided below as relevant to the categories.\(^{16}\) Patton states that a sufficient amount of text should be provided as context to allow the reader to develop their own independent judgment. (Patton, 1990) To help the reader maintain perspective from within the sea of data, a header is provided which shows the current category. Also, the sub-question that guided selection of text for that category is provided.

**Activity**

**How do participant activities affect open space planning?**

The message is that the open space program needs to be adaptive to meet changing needs, tastes, and trends.

\(^{16}\) Complete interview transcripts can be found in Appendix II.

**Presentation of Data**
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How do participant activities affect open space planning?

PP1: Over the years we've tried new facilities frequently, we tried exercise trails and I'm still not sure why they didn't catch on, fitness courses, and every new park for a while was proposed to have a fitness course; well after we built the first several of them we realized that they really weren't getting used that much so we took them out of; we hadn't built the rest of the parks and now we keep them mostly in our larger parks. There are new facilities that we try from time to time handball courts, paddle tennis; you like to be up on different trends, we are going to try and provide something for roller blading.

PP1: we've been asked to look into a lot of facilities that are up and coming trends, there's roller blading and street hockey. All of them; over the years we've had a lot of pressure from these. . . . It is very difficult to project the true needs for new upcoming facilities.

PP2: [Park planning] is affected by changing attitudes and ideas, changing population, diversification, diversity, in terms of how do we address the issue of recreational facilities.

Additionally, a diversity of interests should be satisfied.

PP3: We found from the survey that a lot people just want to preserve open space to have areas they can just go and be quiet and sit in a park, walk trails, so we kind of directed our program towards that.

In order to stay current with changing needs and interests, the county's residents are surveyed periodically (see Survey section). In conjunction with the survey, participation rates are measured. These participation rates translate into facility needs when analyzed against population projections. (Park, 1988) So, the amount of current activity directly impacts the projected future needs for facilities. As tastes change, so goes the demand for facilities. The late seventies saw rapid increase in tennis and there was a push to provide facilities to meet the increased demand. Over time, the interest waned and under utilized tennis courts must be maintained or converted to meet new demands. Juggling to satisfy needs without over committing to satisfy temporary fads is a difficult chore.
Activity Design People Survey Evaluation Vision Political Fiscal
Economic Environmental Regulatory Tools Zoning Private Strategy

To provide a full diversity of activities, Montgomery County relies on private initiatives. Activities such as hunting, fishing, and mountain biking occur on private land.

Design

How do design decisions and open space planning issues interrelate?

The On Wedges and Corridors (1964) document incited many ideas that for the time can be best described as visionary. The plan encouraged imaginative urban design: called for greenbelts to separate uses around the new small towns, investigate the possibility for clustering to preserve open land, and make considerations for pedestrian traffic are some examples.

As stated in On Wedges and Corridors (1964), greenbelts “add greatly to the quality and pleasing appearance of communities.” Their purpose is give identity or shape to new towns, clusters, and even existing towns. Greenbelts “will be an enduring buffer between rural and urban uses.” Greenbelts have an important function in the wedge and corridor concept. The concept envisioned the wedges as large infiltration basins that filter the silt and debris from corridor runoff. Therefore, the purchase of parkland was called for in On Wedges and Corridors (1964) around urban centers in order to create a barrier that says urbanization stops here and “rural” residential living occurs beyond in the wedge. The purpose of this parkland was to provide stormwater infiltration, recreation opportunities, and a visual barrier between land uses.

RG: in wedges and corridors, it mentioned the use of greenbelts to separate uses, did that happen?

CP1: yeah, look at this map, we have a small dividing line between gaithersburg and gaithersburg vicinity it didn’t quite get completed, we have an absolute
Activity  Design  People  Survey  Evaluation  Vision  Political  Fiscal
Economic  Environmental  Regulatory  Tools  Zoning  Private  Strategy

How do design decisions and open space planning issues interrelate?

complete line in germantown we have a complete line between ogden space
[??]; And a greenbelt separating our old from the others and certainly we bought
every one of our stream valleys along the line. We've done pretty well.

CP1: There is value in just passing through, people feel better about areas that
are heavily treed.

PP1: we are getting more into greenway planning but essentially we've always
had greenways as stream valley parks now they're really just calling them
greenways

PP3: Creating a greenway system throughout the county not only for pedestrian
transportation corridors but wildlife corridors.

On Wedges and Corridors (1964) saw the need to address future travel
congestion and called for pedestrian travel through walking and biking.

RG: are there trends in the county that are affecting you near term, changing the
way you thinking about planning?

CP1: the biggest large scale trend would be the move toward transit oriented
development. To try to get more areas where cars aren't necessary to have a
decent standard of life and have an environment that is better for pedestrians
than it is for cars; we've only seen a couple on the ground examples of that so
certainly that's the first step, we try to [evaluate the concept] as early as we can.

The importance of community identity is discussed in various county
Montgomery County Planning Board (1974) states "of all the elements of urban
growth, community is perhaps the most elusive and hard to quantify." The

concepts and importance of community are elaborated below:

We know that community is not primarily a physically or spatially determined
phenomenon. It is a product of voluntary human actions, many of which
frequently seem to transcend physical barriers. It is also a product of each
individual's personal "perception," which frequently varies with age, health,
family size, and many other fluctuating factors. Perhaps for these reasons, the
literature does not seem to reveal any solid consensus on the "right" relationship
between urban form, or physical design, and the amorphous concept of
community. Since we have defined land use as the handle by which to deal with
growth policy, this question is important. Some concepts of community may be
well beyond the reach of any practical attempt at growth policy; others may well merit serious effort.

The one spatial conclusion that seems to thread through many sociological works is the idea that community is fostered when the physical environment is structured so as to allow people to come together in one place for a mixed range of purposes and to foster, through this process, the opportunity for a number of unplanned, casual enriching and rewarding experience to those who wish to avail themselves of such opportunities. (Framework, 1974)

In the General Plan (1993) under Land Use goals, strategy “C” of objective 8 calls for the integration of “open space, parks, and recreational facilities into urbanized areas to promote public activity and community identity.” The PROS master plan document calls for the use of parks, recreation, and open space to prevent county towns from becoming homogeneous, to give identity to communities/neighborhoods and to separate towns and land uses.

RG: It seems that most of the discussion has focused on residential development; how is commercial development handled?

CP2: let me think, in sandy spring; that’s a very good question, this is a very small scale area and has a little village center, and there has been some discussion whether or not there should be a village green. And if there is, how are you going to get it in an area where the property is zoned commercial. I don’t know the answer to that. We haven’t really addressed it. We haven’t agreed on whether not the village green idea needs to be emphasized in the master plan or could it happen on its own.

The concepts of community are considered during the development of area master plans. There is a connection between what the documentation calls for and what the planners are striving to achieve.

As previously explained in the Methodology section, one of the criteria for selection of case study was to find an area that was once rural and experienced

---

17 See Appendix I for goals and objectives of the General Plan and the PROS plan.
rapid growth but had not reached a stage of full development. Thus, it is valuable to know what the “experts” have learned from the past that is affecting future planning. I thought I would hear enlightening Strategic Planning issues when in fact most answers focused on micro issues that involve Design (which were also enlightening).

RG: what have you learned from this urbanization here that’s impacting your planning of the rural areas out here.

PP1: were trying not to parks, active parks, that back directly onto homeowners property; we run into problems with this because developers are trying to maximize the use of their property; its a constant battle to keep enough buffer area; we try to put streets in between to separate. Active recreation its just a very large impact on the adjacent residents. That’s one thing we were trying to do differently.

PP2: stream valley parks, if you look at a map, very obvious also the program it started off if you look at portions of sligoe and other branches in downtown areas are very narrow; what we’ve learned is we need a wider stream valley and buffer, we have always gone after the flood plan per se, um particularly since 1960 we are now getting to own the steep slopes and beyond the steep slopes.

RG: it sounds like the objective is more conservation oriented.

PP2: that and also the reality of the situation is that it is hard to build a... provide access to the stream valley parks in terms of the hiker/biker trails when you have to go through wetlands or floodplain.

PP1: we are having problems right now because our current concept of local parks used to be ten acres and now we trying to get fifteen, it isn’t really big enough to provide recreation facilities and enough buffer areas so that the adjacent neighbors aren’t bothered by the park and we will have to either go to bigger parks in which case we might have to spend more money to buy the land or rethink our concept.

CP1: there is always a push to underestimate the needs for public rights of way there is always something else you want to do and when you come back into a neighborhood it’s a real problem so if anything we’ve had experience in at least the last 10 years in really trying to be aggressive about maintaining right of way. What we did best in the downtown though was get land in advance of development and real cheap; ah were not doing so well in these fiscally tough times.
Design issues are affected by Regulatory activity:

PP1: the changing environmental regulations over the last 5 - 10 years and now ADA are going to make a tremendous change in the way we develop our parks; we have had good luck with getting the developer dedicating the site, to grade the site before he gives it to us so ah alleviate the ADA problem so we know we are getting a usable site.

 Connecting public spaces is a priority where possible:

RG: through your master planning are you trying to link spaces of one subdivision together with the next?

PP2: well yeah we already know; we have a map on the wall that says we own this. If we have a subdivision come in ideally we would like to acquire this. We have a subdivision come in triggers the process off where we look at the subdivision to see where it is if it is next to a park obviously we are going to take a close look at it.

PP3: there are some preservation areas that we won't want because it doesn't connect anywhere, has no real significance, all it will be is a liability to us and we would be hit with maintaining a homeowners small piece of land. So in those cases we don't accept and say put it to somebody else.

People

What role does the public (People) play in the PROS planning process?

Since PROS planning is conducted for the benefit of humans (and other creatures), it is hoped that the public would have a voice in the planning process.

CP2: it is my responsibility to orchestrate community involvement and participation during the process; Then, I take the staff draft to the planning authority and it changes its name as it goes through the process depending upon who has touched it but basically it goes to the planning board and they hold public hearings and then hold work sessions. I'm responsible for moving the plan through that process and then; their are a lot of players and then I take the plan to the county council and they go through their own public hearing process then a final plan is put together.
Activity  Design  People  Survey  Evaluation  Vision  Political  Fiscal
Economic  Environmental  Regulatory  Tools  Zoning  Private  Strategy

What role does the public (People) play in the PROS planning process?

RG: how is the master plan formulated. What kinds of things do you take into consideration?

CP1: about everything, . . . local concerns, the whole gamut of effects.

CP2: We work with a group from the community that gives us insight into the community so that is the part we've been working on.

One of the issues that concerns open space planning is the future use of open lands. Montgomery County places the land in public trust so it is difficult to remove land from public use; however, there are pressures to use the public right-of-way. The people can have an effect on the use as seen by example below:

CP2: There has been a lot of concern in the community about whether or not future development can use open space; like we need to expand our day care facility can we use your nice open space.

RG: when those issues do crop up, what is the public reaction?

PP1: well, recently we had a proposal to put a Cellular One tower on one of our parks. The park staff recommended to the commission not to allow this. The park commission voted to allow it and the people are still screaming and now the park commission is reconsidering it and that situation will probably end up being some kind of political decision; I would guess that utility corridors are one of the biggest, and roads, are the biggest problems we have and in the past we just let them go through where ever they wanted and now with the new environmental sensitivities at an absolute high right now and a, water sewer electric get through easier because they can be done in a less damaging way and there are only certain places that sewer and water can be run, roads, uh are given a real hard time and other facilities.

PP2: we used to have like school bus parking lot on park land. Those type of wholesale things don't happen; I can't remember the last episode when that happened?

PP1: the citizens are normally real, adjacent neighbors, are real persistent.
What role does the public (People) play in the PROS planning process?

When the interviewees were questioned on the establishment of an open space preservation program, some responded on the importance of the public in the process.

RG: if you were to take a new position with a county that is on the suburban fringe and has not been involved with pros planning but is seeing the need, how would you go about setting up a new pros plan. what support would you like to see?

CP2: the first thing I would do is go out into the community and find out what their issues were. What do you, why are you, when are you looking for; . . . I think there should be a community driven effort to protect open space . . . where people pool their resources; there are towns in new england where the residents decide they want to buy it and preserve it.

CP1: [speaking on the value of open space] you need a culture that values it, and if the culture values it, the people will vote in politicians who think it's a value and if they don't they will vote in people who don't value it.

CP1: what you need to do is number one a willingness on the public's part to buy land because that's the easiest and most direct way to control growth geographically

PP1: I feel that planning parks is a very inexact science. A lot of it is gained through continuing knowledge of your county and the people and your park system and what you've come to learn does well that is successful and what isn't.

Connected to providing a variety of Activities that satisfies a wide diversity of People, CP1 says it "is something you plan for.

RG: while I was driving in rockville, I past three churches in a row, korean baptist, chinese, then a third nationality, it appears that you have to deal with a diverse population mix.

CP1: we have the highest percentage of non us born immigrants that are first generation in the state of MD, and nationally we are pretty high. We get the asian doctor, we get the downtown diplomat, we also went the waves of tacoma park we got the Vietnamese, Nicaraguan during their war, Cuban wave hasn't hit us yet, but sure we get plenty of nationalities it is something you plan for. What you end up doing in Tacoma park is taking a park and making a job fair, it was
What role does the public (People) play in the PROS planning process?

sort of a pick up labor place that was really informal, messy, but it served a purpose.

PP2: [park planning] is affected by changing attitudes and ideas, changing population, diversification, diversity, in terms of how do we address the issue of recreational facilities.

Survey

Are surveys an effective management tool in the PROS planning process?

Surveys are one means by which the People can affect the planning process. Planners rely on this tool to ascertain the needs, wants, and desires of park users. (Park, 1988) Performed periodically, surveys provide vital information that is useful in developing the PROS plan. When compared with previous surveys, analysis reveals trends and shifts in demographics. (1990 Park User Survey, 1991)

PP3: We also look at needs assessment countywide which we did 2 years ago a survey of the citizens to try to determining what the participation rates were in 32 recreational categories. We try to find out what was priority to the citizens and what they like to do. From that, we try to ascertain and get direction of where we should focus our priorities over the next 15 years. . . . We found from the survey that a lot people just want to preserve open space to have areas they can just go and be quiet and sit in a park, walk trails, so we kind of directed our program towards that. Creating a greenway system throughout the county not only for pedestrian transportation corridors but wildlife corridors.

PP3: One of the reasons we did the participation survey was to say for every thousand of people you bring in you have to build a soccer field. We updated our standards and that's where we negotiate from. We go in and look at their development and say ok your development based on our standards you have to put in one tot lot, 2 baseball fields, three multi-use courts.

PP3: We also do land acquisition. Based on some of the needs assessment information we have identified certain areas of the county that we're deficient and need to buy large tracts of land.
Are surveys an effective management tool in the PROS planning process?

RG: you said about measuring participation do you do that by observation or by survey, you said the fitness trails do not work.

PP1: we do surveys ... we do all kinds of surveys. This has all the parks in it, you will have to read our methodology to understand how we do it.

Surveys are also used to help justify the CIP and operating budgets. (1390 Park User Survey, 1991)

PP1: we've been asked to look into a lot of facilities that are up and coming trends, there's roller blading and street hockey. All of them; over the years we’ve had a lot of pressure from these. Rick developed a mathematical model based on type data well that's probably not the right word, survey data that determines participation rates of various facilities. It is very difficult to project the true needs for new upcoming facilities because you don’t have the database.

RG: in pros, I read there is a facility gap between what you have now and what you thought you would need? Is that facilities that comes from your model? For example, listed a shortage of ball fields in a certain region.

PP2: ah yeah, sure, all we do is take what is in the pros plan for need [which comes from survey data] and look at what's in our CIP and that tells you the gap right away.

One possible drawback in Montgomery County’s procedure of surveying is that surveys are conducted at park sites so only park users can participate. Their methodology fails to capture the valuable opinions of non-users.

Some participants referred to the use of Survey for Evaluating success. Those comments will be reserved for the Evaluation section which follows.

Evaluation

How do you evaluate your success?

With a broad, open-ended question, a diversity of responses were ascertained from the following question:
RG: How do you evaluate your success? How do you know if your successful?

CP1: seriously? the clearest way that we know if we've done really bad work, is that the incumbents don't get re-elected. a lot of times in election years, we are the issue. growth is to fast, too slow, too low, too high, in the wrong place, spent too much on this, spent too little on that, we get on all sides, a lot of the times we are the issue. another measure is the appreciation rate of residential communities. Are we increasing the value of their community as measured by the market place because you can take opinion surveys, you can do everything but the marketplace tells you where places are desirable to live. And if we are maintaining that we're doing well. We also measure on the economic side of how we are doing with job growth. Because we are not the real generator of growth we are the secondary generator of growth, we need to have decent jobs at some reasonable distance. Then we have a perverse measure and that's an inclusionary measure, how much have we provided for people who can't afford to live in the county? Are doing inclusionary we like to hope we're striking [a balance]

RG: How do you evaluate your success?

PP1: different surveys over the years regarding satisfaction level um of the people with their parks and the last time we did the survey which was in 1990 we asked the users of the parks how satisfied they were with the different parks were there additional facilities they needed or if there were problems they thought should be corrected and that kind of thing essentially that's mainly the way we do it, we don't have enough money or enough planning staff to do nearly enough of what we feel should be done that's probably [true] everywhere. So we try to establish priorities and a lot of the discussion is over what should be given priority for both funding and planning.

RG: do you go back and say look at the 88 plan and the objectives you had here and how many of those did you meet or not meet.

PP1: no that's subjective; technically the objectives in that plan although I know objectives should be numerically related, I guess your true objectives should say acquire ten local parks by the year 2000. Our objectives in there are not that specific they are more goal oriented type things.

RG: do you keep statistics on park acreage per capita or 1000 capita?

PP1: we keep um statistics tenants projection and our facility increases, we don't believe that acres per thousand or facilities per thousand is the really the way to go at this point. Our plan right now at this point in time are participation rates geared rather than the other although because of pressure for this kind of information we do have some charts that list this but technically; because our facilities vary so much in quality and type it is very difficult to do things that way
and we feel that national standards are not necessarily relevant to our particular county.

RG: How do you evaluate your success?

PP3: development side meeting schedules getting the development in; the people negotiating proffers basically how much we are able to add either dollar contributions or acreage to the parks; with the long range planning group, that one is real hard, we’ve just really gotten into that. Um and that’s not really something you can real clearly evaluate. Basically I guess it’s what results the policy changes give us so it’s kind of related to all the other things.

Although the park planners discussed “facility gap”, they did not mention this as a tool for measuring success. (see Survey) Facility gap is simply the difference between what is needed and what is being built and planned for construction. This is one technique that they can (and maybe they do use it) use to measure how successful they have been at meeting their objectives. At present, the facility gap is widening due to fiscal constraints. (Park, 1993)

-As stated in the 1990 Park User Survey (1991), current surveys are compared with previous surveys; this can be an effective form of evaluation in my opinion but was not mentioned by the interviewees.

Goals, objectives, and strategies are detailed in both the General Plan and the PROS Plan (see Appendix I). Comparing achievements versus the county’s goals is an additional means for self-evaluation.

Vision

How visionary is today’s planning process?
While Evaluation is a tool to look backward at past performance, it is important to understand how Vision looking forward is incorporated into the PROS plan.

The originators of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission can be described as visionaries. Their relentless pursuit in the acquisition of parkland beyond that which was federally funded has formed the foundation of an extensive parks, recreation, and open space network. The purpose of this category was to see if that same vision for the future is inherent in present day planners.

In the simplest of terms, vision may be better described as forecasting. Fundamentally, vision is the planners perspective of future needs, wants, and opportunities. Here are there comments on the forecasting horizon:

RG: you mentioned the 6 year capital improvements program and then there is "BSY"

PP1: beyond six years. Here's the latest copy.

RG: so, does this bsy cover "what will the county look like in 50 years?"

PP1: um, not really, what it

PP2: no

PP1: does is discuss individual projects beyond 6 yrs.

RG: does it, do you do planning like 10 years out?

PP2: no, that is occurring in the thicker document [the General Plan] you have and also in the implementation plan;

PP1: the pros plan is the long range plan; the implementation study tells you how you are going to implement that plan very specifically site by site
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How visionary is today's planning process?

RG: pros comes first then the plan comes out of that?

PP1: right,

And

RG: how far into the future do you look when you construct the plan?

CP2: we look out 15 - 20 years.

RG: Does it vary if you are out in the rural edges do they have a longer time horizon of the county versus more urbanized area?

CP2: my perception is that the horizon of the plan is met responsive to the circumstances. My understanding is if there are no new issues that need to be addressed in 15 years, we're not going to open up the plan just to open up the plan. If there are issues that come up before that are critical issues that have to be addressed, it is likely the plan will be re-opened.

RG: as far as the planning goes, how far forward do you look as far as time horizon?

CP1: on the longest range forecast we do we are looking about 25 or 30 years. We try to do our master plans so that they have at least a 15 year life if they can where we have active areas of high densities and need for a lot of details they last for about 7 years.

Next, a look at what they are doing versus what their stated objectives are: The Long Range Planning Guide (1995) deals with PROS development "Beyond Six Years" or BSY. As a planning tool, the long range plan acts as a wish list that identifies needed future projects. Land that must be acquired to fulfill long range plans is identified. The Long Range Planning Guide utilizes the long range area master plan created by the planning office and thereby coordinates efforts between the Montgomery County planning department and the parks department.
Regarding their planning philosophies, the following comments were made:

PP1: [the implementation plan] is essentially a listing for people of what is not in our current 6 year capital program so if someone is buying a house in a certain area and want to know what might be there 6 years from now or ten years from now they can also look at that document. In terms of visionary, we attempted to be more, I don’t know how to say this, um practical we’re getting ready to update our plan again we may try to be more visionary but we’ve been pretty down to earth practical in our planning to date, what do you think pp2?

PP2: pretty practical.

RG: does funding dictate the type of planning you do, visionary or practical?

PP1: yeah.

PP2: no not really it’s affected by changing attitudes and ideas, changing population, diversification, diversity, in terms of how do we address the issue of recreational facilities.

PP1: we are getting more into greenway planning but essentially we’ve always had greenways as stream valley parks now their really just calling them greenways um you may be familiar with some of the planners, CP1, have very I guess you would call them forward thinking ideas but some of them may not be practically feasible. One of the latest is buying all the homes on one side of Georgia Avenue to create a green corridor there, a nice idea but I wouldn’t have the nerve to suggest it myself because I don’t know I don’t really think not just from a fiscal standpoint but from a standpoint of forcing people from their homes without a really good reason.

CP1: What we did best in the downtown though was get land in advance of development and real cheap; ah were not doing so well in these fiscally tough times. Our budget ah ; if you take any ten year period in montgomery county you won’t have a decline in real estate value and if you take any 20 year period of time the appreciation of land has probably been higher that cpi [consumer price index]. So as an investment, we need to encourage the county to do a lot more investing in land.

The park planners are more focused on meeting immediate needs versus the community planners who seem to incorporate a longer time horizon into their planning efforts. This observation is probably due to the characteristics and
responsibilities of the varying jobs. Besides, it is the planner’s area master plan that identifies the need for tomorrow’s parks.

**Political**

*What are the political impacts on the planning process?*

As in any public organization, political pressures can usually be found at some level. The interview data suggests that there are underlying political influences in the planning process. When asked about measuring success, CP1 had this interesting comment:

CP1: the clearest way that we know if we’ve done really bad work, is that the incumbents don’t get re-elected. a lot of times in election years, we are the issue. growth is to fast, too slow, too low, too high, in the wrong place, spent too much on this, spent too little on that, we get it on all sides, a lot of the times we are the issue.

Here, CP2 describes the approval process of an area master plan:

RG: you said you take the plan and walk it through the process, what are some of the steps that you will go through?

CP2: well, the first step which we’re bringing to culmination right now is the preparation of the staff draft master plan which is the staff’s recommendation. We work with a group from the community that gives us insight into the community so that is the part we’ve been working on. I’m about to put the staff draft together. Then, I take the staff draft to the planning authority and it changes its name as it goes through the process depending upon who has touched it but basically it goes to the planning board and they hold public hearings and then hold work sessions. I’m responsible for moving the plan through that process and then ; their are a lot of players and then i take the plan to the county council and they go through their own public hearing process then a final plan is put together.

This example shows how an issue can become politicized as it moves through the system.
What are the **political** impacts on the planning process?

RG: Lands that you have are under a land trust. How do you handle the pressures from outside groups for the use of your land. Whether it be a new library, fire station, et cetera

PP2: they are handled interagency wide when somebody thinks about that your talking about an interagency type of committee something to that affect typically looking at different sites.

PP1: park staff tends to be very protective of our land but often times a political decision will

PP1: well, recently we had a proposal to put a cellular one tower on one of our parks. The park staff recommended to the commission not to allow this. The park commission voted to allow it and the people are still screaming and now the park commission is reconsidering it and that situation will probably end up being some kind of political decision;

While procedures (**Regulatory**) are in place to protect parkland, the commission must have been influenced by outsiders to overrule the recommendation of the park staff. Planners seem to take the perspective that they have a job to do and they will do it. If an action or objective is interrupted because of political posturing, it is a reality of public government and can not cause them to lose focus of their responsibilities. It may, however, cause them to change directions and/or energies. Summarizing, sometimes decisions are made beyond (above their heads) the control of the planners.

**Fiscal**

Describe how **fiscal** restraints impact the planning process?

Always an issue, fiscal constraints will effect the planning and implementation of PROS plans. There are a couple of different issues here. They include: money for planning resources such as personnel, money to implement the plan, and money to maintain facilities. The planning department of
Describe how fiscal restraints impact the planning process?

parks has no responsibility for maintenance of facilities except when large scale capital improvements are planned.

Valuable impressions of fiscal status are presented below:

RG: what is the status of budget? In relative terms is it growing, staying the same, or reduced?

PP1: actually, I guess we had our major cut about 4 yrs ago would you say?

PP2: yeah

PP1: so we had a big hit 4 yrs ago and then since then last year for instance we were required to have hardly any new projects this year we've loosened up a little bit; we've a couple more.

RG: so when they reduce that, what suffers?

PP3: we were constrained to $3 mil per year capital improvements program. So it took all of our money and put it in the out years which is after 98, we couldn't get to it. What that did to us was it reduced our ability to construct, acquire, everything. We also lost staffing positions because a great portion of the design and construction staff were bond funded. We didn't have the money to build the projects. We could carry the wpfo (work performed for others) staff.

Discussing the source of funds,

RG: where does the money for acquisition come from; how is it funded?

PP2: three sources: 1 the most minor one is the water conservation fund really just a drop in the bucket to be honest. 2. Real estate transfer tax

PP1: results in approximately $4 million per year,

PP2: 3. Commission bonding

RG: do you get funding now from the government that helps the pros plan?

PP2: yeah through the land water conservation act

RG: that's the drop in the bucket you were talking about

PP2: it's not much, we usually let it build up before we use it
Regarding new techniques for funding PROS, this was the response:

RG: are you investigating new means of funding? I read about considering usage fees; is that still being investigated?

PP1: occasionally look at things like that, we aren’t you know: the most recent thing that was brought up was parking fees at regional parks. But we, I don’t know where we are going to move on that there are problems related to everything; if you charge a fee for parking at the regional park like at Wheaton the neighborhoods are going to be overwhelmed by people parking outside the park so they don’t have to go in and pay; sometimes the cost of solving the problem you created is more than the money you are collecting.

PP1: our county residents pay a very high tax bill right now and the thinking has been they are paying already for these facilities.

An interesting perspective on the purchase of land:

CP1: What we did best in the downtown though was get land in advance of development and real cheap; ah were not doing so well in these fiscally tough times. Our budget ah : if you take any ten year period in montgomery county you won’t have a decline in real estate value and if you take any 20 year period of time the appreciation of land has probably been higher than cpi [consumer price index]. So as an investment, we need to encourage the county to do a lot more investing in land.

Economic

Are there economic benefits of open space?

Related to Fiscal issues, a category on economic benefits was established to express the opinions of the interviewees on the value of open space.

RG: what do you feel are the economic benefits of open space?

CP1: you should look for some economic studies, that in effect determined that the value of the open space is really captured by the private land around the open space. I go out an out an buy an acre in the middle of a subdivision and I spend a million bucks for that, the real question is what have I now; and I take that million bucks and its off the tax record so not only have I lost 1 mil capital; I’ve lost a thousand bucks per year for all time; but now what I got to do if I’m
going to be just, what have I done to the value of the home that immediately surrounds the park and what have I done to the value of homes in a larger area and I think you will find, we've taken a hell of a lot of land of the tax records in Montgomery County but I think we have incorporated that value into the value of our residential houses. So their houses are more valuable because we have parks. Now we haven't done that kind of study but there are studies out there.

RG: I feel it is hard to justify a pros plan based on economic value. Would you agree with that?

CP1: yes, because you have to put a value on what it is you get from a stream valley that somebody uses, and nobody will pay for that but it has a form of psychological value and a quality of life value that you can't measure. There is value in just passing through, people feel better about areas that are heavily treed. But we don't do it on an economic basis you need a culture that values it, and if the culture values it, the people will vote in politicians who think it's a value and if they don't they will vote in people who don't value it.

RG: do you feel there are economic benefits of open space?

PP3: adjacent property values are higher. That's one element and the other thing is destination drives property values. The closer you are to Washington the higher your property value is going to be; for a little piece of nothing you have enormous prices, the further away you go, you've got more space but property values are greater.

RG: what is your opinion on the economic benefits of open space?

CP2: well, it seems to me that open space is highly valued in Montgomery County and the extent that a developer can provide access to it, views of it, improves the value of the property. There is always that conflict between new development sitting on somebody else's open space that they want to be looking at. And I think that is just a consequential issue. I do believe in the capital; free market economy and that would if it truly were an economic generator then you would have it [open space] there and then we wouldn't need to have this discussion. It has to do with perceived benefit and where they show up and they might not show up directly in the pockets of the people who are making the decision. There is another way to keep open space is to just leave it up to the person who bought it. Some people clearly have kept farms; in certain areas farms read as open space. They really are under human cultivation they've been changed they're not in their natural state but you could argue there are people who do farming even though there is a higher economic value changing to something else.

But,

PP1: were trying not to do parks active parks that back directly onto homeowners property; we run into problems with this because developers are
Are there economic benefits of open space?

trying to maximize the use of their property; its a constant battle to keep enough buffer area; we try to put streets in between to separate. Active recreation its just a very large impact on the adjacent residents. That's one thing were trying to do differently.

There can be a conflict between active use parks and adjacent residential uses. This correlates with the studies by Weicker & Zerbst (1973) and Stevens & Allen (1982) which suggested adjacent house values may suffer while one block removed may be unaffected or slightly higher in value. To me, this would suggest Design of facilities could reduce the negative impact resulting in appreciation of adjacent properties.

Environmental

How do environmental issues affect PROS planning?

Environmental initiatives are at the forefront of Montgomery County's PROS plan. On Wedges and Corridors (1964) had a visionary view of the role environmental conservation can have regarding open space preservation. It stated Each new town is to have its own look. One way to achieve that is to use the existing natural drainage ways in lieu of piped storm water drainage. This should prevent towns from appearing to be stamped from the same mold. What an interesting concept! Additionally, "conservation is especially important to the prevention of floods and soil erosion, the safeguarding of public water supplies, the protection of wildlife, and the retention of natural values." (1964)

Many of the environmental issues presented by the interviewees will be discussed in the Planning Strategy section. Other comments and opinions relevant to the environment are presented below:

PP1: when you read the pros plan you see that the great bulk of our land is in conservation related land. The need for that land of course, is based on the
features and the environmental feature you trying to preserve often a stream valley, ... the changing environmental regulations over the last 5 - 10 years and now ADA are going to make a tremendous change in the way we develop our parks.

PP3: we get the EQC which is environmental quality corridor ; any stream valleys, flood plain areas, automatically have to be preserved. Now the developer can dedicate it to the park authority, to a homeowner's association, primarily if there is some connectivity to it we will demand that it comes to us, there are some preservation areas that we won't want because it doesn't connect anywhere, has no real significance, all it will be is a liability to us and we would be hit with maintaining a homeowner's small piece of land.

PP2: stream valley parks, if you look at a map, very obvious also the program it started off if you look at portions of sligo and other branches in downtown areas are very narrow, what we've learned is we need a wider stream valley and buffer, we have always gone after the flood plan per se, um particularly since 1960 we are now getting to own the steep slopes and beyond the steep slopes.

Regulatory

How do state & federal governments impact your open space planning efforts?

New legislation (state & federal) can significantly impact PROS Master Plan. Planning for these changes is nearly impossible. (PROS, 1993) The impacts imposed by state and federal bodies are discussed below.

RG: how does the state impact you?

CP1: they have a significant impact, all of the environmental regulation; we are part of the chesapeake drainage area we are affected by the fact that they have to issue a lot the wetland permits for land development that goes on; they also have a state planning act that we have to comply with. But that really doesn't have; we have more teeth than they do. There is nothing in there that we weren't already doing. We see the state a lot.

RG: how does the federal government impact you?

CP1: the federal government, we are unique in that of course there is a hole in the federal regulations. The core of our employment base is federal on federal areas, so we directly see as employer and on a regulatory basis we see
How do state & federal governments impact your open space planning efforts?

the core of engineers anytime we try call out _ to get a permit, we see federal highway commission

RG: what about legislation from the government: i.e. the ADA?

CP1: a little bit more of a detail for maintenance and construction of facilities, God only knows how many thousand buildings the park agency owns. As a planning matter, it has affected the groundwork, what it has done is make the financial pro formas much tougher for high rises. Since ada, we have not had one high rise.

PP1: I would say, I don’t know how this relates to your question but the changing environmental regulations over the last 5 - 10 years and now ADA are going to make a tremendous change in the way we develop our parks

RG: how does the state impact your operations?

PP3: we have some impact from some mandates, but mostly they help us, I mean there are some state requirements that impact design costs but overall the protection of the environment and some of those things far out weigh any restrictions that we are faced with.

RG: the federal government, same idea, how do they impact you?

PP3: I don’t think they really hurt us, there are ways they could be more helpful to us but overall couldn’t say they hurt us.

PP3: we’ve been involved in monitoring what’s happening in the virginia legislation regarding with regard to impact fees. School systems have a study going on about doing impact fees for schools currently. The only place in VA that you can impose an ordinance that is similar to an impact fee you don’t really call it that is in transportation. Schools have proposed some legislation that would give them that authority and we have been monitoring that and hope to if schools get it in to jump on and just make it schools and parks.

Summarizing, states, through regulatory legislation, provide the impetus for local preservation of lands. This legislation regulates the use of environmentally sensitive lands such as riparian ecosystems, unstable soils, flood plains, and fault lines. It gives the “teeth” to local efforts. While in the past the federal government was an asset to local efforts by means of funding, today it has relatively little impact.
What tools are you using to preserve open space?

For better coherency, the tools section is divided in two parts. The second part is entitled zoning. While zoning is a tool used to preserve open space, a number of tools are zoning related and therefore worthy of a separate category.

On Wedges and Corridors (1964) identified dedication as a means of acquiring land for schools, parks, conservation areas, and public right of way. It further encouraged subdivision controls that contribute to open space through a conservation mentality. For example, the document called for restricting development on steep slopes and natural drainage ways. (On Wedges, 1964) These sentiments are reemphasized in the PROS Plan. (1993)

A discussion with park planners:

RG: can you talk about how you obtain land that you have determined would be desirable for the pros plan?

PP1: when you read the pros plan you see that the great bulk of our land is in conservation related land. The need for that land of course, is based on the features and the environmental feature your trying to preserve often a stream valley, in terms of the local parks which are the small pieces, the pros plan needs that pp2 develops he develops by planning area those small black areas then you can convert the facilities pretty easily to a number of local parks. If you’re going to assume a local park includes certain things, then we have an area master plan process that CP1 told you about those parks are often located with a floating symbol on the area master plan relating to the area they feel residential development is going to concentrate and try and take the whole planning area needs and put a floating symbol where a new local park where their going to put new residential areas; you wouldn’t put it in the middle of an industrial area; you try and figure that out. Then when the subdivision comes in we try and get it through dedication ; we are having problems right now because our current concept of local parks used to be ten acres and now we trying to get fifteen, it isn’t really big enough to provide recreation facilities and enough buffer areas so that the adjacent neighbors are bothered by the park and we will have
What tools are you using to preserve open space?

to either go to bigger parks in which case we might have to spend more money to buy the land or rethink our concept.

RG: Fee simple acquisition was an important tool in establishing your park system in the 20's and 30's, what tool is used most frequently now for obtaining park lands?

PP2: the majority of local parks are obtained through dedication

PP1: and even conservation parks are

PP2: a lot of the stream valley parks there are portions that acquired by dedication too.

PP1: this has a section on future acquisition and talks about percentage

RG: dedication, is it required by developers for approval of development?

PP2: we don't have a mandatory dedication of parkland. What the subdivision allows says is that under certain types of development x amount of percentage of your property has to remain in open space so there are two ways you can do that one way is through your traditional homeowners association or give it to us. In some cases we get a portion of the open space and the home owners will get the remaining portion.

RG: through your master planning are you trying to link spaces of one subdivision together with the next?

PP2: well yeah we already know; we have a map on the wall that says we own this. If we have a subdivision come in ideally we would like to acquire this. We have a subdivision come in triggers the process off where we look at the subdivision to see where it is if it is next to a park obviously we are going to take a close look at it.

RG: ok

PP2: even for areas where we have no acquisition shown we still may go after additional land because it represents an opportunity to get more park land.

A discussion with a community planner:

RG: how are you setting aside open space? What tools are you using?

CP2: well that's a really good question because we are wrestling with that right now. We have an interesting situation where we anticipate having a bigger piece of property set aside for open space than is traditionally achievable under
current rule: cluster zoning and cluster zoning in general so our initial tool we are going to use at the outset is in the design but in terms of actually be zoning will be primary tool; but there is the possibility there will be some acquisition.

RG: could you discuss how you use dedication?

CP2: what happens is the developer comes in and wants to; happens during preliminary planning; review development and if the master plan says that a portion of be used to be parkland we ask for it as a dedication.

RG: has it been challenged in court?

CP2: I'm not that familiar with its history, but you can probably expect that almost anything we do here will be challenged in the courts first off there are cases I would imagine where there is no problem, what is being asked for is a stream buffer to create a continuous linear park and its an area that wouldn't otherwise be used and it goes into park maintenance and homeowners wouldn't be responsible for it; in some situations it is a win/win.

RG: Is it a form of exaction?

CP2: I don't use that term, I not comfortable using that term, I'm not sure of the implications of it. CP1 can clarify that for you. Clearly, there has to be a relationship between what you ask for and what the developer wants to do. And so what I am doing in sandy spring the issue has come up whether or not this hundred plus acres around the sandy spring we want to keep open is going to stay open as a result of a dedication or as a result of simply going in the hands of homeowners association or acquisition. We generally understand under very low yield scenarios, it is probably unrealistic to accept it as a dedication. There is always the case of the developer thinking/feeling for what ever reason he wants to see that in parkland he is not going to be building on it anyway but it is a little hard to explain what your basis is for asking for it when there are 50 houses being built and your asking for 100 acres of open space, there has to be a proportional relationship there.

CP2: one of the other strategies we have site specific guidelines built into the master plan. The re2 with overlay zone would have to be created. There has been a lot of concern in the community about whether or not future development can use open space; like we need to expand our day care facility can we use your nice open space

School facilities are used to help meet that demand for recreational space. The concept was initiated in On Wedges and Corridors (1964) which stated land is “added to school sites to provide large play fields.” The 1993
Pros plan says that schools do play a significant role in meeting park objectives and calls for assistance from other public agencies, with schools in particular, to provide "compatible open spaces, natural areas, and recreation facilities and opportunities in the region." (Park, 1993) The planners are saying the same thing.

RG: What role do schools play in helping to meet objectives of pros?

PP2: It has been increasing. Over the years we have and others have been pressuring schools to provide better recreational facilities in the outdoors constructed to meet the needs of a variety of age groups, particularly ones separated from parks because of that reason.

RG: They are going to have a playground so why don't they have them for both groups [young and old]

PP2: Right have them satisfy and a have a playground that's comparable to a local park and their doing that sink in the extra 50 to 60 thousand and build a regulation size ball field which they have to do anyway for high school.

RG: Schools are playing a significant role in open space.

CP1: At the cost of government, um we deal with the school board while we are doing the master plan, they let us know of areas they think they will need schools in the future when we have large development, we make dedication a requirement for schools. But a lot of times we will give the landowner the benefit of that density back on his site so we get the school site for nothing and he doesn't feel like he lost anything. The units get closer together which has some benefits actually. We will identify potential areas that we need to look for schools.

RG: Do you use schools as part of developing your parks?

PP3: We tie in some community/school parks, we have a couple of developments that are going to utilize that concept in the future yes.

As previously mentioned, Montgomery County utilizes a land trust for preservation of park, recreation, and open space land.
As presented in the literature review section, there is a long list of tools at the disposal of planners for the preservation of PROS. Some are regulatory such as subdivision requirements while others are non-regulatory such as the use of schools for coordinated open space. A discussion of findings will be presented in the conclusion section.

Zoning

How do you use zoning to influence PROS planning?

The drafters of On Wedges and Corridors (1964) called for cluster living in the 1962 plan: “perhaps townhouses, garden apts., high rise and single family around work centers and commercial areas.” The aesthetic benefits of cluster design over rows was mentioned; what a radical idea. Even the issue of who is responsible for maintenance in a cluster was addressed with two solutions offered: “1. Homeowners association 2. Public=> if public, On Wedges and Corridors suggests cost to be defrayed by a tax resembling front foot benefit charges or by putting cluster developments into special tax districts for maintenance charges.” (1964)

As previously mentioned, zoning is a tool used to control land use and associated amenities. The following passage with a community planner reveals some of the thought process involved in developing a zoning strategy and the issues that must be addressed:

RG: how are you setting aside open space? What tools are you using?

CP2: well that's a really good question because we are wrestling with that right now. We have an interesting situation where we anticipate having a bigger piece of property set aside for open space than is traditionally achievable under current rule: cluster zoning and cluster zoning in general so our initial tool we are
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going to use at the outset is in the design but in terms of actually be zoning will be primary tool; but there is the possibility there will be some acquisition.

RG: what do you mean by zoning will be the primary tool?

CP2: ok, zoning; our zoning strategies gel as we go through the master plan process because they; we first focus our attention on resolving the issues that need to be resolved during the process; we have to deal with what the end product is meant to be and then we look at tools. We've laid out a few tools already that we've identified as potential zoning strategies; we've done a broad brush first look at that seeing if we have tools already that we want to use so we have some indication of where we are headed. Those will gel because of the process as we clarify and refine where we are headed. We're looking at several possibilities right now. We're looking at the use of an re2/tdr zone which is essentially a tdr receiving area, to achieve what we want to achieve. We are looking at the use of what we call floating zone currently in the pd zone [planned development] and we are also looking at the possibility of an overlay zone.

CP2: one of the other strategies we have site specific guidelines built into the master plan. The re2 with overlay zone would have to be created. There has been a lot of concern in the community about whether or not future development can use open space; like we need to expand our day care facility we can use your nice open space

RG: the issue of creating open space through clustering then allowing future development on open space?

CP2: yes,

RG: are there things in place to resist building on open lands?

CP2: yes, tom kennedy of our legal staff drafted “the last word” on that aspect of protecting open space. You will notice that of the methods we are looking at not one of them is what we refer to as um one of our cluster zones, which I think is very interesting because what that says is we don’t have a cluster zone right now that will allow us achieve what we want to in this particular setting. What cluster zone does is basically result in homogeneous lot sizes. . . Do you want me to give you a brief description of our zoning?

RG: sure

CP2: cluster zone says if you have traditional zoning and 50 acres, you can develop it at 1 unit per acre; cluster says you can get 50 units can concentrate to one part of lot. And under our current cluster zoning, there is a minimum lot size and goes through site plan review. The benefit of doing this is you may not be able to get 50 units on the fifty acres because of undevelopable land, so there is an incentive to cluster. The overlay takes the base zone again 50 units, this zone
doesn’t exist, the mechanism does and overlay is a mechanism but the zone for
the application doesn’t exist right now; and traditionally an overlay zone is more
restrictive then the zone underneath but we looking right now to find out if we
can create an overlay zone that has more flexibility in certain areas. The overlay
zone sits on top of the underlying zone and the what we are trying to create is an
overlay zone that is framed to pick up guidelines that appear in a master plan
and plug them into the right slot in the zone in the way the zone is written. So,
you could take your framework in the zone and it refers back to the master plan
in particular areas and you will do what the master plan says in terms of
percentage of open space, lot sizes, student housing, so its a unique tool. One of
the advantages of the overlay zone is it is automatically affected in other words
as soon as the master plan is completed if you have the zone crafted, it goes
into effect like that [right away]. Timing can be very important.

RG: has clustering been successful; have developers been using it.

CP2: well that’s a good question, we have been asking ourselves that actually. I
can’t answer that, when I started on this plan though we took a look at the logan
cluster option to see if that was being used, we have cluster options in a lot of
places, a lot of medium density residential zones. I was only looking in logan, we
actually convened a group of developers and asked them that question because
we wanted to understand if they would use it. What I heard from the group,
which came from the suburban maryland [builder’s] association, was that yeah
they like the cluster and that they felt the market in mont co is so strong for
housing it was hardly an issue of whether or not they could market their homes
in the low density cluster option. The way those zones are set up, the smallest lot
size is still of a size that made the house very marketable. Now I went out to try
to find developments that were developed using the cluster option and that was
a little harder under the low density cluster option which is under one for one or
one for two acres.

Private

What role do private initiatives play in the development of the PROS
plan?

On Wedges and Corridors (1964) spoke of the need to coordinate public
and private initiatives to satisfy the diversity of activities common to the
populous. Private areas in rural reaches have “elbow room” that can provide for
activities such as hunting, camping, fishing, horseback riding, and water skiing.
Operation of for profit private centers should be encouraged by government
What role do private initiatives play in the development of the PROS plan? policy. Additionally, *On Wedges and Corridors* (1964) suggests acquiring public right to large private lands for activities such as hunting and hiking, fishing and horseting. These thoughts are echoed in the PROS Plan which calls for the private sector to provide “compatible open spaces, natural areas, and recreation facilities” opportunities in the region.” (Park, 1993)

One of the strategies of the Parks Department is “to encourage private dedication of land as a means of parkland acquisition.” (Park, 1993) From the discussion, it does not appear as if this strategy is being actively pursued.

RG: what role do private initiatives play in pros plan?  
PP2: not a big role, it hasn’t  
PP1: we’ve got one big park, over at ; we’ve gotten several large parks  
PP2: yeah  
PP1: greenfarm, recently had a donation of over $1 mil for facilities brookside gardens; the education center was donated. I guess is we get some but not a lot  
PP2: we don’t go after it.  
PP1: that’s for sure  
RG: I take it then that it is not something you can rely on or plan for.?  
PP1: right.

*On Wedges and Corridors* (1964) suggested the use of scenic easements to preserve nice views and maintain land under private ownership. This is happening:

RG: you talked about the federal government owning a lot of land here, what role do private commercial landowners play in helping to meet open space objectives.
Activity Design People Survey Evaluation Vision Political Fiscal
Economic Environmental Regulatory Tools Zoning Private Strategy

What role do private initiatives play in the development of the PROS plan?

CP1: sure, we do a lot of conservation easements, we do lots of homeowner association maintained areas. We do lots of ways where we end up not taking the land as a public use but making keep the area green.

RG: how do you accomplish this from a planning standpoint?

CP1: it's really done on a regulatory basis although there are some areas where in the plan we say special regulations should be developed xyz; or the buffer in this area should be 150 feet because of xyz. Aside from that, in the regulations we will make them buildable lots or out lots, its the nature of the game.

In addition to the people safeguarding their interests, there are watchdog groups that are active in the county.

RG: are there watchdog groups that [keep an eye on public activities]

PP2: yeah there are a couple of watchdog groups, environmental organizations that are very interested in what we do

RG: what groups would they be?

RD and PP1: audubon society is the biggest one, sierra club

RG: so their national groups that have local chapters?

PP1: yeah right

PP2: we have a lot of national groups based here adjacent to one of our parks

Planning Strategy

What would your strategy be for developing an open space preservation program?

While many of the categories deal with planning initiatives in one way or another, the purpose of this category is to reveal the opinions of the experts in terms of strategic planning.

On Wedges and Corridors (1964) presented strategic ideas regarding PROS planning. Specific points of interest here “well designed residential
communities... with adequate local parks and playgrounds” and “a logical
distribution of school and park facilities, with sites secured well ahead of rising
land costs.” Additionally, “coordinate the park acquisition program with the
corridor - wedge form of development, seek additional state and federal
matching funds for park acquisition, use subdivision powers to better advantage
for reserving and acquiring park land, keep park development in step with
growing population.”

Current county documentation suggests that strategic planning is
important for maintaining a coordinated focus. The General Plan (1993) lists
seven goals affecting Land Use, Housing, Economic Activity, Transportation,
Environment, Community Identification and Design, and Regionalism. Objectives
are drafted for each of the goals with strategies identified on how to satisfy
objectives.

Separately, a mission statement for the department of parks forms the
foundation for park planning:

The mission of the Montgomery County Department of Parks is to provide a park
system which, in harmony with our natural resources, conserves and enhances
the environment, offers a variety of leisure opportunities, and is accessible, safe
and enjoyable for all.

Goals and objectives are written to be “utilized in the planning for Montgomery
County parks.” (Park, 1993) It seems that although the park master plans and
the area master plans are “compatible”, they march along independently. A
listing of the goals and objectives for both the PROS Plan and the General Plan
(as related to this document) are listed in Appendix I
The thoughts of the planners regarding the initiation of an open space preservation plan:

RG: if you were to take a new position with a county that is on the suburban fringe and has not been involved with pros planning but is seeing the need, how would you go about setting up a new pros. what support would you like to see?

CP2: the first thing I would do is go out into the community and find out what their issues were. What do you, why are you, when are you looking for; then I would want to find out the flood areas, get an idea of where the priorities are, and if it turns out that there areas should be preserved and recreational facilities. First you have to understand the land and the environment, and probably also the region because it may be that; in the region and what the development pressures are going to be. In terms of tools, I think it is very important to use tools that exist; that are appropriate too, we have very many tools in mont co that are appropriate to mont co and it would be wonderful just start a list of tools but it is very important I think in an area to get a sense of what level of complexity can be tolerated because we have a very strong government, and in other areas some of the tools would not be tolerated. I think I would also look at mechanisms that are not government generated. I think there should be a community driven effort to protect open space and the tools where people pool their resources; there are towns in new england where the residents decide they want to buy it and preserve it. I think the idea of doing a master plan designating certain areas to remain open is really important land use; and I would certainly look at cluster if there is already development potential. One thing I think is really important is good coordination between county and towns or lower jurisdictions. Because you can end up with a town annexing; that happens a lot in our county. Because the developer was unable to get what he wanted from the county.

RG: if you were to take a new position with a county that was not involved with pros planning, how would you go about setting up a new pros. what support would you like to see?

PP3: well I would start with a survey and evaluation of where they are today. Get a snapshot of where they are today. Look at what the projections are for growth within the jurisdiction, look at what other places are doing. Look at where they are going and see how that's going to affect the quality of life that has been established in the community and how much change people can handle. Growth potential, if they have good planning documents, they know how much population they are going to try to grow to, look at what your recreational demand is now and multiply that over population expansion and make sure you have the ability to provide at least the same level of service.
RG: if you were to take a new position with a county, how would you go about setting up a new pros plan?

CP1: what you need to do is number one a willingness on the public’s part to buy land because that’s the easiest and most direct way to control growth geographically, next you need to set up a rational defensible environmental regulations to help with for example water quality on a regional basis like the chesapeake bay so that you can get some teeth and you can say yes you can develop but you have to set aside this land. Do what you can on the regulatory side. The hard part is getting somebody to say I know we don’t need that land now; I know there’s nobody out there but we should buy the land.

RG: and determining which land to buy,

CP1: you know what sensitive areas are, so you know environmentally what you need to protect and from there it’s just a matter of what else is nice to make a it usable beyond place and environment. I think these days in parkland you always have the two issues if you going to have a really [good] park system. You will never survive if all of your parks are just ball fields; because there isn’t that sufficient demand that is going pay [?] but if you say not only do we get the ball field but your house never gets flooded again because we saved the flood plain; then, we have two reasons.

The 1988 PROS plan addressed the importance of understanding the macro issues such as population, jobs, and new development. (Park, 1988). The planners concur stating:

CP1: we have the highest percentage of non us born immigrants that are first generation in the state of MD, and nationally we are pretty high. . . it is something you plan for.

CP1: Are we increasing the value of their community as measured by the market place because you can take opinion surveys, you can do everything but the marketplace tells you where places are desirable to live. And if we are maintaining that we’re doing well. We also measure on the economic side of how we are doing with job growth. Because we are not the real generator of growth we are the secondary generator of growth, we need to have decent jobs at some reasonable distance.

Rd [Park planning] is affected by changing attitudes and ideas, changing population, diversification, diversity, in terms of how do we address the issue of recreational facilities.

PP1: I feel that planning parks is a very inexact science. A lot of it is gained through continuing knowledge of your county and the people and your park
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What would your strategy be for developing an open space preservation program?

system and what you've come to learn does well that is successful and what isn't.

SUMMARY

The 1993 PROS plan devotes a section to "major changes since the 1988 PROS plan." I have created a table below that classifies the impacts into the my categories. The point of this exercise is to show the diversity of issues that do impact the PROS planning process. While the names of the categories and boundary lines between categories can be argued, the diversity of issues cannot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Fiscal</td>
<td>Increased Parkland usage combined with decreased maintenance budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/Environmental</td>
<td>New legislation: environmental regulations will help preserve natural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/Tool/Design</td>
<td>Greenways: since this initiative is being touted by the state, classified as regulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal</td>
<td>Decreasing Capital Improvements Expenditures has resulted from fiscal constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People/Strategic</td>
<td>Population growth that significantly exceeded planned projections; and increase in minority populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Tool</td>
<td>Increased focus of requiring new developments to provide recreation facilities affords the opportunity to focus on other needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Construction of new school facilities with associated playing fields has decreased the need for park facilities in some areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/Design</td>
<td>Adoption of the Americans with Disabilities Act poses the challenge of creating facilities that are accessible to all people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5**

*(Park, 1993)*
ANALYSIS

This chapter contains three sections: 1. a codifying of the interview data, 2. an analysis of the operational relationship between park planning and community planning departments, and 3. a synopsis of what was learned from Montgomery County.

CODIFYING INTERVIEW DATA

The purpose of this section is to arrange the responses presented in the results chapter by category and planner. While the context of what was said is of primary importance, categorizing responses may reveal additional insight into the process of PROS planning. The table below represents that the park planner (PP) or community planner's (CP) comments were selected to represent the categories of the previous chapter.
## Figure 6

Observations from the above table include:

- Three categories had responses from park planners only: Activity, Survey, and Environment,
- One category had responses from only one person: Zoning by CP2,
- When CP1 was not included, CP2 was not included (except on one occasion),
- When PP1 was not included, PP2 was not included,
- There were an odd number of responses only four times,
- When one from each group responded, it was the same two people: Evaluate and Regulatory.
What is the significance of the above observations? The patterns suggest that there may be a difference concerning open space planning and preservation between park planning and community planning. Therefore, further investigation is warranted.

**ANALYSIS OF PARK AND COMMUNITY PLANNING**

Recalling the question of this work: *within the context of a growth management planning philosophy, how is the preservation of land for parks, recreation, and open space being accomplished?*, we see in Montgomery County that there are two departments (planning and parks) with significant impact on the preservation of open space within the government framework. This section explores the relationship between the two groups in an attempt to understand how they have been successful in developing a system of parks, recreation, and open space. The initial responses given by the community planners and park planners and the matrix shown in the previous section suggest that incompatibilities exist between their operations leading me to believe that they function, for the most part, independently. Specifically, this section will define the operational relationship between the community planners and park planners in order to answer the following questions: do the perceived differences exist, is it (or is it not) healthy to have these perceived differences, and/or are the differences explainable by the varying responsibilities of the two departments. The source for analysis comes from the initial interviews and follow-up interviews. Literature and county documents help support my findings.
First, an understanding of the organizational chart will put this analysis in perspective. The two departments are hierarchically equal within the county government structure. Both departments report to the Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commision. This analysis will answer to what extent the horizontal connector line exists if at all suggesting interaction between departments.

Figure 7

An understanding of their perspectives' on open space needs clarifying. Theoretically, both departments view open space in the same vein: as "raw, undeveloped land." From a practical matter though, the two groups must assume independent definitions regarding open space. Park planning's mission is to focus on publicly owned land: land that becomes part of the parks, recreation, and open space system. An exception is the park planners role in dedication of open land to homeowners associations (HOA's) during the subdivision process. Community planners, on the other hand, involve themselves in a diversity of land-use and design issues that pertain to the preservation of open space. While some issues deal with the designation of land for public use such as identifying potential areas for future regional parks, other issues deal with the use of privately held land such as establishing setbacks.
requiring buffers along roadways, maintaining natural vegetation along privately held stream banks, and creating agricultural zoning areas. These initiatives can be described as character defining efforts. That is not to say the park planners are not concerned with character defining initiatives because their efforts do define the character of the local community and in particular properties adjacent to parkland. The community planners, however, can conserve a rural setting through their efforts that would be difficult to achieve through publicly controlled land.

**Growth Management and Open Space Planning**

The perspectives of the two departments on the process of PROS planning regarding growth management are discussed below. Initially, comments from the planning department were definitive in support of growth management:

- **RG:** Do you see park planning as part of your growth management scenario.
- **CP1:** absolutely

while park planners stated that their efforts did not “direct growth”:

- **RD:** we don’t see it as directing growth; we try to respond to areas that are going through growth.

This led me to conclude that park planning was operating in a reactive mode versus a proactive mode while community planning efforts were, as expected proactive. When questioned on these issues in a follow-up interview, **PP2** responded as follows:

- **RG:** one of the things in the general plan states that their planning efforts are described as a growth management strategy, do you see what you are doing in pros planning as contributing to that idea of growth management?
- **PP2:** [hesitation] uh, yeah in some degree yes; it’s part of the entire process but the biggest impact is through the zoning and land-use pattern.
- **RG:** let me try to pinpoint this a little more, do you think what you do is more proactive or reactive in your job.
PP2: oh it is more proactive. We have crisis but most of my, I work on other things besides long range planning issues I work short term issues. They are the ones that

RG: can become a little more reactive?

PP2: right.

RG: and that is the list you have in front of you for things to do.

PP2: that’s right

and a follow-up interview with CP2, a community planner;

RG: a lot of the literature suggests that Montgomery County’s planning efforts uses a growth management strategy, would you say that your efforts in open space planning contribute to this philosophy of growth management?

CP2: their consistent with it but they are, that was not why we developed in this plan. The purpose was to preserve rural character. The actual yield, dwelling units, is not necessarily going to be any different. It might even be a little higher, so the way we are looking at it is not being used for growth management in the sense of the amount of growth, it definitely is managing where it goes.

To get a better handle on this topic, I returned to the county documentation. In particular, the Long Range Planning Guide for Parkland Acquisition and Development in Montgomery County Parks (1995) identifies lands to be acquired for future inclusion in the park inventory. The purpose of the plan confirms that the efforts of the planning and parks departments are proactive. I feel this document clearly impacts the location of development. Quoting the document, “the purpose of this document is to provide information on long range planning proposals for parkland acquisition and development. . . . This Planning Guide provides area residents with information regarding parks planned for their neighborhoods and will serve as a companion document to the Capital Improvements Program.” (Long, 1995)

To more specifically address the relationship of PROS planning and growth management, I return to Brower and Godschalk’s (1989) definition which defines growth management as “a conscious government program to influence
the rate, amount, type, location, and/or cost of development." The responses
given by the planners led to the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* because of surrounding land prices.

Figure 8

In trying to clarify how open space preservation impacts growth, only
location was an immediate response from the planners. The cost of development
was mentioned as property values are impacted by surrounding open space. It
was acknowledged that this has not been proven by the county but is a
"philosophical belief." The addition of a new park will not effect the rate of
growth in the opinion of CP1. Likewise, the amount of growth is not impacted by
the addition of a new park, but it will limit the amount of land available for growth.
PROS planning and development does not impact the type of development that
occurs.

Since community planners must consider all of the factors that impact
growth, it makes sense that they conceive of PROS planning as an influence on
growth and development. They seem to have a more developed perspective of
the relationship of open space planning and growth versus park planners. But,
by action, I feel the park planners are involving themselves in growth
management through the process of determining future PROS locations and the
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timing of park development. The implications of growth and open space will be discussed in the concluding chapter.

**Tools**

After an initial look at the tools used to preserve land, I concluded that there is little synergy between community planning and park planning. Park planners rely mostly on dedication, some acquisition, and a little donation to obtain land. Area planners are involved with density, land-use, and a myriad of zoning options. However on further inspection, the land zoned by the area planners today becomes the land dedicated to the park planners tomorrow. Master plans and subdivision requirements call out a minimum amount of land (typically a percentage) that must be preserved as open space. The developer has the choice of donating it to a homeowner's association or to the parks department. If the land is adjacent to other parkland or has been identified as a desirable component of future PROS land, the parks department will actively pursue dedication to the county.

As discussed previously in this chapter, the two groups have varying perspectives of open space due to the requirements of their jobs. Because of this, community planners find themselves using tools to preserve open space that the park planners do not involve themselves with. For example, to maintain the character of a rural, scenic drive, the planners may write a subdivision code requiring that any new development maintain a naturally vegetated buffer along roads bordering the development. Thus, the perceived differences between the community planners and the park planners are explainable due to the differing responsibilities of the departments.

**Goals & Objectives**

How is it that Montgomery County is able to implement a successful open space preservation program when there appears to be no cohesion in their
individually stated goals and objectives and they apparently function with two different planning horizons? The answer is simple: through teamwork. Park planners are integral members of the area master plan teams. Porterfield (1995) expresses the importance of teamwork: “good community planning can be accomplished only through teamwork; and teamwork can be achieved only through an understanding of the importance of the role of each member and a common respect for the part that each can play in the process.” Further, The Practice of Local Government Planning states that “communication between a planning agency and other governmental units contributes to the agency’s effectiveness. The day-to-day contact between a planning agency and other units is an important source of information for plan formulation and is also a means of gauging response to various plan proposals.” (So, 1988) This theory is reemphasized by Gold (1980) who states, “the preparation of the park, recreation, and open space element of a comprehensive plan is the joint responsibility of most local planning and recreation agencies.” The relationship between the two agencies is discussed below:

RG: that was my next question is how do you, what is your relationship with [park planning] throughout your [area master plan] process.

CP2: they have been involved throughout the process, since the very beginning. Especially since there is such a significant open space issue. Yeah definitely.

RG: can you explain your relationship with the community planners, how do you interact, interface with them.

PP2: sure, the obvious one is they are a different department, same agency different department. Particularly for area master plans that deals with a certain area of the county, I am working on some more right now. Our relationship is we are a part of the team effort that goes into making these documents, with the responsibility for the park and recreation section given to us and to me for the areas that I work on. They will often ask certain questions which I need to respond to; if they come up with their own ideas they’ll ask “how do you like this” and I’ll respond to that. It’s a good working relationship generally. There have been problems in the past but that is because of differences of opinion but we do interact a lot with them in the area master plans, we interact with them in terms of the subdivision process and I’m trying to think what else.
Current county documentation suggests that strategic planning is important for maintaining a coordinated focus. Porterfield (1995) asserts the “need to establish goals that guide our planning efforts.” However, the stated goals and objectives of the two departments have little synergy. To overcome this, park planners represent the issues relative to park planning on the area master plan teams and through this convey the goals and objectives of the PROS Plan. Gold discusses the desired relationship between the general (comprehensive) plan and the PROS plan: “the comprehensive plan provides the basis for a community’s recreation plan and should be completed first. It provides general concepts and goals for the social and physical development. The [PROS] plan details a community’s recreation needs with specific recommendations for land acquisition, facility development, operations, maintenance, and financing that are not normally part of the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan and the recreation plan complement each other.” (Gold, 1980)

When questioned to what extent are the planners influenced by the stated goals and objectives, the following responses were given:

Park planner:

RG: in the pros plan it lists some objectives; um it lists objectives, how influential are they in helping you do your daily job.

PP2: I have to look at them I can’t remember everything.

RG: I think there on pg. 11.

PP2: goals and objectives; I would say we don’t look at them everyday, I know what they are, a lot of it is what we do automatically. So yes they are important.

---

RG: and then right behind those are the goals and objectives of the general plan, do they influence what you do?

PP2: [looks at goals and objectives] well, it sort of reiterates what we have been doing and puts it in a written statement, we have been doing this all along. And, there is nothing new in there that is not something that we haven’t been doing.

Community planners:

RG: in the general plan there are several goals, objectives and strategies listed, how influential are they in your process of developing a master plan.

CP2: well, we address all those goals and objectives

RG: individually?

CP2: well, not all of them but we address how we comply with the general plan. I should say this: the value and the culture of the planners here is such that they are very well represented in the general plan which we certainly had a part in developing, so I almost feel that the general plan refinement codified and validated things we were already trying to accomplish. So it is not like going to another document and say how are we going to accomplish it; it is so much a part of the value and culture here.

RG: if I understand what I read in the gp right, it is a document that sets a framework for you to develop your master plan but your master plan then in effect evolves the general plan.

CP2: yes, exactly, exactly. We can work on the whole master plan and then go back at the end of the process and say how have we done with the gp and it fits so incredibly well. There is a lot of cohesion. How you interpret it, how you resolve unique tradeoffs is the master plan issue; you can’t do everything you’re going to have to make hard choices.

RG: priorities et ceteras

CP2: exactly

RG: do you consider the pros plan objectives when you develop your master plan?

CP2: we have parks department staff on our team.

RG: oh you do.

CP2: we rely on them very heavily to provide us with that sort of guidance, they open up the pros plan, that is there, they’re our link to the pros plan.

And,
RG: the objectives and goals that are stated in the general plan, how closely are they followed in the day to day work your area planners are doing?

CP1: well pretty much I mean everybody has to at first at least reflect on the issues, am I violating the general plan by doing this? But sometimes it's a quick no sometimes its a more thoughtful no. It depends upon the scope of the project and the scale of what you are analyzing. It's hard to say that an individual special exception for a doctor's office would violate the general plan unless you had 20 of them in one area. It's generally a quick no, but certainly when we get the request to put in a huge school complex in the agricultural wedge we go through that in spades to see how bad it will be, what it will really mean, is it a terrible thing. We do violate more, if you will, for public purposes, but that is one of those outs in the general plan. That is within our agricultural wedge we have a resource recovery area if you read that as solid waste, trash, composting, incineration, you know a lot of those things if they were private would be considered industrial. It is one of those necessities of life.

It is apparent that the goals and objectives written in the general plan form the foundation for planning area master planning activities. The correlation is not as readily apparent concerning park planning goals and objectives.

Separately, the planning horizon of the two groups seemed to be significantly different. During initial interviews, the community planners indicated that they look into the future 15-20 years while park planners stated their horizon is as short as 6 months to 6 years. Upon further review, I feel the time horizon of the park planners is on par to that of the community planners. Their contribution to the master plan process and the subsequent identification of land and projects that make up the Long Range Plan (1995) extends well beyond six years. Gold (1980) states that “the time horizon for the park and recreation plan should parallel the comprehensive plan.” To stay current with trends, the economy, technology, and resources, the plan should undergo periodic revisions (every five years for example). In the reality of day-to-day operations, the park planners as a result of the nature of their job are more focused on meeting immediate needs.
Summary

For the most part, the inconsistencies that seemed apparent after initial review can be explained by the job requirements or they did not exist as the initial interviews led me to believe. I can say with confidence that a horizontal connector line should be drawn on the planning board organizational chart showing the interaction between Park and Planning. This connection is important for a coordinated, cohesive open space planning program.

![Diagram of Planning Board and its departments]

Figure 9

SYNOPSIS OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY

This section will highlight some of the insights gained from studying how Montgomery County has been successful in the preservation of land for parks, recreation, and open space. The basis of which comes from the results chapter. Based on the above analysis, the success is attributable to the combined efforts of park and planning.

Preservation based on environmental issues has formed the foundation of the PROS system. We see this in particular with the preservation of stream valley corridors and in the greenbelts that surround the urban centers.

Extraordinary vision: with the organization of the Maryland-National Park and Planning Commission in 1927, the impetus for preservation of land was in place. I personally feel that since it is the Park and Planning Commission that the Parks Department has benefitted from a level of awareness, both within the county.
government and the public, which has attributed to it's success. I did not try to prove this and am not sure how one would prove this hypothesis.

Help from the federal government and the state: both organizations are responsible for the formulation of the M-NP&PC. The federal government made significant financial contributions allowing for significant acquisition.

Financial commitment: the county continued funding for acquisition and development of PROS land after the federal government ceased providing matching funds. They could have said "we have accumulated a significant and sufficient amount of land"; instead they said "we have only begun to acquire what we will eventually need."

As a result, they were able to acquire land "early and aggressively" and ahead of development.

Planning: they have planned for PROS. It sounds simplistic, but one reason they have been successful is because they planned. As a body, they were and are willing to develop and try a variety of techniques for the preservation of open space.

The efforts over the years have resulted in a PROS system that has become part of the culture and values of the people of Montgomery County. These people now demand and expect continued attention dedicated to the PROS system.
CONCLUSIONS

What have we learned from Montgomery County and the literature on the preservation of land for parks, recreation, and open space? This section elaborates on the significant findings and implications of the results and analysis sections with interjections from the literature review section as appropriate. Areas worthy of further investigation and a summary conclude this section.

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES

The consensus from the case study and literature is, as one might expect, that environmental initiatives form the foundation for open space planning. Identifying land that is unsuitable for development from an environmental perspective (perhaps using McHargian techniques) will result in a network of open land throughout the jurisdiction. Linear corridors appear that can connect spaces and offer accessibility (or the opportunity to participate) to a significant proportion of the population. Montgomery County uses the natural drainage channels to create these fingers of open space throughout the county. Applying regulatory controls, the land will not have to be purchased to ensure that it remains in a natural state. This forms the basis from which a comprehensive PROS plan can be developed.

Beyond all of the benefits identified in the literature review section, the existing natural systems are the most cost effective way of dealing with societies wastes such as contaminated stormwater from hard surfaces. (Common, 1993)

EARLY AND AGGRESSIVELY

I feel PROS land should be identified and secured “early and aggressively” in advance of development pressures. The identification of PROS land is based on environmental analysis or other need based factors such as population centers. The land can be secured by fee simple acquisition or any of
the other techniques discussed in the Literature Review chapter. The objective is to identify and secure land before it appreciates in value or becomes unavailable as a result of development pressure. If the jurisdiction does not have the resources to acquire the land in advance of development, the desirable components of the open space system are identified and can be secured as the land is developed by means of dedication. 19

DECISIONS WITH VISION

I can conclude from studying Montgomery County that a vision for the future is critical to the success of the open space system. Vision was needed to commit resources in 1927 to establish the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Vision was needed to preserve all of the stream valley corridors in the lower county in advance of development. There are two scales to this notion of vision as I see it: the macro planning objectives and the micro objectives. The macro objectives involve the larger picture of open space planning such as “what do we want this county to look like in 20 years, 50 years, or 100 years?” The micro issues suggest that at the project scale, decisions should be based on projected future needs and not from a perspective of today’s needs. For example, in a developing area, the 100 year floodplain will constantly grow larger requiring more and more land; plan for the future 100 year floodplain. It was Matthew Arnold who said in 1875 “the free thinking of one age is the common sense of the next.” Decisions made 5 to 10 years ago are generally not thought of as visionary but more like 50 plus years ago. Perhaps a good rule of thumb should be that we look forward as far as we look back. The

19 Montgomery County uses an Advanced Land Acquisition program to purchase land identified in the master plan as a desirable component of their open space system when it is threatened by development or made available for sale. This program is used when the money has not been allocated in the current CIP but is part of the county’s long range plan. The fund is revolving so that when the money would have been allocated in the CIP, it is transferred to the Advanced Land Acquisition fund. The use of this program is not limited to PROS land but can be used to satisfy any county need for land such as highways or fire stations.
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open space components need to be flexible to adjust to meet changing needs, activities, and user groups.

**TEAMWORK**

I found that part of Montgomery County’s success in park planning can be attributed to the teamwork that occurs between the community planning department and the park planning department. Working together, both the macro and micro issues that face both departments regarding open space planning can be incorporated into the master plan. It was stated in the Analysis chapter that park planners bring the ideas and objectives of the PROS master plan to the community master plan table. This process helps to ensure that the objectives of the PROS master plan are met through the adoption of the area master plans. Success comes from planning for success.

**GROWTH AND OPEN SPACE PLANNING**

To summarize, open space planning is one facet of a growth management strategy that does little to control growth on the individual project level but when considering the larger picture can have a significant impact on the character of the jurisdiction. This character then helps to define an area and give it identity and may then influence some of the variables associated with growth management. For example, if a place is desirable to live due in part to its parks system (which we found to be true in Montgomery County) then I can extract from those comments and imply that the rate of settlement will be impacted by parks. In conjunction with the rate of growth, the amount of growth will equally be effected. PROS will also have a small effect on the amount of land available for development as stated by CP1 of Montgomery County, MD. We already saw that open space preservation impacts location and the cost of development relative to market value of the land. Additionally however, relating to the cost of development, there are several examples in the literature that confirm that open

CONCLUSIONS  111
space preservation can reduce the cost of infrastructure improvements, such as when used to mitigate stormwater runoff. This is philosophically different from the planners' affirmative response regarding how open space impacts growth from a cost perspective. There were many ancillary benefits given as well (see Literature Review, Chapter 2). The timing of development, which is not specifically addressed in the Brower and Godschalk definition, is also impacted by park acquisition and development. The only factor not impacted by open space planning is the type of development that results. Summarizing, to influence development, either positively or negatively, methods such as land-use planning and infrastructure improvements are more effective than PROS planning. The control afforded by use of these methods exceeds the ancillary benefits of open space planning. So, do open space planning for the supplementary benefits; not to control growth. Use it as a component of a larger mission. The chart presented in the analysis section can thus be amended as appears below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Impact*</th>
<th>Grand Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Planner perspectives

* because of surrounding land prices; ^ includes a wider range of cost benefits.

Figure 10
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INFLUENCING CITIZENS’ VALUES

I questioned the planners on "how would you go about developing a new PROS plan?" in an area that does not have a plan for open space preservation. Several mentioned the need for an inventory of environmental resources, some mentioned surveying the public to determine what they wanted, but none mentioned the need of educating the public as a component of the PROS planning process. Brower (1984) and Findley (1986) both cited the importance of communication with the public to explain the jurisdiction’s intentions, to present the associated pros and cons of a given policy, and to facilitate feedback from the constituents. This interaction with the community does take place in the area master plan process in Montgomery County.

Publicly owned open space does not generate tax revenues and costs money to maintain. The incentive for public officials to pursue an open space preservation program is negatively impacted by these economic constraints. Funding for public open space is one of the first “casualties” of budget cuts because open space is considered an amenity. (Fox, 1990) If the people assume an apathetic position towards open space and view open space as an amenity, instituting an open space program will be difficult. Burns (1993) supports this view stating "community values shape the local planning approach and specific programs." An uninformed public may see no value in spending money to preserve open lands when all about them is open. When the reality of being caged by development is realized, the public will become instantly interested in open space preservation and run to the local planning board for protection. Educating the public on the importance of open space planning (and a commitment to open space planning in advance of development) is a critical

---

20 The General Plan, (1993) does mention the importance of citizenry education stating “the success of the General Plan will be dependent in large part upon an educational outreach.”
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component of a preservation program. A well informed community will likely see
the benefits as a reasonable expense and approve the expenditures. As stated
by CP1, “You will never survive if all of your parks are just ball fields; . . but if
you say not only do we get the ball field but your house never gets flooded again
because we saved the flood plane; then we have two reasons.” Over time as the
public’s values evolve, they may begin to demand comprehensive open space
planning from their representatives.

Recalling the proposal for erecting a cellular telephone tower in a
Montgomery County park, the people revolted when they learned of the planning
boards intentions of overruling the decision made by the Department of Parks
not to allow the tower on park property. The public must be informed in order
that they may help shape their community and determine what level of quality
they want in their daily lives.

I learned from Montgomery County that the PROS system has become
part of the people’s values and culture. I reason that this is why none of the
planners mentioned education when responding to “how would you go about
developing a new PROS plan?”

AREAS FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

While all of my conclusions are subject to further scrutiny, below I have
presented some areas for inquiry that surfaced during this investigation that are
not directly connected to the focus of this thesis.
Evaluating Success

The interviewees seemed to struggle when questioned on this topic. The fact that there was no consensus among their answers indicates to me that there is no formal system for evaluating performance.

The literature on "how to" evaluate success is sparse. The Practice of Local Government Planning (So, 1988) suggests that situation analysis is one method. Referred to as SWOT Analysis in strategic business management, situation analysis considers the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of operations. Exposing proven approaches or presenting new systems for monitoring performance is a present need in the planning field.

Outside the United States

How have countries outside of the United States, particularly in Europe and the Far East, dealt with the issue of preserving open space to control growth, to provide recreation, and preserve environmental systems. The advantage of such a study is twofold: 1. societies have been around hundreds of years longer than American communities yielding opportunities to learn from mistakes and successes, 2. land, in general, is at a premium and therefore there may be some valuable lessons to learn from Europe/Asian planners.

Non-Residential Role in Open Space Planning

The role of non-residential development in open space planning needs studying. A vast majority of the literature about growth management and open space planning strictly pertains to residential development. Growth management methods, in general, are concerned with controlling the quantity, timing, rate, and cost of residential development. Open space planning literature addresses open space within residential developments and zoning of residential neighborhoods. I think the role and impact of non-residential development should be investigated in greater detail. CP2 mentioned the need for this in the
planning of Sandy Spring/Ashton where they are considering a village green. Should new businesses be required to dedicate part of the land needed; should a special tax be levied on business to pay for acquisition of the land and upkeep?

What about businesses removed from downtown districts that are part of a business park or industrial strip? How should these land uses interface with the open space planning efforts? I think there may be opportunity here to meet a variety of objectives including recreational opportunities for employees and the community at large and to meet environmental initiatives such as stormwater infiltration or providing wildlife habitation. The local jurisdiction may not be interested in owning the land but can impact it’s design through regulatory measures. Perhaps understanding how mixed-use developments deal with varying uses is a good place to start.

Life Cycle

One of the premises of this study was that small rural communities that are beginning to feel growth pressures and see the need for long-term open space planning would benefit from this work. Burns (1993), however, suggests that communities large in area and with a significant population will have the most success initiating an open space program by doing so through their comprehensive planning. I have reasoned that larger communities are better equipped because 1. they have or can afford the staff to do it, 2. it is something the constituents want and, 3. there is a perceived need. This has led me to wonder if communities go through life cycles or stages similar to those of consumer products. Product marketing identifies four stages of a product’s life cycle: introduction, growth, maturity, and decline. I wonder if a parallel analysis can be made of a developing community and if so what are the ramifications of growth management and open space planning in each phase? As we learned
from Montgomery County, much of their success is attributed to early and active identification and acquisition of open land. My premise is that planning should occur in the first phase when there is an abundance of land and critical areas can be identified and set aside. During the subsequent phases, the plan should be implemented and adjusted. So (1988) discusses the lack of literature in the planning field that pertains to strategic planning. There is a need to study the application of effective private sector methods to the public realm.

**SUMMARY**

Comparing open space preservation to retirement savings, it is better to put away a little each year even though it may be difficult versus putting in twice as much next year. It is unlikely that if you have trouble finding the means to put away this year’s allotment that you will be able to put away twice as much next year. Stashing away a little each year (as has been done in Montgomery County) will result in a significant nest egg.
COULD WE HAVE SEEN AHEAD, AS WE CAN NOW
LOOK BACK, WE WOULD IMMEDIATELY HAVE
BEGIN THE SEGREGATION OF LANDS FOR PARK
PURPOSES IN ALL OUR SUBDIVISIONS, AND WOULD
NOT ONLY HAVE SERVED THE COMMUNITY BETTER,
BUT WOULD HAVE RECEIVED A RETURN . . . TO
REPAY AMPLY FOR EVERY FOOT OF GROUND SO
UTILIZED” WILLIAM A HARMON 1909

Indian chiefs are required to consider the impact of their decisions on the next seven generations. Perhaps we can start by questioning the impact of our decisions two generations forward. In forty years, will we be judged by our lost opportunities or by our accomplishments??

CONCLUSIONS 118
APPENDIX I

This appendix contains the goals and objectives for both the General Plan (1993) and the Park, Recreation & Open Space Master Plan Update. 1993.

GENERAL PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The General Plan (1993) lists seven goals affecting Land Use, Housing, Economic Activity, Transportation, Environment, Community Identification and Design, and Regionalism. Objectives are drafted for each of the goals with strategies identified on how to satisfy objectives. Those Goals, Objectives, Strategies of particular interest to this document are listed below:

Goal: Land Use

Objective: Provide a coordinated and comprehensive system of parks, recreation and open space.

Strategies:

A. Give priority to open space, park, and recreation investments in areas with the greatest existing or proposed residential density and in areas with important environmental feature.

B. Use open space, parks, and recreation facilities to shape and enhance the development and identity of individual neighborhoods, cluster developments, existing communities, and transitions between communities.

C. Integrate open space, parks, and recreational facilities into urbanized areas to promote public activity and community identity.

D. Plan for and encourage the provision of greenways to connect urban and rural open spaces, to provide access to parkland, to connect major stream valley park areas, and for recreational purposes such as walking and biking.

Goal: Environment - Conserve and protect natural resources to provide a healthy and beautiful environment for present and future generations. Manage the impacts of human activity on our natural resources in a balanced manner to sustain human, plant and animal life.

Objective: Promote an awareness of environmental issues and instill a commitment to environmental stewardship.

APPENDIX I 119
Strategies:

A. Encourage public and private efforts to conserve, protect, and restore the environment and natural resources.

B. Encourage environmentally prudent behavior in individual decisions on consumption; travel; yard maintenance; location of homes, work, and other activities; and resource management.

Objective: Preserve natural areas and features that are ecologically unusual, environmentally sensitive, or possess outstanding natural beauty.

Strategies:

A. Protect natural resources through identification, public acquisition, conservation easements, public education, citizen involvement, and private conservation efforts.

B. Connect parks and conservation areas to form an open space and conservation-oriented greenway system.

C. Require open space dedications in new subdivisions that maximize protection of stream valleys and other sensitive environmental features.

D. Ensure that development guidelines are reviewed periodically to make certain that they are environmentally sensitive and reflect current technologies and knowledge of the environment.

E. Limit construction on soils and slopes not suited for development.

Objective: Conserve County waterways, wetlands, and sensitive parts of stream valleys to minimize flooding, pollution, sedimentation, and damage to the ecology and to preserve natural beauty and open space.

Strategies:

A. Identify and protect wetlands and other sensitive parts of watersheds.

B. Continue parkland acquisition in key stream valleys.

C. Limit the potential damage to life and property from flooding.

D. Prohibit development too close to streams, in the 100-year ultimate floodplain, and in flooding danger reach areas of dams, unless no feasible alternative is available.

E. Maintain the natural character of drainage areas in the immediate vicinity of streams, rivers, and lakes.

F. Plant and retain trees and other vegetation near streams.
G. Minimize impacts from construction and operation of public and private facilities located in stream valleys, buffers, and floodplains; first priority should be given to preserving natural areas (avoidance), second priority to mitigation, and third priority to replacement with functional equivalents.

H. Develop programs to rehabilitate damaged streams.

I. Mandate "no net loss" of wetlands.

Objective: Preserve and enhance a diversity of plant and animal species in self-sustaining concentrations.

Strategies:

A. Determine and protect the land masses and linkages necessary to support a diversity of species in self-sustaining concentrations.

B. Identify areas that have the most species needing protection.

C. Plan a system of parks, conservation areas, subdivision open space, and easements to support a diversity of species in self-sustaining concentrations.

D. Ensure protection of environmentally sensitive habitats and unbuildable land through the master plan and development review process.

E. Minimize forest fragmentation to protect habitat continuity.

Objective: Increase and conserve the County's forests and trees.

Strategies:

A. Identify and designate forest preservation and tree planting areas.

B. Ensure forestland conservation, tree planting, and related maintenance in all new development.

C. Provide for increased tree cover and maintenance in urban and suburban areas and along transportation rights-of-way.

D. Encourage private and public landowners to protect existing trees and to plant additional environmentally appropriate trees on their properties. (General, 1993)

this comes from Park, 1993; this is the parks department's stated goals, objectives and strategies:

A Policy for Parks
Goal: To acquire and maintain a system of natural areas, open spaces, and recreation facilities developed in harmony with our natural resources to perpetuate an environment fit for life and fit for living.

A. Acquisition of Parklands

Objective: the objectives of the program for parkland acquisition shall be:

1. To acquire lands for a balanced park system in the region to provide:
   a. Our citizens with a wide choice of both active and passive recreation opportunities as major factors in enhancing the quality of life.
   b. Adequate parklands to accommodate conservation and preservation needs.

2. To acquire parklands based on the following considerations:
   a. Local and regional demand for public park and recreation facilities based on current need and projected population changes.
   b. Protection and preservation of natural areas.
   c. Protection and preservation of watersheds.
   d. Protection and preservation of cultural and historical sites.

3. To encourage private dedication of land as a means of parkland acquisition.

B. Develop and Management of the Park System

1. The objectives of the planning, design, construction, and management of the park system shall be based on:
   a. Meeting the needs of recreation and preservation in a manner that is harmonious with the natural beauty and parkland physiography, reflecting full concern for the environment.
   b. A planned and scientific approach to resource management, cognizant of the ecological interdependencies of people, the biota, water, and soil.

2. To preserve natural resources, the Department of Parks shall:
   a. limit the development of active-use areas in regional parks to no more than 1/3 of their total park acreage, with the remaining acreage designated as natural areas and/or conservation areas. Development in other categories of parks shall be determined
on a case-by-case basis with full consideration of the values of the natural features.

b. Prepare an environmental evaluations part of park development or rehabilitation plans where deemed appropriate by the Park Commission.

c. Review as necessary the impact of park use, development, and management practices on parkland.

C. Relationship of the Department of Parks to Other Public Agencies, Education, and the Private Sector.

1. The Department of Parks shall encourage other public agencies and the private sector to assist in providing compatible open spaces, natural areas, and recreation facilities and opportunities in the region.

2. The Department of Parks shall encourage and support research in the environmental sciences by other public agencies, institutions of higher learning, and the private sector; and support programs in outdoor education and recreation in the school system.

Lands and facilities under the control of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission are held as a public trust for the enjoyment and education of present and future generations. The Commission is pledged to protect these holdings from encroachment that would threaten their use as parkland. The Commission recognized that under rare circumstances non-park uses may be required on park property in order to serve the greater public interest.

To accompany the mission statement presented in “Vision”, the county states the “purpose” of the PROS plan as follows:

- To establish goals, objectives and guidelines for the acquisition, development and maintenance of the Montgomery County Park System.

- To provide information on regulations and preservation needs for important environmental, historic and archaeological areas.

- To help establish park acquisition and development priorities in the six-year Capital Improvements Program.

- To provide guidance regarding recreation facility needs during the preparation of local park development plans and large park master plans.

- To provide input to area and park master plans regarding the need for public parkland and recreation facilities. (Park, 1993)

**PROS Master Plan Goals and Objectives**
The goals and objectives specific to the PROS plan are as follows:

**Goal:** To acquire and maintain a system of natural areas, open spaces, and recreation facilities developed in harmony with our natural resources to perpetuate an environment fit for life and fit for living.

A. Acquisition of Parklands

**Objective:** The objectives of the program for parkland acquisition shall be:

1. To acquire lands for a balanced park system in the region to provide:
   a. Our citizens with a wide choice of both active and passive recreation opportunities as major factors in enhancing the quality of life.
   b. Adequate parklands to accommodate conservation and preservation needs.

2. To acquire parklands based on the following considerations:
   a. Local and regional demand for public park and recreation facilities based on current need and projected population changes.
   b. Protection and preservation of natural areas.
   c. Protection and preservation of watersheds.
   d. Protection and preservation of cultural and historical sites.

3. To encourage private dedication of land as a means of parkland acquisition.

B. Development and Management of the Park System

1. The objectives of the planning, design, construction, and management of the park system shall be based on:
   a. Meeting the needs of recreation and preservation in a manner that is harmonious with the natural beauty and parkland physiography, reflecting full concern for the environment.
   b. A planned and scientific approach to resource management, cognizant of the ecological interdependencies of people, the biota, water, and soil.

2. To preserve natural resources, the Department of Parks shall:
a. Limit the development of active-use areas in regional parks to no more than 1/3 of their total park acreage, with the remaining acreage designated as natural areas and/or conservation areas. Development in other categories of parks shall be determined on a case-by-case basis with full consideration of the values of the natural features.

b. Prepare an environmental evaluation as part of park development or rehabilitation plans where deemed appropriate by the Park Commission.

c. Review as necessary the impact of park use, development, and management practices on parkland.

C. Relationship of the Department of Parks to Other Public Agencies, Education, and the Private Sector.

1. The Department of Parks shall encourage other public agencies and the private sector to assist in providing compatible open spaces, natural areas, and recreation facilities and opportunities in the region.

2. The Department of Parks shall encourage and support research in the environmental sciences by other public agencies, institutions of higher learning, and the private sector, and support programs in outdoor education and recreation in the school system.

3. Lands and facilities under the control of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission are held as a public trust for the enjoyment and education of present and future generations. The Commission is pledged to protect these holdings from encroachment that would threaten their use as parkland. The Commission recognized that under rare circumstances non-park uses may be required on park property in order to serve the greater public interest.
APPENDIX II

This section contains interviews with Montgomery County, MD park and community planners and a Fairfax County, VA park planner.

CONVERSATION WITH PARK PLANNER 1 (PP1) AND PARK PLANNER 2 (PP2)

RG: Let's start with some background information, who has budgetary responsibility?

PP1: Well, only to the extent that our office has capital improvements program which is a 6 year expenditure proposal and so the cost of acquiring and developing the land or renovating the facilities through that program we get involved in; the budgeting processes is mostly the funding of the personnel to maintain the property and we don't get involved with.

PP2: operating budget

PP1: yeah operating budget; we're involved with the capital budget.

RG: so capital budget would be the capital to acquire new lands and to develop new lands and maintenance falls under operating budget?

PP1: yes that is correct.

RG: what is the status of budget? In relative terms is it growing, staying the same, or reduced?

PP1: actually, I guess we had our major cut about 4 yrs ago would you say?

PP2: yeah

PP1: so we had a bid hit 4 yrs ago and then since then last year for instance we were required to have hardly any new projects this year we've loosened up a little bit we've a couple more.

PP2: acquisition money has grown.

PP1: acquisition yeah, because we have program open space funding; has not been a problem.

RG: you mentioned the 6 year capital improvements program and then there is "BSY"

PP1: beyond six years. Here's the latest copy. Do you have a copy of our park, recreation & open space master plan.

RG: yeah
RG: so, does this bsy cover “what will the county look like in 50 years?”

PP1: um, not really, what it

PP2: no

PP1: does is discuss individual projects beyond 6 yrs.

RG: does it do you do planning like 10 years out?

PP2: no, that is occurring in the thicker document you have and also in the implementation plan; do you have that?

PP1: that you probably don’t have, that is meat and potatoes, you should see that for the sequencing we go through; the pros plan is the long range plan implementation study which tells you how you are going to implement that plan very specifically site by site.

RG: pros comes first then the plan comes out of that?

PP1: right, and that is essentially a listing for people of what is not in our current 6 year capital program so if someone is buying a house in a certain area and want to know what might be there 6 years from now or ten years from now they can also look at that document. In terms of visionary, we attempted to be more, I don’t know how to say this, um practical we’re getting ready to update our plan again we may try to be more visionary but we’ve been pretty down to earth practical in our planning to date, what do you think pp2?

PP2: pretty practical.

RG: does funding dictate the type of planning you do, visionary or practical?

PP1: yeah

PP2: no not really it’s affected by changing attitudes and ideas, changing population, diversification, diversity, in terms of how do we address the issue of recreational facilities.

PP1: we are getting more into greenway planning but essentially we’ve always had greenways as stream valley parks now their really just calling them greenways um you may be familiar some of the planners Jeff Zyontz have very I guess you would call them forward thinking ideas but some of them may not be practically feasible. One of the latest is buying all the homes on one side of Georgia Avenue to create a green corridor there, a nice idea but I wouldn’t have the nerve to suggest it myself because I don’t know I don’t really think not just from a fiscal standpoint but from a standpoint of forcing people from their homes without a really good reason.

RG: does this notion of greenways come top down encourage by state or federal authorities?
PP1: definitely

RG: I thought I saw something mentioned in one of the documents encouraging greenways.

PP1: yeah, definitely

RG: and is that involve istea money as well?

PP1: istea money if your putting a trail through the greenway; pp2 may have some more forward thinking ideas for our upcoming plan too, we've been asked to look into a lot of facilities that are up and coming trends, there's roller balding and street hockey. All of them; over the years we've had a lot of pressure from these. Rick developed a mathematical model based on type data well that's probably not the right word, survey data that determines participation rates of various facilities. It is very difficult to project the true needs for new upcoming facilities because you don't have the database.

RG: in pros, I read there is a facility gap between what you have now and what you thought you would need? Is that facilities that comes from your model? For example, listed a shortage of ball fields in a certain region.

PP2: ah yeah, sure, all we do is take what is in the pros plan for need and look at what's in our CIP and that tells you the gap right away.

PP1: there.

PP2: we had a some charts that are actually from the facility gap.

RG: can you talk about how you obtain land that you have determined would be desirable for the pros plan?

PP1: when you read the pros plan you see that the great bulk of our land is in conservation related land. The need for that land of course, is based on the features and the environmental feature your trying to preserve often a stream valley, in terms of the local parks which are the small pieces, the pros plan needs that pp2 develops he develops by planning area those small black areas then you can convert the facilities pretty easily to a number of local parks. If you're going to assume a local park includes certain things, then we have an area master plan process that cp1 told you about those parks are often located with a floating symbol on the area master plan relating to the area they feel residential development is going to concentrate and try and take the whole planning area needs and put a floating symbol where a new local park where their going to put new residential areas; you wouldn't put it in the middle of an industrial area; you try and figure that out. Then when the subdivision comes in we try and get it through dedication; we are having problems right now because our current concept of local parks used to be ten acres and now we trying to get fifteen, it isn't really big enough to provide recreation facilities and enough buffer areas so that the adjacent neighbors are bothered by the park and we will have to either go to bigger parks in which case we might have to spend more money to buy the land or rethink our concept.
RG: Fee simple acquisition was an important tool in establishing your park
system in the 20's and 30's, what tool is used most frequently now for obtaining
park lands?

PP2: the majority of local parks are obtained through dedication

PP1: and even conservation parks are

PP2: a lot of the stream valley parks there are portions that acquired by
dedication too.

PP1: this has a section on future acquisition and talks about percentage

RG: dedication, is it required by developers for approval of development?

PP2: we don't have a mandatory dedication of parkland. What the subdivision
allows says is that under certain types of development x amount of percentage
of your property has to remain in open space so there are two ways you can do
that one way is through your traditional homeowners association or give it to us.
In some cases we get a portion of the open space and the home owners will get
the remaining portion.

RG: through your master planning are you trying to link spaces of one
subdivision together with the next?

PP2: well yeah we already know; we have a map on the wall that says we own
this. If we have a subdivision come in ideally we would like to acquire this. We
have a subdivision come in triggers the process off where we look at the
subdivision to see where it is if it is next to a park obviously we are going to take
a close look at it.

RG: ok

PP2: even for areas where we have no acquisition shown we still may go after
additional land because it represents an opportunity to get more park land.

RG: where does the money for acquisition come from; how is it funded?

PP2: three sources: 1 the most minor one is the water conservation fund really
just a drop in the bucket to be honest. 2. Real estate transfer tax

PP1: results in approximately $4 million per year,

PP2: 3. Commission bonding

RG: are you investigating new means of funding?

PP2:

RG: I read about considering usage fees; is that still being investigated?
PP1: occasionally look at things like that, we aren't you know; the most recent thing that was brought up was parking fees at regional parks. But we, I don't know where we are going to move on that there are problems related to everything; if you charge a fee for parking at the regional park like at Wheaton the neighborhoods are going to be overwhelmed by people parking outside the park so they don't have to go in and pay; sometimes the cost of solving the problem you created is more than the money you are collecting.

RG: the town I live in encourages rounding up the bill charged for water, sewer, and trash with moneys going to bike trails. For example, if your bill was $42.10, you are offered the opportunity of rounding up to 43.00 giving the town 90 cents for bike trails.

PP1: that's an interesting idea; our county residents pay a very high tax bill right now and the thinking has been they are paying already for these facilities.

RG: what role does private initiatives play in pros plan?

PP2: not a big role, it hasn't

PP1: we've got one big park, over at; we've gotten several large parks

PP2: yeah

PP1: greenfarm, recently had a donation of over $1 mil for facilities brookside gardens; the education center was donated, I guess is we get some but not a lot

PP2: we don't go after it.

PP1: that's for sure

RG: I take it then that it is not something you can rely on or plan for.

PP1: right.

RG: one of the reasons I selected this county is because of the history of way back in the 1920's where they allocated funds and starting setting land aside somewhat visionary, I guess very visionary; when you look at the county now you have this really highly urbanized belt down closer to dc and then further out the county becomes much more rural; what have you learned from the past that is helping you make decisions now in the rural areas?

PP1: were trying not to parks active parks that back directly onto homeowners property; we run into problems with this because developers are trying to maximize the use of their property; its a constant battle to keep enough buffer area; we try to put streets in between to separate. Active recreation its just a very large impact on the adjacent residents. That's one thing were trying to do differently.

PP2: stream valley parks, if you look at a map, very obvious also the program it started off if you look at portions of sligoe and other branches in downtown areas are very narrow; what we've learned is we need a wider stream valley and
buffer, we have always gone after the flood plan per se, um particularly since 1960 we are now getting to own the steep slopes and beyond the steep slopes.

RG: it sounds like the objective is more conservation oriented.

PP2: that and also the reality of the situation is that it is hard to build a provide access to the stream valley parks in terms of the hiker/biker trails when you have to go through wetlands or floodplain.

PP1: I would say , I don't know how this relates to your question but the changing environmental regulations over the last 5 - 10 years and now ADA are going to make a tremendous change in the way we develop our parks and what can be dissolve and are more than the opposition although when we are acquiring it we're trying to get, we have had good luck with getting the developer dedicating the site to grade the site before he gives it to us so ah alleviate the ADA problem so we know we are getting a usable site

RG: unfunded federal mandates

PP2: yeah that is true

PP2: that is probably the biggest one even though it is very healthy

RG: do you get funding now from the government that helps the pros plan?

PP2: yeah through the land water conservation act

RG: that's the drop in the bucket you were talking about

PP2: it's not much, we usually let it build up before we use it

RG: MD as a state says (in pros 1993) "provision of ample recreation opportunities to attract growth to existing and planned population centers. Do you see your role in pros working as described?"

PP2: we don't see it as directing growth; we try to respond to areas that are going through growth.

RG: where you see the next boom area is where you concentrate efforts?

PP2: right, ideally,

RG: What role do schools play in helping to meet objectives of pros?

PP2: it has been increasing. Over the years we have and others have been pressuring schools to provide better recreational facilities in the outdoors constructed to meet ____ (I remember pp2 stating in a nutshell that recreational facilities on school grounds should be constructed to meet a variety of age groups) particularly ones separated from parks because of that reason.
RG: they are going to have a playground so why don't they have them both groups

PP2: right have them satisfy and a have a playground that's comparable to a local park and their doing that sink in the extra 50 to $60 thousand and build a regulation size ball field which they have to do anyway for high school

RG: Lands that you have are under a land trust. How do you handle the pressures from outside groups for the use of your land. Whether it be a new library, fire station, et cetera

PP2: they are handled interagency wide when somebody thinks about that your talking about an interagency type of committee something to that affect typically looking at different sites.

PP1: park staff tends to be very protective of our land but often times a political decision will

PP2: some of our land is protected in the sense that it was acquired through federal funding, the capers crampton act, preserving stream valley parks. When we do our new master plans now, we are well aware of that issue and we are going to tend to not focus on _____ if a proposed road is bisecting a park it will identify that road as separate from the park whereas in the past we never saw that identification at all so assume it as parkland and then hear there is plans for this road to go through it and people are screaming bloody murder so those types of issues will crop up

RG: when those issues do crop up, what is the public reaction?

PP1: well, recently we had a proposal to put a cellular one tower on one of our parks. The park staff recommended to the commission not to allow this. The park commission voted to allow it and the people are still screaming and now the park commission is reconsidering it and that situation will probably end up being some kind of political decision; I would guess that utility corridors are one of the biggest and roads are the biggest problems we have and in the past we just let them go through where ever they wanted and now with the new environmental sensitivities at an absolute high right now and a water sewer electric get through easier because they can be done in a less damaging way and there are only certain places that sewer and water can be run roads uh are given a real hard time and other facilities

PP2: we used to have like school bus parking lot on park land. Those type of wholesale things don't happen; I can't remember the last episode when that happened?

RG: are there watchdog groups that

PP1: the citizens are normally real adjacent neighbors are real persistent.

PP2: yeah there are a couple of watchdog groups, environmental organizations that are very interested in what we do
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RG: what groups would they be?

RD and PP1: audobon society is the biggest one, sierra club

RG: so their national groups that have local chapters?

PP1: yeah right

PP2: we have a lot of national groups based here adjacent to one of our parks

PP1: but we also have within our own staff now a natural resources group, they feel that it is their role to watch like a hawk not only proposals for other uses that might want to come through the park but proposed park uses.

RG: the way you want to develop it?

PP1: yeah, I have a meeting at 3:00

RG okay

PP1: I have a meeting about a sewer line that is proposed through a park, it would cut trees down and create an open corridor in the park and they have asked us to go approach a private development and see if they would allow the right of way so that it won't disrupt the park; we may do that down the line but there is no way that I feel the private development would want to take that inconvenience onto themselves, its not their problem they would have to cut trees down themselves; anyway I don't know what will happen with that, our natural resources division will be at the meeting.

RG: Pros plan tdr holding areas are fueling future pros land is that correct

end side one

RG: How do you evaluate your success?

PP1: different surveys over the years regarding satisfaction level um of the people with their parks and the last time we did the survey which was in 1990 we asked the users of the parks how satisfied they were with the different parks were there additional facilities they needed or if there were problems they thought should be corrected and that kind of thing essentially that's mainly the way we do it, we don't have enough money or enough planning staff to do nearly enough of what we feel should be done that's probably everywhere. So we try to establish priorities and a lot of the discussion is over what should be given priority for both funding and planning.

RG: do you go back and say look at the 88 plan and the objectives you had here and how many of those did you meet or not meet.

PP1: no that's subjective; technically the objectives in that plan although I know objectives should be numerically related, I guess your true objectives should say
acquire ten local parks by the year 2000. Our objectives in there are not that
specific they are more goal oriented type things.

RG. do you keep statistics on park acreage per capita or 1000 capita?

PP1: we keep um statistics tenants projection and our facility increases, we don't
believe that acres per thousand or facilities per thousand is the really the way to
go at this point. Our plan right now at this point in time are participation rates
grounded rather than the other although because of pressure for this kind of
information we do have some charts that list this but technically; because our
facilities vary so much in quality and type it is very difficult to do things that way
and we feel that national standards are not necessarily relevant to our particular
county. I feel that planning parks is a very inexact science. A lot of it is gained
through continuing knowledge of your county and the people and your park
system and what you’ve come to learn does well that is successful and what
isn’t. Over the years we’ve tried new facilities frequently, we tried exercise trails
and I'm still not sure why they didn’t catch on, fitness courses, and every new
park for a while was proposed to have a fitness course; well after we built the
first several of them we realized that they really weren’t getting used that much
so we took them out of; we hadn’t built the rest of the parks and now we keep
them mostly in our larger parks. There are new facilities that we try from time to
time handball courts, paddle tennis; you like to be up on different trends, we are
going to try and provide something for roller blading, prince George’s county who
is our counter part over there has been a little more progressive in responding to
recreation trends. They have an active enterprise division for instance their roller
blade courts are handled as an enterprise facility. We have an enterprise
division I think we have been more successful at making money then their
enterprise division but they have been more innovative they have a lot of they
have and equestrian center, we have and equestrian center too but it is on a
different level than theirs they rent it out for all kinds of shows.

RG: you said about measuring participation do you do that by observation or by
survey, you said the fitness trails do not work.

PP1: we do surveys ... we do all kinds of surveys this has all the parks in it, you
will have to read our methodology to understand how we do it

**CONVERSATION WITH COMMUNITY PLANNER 1 (CP1)**

CP1: Our parks acquisition goes back to the capper crampton act in 1920 where
we were fortunate enough to log onto a program from Washington that allows
federal funds to be spent on an interconnected parks system so a lot of our
stream valleys were purchased with federal funds.

RG: could you briefly explain how your role versus the role over there?

CP1: they are an operating department for the park system. They are the owners
and managers of parks, so they own 35,000 acres. We are staff for the
Montgomery County Planning Division and we have legislature authority to do
master plans. Advisors of master plans and zoning, administrative authority to
do subdivisions, record plots those types of things.
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RG: do you have budget responsibility for parks?

CP1: we are a bi-county commission we have a joint budget that is submitted by the commissioners to the county council; we effectively have separate budgets. We have a separate internal budget between parks and planning when it comes to the tax rate it looks like one thing.

RG: when that budget is cut, how does that impact you?

CP1: depends on how it is cut, I mean, generally they cut a program or something.

RG: as far as the planning goes, how far forward do you look as far as time horizon?

CP1: on the longest range forecast we do we are looking about 25 or 30 years. We try to do our master plans so that they have at least a 15 year life if they can where we have active areas of high densities and need for a lot of details they last for about 7 years.

RG: how is the master plan formulated. What kinds of things do you take into consideration?

CP1: about everything, I mean go for the natural environment of the area the existing development in the prior plan to the existing plans for master plan of highways, you look at future county wide ___ local concerns the whole gamut of effects. There are some regional issues that really don't get much consideration at all like air quality it's impossible to deal the whole ___ certainly we deal with traffic, zoning

RG: are there trends in the county that are affecting you near term, changing the way you thinking about planning?

CP1: the biggest large scale trend would be the move toward transit oriented development. To try to get more areas where cars aren't necessary to have a decent standard of life and have an environment that is better for pedestrians than it is for cars; we've only seen a couple on the ground examples of that so certainly that's the first ___ we try to measure it as early as we can.

RG: the ones you have seen are they in this county or are you looking elsewhere?

CP1: no in this county, Kentlands is an example. And certainly in terms of walkable edge cities it is relatively the best around. Unlike Tyson's corner where you need a car to go here you can walk to those areas and stop.

RG: in wedges and corridors, it mentioned the use of greenbelts to separate uses, did that happen?

CP1: yeah, look at this map, we have a small dividing line between Gaithersburg and Gaithersburg vicinity it didn't quite get completed, we have an absolute complete line in Germantown we have a complete line between Ogden space??
And a green? Separating our old from the others and certainly we bought every one of our stream valleys along the line. We've done pretty well.

RG: what have you learned from this urbanization here that's impacting your planning of the rural areas out here.

CP1: there is always a push to underestimate the needs for public rights of way there is always something else you want to do and when you come back into a neighborhood it's a real problem so if anything we've had experience in at least the last 10 years in really trying to be aggressive about maintaining right of way. What we did best in the downtown though was get land in advance of development and real cheap; ah were not doing so well in these fiscally tough times. Our budget ah ; if you take any ten year period in montgomery county you won't have a decline in real estate value and if you take any 20 year period of time the appreciation of land has probably been higher that cpi [consumer price index]. So as an investment, we need to encourage the county to a lot more investing in land.

RG: how does the state impact you?

CP1: they have a significant impact, all of the environmental regulation; we are part of the chesapeake drainage area we are affected by the fact that they have to issue a lot the wetland permits for land development that goes on; they also have a state planning act that we have to comply with. But that really doesn't have; we have more teeth than they do. There is nothing in there that we weren't already doing. We see the state a lot.

RG: how does the federal government impact you?

CP1: the federal government, we are unique in that of course there is a hole slew of federal installations. The core of our employment base is federal on federal areas, so we directly see as employer and on a regulatory basis we see the core of engineers anytime we try call out ___ to get a permit, we see federal highway commission.

RG: what about legislation from the government: i.e. the ADA?

CP1: a little bit more of a detail for maintenance and construction of facilities, god only knows how many thousand buildings the park agency owns. As a planning matter, it has affected the groundwork, what it has done is make the financial pro formas much tougher for high rises. Since ada, we have not had one high rise.

RG: you talked about the federal government owning a lot of land here, what role does private commercial landowners play in helping to meet open space objectives.

CP1: sure, we do a lot of conservation easements, we do lots of homeowner association maintained areas. We do lots of ways where we end up not taking the land as a public use but making keep the area green.
RG: how do you accomplish this from a planning standpoint?

CP1: it's really done on a regulatory basis although there are some areas where
in the plan we say special regulations should be developed xyz; or the buffer in
this area should be 150 feet because of xyz. Aside from that, in the regulations
we will make them buildable lots or out lots, its the nature of the game.

RG: Schools are playing a significant role in open space

CP1: at the cost of government, um we deal with the school board while we are
doing the master plan, they let us know of areas they thing they will need
schools in the future when we have large development, we make dedication a
requirement for schools. But a lot of times we will give the landowner the benefit
of that density back on his site so we get the school site for nothing and he
doesn't feel like he lost anything. The units get closer together which has some
benefits actually. We will identify potential areas that we need to look for
schools.

RG: Do you see park planning as part of your growth management scenario.

CP1: absolutely, who was it godschalk from north carolina that did a study that
identified a 80 separate growth techniques and we use more than any other
county that he looked at and that was ten years ago.

RG: if you were to take a new position with a county, how would you go about
setting up a new pros plan. what support would you like to see?

CP1: virginia has a very different view of the world in terms of land use rights;
they start with the basis that the landowner has a right to do whatever the market
will bare and the municipality has an obligation to accommodate what a private
landowner wants to do. I think general tenet of VA, you can't change that court
system, legal system in VA what you need to do is number one an willingness on
the public's part to buy land because that's the easiest and most direct way to
control growth geographically, next you need to set up a rational defensible
environmental regulations to help with for example water quality on a regional
basis like the chesapeake bay so that you can get some teeth and you can say
yes you can develop but you have to set aside this land. Do what you can on the
regulatory side. The hard part is getting somebody to say I know we don't need
that land now; I know there's nobody out there but we should buy the land.

RG: and determining which land to buy,

CP1: you know what sensitive areas are, so you know environmentally what you
need to protect and from there it's just a matter of what else is nice to make a it
usable beyond place and environment. I think these days in parkland you always
have the two issues if your going to have a really ____ park system. You will
never survive if all of your parks are just ball fields; because there isn't that
sufficient demand that is going pay ____ but if you say not only do we get the ball
field but you house never gets flooded again because we saved the flood plane
and we have two reasons;

RG: what do you feel are the economic benefits of open space?
CP1: you should look for some economic studies, that in effect determined that the value of the open space is really captured by the private land around the open space. I go out an out an buy an acre in the middle of a subdivision and I spend a million bucks for that, the real question is what have I now; and I take that million bucks and it's off the tax record so not only have I lost 1 mil capital I've lost a thousand bucks per year for all time; but now what I got to do if i'm going to be just, what have I done to the value of the home that immediately surrounds the park and what have I done to the value of homes in a larger area and I think you will find, we've taken a hell of a lot of land of the tax records in montgomery county but I think we have incorporated that value into the value of our residential houses. So their houses are more valuable because we have parks. Now we haven't done that kind of study but there are studies out there.

RG: I feel it is hard to justify a pros plan based on economic value. Would you agree with that?

CP1: yes, because you have to put a value on what it is you get from a stream valley that somebody uses, and nobody will pay for that but it has a form of psychological value and a quality of life value that you can't measure. There is value in just passing through, people feel better about areas that are heavily treed. But we don't do it on an economic basis you need a culture that values it, and if the culture values it, the people will vote in politicians who think it's a value and if they don't they will vote in people who don't value it.

RG: How do you evaluate your success? How do you know if your successful?

CP1: seriously? the clearest way that we know if we've done really bad work, is that the incumbents don't get re-elected. a lot of times in election years, we are the issue. growth is to fast, too slow, too low, too high, in the wrong place, spent too much on this, spent too little on that, we get on all sides, a lot of the times we are the issue. another measure is the appreciation rate of residential communities. Are we increasing the value of their community as measured by the market place because you can take opinion surveys, you can do everything but the marketplace tells you where places are desirable to live. And if we are maintaining that we doing well. We also measure on the economic side of how we are doing with job growth. Because we are not the real generator of growth we are the secondary generator of growth, we need to have decent jobs at some reasonable distance. Then we have a perverse measure and that's an inclusionary measure, how much have we provided for people who can't afford to live in the county? Are doing inclusionary we like to hope we're striking ___

RG: while I was driving in rockville, I past three churches in a row, korean baptist, chinese, then a third nationality, it appears that you have to deal with a diverse population mix.

CP1: we have the highest percentage of non us born immigrants that are first generation in the state of MD, and nationally we are pretty high. We get the asian doctor, we get the downtown diplomat, we also went the waves of tocoma park we got the Vietnamese, Nicaraguan during their war, Cuban wave hasn't hit us yet, but sure we get plenty of nationalities it is something you plan for. What you end up doing in Tacoma park is taking a park and making a job fair, it was
sort of a pick up labor place that was really informal, messy, but it served a purpose.

RG: discuss your relationship with other departments, i.e. water, roads, sewers, infrastructure.

CP1: constant interfacing, it is critical.

**CONVERSATION WITH PARK PLANNER 3 (PP3)**

RG: could you first explain your responsibilities here

PP3: my title is director of planning and develop. What I do is we deal with everything from concept to concrete, or trees, or whatever. Basically, we put together the long range plan, we develop the five year strategic plan, we work with the county land-use planning folks and deal with trying to mitigate impacts from development and negotiate and do proffer negotiation when that particular type of development comes in when there is primarily residential or an influx of new citizenry that will create a demand for recreational services, we negotiate for that with the developer. We work with the county as they do their comprehensive planning to identify environmental protection and cultural resource protection for the county and work very closely with them making sure that is taken care of and then we come up with management plans that reflect those preservation interests. We also look at needs assessment countywide which we did 2 years ago a survey of the citizens to try to determining what the participation rates were in 32 recreational categories. We try to find out what was priority to the citizens and what they like to do. From that, we try to ascertain and get direction of where we should focus our priorities over the next 15 years. Basically, our 15 year plan is going to focus around sustainability of our current operations because we have a pretty extensive park operations now but we are in need of repair and some of our facilities are deteriorating, and increased demand. Focus on preservation of what is left of the environment in this county and cultural resources. We found from the survey that a lot people just want to preserve open space to have areas they can just go and be quiet and sit in a park, walk trails, so we kind of directed our program towards that. Creating a greenway system throughout the county not only for pedestrian transportation corridors but wildlife corridors.

RG: do you have budget responsibility?

PP3: yes, we put together the capitals improvement program, we do the bond campaigns, and we also do monitoring and requesting the sale of the bond, we develop the priority list for our capital improvements program. The development side then actually based on the priorities that are established go in and design and construct whatever facilities we have in the program. We also do land acquisition. Based on some of the needs assessment information we have identified certain areas of the county that we're deficient and need to buy large tracts of land.

RG: is the acquisition part of your cip budget?
PP3: yes, currently, we have kind of been in an economic jam as everybody has
been with the way the economy’s going right now our bond sales program was
frozen. What they did was, our last bond referendum was in 1988, we have a
seven year program, so by 1996 we’re suppose to have fulfilled all of that
and be on the street with another bond referendum. Well in 1992, they decided
that they weren’t going to sell the bonds they were going to defer them for 10
years because of the way the counties economy was going. They didn’t want
their debt ratio to be out of whack.

RG: so when they reduce that, what suffers?

PP3: we were constrained to $3 mil per year capital improvements program. So
it took all of our money and put it in the out years which is after 98, we couldn’t
get to it. What that did to us was it reduced our ability to construct, acquire,
everything. We also lost staffing positions because a great portion of the design
and construction staff were bond funded. We didn’t have the money to build the
projects. We could carry the wpfo work performed for others staff.

RG: the maintenance side is separate?

PP3: yes, that is totally separate, I have nothing to do with that other than from
the planning perspective. That took a reduction too. But as far as capital
improvements program, generally we try to seek funding for that through
different mechanisms but we’ve had to do some major renovation projects in
fact we have one right now for our rec. centers, we have 8 major rec. facilities,
with swimming pools, ice rink, gymnasium; those types of things; and we have a
program right now that we have requested the county come in and renovate
facilities its a $5.7 mil renovation. And the money is not there, they are saying
take it out of CIP well we only have 8.7 mil in capital program so that can tell
you what happens to the projects that we’re doing.

RG: you said your involved with acquisition and you negotiate with developers
when new tracts are developed, do you acquire significant land from new
developers through dedication.

PP3: that’s right, we get the EQC which is environmental quality corridor; any
stream valleys, flood plain areas, automatically have to be preserved. Now the
developer can dedicate it to the park authority, to a homeowner’s association,
primarily if there is some connectivity to it we will demand that it comes to us,
there are some preservation areas that we wont want because it doesn’t connect
anywhere. has no real significance, all it will be is a liability to us and we would
be hit with maintaining a homeowners small piece of land. So in those cases we
don’t accept and say put it to somebody else. We have almost 17,000 acres of
parkland, I would say roughly half have come through proffers. So we have
standards established they have to give us so many acres; well we get the
EQC; and then we get some many acres based on how many households they
bring for active recreation. One of the reasons we did the participation survey
was to say for every thousand of people you bring in you have to build a soccer
field. We updated our standards and that’s where we negotiate form. We go in
and look at their development and say ok your development based on our
standards you have to put in one tot lot, 2 baseball fields, three multi-use courts.
RG: has the program been challenged in the courts?

PP3: never been challenged. Basically, I think, one of the things is it's a proffer. It's not an impact fee, if it were an impact fee, there is no legislation that allows parks to impose impact fees unlike maryland and other states. If your putting in a pdh (similar to pud) since it is a specialized zoning we do get a certain dollar amount per household as a recreation offset impact. That is the only place where there is no negotiation, they have to pay that. And that's because that don't have to go for pdh designation. That's the only area. Anyplace else it's basically a negotiation and there doing it because they need density credit. So they have the option of cutting their need for density credits or trying to use us in order to get their development.

RG: you mentioned you have a fifteen year plan. Is that the furthest you look out at this time.

PP3: yes, and we will probably update that every five years.

RG: How do you evaluate your success?

PP3: development side meeting schedules getting the development in; the people negotiating proffers basically how much we are able to add either dollar contributions or acreage to the parks; with the long range planning group, that one is real hard, we've just really gotten into that. Um and that's not really something you can real clearly evaluate. Basically I guess it's what results the policy changes give us so it's kind of related to all the other things.

RG: do you consider your role as growth management?

PP3: [hesitation] yes, some of the negotiations that we are currently be involved in and we try to get with developers early on and get them to do what we call "good" development.

RG: if you were to take a new position with a county that was not involved with pros planning, how would you go about setting up a new pros. what support would you like to see?

PP3: well I would start with a survey and evaluation of where they are today. Get a snapshot of where they are today. Look at what the projections are for growth within the jurisdiction, look at what other places are doing. Look at where they are going and see how that's going to affect the quality of life that has been established in the community and how much change people can handle. Growth potential, if they have good planning documents, they know how much population they are going to try to grow to, look at what your recreational demand is now and multiply that over population expansion and make sure you have the ability to provide at least the same level of service.

RG: how does the state impact your operations?

PP3: we have some impact from some mandates, but mostly they help us, i mean there are some state requirements that impact design costs but overall the
protection of the environment and some of those things far out weigh any
restrictions that we are faced with.

RG: the federal government, same idea, how do they impact you?

PP3: I don't think they really hurt us, there are ways they could be more helpful
to us but overall couldn't say they hurt us.

RG: Do you use schools as part of developing your parks?

PP3: we tie in some community/school parks, we have a couple of
developments that are going to utilize that concept in the future yes.

RG: do you feel there are economic benefits of open space?

PP3: adjacent property values are higher. That's one element and the other
thing is destination drives property values. The closer you are to washington the
higher your property value is going to be; for a little piece of nothing you have
enormous prices, the further away you go, you've got more space but property
values are greater.

RG: funding park acquisition, have you look at other techniques of obtaining
funding?

PP3: we've been involved in monitoring what's happening in the virginia
legislation regarding with regard to impact fees. School systems have a study
going on about doing impact fees for schools currently. The only place in VA that
you can impose an ordinance that is similar to an impact fee you don't really call
it that is in transportation. Schools have proposed some legislation that would
give them that authority and we have been monitoring that and hope to if
schools get it in to jump on and just make it schools and parks.

RG: Do you use users fees?

PP3: we do have user fees for certain types of facilities in fact 50% of our
operating capita is generated through user fees.

Thank you.

---

**CONVERSATION WITH COMMUNITY PLANNER 2 (CP2)**

RG: let me start by asking you to state your title and describe your
responsibilities.

CP2: my title depends on the arena actually, i'm a planner in the community
planning division and for the purposes for the work i'm doing on Sandy
Spring/Ashton master plan, I am the lead planner which means that it is my
responsibility to package the plan and escort through the entire process; also it is
my responsibility to orchestrate community involvement and participation during
the process; pulling together the recommendations from different divisions. My
role on this plan has another aspect too because I'm handling many of the
design aspects. So, you don't have to go to the urban designer since I'm
covering that too.

RG: I'm getting two hats for the price of one.

CP2: yes

RG: you said you take the plan and walk it through the process, what are some
of the steps that you will go through?

CP2: well, the first step which we're bringing to culmination right now is the
preparation of the staff draft master plan which is the staff's recommendation.
We work with a group from the community that gives us insight into the
community so that is the part we've been working on. I'm about to put the staff
draft together. Then, I take the staff draft to the planning authority and it changes
its name as it goes through the process depending upon who has touched it but
basically it goes to the planning board and they hold public hearings and then
hold work sessions. I'm responsible for moving the plan through that process and
then; their are a lot of players and then I take the plan to the county council and
they go through their own public hearing process then a final plan is put together.

RG: how long does that process take?

CP2: that would be a good question for Jeff, because plans differ. We started this
one a year ago in August and they are expecting it to be done in late 1996.

RG: how far into the future do you look when you construct the plan?

CP2: we look out 15 - 20 years.

RG: does it vary if you are out in the rural edges do they have a longer time
horizon of the county versus more urbanized area?

CP2: my perception is that the horizon of the plan is met responsive to the
circumstances. My understanding is if there are no new issues that need to be
addressed in 15 years, we're not going to open up the plan just to open up the
plan. If there issues that come up before that are critical issues that have to be
addressed, it is likely the plan will be re-opened.

RG: how are you setting aside open space? What tools are you using?

CP2: well that's a really good question because we are wrestling with that right
now. We have an interesting situation where we anticipate having a bigger piece
of property set aside for open space than is traditionally achievable under
current rule: cluster zoning and cluster zoning in general so our initial tool we are
going to use at the outset is in the design but in terms of actually be zoning will
be primary tool; but there is the possibility there will be some acquisition.

RG: what do you mean by zoning will be the primary tool?
CP2: ok, zoning; our zoning strategies gel as we go through the master plan process because they; we first focus our attention on resolving the issues that need to be resolved during the process we have to deal with what the end product is meant to be and then we look at tools. We've laid out a few tools already that we've identified as potential zoning strategies; we've done a broad brush first look at that seeing if we have tools already that we want to use so we have some indication of where we are headed. Those will gel because of the process as we clarify and refine where we are headed. We're looking at several possibilities right now. We're looking at the use of an re2/tdr zone which is essentially a tdr receiving area, to achieve what we want to achieve. We are looking at the use of what we call floating zone currently in the pd zone [planned development] and we are also looking at the possibility of an overlay zone. See sheet that outlines three strategies and pros and cons.

CP2: one of the other strategies we have site specific guidelines built into the master plan. [See handout for definition of how much open space, lot size density, how much of lot to leave open] the re2 with overlay zone would have to be created. See responses from public questions how you protect open space in future development. There has been a lot of concern in the community about whether or not future development can use open space; like we need to expand our day care facility can we use your nice open space.

RG: the issue of creating open space through clustering then allowing future development on open space?

CP2: yes,

RG: are there things in place to resist building on open lands?

CP2: yes, tom kennedy of our legal staff drafted “the last word” on that aspect of protecting open space. You will notice that of the methods we are looking at not one of them is what we refer to as um one of our cluster zones, which I think is very interesting because what that says is we don’t have a cluster zone right now that will allow us achieve what we want to in this particular setting. What cluster zone does is basically result in homogeneous lot sizes.

RG: see description of zoning

CP2: do you want me to give you a brief description of our zoning?

RG:sure

CP2: cluster zone says if you have traditional zoning and 50 acres, you can develop it at 1 unit per acre; cluster says you can get 50 units can concentrate to one part of lot. And under our current cluster zoning, there is a minimum lot size and goes through site plan review. The benefit of doing this is you may not be able to get 50 units on the fifty acres because of undevelopable land, so there is an incentive to cluster. The overlay takes the base zone again 50 units, this zone doesn't exist, the mechanism does and overlay is a mechanism but the zone for the application doesn't exist right now; and traditionally an overlay zone is more restrictive then the zone underneath but we looking right now to find out if we can create an overlay zone that has more flexibility in certain areas. The overlay
zone sits on top of the underlying zone and the what we are trying to create is an
overlay zone that is framed to pick up guidelines that appear in a master plan
and plug them into the right slot in the zone in the way the zone is written. So,
you could take your framework in the zone and it refers back to the master plan
in particular areas and you will do what the master plan says in terms of
percentage of open space, lot sizes, student housing, so its a unique tool. One of
the advantages of the overlay zone is it is automatically affected in other words
as soon as the master plan is completed if you have the zone crafted, it goes
into effect like that [right away]. Timing can be very important.

RG: could you discuss how you use dedication?

CP2: what happens is the developer comes in and wants to; happens during
preliminary planning; review development and if the master plan says that a
portion of be used to be parkland we ask for it as a dedication.

RG: has it been challenged in court?

CP2: i'm not that familiar with its history, but you can probably expect that
almost anything we do here will be challenged in the courts first off there are
cases i would imagine where there is no problem, what is being asked for is a
stream buffer to create a continuous linear park and its an area that wouldn't
otherwise be used and it goes into park maintenance and homeowners wouldn't
be responsible for it; in some situations it is a win/win.

RG: is it a form of exaction?

CP2: i don't use that term, I not comfortable using that term, I'm not sure of the
implications of it. Jeff can clarify that for you. Clearly, there has to be a
relationship between what you ask for and what the developer wants to do. And
so what i am doing in sandy spring the issue has come up whether or not this
hundred plus acres around the sandy spring we want to keep open is going to
stay open as a result of a dedication or as a result of simply going in the hands
of homeowners association or acquisition. We generally understand under very
low yield scenarios, it is probably unrealistic to accept it as a dedication. There is
always the case of the developer thinking/feeling for what ever reason he wants
to see that in parkland he is not going to be building on it anyway but it is a little
hard to explain what your basis is for asking for it when there are 50 houses
being built and your asking for 100 acres of open space, there has to be a
proportional relationship there.

RG: it seems that most of the discussion has focused on residential
development; how is commercial development handled?

CP2: let me think, in sandy spring; that's a very good question, this is a very
small scale area and has a little village center, and there has been some
discussion whether or not there should be a village green. And if there is, how
are you going to get it in an area where the property is zoned commercial. I don't
know the answer to that. We haven't really addressed it. We haven't agreed on
whether not the village green idea needs to be emphasized in the master plan or
could it happen on its own. That may be more easily answered by someone who
is involved with clarksburg, where they are seeing an influx of commercial
development, lynn coleman or john carter would be who you need to ask.

RG: has clustering been successful; have developers been using it.

CP2: well that's a good question, we have been asking ourselves that actually. I
can't answer that, when I started on this plan though we took a look at the logan
cluster option to see if that was being used, we have cluster options in a lot of
places, a lot of medium density residential zones. I was only looking in logan, we
actually convened a group of developers and asked them that question because
we wanted to understand if they would use it. What I heard from the group,
which came from the suburban maryland ____ association, was that yeah they
like the cluster and that they felt the market in mont co is so strong for housing it
was hardly an issue of whether or not they could market their homes in the low
density cluster option. The way those zones are set up, the smallest lot size is
still of a size that made the house very marketable. Now I want out to tried to
find developments that were developed using the cluster option and that was a
little harder under the low density cluster option which is under one for one or
one for two acres.

RG: how long have you been with mont co park and planning?

CP2: six years, and I have been working as a community planner/designer for
two years or so.

RG: what is your opinion on the economic benefits of open space?

CP2: well, it seems to me that open space is highly valued in mont co. And the
extent that a developer can provide access to it, views of it, improves the value
of the property. There is always that conflict between new development sitting on
somebody else's open space that they want to be looking at. And I think that is
just a consequential issue. I do believe in the capital; free market economy and
that would if it truly were an economic generator then you would have it [open
space] there and then we wouldn't need to have this discussion. It has to do with
perceived benefit and where they show up and they might not show up directly in
the pockets of the people who are making the decision. There is another way to
keep open space is to just leave it up to the person who bought it. Some people
clearly have kept farms; in certain areas farms read as open space. They really
are under human cultivation they've been changed there not in there natural
state but you could argue there are people who do farming even though there is
a higher economic value changing to something else.

RG: do you see this as an issue of public education as far as planning is
concerned; the benefits of maintaining open space as farmland for aesthetics,
cultural, quality of life.

CP2: we have people who of their own are choosing are continuing to farm their
property because that’s what they want to do.

RG: if you were to take a new position with a county that is on the suburban
fringe and has not been involved with pros planning but is seeing the need, how
would you go about setting up a new pros. what support would you like to see?
CP2: the first thing I would do is go out into the community and find out what their issues were. What do you, why are you, when are you looking for; then I would want to find out the flood areas, get an idea of where the priorities are, and if it turns out that there areas should be preserved and recreational facilities. First you have to understand the land and the environment, and probably also the region because it may be that; in the region and what the development pressures are going to be. In terms of tools, I think it is very important to use tools that exist; that are appropriate too, we have very many tools in mont co that are appropriate to mont co and it would be wonderful just start a list of tools but it is very important I think in an area to get a sense of what level of complexity can be tolerated because we have a very strong government, and in other areas some of the tools would not be tolerated. I think I would also look at mechanisms that are not government generated. I think there should be a community driven effort to protect open space and the tools where people pool their resources; there are towns in new england where the residents decide they want to buy it and preserve it.

RG: [conversation]

CP2: I think the idea of doing a master plan designating certain areas to remain open is really important land use; and I would certainly look at cluster if there is already development potential. One thing I think is really important is good coordination between county and towns or lower jurisdictions. Because you can end up with a town annexing; that happens a lot in our county. Because the developer was unable to get what he wanted from the county.

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

CONVERSATION WITH CP2

rg: From your perspective as a community planner, how do you define open space?

CP2: um, as a planner we could probably sit down and come up with a definition; we have a glossary of planning terms that we produced; I will tell you personally I consider it to be property that is not developed with structures. In general, without closed structures: it could include plazas, stream valleys, farms, the surface of a pond; there is a further definition which is rural open space which is a really important part of the plan we are working on and we are defining that I little more closely; but because we looking at rural open space we are including farms.

RG: as far as your planning efforts go, lets say for example you wanted in this new district you are working on that any new roads that are put in that they have a hundred foot buffer on either side that is naturally vegetated. Would that then be considered as open space?

CP2: yeah
RG: is that land accounted for under the parks definition of open space?

CP2: No that would be private. Technically speaking, if you have a big lawn, if you have a house on a five acre piece of property, you have a house set in open space. In our discussion in my plan, we acknowledge the fact that when you have a house on large property you have preserved open space on the lot, but what we say is the character of the open space does not reflect the rural setting because it is lawn, but technically it is open space.

RG: the function of that open land acts the same as far as stormwater infiltration and

CP2: from an environmental point of view it does, from a regulatory pt of view or a land use pt of view it would not show up on our land use maps as open space. It is a fluid term. If you want to define it in the context of the zoning ordinances or land use maps it will have a very tight definition; but the way we use to capture the idea that there are no buildings on the land; we don't consider parking lots as open space. [Laughter]

RG: I guess what you are saying if you were going to have a statistic for the county that said this is the amount of land in open space you are more likely to get a number that the parks people use then the number that is, I don't know how to say it maybe realistic because of some of the undeveloped lands that don't get classified as open space. Would you agree with that?

CP2: ah, I not sure I would agree; let me phrase in a way that I am comfortable with. If you a parks department number for open space, you need to find out from them if they are talking about publicly owned open space.

RG: okay

CP2: that's what you want to know because that is their mission, it doesn't mean that they are defining it differently as planners, but based on their mission, that's what would be most important to them. Um, if you, you could also say what land in the county is committed open space, and then you would get both the public and private. So where we require stream buffers to remain in open space,

RG: it may be held privately but it is still committed as open land.

CP2: yeah, or is going to be, or conservation easements, we generally do not consider lots, med or large to be considered open space.

RG: a lot of the literature suggests that Montgomery County's planning efforts is a growth management strategy, would you say that your efforts in open space planning contribute to this philosophy of growth management?

CP2: their consistent with it but they ar, that was not why we developed [] in this plan. The purpose was to preserve rural character, the actual yield dwelling units, is not necessarily going to be any different it might even be a little higher, so the way we are looking at it is not being used for growth management in the sense of the amount of growth, it's definitely is managing where it goes.
RG: and that by definition is growth management, where your directing, and the
timing

CP2: right, in the micro scale.

RG: it doesn't have as big an influence as say infrastructure improvements?

CP2: yeah,...

rg: in the general plan there are several goals, objectives and strategies listed,
how influential are they in your process of developing a master plan.

CP2: well, we address all those goals and objectives

rg: individually?

CP2: well, not all of them but we address how we comply with the general plan. I
should say this: the value and the culture of the planners here is such that they
are very well represented in the general plan which we certainly had a part in
developing, so I almost feel that the general plan refinement codified and
validated things we were already trying to accomplish. So it is not like going to
another document and say how are we going to accomplish it; it is so much a
part of the value and culture here.

RG: if I understand what I read in the gp right, it is a document that sets a
framework for you to develop your master plan but your master plan then in
effect evolve the general plan.

CP2: yes, exactly, exactly. We can work on the whole master plan and then go
back at the end of the process and say how have we done with the gp and it fits
so incredibly well. There is a lot of cohesion. How you interpret it, how you
resolve unique tradeoffs is the master plan issue; you can't do everything you're
going to have to make hard choices.

RG: priorities etcetera

CP2: exactly

rg: do you consider the pros plan objectives when you develop your master
plan?

CP2: we have parks department staff on our team.

RG: oh you do.

CP2: we rely on them very heavily to provide us with that sort of guidance, they
open up the pros plan, that is there, they're our link to the pros plan.

RG: that was my next question is how do you, what is your relationship with
them throughout your process.
CP2: they have been involved throughout the process, since the very beginning. Especially since there is such a significant open space issue. Yeah definitely.

RG: how does the montgomery county parks, the whole recreation and open space system compare with neighboring jurisdictions in your opinion.

CP2: I don’t have much of a frame of reference because.. I think we have a wonderful system. I have seen a difference in scope and level; that is the most striking difference that I can think of.

RG: what makes you say that it is wonderful?

CP2: well I understand that we have a very extensive parks system, and one that was developed with a lot of foresight. There has been a lot of property purchased and held for a variety of valid reasons; we seem to have a lot of parks in neighborhoods too in addition to the regional ones. And the regional parks have very good facilities.

RG: you said foresight; is that what made this happen you think?

CP2: probably because in the down county area there is a lot of development so that land would need to be set aside early on

CP2: they are sprinkled everywhere, I have a little park right across from my house; it is a leftover street that was never built. Yeah there are parks everywhere.

RG: it makes for a nicer, better quality of life I guess

CP2: yeah, but I can’t quantify it.

CONVERSATION WITH PP2

RG: From your perspective as a park planner, what is your definition of open space?

PP2: um okay Raw undeveloped land. Raw but them i’m taking in terms of development, ah open space can be both developed and undeveloped open space um the implication is there is very little development on it.

RG: the numbers that get reported for the county as lands that are in open space is that land that is held by you folks or is there a broader category

PP2: where was this number

rg: I took it from the pros plan
PP2: it probably includes I would have to go back and look and it probably includes federal and state lands in there. Is it a number over around 27,000 acres?

RG: yeah, yeah

PP2: okay it is definitely fed and state land in there

RG: okay

RG: land that doesn’t come; say is dedicated to a homeowners association that is not accounted for in any of the numbers correct?

PP2: that is correct. Land that is dedicated to homeowners is not counted.

RG: so you could actually be building up a significant amount of preserved open space that is going unaccounted for or is there another way to account for that?

PP2: ah there is no real easy way to do it, the land is recorded under an HOA name so conceivably if you have a sophisticated computer system you could find out

RG: yeah. okay

PP2: but the reality is it has never been tracked.

RG: in the pros plan it list some objectives; um it lists objectives, how influential are they in helping you do your daily job.

PP2: I have to look at them I can’t remember everything.

RG: I think there on pg 11.

PP2: goals and objectives; I would say we don’t look at them everyday, I know what they are, a lot of it is what we do automatically. So yes they are important.

RG: and then right behind those are the goals and objectives of the general plan, do they influence what you do?

PP2: [looks at goals and objectives] well, it sort of reiterates what we have been doing and puts it in a written statement, we have been doing this all along. Ah, there is nothing new in there that is not something that we haven’t been doing.

RG: can you explain your relationship with the community planners, how do you interact, interface with them.

PP2: sure, the obvious one is they are a different department, same agency different department. Particularly for area master plans that deals with a certain area of the county, I am working on some more right now. Our relationship is we a part of the team effort that goes into making these documents, with the responsibility for the park and recreation section given to us and to me for the areas that I work on. They will often ask certain questions which I need to
respond to; if they come up with their own ideas they’ll ask “how do you like this” and I’ll respond to that. It’s a good working relationship generally. There have been problems in the past but that is because of differences of opinion but we do interact a lot with them in the area master plans, we interact with them in terms of the subdivision process and I’m trying to think what else.

RG: do you influence the subdivision requirements or regulations?

PP2: somewhat, okay because the way there are certain restrictions we have in place and so they are well aware of those restrictions too. Um but yes we do.

RG: okay, all right um one of the things in the general plan states that their planning efforts are described as growth management strategy, do you see what you are doing in pros planning as contributing to that idea of growth management?

PP2: [hesitation] uh, yeah in some degree yes; it’s part of the entire process but the biggest impact is through the zoning and land use pattern.

RG: let me try to pinpoint this a little more, do you think what you do is more proactive or reactive in your job.

PP2: oh it is more proactive. We have crisis but most of my, I work on other things besides long range planning issues I work short term issues. They are the ones that

rg: can become a little more reactive?

PP2: right.

RG: and that is the list you have in front of you for things to do.

PP2: that’s right

rg: you had mention that dedication is how you get most of your land and that’s basically if I had 100 acres I was going to build on the subdivision would tell me how much I would have to set aside is that correct?

PP2: well some jurisdictions have a subdivision regulation that say x amount of acres to park land basically the zoning regulations in the county for certain types of zones have percentages of open space, generally, what happens is that these developers will donate their open portion if not all of the open space to our department particularly if it adjoins existing parks. And it is within our take times. Where we get into a discussion with them is ; sometimes they want us to pick up other land that is more really more appropriately owned by HOA’s. That is usually resolved in the subdivision process.

RG: do you ever request money in lieu of land

PP2: no, we don’t have that option.
RG: okay

rg: so even if the land doesn't fit your plan

PP2: well we don't have to take it we only go after what is in our acquisition lines or what makes sense in terms of is it adjacent

rg: connected spaces?

PP2: right, right that's critical plus the other thing that is critical is we don't want to own a piece of land that is 20 feet wide and goes behind house,

rg: right

PP2: in some cases it may make somewhat sense, but in our case it is impossible to maintain or get access to so that's one of the problems.

rg: how does your park system compare to the neighboring park systems versus say prince george, fairfax, loudon,

PP2: well we have more land then any of them.

RG: why have you been able to do that?

PP2: we have been very aggressive in terms of acquisition and development. We have more land and facilities. Our population is high too but population aside we have been very aggressive um the park system has always been a major factor.

RG: so you have the commitment of funds and personnel?

PP2: that's right, and don't forget in VA your talking bond issues for acquisition and development.

RG: and where you are it's part of the property tax

PP2: it's part of the property tax um and plus are revenue that we get from program open space.

RG: who does the director of parks report to?

PP2: the director of parks reports to the park commission/montgomery county planning board.

RG: I think that's it

PP2: yeah, if you take a look at um all the areas in terms of acres we are one of the largest, but then because of people have been very aggressive, um we have we have always had some type of long range planning too even before we had a master plan we always knew what our land acquisition is going to be. If we cant buy it outright, we generally acquire it through the subdivision process any land that comes up for development because most of these development projects are
um fall under zoning classification that we can get the open space dedicated to
us.

RG: do you find it is happening at all through commercial development at all?

PP2: ah very little. um the cbd the central business district land is very
expensive we're talking 4-500 dollars per square foot. Um we haven't gotten that
much dedication in terms of open space.

RG: what about industrial parks, are they contributing

PP2: no they haven't contributed

rg: thanks pp2 blah blah blah.

CONVERSATION WITH CP1

rg: During our previous discussion, i had asked you if you consider your efforts
in open space planning to be a component of growth management efforts and
you had suggested that yes it was.

CP1: are you including agriculture preservation as open space planning.

RG: i'm concentration on parks, recreation, and open space.

CP1: well sure, I mean we always consider how parks work as buffers and
shapers of our urban development everywhere we go.

RG: let me get a little more specific, brower and godschalk have a definition that
says growth management influences the rate, location, type, amount, and cost.
With your open space planning which of the variables does it effect?

CP1: location

rg: does it affect the rate at all?

CP1: no, I mean if we put a park in, it doesn't mean that the rate of growth will
be higher or lower. It might be more expensive when it comes in but the general
market circumstances control rate.

RG: the amount?

CP1: no, the amount of growth is controlled by those areas that you do not
designate as open space. It's the negative [laughter] and price, well again, we
would like to think that the amount of public investment we put into our open
space does reflect in the market values of the properties that surround that open
space. We have never proven that in an academic paper, but I think that's sort
of a philosophical belief. By God, I wish we could prove that.

RG: that would take a lot of work.
CP1: it really does because all circumstances are local and all circumstances are different. You couldn’t prove that a lack of a park in potomac would have decreased prices or the presence of one increased prices.

RG: the objectives and goals that are stated in the general plan, how closely are they followed in the day to day work your area planners are doing?

CP1: well pretty much I mean everybody has to at first at least reflect on the issues. am I violating the general plan by doing this? But sometimes it’s a quick no sometimes its a more thoughtful no. It depends upon the scope of the project and the scale of what you are analyzing. It’s hard to say that an individual special exception for a doctor’s office would violate the general plan unless you had 20 of them in one area. It’s generally a quick no; but certainly when we get the request to put in a huge school complex in the agricultural wedge we go through that in spades to see how bad it will be, what it will really mean, is it a terrible thing. We do violate more, if you will, for public purposes, but that is one of those outs in the general plan. That is within our agricultural wedge we have a resource recovery area if you read that as solid waste, trash, composting, incineration, you know a lot of those things if they were private would be considered industrial. It is one of those necessities of life.

RG: you have to handle your trash somehow.

CP1: or store it in your basement until you move.

RG: how does Montgomery County’s PROS compare to neighboring jurisdictions, pg, loudon, fairfax

CP1: I think within prince george’s county you will find inside the beltway our achievements are fairly similar and that’s because um they took advantage of the same monies that were available in 1927 that we did. So typically their downstream streams are all in parks. I really don’t know how we compare with the others in terms of the percentage of our total land in parks or the percentage of our streams in parks. But I think we are enormously successful, we are helped not only by our own efforts as an agency but we have the C&O canal federal park along one border and we have a fairly significant Seneca State park up near germantown.

RG: one thing I noticed is Capper crampton only gave a very small percentage of your overall open space. What has made you successful, enabled you to put away so much land?

CP1: I think it is in underlying political value that what makes Montgomery County a good place to live is its parks so that there was always a political will to get the money and um and to make sure the natural resources were preserved was critical. Even when the direct budget line item doesn’t say build a park here for the last I guess 1970 we have had something call advanced land acquisition so if the master plan says it should be a park even if though its not in the capital improvements plan program when the thing is put up for sale or it is threatened by development we can go in and buy it in advance of the capital program. That has been an enormous advantage and its a revolving fund, so as soon as that
park does come in the CIP we then pay that fund back and have more money for that fund to go buy other land in advance of need. A great program.

RG: so is that helping ensure future success?

CP1: yes, that's not only for parks, that's also for any public infrastructure?

CP1: yes, I mean we're saving portions for the intercounty connector that way, we reserve future fire stations and police stations that way.

RG: good!
## APPENDIX III

This appendix contains the categories and the associated labels that make up the category. They are grouped alphabetically by category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>active recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>ball field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>equestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>handball court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>paddle tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>roller blading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>soccer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>street hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td>trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>connectivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
design  density
design  facilitate
design  feature
design  grade
design  green corridor
design  greenway
design  idea
design  interconnected
design  instead
design  linear park
design  link
design  local park
design  maintain
design  maintenance
design  public rights of way
design  recreation
design  trail
design  transit oriented development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>invest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>parking fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>real estate value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>enviro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>environmental quality corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>eqc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>natural resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>stream valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>utility corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>wildlife corridor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiscal</td>
<td>acquire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiscal</td>
<td>bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiscal</td>
<td>budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiscal</td>
<td>capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiscal</td>
<td>capital improvements program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiscal</td>
<td>cip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiscal</td>
<td>commission bonding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiscal</td>
<td>cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiscal</td>
<td>federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>homeowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>homeowner association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

fiscal fiscal
fiscal funding
fiscal money
fiscal operating
fiscal project
fiscal real estate transfer tax
fiscal recreation offset impact
fiscal tax
fiscal usage fee
fiscal user fee
people immigrant
people landowner
people local
people maintain
people neighbor
people neighborhood
people pedestrian
people people
people population
people psychological
people public
people quality of life
people residential
people sensitive
people user

Category Label
political incumbent
political  government
political  interagency
political  istea
political  money
political  national
political  plan
political  political
political  tax

Category  Label
private  audobon
private  donat
private  iniative
private  land trust
private  private
private  sierra
private  watchdog group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>ada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>capper crampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>cultural resource protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>high rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>impact fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>istea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>land water conservation act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>regulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory</td>
<td>water conservation fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>edge cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>educate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>enterprise division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>floating symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>godschalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>growth management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>master plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>park system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic</td>
<td>plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strategic  proportional
strategic  pros
strategic  region
strategic  science
strategic  strategic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>survey</td>
<td>community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey</td>
<td>data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey</td>
<td>issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey</td>
<td>needs assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey</td>
<td>park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey</td>
<td>participation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey</td>
<td>standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey</td>
<td>statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey</td>
<td>survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey</td>
<td>trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>acquire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>bought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>buy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>conservation easement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>density credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>donat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>fee simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>green corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>impact fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>land trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool</td>
<td>negotiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision</td>
<td>attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision</td>
<td>beyond six years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision</td>
<td>cheap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision</td>
<td>comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision</td>
<td>diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision</td>
<td>fifteen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vision forecast
vision future
vision idea
vision knowledge
vision long range
vision model
vision planning area
vision population
vision priorities
vision project
vision ten
vision vision

category label
zoning cluster
zoning commercial
zoning density
zoning industrial
zoning  land use
zoning  land-use
zoning  overlay
zoning  pd
zoning  re2
zoning  tdr
zoning  traditional
zoning  zoning
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