

**MEMORANDUM**

April 29, 2010

TO: Public Safety Committee

FROM: Linda McMillan, Senior Legislative Analyst 

SUBJECT: **FY11 Operating Budget: M-NCPPC Park Police** (includes discussion of Park Police/County Police Consolidation and Deer Management) – **Continued from April 28th**

***Expected for this worksession:***

Royce Hanson, Chair, Montgomery County Planning Board  
Mary Bradford, Director, M-NCPPC Parks Department  
Chief Darien Manley, M-NCPPC Park Police  
John Hench, Chief, Park and Planning Stewardship Division  
Alex Espinoza, Office of Management and Budget  
Assistant Chief Betsy Davis, Montgomery County Police Department

The Committee began its review of the Park Police budget at its April 28<sup>th</sup> session. Council staff suggests the following order for this discussion.

1. Complete Committee recommendations on changes/reductions to the Park Police budget that are proposed in order to meet the March 15<sup>th</sup> budget allocation.
2. Complete Committee recommendation on how to allocate the Executive's \$2 million budget reduction that he attributes to consolidation of Park Police and County Police functions.
3. Discuss how the Council should proceed with the proposal to consolidate Park Police and County Police functions.

The full Council is scheduled to review the Park and Planning budget at it May 10<sup>th</sup> worksession.

## 1. Park Police Budget – Meeting the March 15<sup>th</sup> allocation

### Overview (©1-2)

Park and Planning's **original** recommended budget asked for \$13.379 million for the Park Police which would support 119.6 net workyears after lapse. The original budget request asked for four new Park Police Officers to handle growth in the parks over the last several years.

M-NCPPC Park Police					ORIGINAL	
in \$000s	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	%Change
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Approved	Recommend	FY09-10
Personnel	9,576	10,487	10,393	11,569	12,222	5.6%
Operating	783	839	1305	942	1,057	12.2%
Capital	171	66	135	-	100	na
(other)	-					
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10,530</b>	<b>11,392</b>	<b>11,833</b>	<b>12,511</b>	<b>13,379</b>	<b>6.9%</b>
Workyears	117.5	112.9	114.7	115.6	119.6	3.5%

Park and Planning has submitted to the Council \$14.5 million in reductions that would be taken in order to meet the Executive's recommended FY11 allocation to Park and Planning. The PHED Committee accepted this package of reductions at their April 26<sup>th</sup> worksession, but noted that the Public Safety Committee would give further review to the items related to Park Police. The reductions include:

Item	Amount	Comment
Cost of Living Adjustment for FOP Members	\$230,000	Eliminates a COLA for FOP. The recommendation requires renegotiation of the FOP contract. If an agreement cannot be reached, 5 positions would have to be reduced to reach an equivalent savings.
Furlough	not broken out for Park Police	All employees will be required to take 10 days of furlough without pay. Requires renegotiation of contract with FOP.
Eliminate Park Ranger Program	\$187,400	Park Police will address complaints as time allows. Permanent and seasonal positions.
Reduce Park Police Horse Mounted Patrol and clothing allowance and horse care	\$364,900 7 positions eliminated 7 wys remaining	Eliminate 50% of this special operations unit. Reduced trail and park patrol which substantially impacts the ability to patrol certain park areas. Loss of support to County Police for searches and reduced crowd control capability.
Reduce Park Police Patrol and clothing allowance	\$536,400 12 positions eliminated 40 workyears remaining	Reduce prevention, education, outreach, community meetings, and hotspot patrols. Reduced police officer participation at Long Branch Community Center and other parks. May impact crime, safety, and utilization of the parks.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,318,700</b>	<b>Does not include savings/impacts from furloughs</b>

## Authorized Officer Complement

The original proposed budget would have provided an authorized police officer complement of 101 Park Police Officers. If current lapse is continued and the previously listed reductions are taken, the complement will be 70 Park Police Officers.

Original Park and Planning Recommendation	101 Officers
Less 4 new positions in original request	-4
Less positions being held vacant to meet lapse requirement	-9
Less Mounted Patrol reduction	-6
Less Patrol reduction	-12
<b>FY11 Authorized Complement</b>	<b>70 Officers</b>

**Before discussing the budget issues raised by Council staff, Council staff suggests that the Committee review the 2009 crime report (© 9-10) with Chief Manley so that the Committee members have context for understanding the current crime and other policing issues facing the department and what the impacts may be from the proposed reductions.**

### *Issues for discussion:*

1. Do the budget savings for Mounted Patrol and Patrol assumed that officers will be reduced through attrition or will there be a reduction in force of Police Officers?

*At the April 28<sup>th</sup> session the Committee was told that the required savings cannot be met through attrition and so some number of RIFs will be necessary. Officers will also be offered the Retirement Incentive Program in hopes that some reductions can come through retirements. Park and Planning asked whether, given the discussion about consolidation, Park Police Officers that would be RIF-ed might be able to continue in support of county police functions.*

2. How does Park and Planning expect to implement a 10 day furlough for the remaining Officers? Is there any provision for additional overtime that may be needed to cover shortfalls?

*The Committee was told that all personnel will be subject to the 10 day furlough and that all efforts would be made to carefully schedule to avoid the use of overtime.*

3. What is Park and Planning's initial thinking on how patrol will be reduced? Will beats have to be combined in order to have adequate coverage? Will patrol be a respond to call operation? Can the impact be adjusted from the summer months to the winter months to respond to the seasonal use of the parks?

*The Committee was told that there may be impacts on special units and that at times patrols beats may have to be combined. Parks will look at the issue of seasonal park use but noted that in the winter months when park use is down is when the Police Officers have completed required training and participated in deer management efforts.*

## Deer Management

Last November, the PS Committee held its annual discussion on deer management. At that meeting, the Committee discussed the information provided in an August letter to Councilmembers Andrews and Knapp about the next six sites that would be addressed if additional funds were made available and the criteria for picking these sites. (© 11-15). The costs were provided more as the “average” cost per site, rather than the marginal costs as it was noted in the discussion that to undertake any new site would require additional staff for coordination of the efforts, especially since the down-county sites are complicated in terms of securing the area to be hunted.

Item	Amount	Comment
Furlough	not broken out	All employees will be required to take 10 days of furlough without pay.
Eliminate and Reduce Contracts	\$6,000 in supplies and \$32,200 in contractual charges	Defer infra red survey of deer population in county parks that provides data needed for management plans.
Reduce Deer Management Program	\$43,700 1 workyear reduction 1 workyear remaining	Reduced deer management efforts could mean increases degradation of natural areas, losses to the agricultural community, and increased deer related collisions. Program would lose momentum it has gained in last 14 years.

### Council staff recommendation:

- **Place \$81,900 on the reconciliation list to keep the deer management program at its current level of effort.** The deer population grows very quickly and reducing the ability to thin the population will lead to increased crop and plant damage and most likely will lead to increased deer vehicle collisions. A one year reduction in effort could take multiple years to overcome.
- **Ask Park and Planning whether Park Police Officer reductions can be done in two phases in order to assess actual savings** – Park and Planning has proposed a reduction of 18 Park Police Officers with the savings based on an average cost of \$43,700 per workyear. This average of \$43,700 is an agency-wide average, not the average cost of a Park Police Officer. The savings from the reduction of a Park Police Officer will be higher than \$43,700. Council staff is concerned savings from abolishing 18 positions will be larger than required and unnecessarily impact the number of Officers on the force. If it is possible, Council staff suggests that Park and Planning begin by abolishing 12 positions and reassess the savings achieved. If additional savings are needed, then additional positions could be abolished.

*Council staff notes that the PHED Committee has placed \$500,000 on the reconciliation list for Park and Planning for Park and Planning’s highest priority which is restoration a part of the \$1.3 million reduction proposed for maintenance.*

## 2. Assignment of \$2 Million Budget Savings from Consolidation

At the April 28<sup>th</sup> session the Committee was informed by the County's Office of Management and Budget that they expect that about \$1.4 million of the \$2 million proposed reduction would come from elimination of the County Police Department's January recruit class because Park Police Officers would be redeployed to support County Police functions, about \$500,000 would be a reduction to Park and Planning because communications staff would be reassigned to the County E911 Center, and about \$100,000 would come from unidentified additional consolidation savings. OMB will be providing the Council with written information on the proposal.

At the PHED Committee session, Park and Planning shared that they do not believe there will be such a savings in FY11 and asked that, if an additional reduction must be attributed to the Park and Planning budget, they just be given a bottom line number and they will come to the Council with another package of recommendations. They did however note the disproportionate percentage budget reduction that has already been assigned to Park and Planning and in particular to the Park Police in comparison to the County Police.

**Council staff, while supportive of planning a consolidation, continues to doubt that \$2 million in savings can be achieved in FY11. However, the Council must track the Executive's proposed adjustment in its macro tracking so a decision must be made on how to do so.**

### **Council staff recommends the following:**

- Reduce the budget of the County Police Department by \$1,500,000 (\$1.4 million for recruit class and \$100,000 in unidentified savings) to reflect that it was the Executive's intent that most of the budget savings would be realized from a reduction in county appropriation and not appropriation to the Park and Planning Commission. *(Council staff notes that the PS Committee has asked for some options related to the County Police recruit classes that may impact this item as well.)*
- Reduce the budget of the Park and Planning Commission by \$500,000 in recognition that the Executive's intent is that at least this amount of savings was to come from appropriation to Park and Planning.
- Place both of these items on the reconciliation list and work to see if other adjustments made throughout the aggregate budget can offset these reductions as they are unlikely to be realized.
- If the Council is unable to offset most or all the reductions to County Police and Park Police, then the PS and PHED Committees should schedule a joint worksession for October to review what savings have been accomplished or to review savings plans from the Executive and Park and Planning to show how they will meet the bottom line appropriations.

### 3. Potential Merger of Park Police and County Police Functions

At the April 26<sup>th</sup> session, the Committee discussed the possibility of consolidation of Park Police and County Police and an alternative proposal presented by the Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge 30, which would reduce duplication by consolidating the Montgomery County Park Police and Prince George's County Park Police into a single police agency that would report to the Bi-County Central Administrative Services. The FOP proposal is attached at ©16-17. The Committee heard from Chairman Hanson, Parks Director Bradford, and Chief Manley their concerns about misguided conclusions regarding cost savings, impact on employees, legal issues, and impacts on the safety of the park that could lead to a decline in park use.

As noted in the April 26<sup>th</sup> packet, Council believes there is merit to consolidating Park Police and County Police functions in many areas. However, Council staff believes the Council should be able to review a detailed transition plan on consolidating these policing agencies. The plan must:

- Show how consideration has been given to each of the duties of the Park Police and how they have either been assigned to another agency, how they would remain in Park and Planning, or whether the duty or function would be completely eliminated.
- Identify how personnel would either be transferred to another agency or continue their duties in Park and Planning. It must identify when changes can be made by contract or memorandum of understanding, when such agreements can be approved by the Montgomery County Planning Board, and when an agreement would require Bi-county approval. It must discuss any potential requirements for collective bargaining.
- Identify whether there is an expectation that reductions in personnel will be made through attrition and when there would likely be a reduction-in-force.
- Inform the Council, Executive, and Park and Planning about expected cost savings and long term changes in costs that would be expected based on which personnel system or other operation (such as fleet management) is used.

Council staff will provide the Committee with draft language at the session that might be included in appropriation resolutions that would outline how the Council wants to proceed with this issue (it will include reference to the FOP Lodge 30 proposal).

**PARK POLICE**

Summary of Annual Comparisons by Major Object	Actual FY08	Actual FY09	Budget FY10	Proposed FY11
<b>Personnel Services</b>	\$10,487,280	\$10,393,232	\$11,569,800	\$12,221,900
<b>Supplies &amp; Materials</b>	\$551,817	\$968,797	\$630,800	\$746,300
<b>Other Services &amp; Charges</b>	\$286,765	\$335,785	\$311,400	\$311,400
<b>Capital Outlay</b>	\$65,596	\$135,467	\$0	\$100,000
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$11,391,458</b>	<b>\$11,833,281</b>	<b>\$12,512,000</b>	<b>\$13,379,600</b>
<b>Chargebacks</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11,391,458</b>	<b>\$11,833,281</b>	<b>\$12,512,000</b>	<b>\$13,379,600</b>
<b>Positions/Workyears Full Time Career</b>	120.00 116.60	122.00 119.32	122.00 120.11	126.00 124.11
<b>Positions/Workyears Part-Time Career</b>	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00
<b>Positions/Workyears Total Career</b>	<b>120.00 116.60</b>	<b>122.00 119.32</b>	<b>122.00 120.11</b>	<b>126.00 124.11</b>
<b>Positions/Workyears Term Contract</b>	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00
<b>Seasonal/Intermittent</b>	4.95	4.50	4.50	4.50
<b>Chargebacks</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Less Normal Lapse</b>	(8.70)	(9.10)	(9.05)	(9.00)
<b>Workyears Total</b>	<b>112.85</b>	<b>114.72</b>	<b>115.56</b>	<b>119.61</b>

**DIVISION GOAL**

To enforce rules and regulations and protect the patrons, properties, resources and activities within the Montgomery County park system.

**DIVISION OVERVIEW**

The Division is committed to providing professional public safety services with a focus on community interaction, active park patrols, and comprehensive officer training, which provides a crime prevention and detection approach that ensures a safe park system.

The Park Police Division is divided into two branches:

The **Support Operations branch** which includes Investigative Services, Support Services, and Technical Services, and the **Field Operations branch** which includes Patrol Services, Special Services and Special Operations functions.

The use of bicycle, all terrain vehicle, marine, K-9, and horse-mounted officers demonstrates the unique variety of resources the Park Police deploy to ensure that populated as well as isolated areas of the park system are patrolled. The Division's staff complement, prior to lapse and mandatory reductions is 101 sworn officers, 25 civilians, 7 seasonal personnel (4.5 WYs) and approximately 35 volunteers for FY11.

**FY11 MAJOR CHANGES**

- Four new officer workyears are included in the proposed FY11 staff complement. This unfunded obligation request is supported by the increase in parkland, the expansion of existing parks with new amenities, and newly developed parks through the CIP. These facilities and amenities include a trail extension at Black Hill; the opening of dog exercise areas at Olney Manor, Randolph Hills, and Cabin John Regional Park; a new parking lot at the Green Farm Conservation Park; new trailhead parking at Little Bennett Regional Park; a new basketball court at Ridge Road Recreational Park; the opening of new facilities at Woodstock Equestrian Park; construction at Aurora Hills with ball fields, basketball



court, playground, tot lot, picnic shelters, pergolas, and parking lot; Clarksburg Greenway trail; the opening of Clarksburg Village Local Park; Dowden's Ordinary, a historical site; and the Indian Spring trail connector at Northwest Branch. Funding for these obligations includes \$267,600 in personnel services, \$115,500 in supplies and materials and \$100,000 in capital outlay.



**MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**  
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

**OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN**

April 23, 2010

The Honorable Nancy Floreen  
President, Montgomery County Council  
Rockville, Maryland

Via email

President Floreen and Members of the County Council:

In his latest letter describing the county's fiscal situation, the County Executive recommended the elimination of the Montgomery County Division of the Park Police of the Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission, suggesting that Park Police functions could and should be performed by the County's Police Department. This is proposed ostensibly to save \$2 million in FY 2011. I was asked to support this action.

I cannot in good conscience do so, and I urge that it be resisted. Since I shall soon leave the Commission, I have no personal stake in the outcome, but think it so contrary to the public interest that I cannot remain silent.

It is bad public policy and bad management.

It imperils the safety of park users, especially in down-county parks.

It will not save money. Rather, it will ultimately increase costs. This proposal is not about saving money. It is another attempt by the Executive to wrest power over the park system and park land. There has been no underlying analysis of the assumptions used to reach the purported savings nor any impact statement.

It cannot be achieved without change in state law. And even if it were desirable, it could not be accomplished in the next fiscal year, and therefore, it should not be relied on to reduce the 2011 proposed budget.

At a minimum, a policy with such far-reaching consequences should not be made on the basis of a bare assertion late in the budget cycle when there is no opportunity for full public discussion.

If the Executive is genuinely interested in saving money and creating greater operational efficiencies for park and recreation facilities and programs, the Commission stands ready to provide even greater savings than claimed here by merging the Recreation Department into the Department of Parks, as was done almost 40 years ago in Prince George's County.

**This proposal imperils the safety and convenience of the park system.** The mission of the Park Police is to ensure that park users have a safe and enjoyable experience in over 400 active park sites and some 35,000 acres of parkland, including an extensive park trail system that requires bike and horseback patrols. Other jurisdictions that have merged park police into the regular police department have experienced a deterioration of park safety. This results from the absence of a police force specially trained and dedicated to working with park users, and whose officers regard their presence in the parks and responding to service calls concerning parks as their top priority. Regular police departments and their officers tend to place a lower priority on affirmative measures of park protection. Our Parks Department is the most highly honored in the nation by its peers, having won 5 gold medals of the National Recreation and Parks Association. A key to repeatedly winning this top honor is the existence and excellence of the Park Police as a unit dedicated to parks and under the jurisdiction of the Commission. The Park Police are no luxury. They are integral to the quality of parks, which county citizens rank as their most used and highly regarded public service, according to the County's latest survey.

**The Proposal will not save money.** The Executive asserts the merger of Park Police into the County Police Department will save \$2 million in the next fiscal year. No evidence was produced to back up this assertion, other than to propose reducing the Park budget by that amount. That sort of reduction can be achieved without a transfer of personnel or functions, which, once studied will show that such a move will actually result in greater costs to the County. The County police pay scale for comparable positions is higher than the Commission's. An average Park Police work year costs about \$101,000, compared with an average county police work year of between \$117,000 and \$123,000, and this figure includes part-time crossing guards. Among other problems, the transfer of police retirement obligations to the County will cost it money. Given the County Executive's police funding history, along with these figures, it is hard to believe that this proposal is primarily aimed at saving money. We agree that some small savings can be achieved by consolidation of dispatch. We have already achieved savings through an existing MOU with County police, which deals with specialized services, such as homicide investigations. I signed this MOU shortly after I returned to the Commission in 2006. The more prudent approach would be to consider other services that could be added to the MOU.

**Merger will require amendment of state law.** The Park Police are authorized and provided for under Article 28 of the State Code. They are appointed by MNCPPC to protect the parks and carry out Commission regulations. State law expressly requires that the Park Police fall under the supervision of the Commission. Although County police have concurrent criminal jurisdiction in parks within the County, they are not charged with enforcing Commission regulations. Nor are they under Commission supervision to protect Commission assets, so they have no greater obligation to respond to Commission direction than to any other request for service. The proposed merger will require a change in state law, with substantial impact on Prince George's County as well as Montgomery. Even if this were a good idea—which it is not—legislation allowing it cannot be adopted and signed before next year. There is no assurance that such a change in state law would occur, and it probably could not be implemented for at least another year. A transfer of Park Policing functions most likely cannot happen before FY2013. Therefore, it should not be relied on to reduce the 2011 proposed budget.

**It is bad public policy.** It is important to reflect on why there is a Park Police force. Both counties surely had able police departments when the Park Police were established in 1953. But they did not or could not provide the adequate and *active* uniform presence that is necessary for protection of the parks and park users. This was not because they were not good officers. It is because park policing is a specialized activity and it involves a lot of tasks that regular police do not like to, or are not trained to perform. Many Park Police tasks are less traditional than those of a more reactive law enforcement agency. They include patrolling remote areas of stream valleys and woodlands; boat, bicycle, ATV and horse patrols; being a presence at large social gatherings in parks; sorting out who actually has the right permit for the right time on an overused ball field; possessing intimate knowledge of the parks and its facilities to aid park users, interpreting park features for children and adults; combining a balanced mix of education and enforcement.. These functions and priorities become even more important as the economic downturn drives more and more families to find no- and low-cost opportunities for healthy entertainment and recreation in the Park system.


What is central to the effectiveness of the Park Police is that they are under the supervision of the Commission and the Director of Parks. They have a focused mission that has made our parks among the safest in the nation. They are a friendly face of the park system. They are one of our best investments.

The Honorable Nancy Floreen  
April 23, 2010  
Page 4 of 4


**The proposal is the first step toward destruction of a great park system, and ultimately, the Commission.** The Executive has made no secret of his interest in taking control of the parks. Even though it is clear that the only way money might be actually saved through a merger of Commission functions and County functions is through a merger of the Department of Recreation into the Department of Parks. Such a merger was accomplished 40 years ago in Prince George's County. The result is a far richer recreation program than we have in Montgomery County. By dismembering the Park Police the predictable result will be a decline in park safety, which will then be used as an excuse for transferring the entire department and its management of all of the County's parkland to the Executive. This will place 10% of the County's land area that has been acquired over the years and dedicated to active and passive parks, conservation areas, and environmentally protected areas under direct political control, rather than in the trust of the independent Park and Planning Commission. This is a result that I shall oppose with every bit of energy and resolve I can muster.

As always, I am confident that my commissioner colleagues and the staff of MNCPPC are ready and willing to shoulder our fair share of the budgetary pain that must occur. I fervently hope that decisions will be made that avoid unfortunate unintended long-term consequences for a great park system.

Sincerely,

  
Royce Hanson

# PARK POLICE



**Administration, Professional Standards and Labor Relations, Research and Development**

- Procurement
- Operating Budget Development and Oversight
- Court Liaison
- Training
- Grant Development

**Assistant Chief  
Field Operations Branch**

**Special Operations**

- Horse Mounted Patrols
- Motorcycle Patrols
- Marine Patrols

**Patrol**

- Automobile Patrols
- Canine Patrols
- Bicycle Patrols
- Community Involvement (Problem-Oriented Policing)
- Park Rangers
- ATV
- Traffic Safety
- SERT

**Special Services**

- County Government Liaison Function
- Special Events Analysis/Coordination
- Public Safety Education and Park Facility Assessments
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)
- Media Relations
- Volunteer Program

**Assistant Chief  
Support Operations Branch**

**Support Services**

- Facility Management
- Evidence and Property Management
- Records Unit
- Crime Statistics Analysis
- Fleet Management


**Technical Services**

- Communications
- Computer Aided Dispatching (CAD)
- "Keystone" Records Management System
- Mobile Data Information System

**Investigative Services**

- Applicant Recruitment and Background Investigations
- Criminal Investigations
- Evidence Collection and Preparation
- Undercover/Selective Enforcement Assignments
- Special Investigations

**EXHIBIT 3: MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK POLICE MONTGOMERY COUNTY DIVISION ORGANIZATION CHART**  
 (Authorized Strength – 95 Sworn, 21 Civilian)



**MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK POLICE**  
**MONTGOMERY COUNTY DIVISION**  
**2006-2009 ANNUAL CRIME STATISTICS**

PART I OFFENSES						Self-
CRIME	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change	Initiated
MURDER	1	6	1	0	-1	0
RAPE	2	0	2	1	-1	0
ROBBERY	8	8	13	16	3	0
1ST DEGREE ASSAULTS	13	5	6	4	-2	3
Gun	4	3	3	1	-2	
Knife	3	2	1	0	-1	
Other	6	0	2	3	1	
BURGLARY	13	13	15	24	9	4
Force	12	9	14	18	4	
No Force	1	4	0	4	4	
Attempts	0	0	1	2	1	
THEFTS	173	183	208	179	-29	11
AUTO THEFTS	2	8	8	3	-5	2
<b>PART I TOTALS</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>-26</b>	<b>20</b>

PART II OFFENSES						Self-
OFFENSE	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change	Initiated
DESTRUCTION	337	290	239	227	-12	113
Vandalism	75	47	61	62	1	
Hate/Violence	8	12	4	6	2	
Graffiti	254	231	174	159	-15	
SEX OFFENSES	11	20	19	7	-12	1
NARCOTIC DRUG LAWS	163	104	209	245	36	212
LITTERING/DUMPING	31	39	42	64	22	30
2ND DEGREE ASSAULTS	43	25	62	48	-14	8
OTHER PART II	249	139	265	274	9	227
WARRANTS SERVED	-	63	41	97	56	97
<b>PART II TOTAL</b>	<b>834</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>877</b>	<b>962</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>688</b>
<b>TOTAL OFFENSES</b>	<b>1046</b>	<b>903</b>	<b>1130</b>	<b>1189</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>708</b>

\* "Change" is difference between 2008 and 2009 figures only

**2006-2009 ANNUAL CRIME STATISTICS  
CONTINUED**

<b>ARRESTS</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>CHANGE</b>
Adult Physical Arrests	181	141	244	262	18
Juvenile Physical Arrests	58	46	76	94	18
Adult Criminal Citations	220	144	275	358	83
Juvenile Criminal Citations	244	163	270	284	14
Outstanding Warrant Arrests	106	148	176	198	22
<b>TOTAL ARRESTS</b>	<b>809</b>	<b>642</b>	<b>1041</b>	<b>1196</b>	<b>155</b>

<b>CITATIONS</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>CHANGE</b>
Civil	1050	899	1051	948	-103
Parking	1166	949	1550	1218	-332
State	3535	3153	5469	6682	1,213
DNR	48	49	46	7	-39
Warnings	2558	2639	4198	3477	-721
SERO	339	280	542	507	-35
<b>TOTAL CITATIONS</b>	<b>8,696</b>	<b>7,969</b>	<b>12,856</b>	<b>12,839</b>	<b>-17</b>

<b>ACCIDENTS</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>CHANGE</b>
Fatal	0	0	0	0	0
Injury	28	8	30	18	-12
Property Damage	46	58	72	67	-5
Hit and Run	6	6	6	3	-3
<b>TOTAL ACCIDENTS</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>-20</b>

<b>POLICE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>CHANGE</b>
Self Initiated Calls	79,655	66,926	80,890	87,705	6,815
Total Calls for Service	85,100	72,502	86,416	93,244	6,828
<b>REPORTS WRITTEN</b>	<b>1875</b>	<b>1619</b>	<b>2072</b>	<b>2238</b>	<b>166</b>

\* "Change" is difference between 2008 and 2009 figures only



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

August 18, 2009

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Phil Andrews, Chair, Public Safety Committee, Montgomery County Council  
Mike Knapp, Chair, Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee,  
Montgomery County Council

**FROM:** Mary Bradford, Director, M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks

**SUBJECT: Deer Control in Montgomery County Parks**

---

The following information is provided in response to your memo on Deer Control in Montgomery County Parks dated July 20, 2009 (Attached) in which you requested the following:

- Information on the five areas that Park's has assessed as being the next highest priorities for deer management
- The criteria used in setting priorities
- The method of deer management proposed for use – managed hunt with firearms or bow, or sharpshooters
- Estimated costs for implementing deer management in each of these locations
- Where the section of Rock Creek Park that is near the Winkler property falls in these priorities.

Below, in table 1, you will find the next highest priorities for deer management as assessed by Montgomery Parks and the Montgomery County Deer Management Work Group. I have chosen to include the top six parks because the park specifically mentioned in your request, Rock Creek Stream Valley Unit 2, ranked just outside of the top five. The parks are identified through community complaint of deer impacts, and have been ranked, using a process developed by the Montgomery County Deer Management Work Group, through a matrix (tables 2&3) consisting of indices pertaining to public safety i.e. Deer-vehicle Collisions, agricultural damage, natural resources impacts, and private landscape damage. When necessary and available, information pertaining to known deer densities is included in this evaluation as well.

Please note that while the costs associated with these new locations are not insurmountable, these efforts are logistically complex and require a broad spectrum of staff and resources across four park Divisions, i.e. Park Planning and Stewardship, Park Police, Northern and Southern Regions, and others, which are not readily available at this time.

Cost projections assigned for each park and method used, and the minimal initial harvest recommended have been derived from an analysis of current program costs and associated data sets.

Table 1. Prioritized parkland, for future deer management, as assessed by Montgomery Parks and the Montgomery County Deer Management Work Group.

Rank	Park	Methodology	Initial Harvest*	Estimated Cost
1	North Branch Stream Valley Park, Unit 4 Olney	Sharpshooting	75	\$33,229.20
2	Paint Branch Stream Valley Park, Unit 5&6 White Oak/Colesville	Sharpshooting	50	\$22,154.20
3	Serpentine Barrens Conservation Park Travillah	Sharpshooting	50	\$22,154.20
4	Muddy Branch Stream Valley Park, Unit 1 Darnestown	Archery Hunting	50	\$14,304.00
5	Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park, Units 3, 4 &5 Silver Spring	Sharpshooting	80	\$35,504.20
6	Rock Creek Stream Valley Unit 2 Chevy Chase	Sharpshooting	50	\$22,154.20

\*Based on estimated deer population on parkland only. Annual, and likely ongoing, treatments will be necessary to maintain densities that may exhibit an increase from both population growth and immigration. This initial harvest will allow for staff to learn more about population dynamics, landscape use, and true population density.

Table 2. Criteria for Setting Deer Management Priorities

Hotspot	Deer Vehicle Collision's (weight x2)	Agriculture Damage (weight x 2)	Browse	Significant Habitat (weight x2)	Landscape Damage	Weighted totals
North Branch SVP4	4	6	N/A*	4	3	17
Paint Branch SVP	6	2	N/A*	6	2	16
Serpentine Barrens CP	2	2	N/A*	8	1	13
Muddy Branch SVP1	2	2	N/A*	6	3	13
Sligo Creek SVP's 4&5	4	2	N/A*	4	2	12
Rock Creek SVP 2	4	2	N/A*	4	2	12

\*Work program allocations do not allow for browse data to be collected any longer. This practice was abandoned in Fiscal Year 2005 due to budget constraints.

Table 3. Numeric Values Assigned to Deer Management Criteria.

Impacts Index Value	Deer Vehicle Collisions w/in one-half mile of area	Deer Population Density (#/sq.mi)	Agricultural Damage in area	Natural Vegetation Impacts; Browse	Significance of Natural Community	Landscape Damage
1	0-14	<61	No Agriculture in area	No Natural Areas	Low Quality; No significant concerns	No complaint calls or reports
2	15-29	61-95	Light damage 10-20% losses	Browse 1-9%	Good Quality; No rare or uncommon plant species	Few complaint calls; minimum local measures taken
3	30-44	96-130	Medium damage 21-33% losses	Browse 10-49%	Moderate to High Quality w/ rare or uncommon species	Moderate # of complaint calls and moderate local measures taken
4	>44	>130	Heavy Damage >33% losses	Browse >49%	Very High Quality; of significant countywide significance	High number of calls and measures taken

The Department of Park's deer management program has expanded significantly over the past 14 years with only two incremental increases in budget for professional services and supplies and equipment. More importantly, there have been no increases in staffing during these 14 years. What started out as a minor effort managing deer in two parks has grown to a major program managing deer in twenty-seven parks covering approximately fifteen thousand acres- 44% of total park acreage. Staff now utilizes four separate methods of deer management – each with its own set of program requirements. Four methods include Lottery Based Managed Shotgun Hunting, Park Police-based Sharpshooting, Cooperative Deer Hunting, and Lease Tenant Deer Hunting.

Additionally, the county's economic difficulties have resulted in a struggle to maintain such services. As you are aware, the county's approved budget for Montgomery Parks does not maintain the same services as Fiscal Year 2009. Approximately \$121,000.00 was available for deer management in Fiscal Year 2009, whereas approximately \$91,000.00 is available in Fiscal Year 2010.

The cost of further expansion to address the six sites listed in Table 1 is estimated at \$149,500.00 in FY10.

<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>	<b>FY12</b>
Personnel	\$93,500.00 (1.48WY's)	\$100,000.00 (1.48WY's)	\$107,000.00 (1.48WY's)
ISF	\$27,500.00	N/A	N/A
Professional Services	\$25,500.00	\$26,100.00	\$26,700.00
Supplies & Materials	\$3,000.00	\$3,100.00	\$4,200.00
<b>Total Allocation:</b>	<b>\$149,500.00</b>	<b>\$129,200.00</b>	<b>\$137,900.00</b>
Annual increase based on 7% compensation adjustment and animalization for personnel and 2.5% CPI for Professional Services and Supplies and Materials. It is anticipated that a continuous need for deer management will be required at each site beyond FY12.			

- cc. Royce Hanson, Planning Board Chair, M-NCPPC Montgomery County
- Mike Riley, Deputy Director- Administration, M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks
- John Hench, Chief, Park Planning and Stewardship Division, M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks
- Rob Gibbs, Natural Resources Manager, M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks
- Bill Hamilton, Principal Natural Resources Specialist, M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks

C:\Documents and Settings\Bill.Hamilton\Correspondence from Director\FY10 Response to Council Request.doc




MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL  
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

MEMORANDUM

July 20, 2009

TO: Mary Bradford, Director, M-NCPPC Parks Department

FROM: Phil Andrews, Chair, Public Safety Committee   
Mike Knapp, Chair, Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee 

SUBJECT: **Deer Control in Montgomery County Parks**

In February, the Public Safety Committee held its annual session on the findings and recommendations of the Deer Management Work Group. Mr. Fred Winkler of Susanna Lane in Chevy Chase, who is a long-time county resident, shared his concern about the over-population of deer in Rock Creek Park and the damage they are doing to vegetation in the area. Mr. Winkler believes that sharp-shooting would be appropriate for the area. We understand that Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Gibbs have discussed this issue with Mr. Winkler in the past. Based on the information Mr. Winkler forwarded after the February meeting and his description of the situation, Linda McMillan of Council staff asked Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Gibbs to walk the area with Mr. Winkler and his son, which they did on the evening of June 15<sup>th</sup>. We understand that deer were out that evening and that Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Gibbs discussed with the Winklers the precautions that would have to be taken if sharp shooting was used to reduce the number of deer. They also explained that no additional funding has been provided to allow Parks to expand their efforts beyond the parks included in the 2008-09 hunting season.

At the February Public Safety Committee meeting Park and Planning said that they have identified other areas where deer management efforts should be implemented given the over population of deer.

We are requesting information from Park and Planning on the five areas Parks has assessed as being the next highest priority for deer management. As a part of this request, we would like to understand the criteria used in setting priorities, whether Parks could use a managed hunt (bow or firearms) or would need to use sharpshooters, and what the estimated cost for each of the five areas would be. We would also like to understand where the section of Rock Creek that is near the Winkler property would fall in terms of priority for deer reduction.

STELLA B. WERNER COUNCIL OFFICE BUILDING • 100 MARYLAND AVENUE • ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850  
240/777-7900 • TTY 240/777-7914 • FAX 240/777-7989  
WWW.MONTGOMERYCOUNTYMD.GOV

 PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

We recognize that the Council did not specifically add new resources for deer management in the FY10 budget and do not know, given ongoing budget constraints, whether any additional money can be found. However, we continue to hear more and more from residents whose property is damaged and who have evidence of Lyme Disease in their neighborhoods that more deer control efforts are needed. We would like to understand the incremental cost of trying to expand this program and see whether anything can be done in time for the 2009-2010 hunting season.

We would appreciate having a response by August 26 so that we can determine if a worksession should be scheduled in September.

We would also like to thank Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Gibbs for taking the time to tour the Rock Creek area with the Winklers and Ms. McMillan and for engaging in what we understand was a very frank, thoughtful, and thorough discussion.

C: Councilmembers  
Royce Hanson, Planning Board Chair  
Bill Hamilton, Parks Department  
Rob Gibbs, Parks Department

f:\mcmillan\police\2009\deer management memo to Bradford.doc



# *The* **FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE**

**Maryland-National Capital Park Police Lodge 30, Inc.**

2905-A Old Largo Rd, PO Box 1325, Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20773

Office (301) 780-3500 Fax (301) 780-3100

*“Serving Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties Since 1973”*

## Bi-County Park Police Merger Proposal

As an organization that represents over 300 plus members of the Maryland National Capital Park Police, active and retired, FOP Lodge #30 believes a merger between the Montgomery and Prince George’s Divisions would provide a reduction in cost and eliminate a duplication of services.

### Proposed Changes:

- Creation of Public Safety Director
- Elimination of One (1) Captain’s Position
- Elimination of Six (6) Lieutenant’s Positions
- Reduction of Overtime Costs by better distribution of staffing levels and requirements
- Reduced Cost Through Combination of Sections
  - Mounted Unit
  - Tactical Services
  - Motor Services
  - Investigations/Backgrounds
  - Internal Affairs
  - Research and Development
  - Records/Property/Evidence

This merger would accomplish significant cost savings, greater efficiency, and would maintain the high standards and services provided by the Park Police.

Please see the attached organizational chart.

