

PHED COMMITTEE #2  
April 29, 2013  
**Worksession**

*Please bring the April 16 PHED Committee packet and April 19 Joint PHED and Education Committee packet on the Recreation Department's FY14 Operating Budget to this worksession.*

**MEMORANDUM**

April 26, 2013

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee

FROM: Vivian Yao, Legislative Analyst 

SUBJECT: **Worksession: FY14 Operating Budget, Montgomery County Recreation Department *continued***

Those expected to attend this worksession include:

- Gabriel Albornoz, Director, Montgomery County Recreation Department (MCRD)
- Jeff Bourne, Division Chief, MCRD
- Robin Riley, Division Chief, MCRD
- Vicki Kane, Administrative Specialist, MCRD
- Deborah Lambert, Office of Management and Budget

The Committee will continue its review of the FY14 Operating Budget for the Montgomery County Recreation Department.

**SUMMARY OF REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT'S FY14 BUDGET**

***April 16 PHED Meeting***

The Committee held its first worksession on the Department's budget on April 16. At the meeting, the Committee reviewed the County Executive's FY14 recommended adjustments for the Recreation Department listed in the following table except the adjustments related to school-based afterschool programming, the Collaboration Council contract, the Kennedy Cluster OOST Coordinator, and the Jewish Council for the Aging Senior Transportation Partnership.

<b>Same Service Adjustments</b>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>FTE</b>
FY14 Compensation Adjustment	\$ 321,485	0.00
Other Labor Contract Costs	\$ 303,491	0.00
Group Insurance Adjustment	\$ 120,983	0.00
Motor Pool Adjustment	\$ 108,145	0.00
Retirement Adjustment	\$ 91,369	0.00
Point of Sale Equipment	\$ 77,000	0.00
Risk Management Adjustment	\$ 35,970	0.00
Basketball Referees Contract	\$ 28,904	0.00
Pool Chemicals	\$ 20,300	0.00
Annualization of FY13 Lapsed Positions	\$ 19,332	0.00
Printing and Mail Adjustment	\$ 2,428	0.00
Shift STEP Operating to STEP Seasonal Salaries	\$ -	7.80
Technical Adjustment: Seasonal FTE	\$ -	-0.60
Annualization of FY13 Personnel Costs	\$ (108,319)	0.00
Closure of Ross Boddy Neighborhood Recreation Center Due to Renovation and Retain Sr. Progra	\$ (109,193)	-1.40
Elimination of FY13 \$2,000 Lump Sum	\$ (199,419)	0.00
<b>Subtotal: Same Service Adjustments</b>	<b>\$ 712,476</b>	<b>5.80</b>
<b>Program Enhancements</b>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>FTE</b>
Jewish Council for the Aging Senior Transportation Partnership (Jan. 2014 Implementation)	\$ 318,750	0.00
Plum Gar Neighborhood Recreation Center Reopening	\$ 278,000	2.30
Collaboration Council Contract: infoMontgoemry, Excel Beyond the Bell, and Operating Support	\$ 228,660	0.00
One Excel Beyond the Bell Middle School Site	\$ 136,347	2.49
Thre Summer Extended Learning Opportunity Middle School Sites	\$ 94,140	1.37
Kennedy Cluster and Out-of-School Time Coordinator	\$ 80,000	0.00
Plum Gar Neighborhood to Community Recreation Center	\$ 34,650	1.60
Plum Gar Club Rec Preogram	\$ 27,870	1.10
Senior Mini Trips (Jan. 2014 Implementation)	\$ 25,120	0.12
Club Rec After School Program at Ken Gar	\$ 10,364	0.22
55+ Senior Program at Ken Gar	\$ 5,450	0.14
<b>Subtotal: Program Enhancements</b>	<b>\$ 1,239,351</b>	<b>9.34</b>
<b>Grand Total: Net decrease (tax-s supported)</b>	<b>\$ 1,951,827</b>	<b>15.14</b>

The Committee recommended approval of the adjustments reviewed, and requested follow-up information on several issues:

- The adequacy of Department staffing levels taking into account the extent to which service levels have changed since the significant reductions to the Department's budget;
- The funding necessary to provide adequate staffing for the Student Teen Employment Program and increase the capacity of the program to accommodate 13 additional participants; and
- The sufficiency of available financial aid in meeting the demand of low-income families needing access to recreation programming, including summer camps and summer fun centers and summer pool passes.

The Committee also requested information on the status of Department of Recreation and Parks Department efforts to develop a single-entry registration system for all programs and classes operated by the two Departments and what needs to be done to make it happen. Council staff notes this issue is being briefed in the Park and Planning Operating Budget packet for this meeting.

***April 19 PHED and Education Committee Meeting***

On April 19, the PHED and Education Committees met jointly to review funding related to school-based after school programs including Excel Beyond the Bell, RecExtra, and the Sports Academies and Montgomery County Collaboration Council for Children, Youth and Families (Collaboration Council) contracts. The Committees recommended approval of the RecExtra and Sports Academies' proposed budgets as well as the following adjustments recommended by the County Executive: \$136,347 to add one Excel Beyond the Bell (EBB) middle school site; \$94,140 to add three summer Extended Learning Opportunity program sites; and \$228,660 to be provided in a contract with the Collaboration Council.

Committee members requested that MCPS revisit policies regarding eligibility for afterschool programs and suggested that making after school activities accessible to students could help increase school engagement and learning. MCPS representative Kimberly Statham agreed to bring the comments back to the Board of Education. Trend information on academic ineligibility rates in Middle Schools and High Schools was included in OLO's March 12 Report on the Achievement Gap and is attached at ©4-5.

Committee members expressed the need for solid metrics that measure the extent to which children who participate in after school programs show improvement in academic or school-related measures. Councilmember Elrich requested information about programs implemented in other jurisdictions that have demonstrated positive impact on the academic achievement of at-risk students. PHED Committee Chair Floreen suggested that the Office of Legislative Oversight could be a resource in analyzing program data and researching evidence-based practices.

Committee members requested information on what it would cost to take steps to extend EBB to all schools. Collaboration Council Executive Director Carol Walsh answered that EBB partnership will be working with the Finance Project to explore expansion and funding of the project. Funding to support consultant work on expanding EBB program was recommended by the HHS and Education Committee in its review of the proposed Kennedy Cluster and Out-of-School Time Consultant as described below.

***April 24 HHS and Education Committee Meeting***

On April 24, the HHS and Education Committee reviewed the Executive's recommendation to add \$80,000 in the Department's FY14 budget for a Kennedy Cluster and Out-of-School Time Consultant. The Committees recommended approval of \$30,000 for a consultant to assist in developing a model to expand EBB to other middle schools and execute an MOU between strategic partners; however, the Committees did not recommend approval of the \$50,000 for a Kennedy Cluster consultant. The Committees felt that the expansion of the Kennedy Cluster project is not warranted absent information demonstrating the impact of the services on improving academic outcomes and reducing the achievement gap for African American students.

***April 25 PHED and HHS Committee Meeting***

The PHED and HHS Committees met on April 25 to review the Executive's Senior Transportation Partnership. The Committees recommended approval of the Executive's

recommendation to add \$318,750 to the Department of Recreation for the Jewish Council for the Aging Senior Transportation Partnership to start in January 2014.

### **I. Recreation Department Staffing**

At the April 16 meeting, the Committee reviewed information **that Department positions have been significantly reduced since FY08 due to fiscal constraints and have not, in large part, been restored. The number of total positions continues to be 38.7% lower than the FY08 level, and management level positions continue to be 53% lower than the FY08 level.** Despite the reduced staffing levels, the Department has been charged with delivering many new initiatives and programs with little increase in management and career staff, who must provide oversight to temporary seasonal employees who are increasingly performing the Department's work.

Committee members expressed concern about the reductions that have been made to Department staffing and requested information demonstrating the extent to which reductions in staffing have affected the amount and quality of services being provided. Councilmember Elrich requested information about changes in the total number of repeat participants in recreation programming and level of youth programming, staffing and youth served by the Department prior to recent budget and staffing cuts.

PHED Committee Chair Floreen recommended adding a Manager III position to the Department's complement and requested information about the cost for doing so. The Committee requested that the Department perform a staffing study addressing issues highlighted by Council staff and providing its findings and recommendations to the Council in FY14.

#### ***Organizational Capacity***

Organizational charts for the Department in FY08 and recommended for FY14 are attached to the April 19 Joint PHED and Education Committee packet at ©16-17 and show the changes to career staffing levels between that time period. The following table shows some of the staffing changes reflected in the organizational charts:

	FY08	FY14	% change
Total Complement	168 staff	103 staff	-38.7%
Management Staff	15 staff	7 staff	-53.3%
Teen and Out of School Programs	22 staff	8 staff	-72.7%
Dedicated Senior Program Staff	14 staff	6 staff	-57.1%
Community Center Management	4 managers over 17 community centers in 4 areas	1 manager <sup>1</sup> over 19 community centers, 5 senior centers, 11 senior programs, camps, and youth sports	-75%
Aquatics	27 staff	17 staff	-37.0%

<sup>1</sup> Community Center staffing also includes three Recreation Supervisors.

There has also been a decreasing trend in the Department's performance measure for the total number of repeat participants in recreation programs. **In FY08, there were 61,616 repeat participants, which has dropped to 49,000 participants for FY13, FY14, and FY15, a decrease of 20.5%.**

**If the Committee is interested in adding a Manager III position to support youth or senior programming given the significantly reduced oversight, staffing and service trends, it would need to add \$107,751 to the reconciliation list.**

***Youth Programming Changes***

The follow table shows information on the status of youth programs delivered by the Department in FY08 and those currently being provided.

**Youth Programs**

	FY 2008	FY 2013 YTD	STATUS
<b>Program Name</b>	<b># Students</b>	<b># Students</b>	<b>Active</b>
Teen Clubs	1,200	0	NO
Under 21 Pool Parties	1,160	0	NO
Battle of the Bands	350	0	NO
Summer Teen Centers	870	0	NO
Library Summer Concert Series	400	0	NO
Friday Night Bball	200	0	NO
MC GOALS Soccer Program	200	0	NO
Teen Leadership - Big Buddy/Little Buddy, MCSADD, KEEN, YAC <sup>3</sup>	155	80	NO
Early Release Days	550		NO
Teen Travel (6 wks summer) <sup>2</sup>	146	0	NO
FUTSAL	300	300	YES
* Rec Extra	3,565	951	YES
* Sports Academy (4 days/week) <sup>1</sup>	592	467	YES
STEP	0	60	YES
Teen Café/Teen Events	0	775	YES
Excel Beyond the Bell	0	767	YES
Summer Extended Learning Opportunity	0	60	YES
	<b>9,688</b>	<b>3,460</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Two sites active four days in FY 13

<sup>2</sup> Four weeks summer in FY 13

<sup>3</sup> YAC is still active in FY 13

\* Total Average daily attendance used

The April 19<sup>th</sup> Joint PHED and Education Committee packet also included tables at ©12-13 that compared participation measures for RecExtra<sup>2</sup> and Sports Academies programs in FY09 and FY13 to date. The tables showed the following:

- Average daily attendance dropped at all sites that continue to have RecExtra programming. The size of the reductions at the different sites ranged from 9.9% to 55.3%.
- The RecExtra program is currently being delivered at 12 middle schools, and 22 middle schools do not have any comprehensive afterschool program delivered in partnership with the Recreation Department.
- Across all middle schools that do not have an EBB program, average daily attendance dropped a total of 71.6%.
- Two of the six Sports Academies providing services in FY09 are no longer operational.
- The number of participants in Sports Academies decreased by 34.8% during this time period, and the average daily attendance across all programs decreased by 27.5%.
- All Sports Academies experienced a reduction in total participants ranging from 4% for the Blair Sports Academy to 100% for the Paint Branch and Seneca Valley programs.
- Three of the four continuing programs increased their average daily attendance; Blair increased their average by 31.3%, Einstein by 25%, and Wheaton by 0.9%.

Director Albornozy clarified at the April 19 meeting that the reduction in the average daily attendance the RecExtra programs and Sports Academies resulted from the closing of program sites at particular schools. He also suggested that the changes in activity bus availability at program sites have also affected attendance figures.

## **II. Student Teen Employment Program**

In response to a recommendation by Council President Navarro (©6-7), the Committee expressed interest in adding funding to the reconciliation list to support staffing of the Student Teen Employment Program and expansion of the program to thirteen participants. The Department reported that in order to add additional capacity to the program, funding would be needed to support an additional staff position, as the current staff is currently stretched serving multiple teen programs. The Committee requested information on the funding needed to add a career staff person and other amounts needed to expand capacity as requested.

The Department reports the following costs for expansion totaling \$152,901:

- \$80,142 for a Recreation Specialist to manage the STEP program;
- \$67,759 for seasonal salaries to accommodate an additional 13 participants; and
- \$5,000 in additional operating expenses.

---

<sup>2</sup> Council staff did not include average attendance data for EBB sites because the EBB program provides enhanced programming and is better resourced.

### III. Financial Aid And Other Revenue Issues

The Committee was briefed on the recommended level of financial aid to be provided by the Department in FY14 and changes being recommended to the process for allocating and expending financial aid awards. The Department has historically decreased its fee revenue estimates to provide financial assistance to needy residents. The Department first capped the pool of authorized financial aid awards in calendar year 2009 because of the great demand for assistance in the increasingly challenging fiscal climate and increasing reliance on the Department to generate fee revenue to support its operations.

The great demand for financial aid has been evidenced by how quickly the total amounts made available for financial aid awards have been fully allocated once the Department has begun to accept financial aid applications. As a result, the Committee expressed concern about whether the availability of financial aid is sufficient to meet the demand of low-income families needing access to recreation programming, including summer camps and summer fun centers and summer pool passes. **The Committee expressed interest in making three increments of \$125,000 available as additional financial aid for needy families, but wanted to know the appropriate mechanism to account for the increased aid.** Councilmember Leventhal stated that the priority for use of financial aid should be summer camp programming and summer pool passes.

Councilmember Leventhal also requested information about the unit cost of delivering various recreation services. He was interested in understanding whether revenue foregone by providing financial aid to a customer would equal the cost of the providing the service and if not whether additional clients could be served without charging the regular published fees to financial aid. However, the Department was not able to provide the requested information prior to packet publication.

**Executive staff requests that the Council hold off increasing available financial aid for calendar year 2014.** The Department will be implementing changes to its financial program for calendar year 2014 that are designed to increase use of funding available for financial aid. Historically, financial aid recipients have accessed financial aid awards on a first come, first served basis, but as the whole, have not fully spent out their award allocations. The highest rate of spend out in a given calendar year has been about 63%. Council staff observes that by making actual use of funding, rather than the allocation of a funding award, on a first come, first served basis, the Department is making almost \$400,000 more available for use by low-income residents.

Council staff presents the following options for the Committee's consideration:

- **Monitor Implementation of the Department's Financial Aid Program Changes:** The changes that the Department will be implementing to its financial aid program will have the effect of making more financial aid dollars available for use. As a result, the Committee may want to hold off adding funding at this time. The Committee, in any case, should request quarterly updates on: (1) the number of families who have applied;

(2) the number of families who have qualified for financial aid; (3) the total amount of financial aid that qualified families are eligible to receive; (4) the actual amounts used broken out by use category, e.g., summer program, pool pass, sport league, weight room membership; and (5) the number of families/children actually served through financial assistance.

- **Target financial aid for specific purposes:** There may be specific recreation services that are higher priority uses for financial aid like low-cost, supervised summer programs (e.g., summer camps and summer fun centers). The Department reports that it has the ability to target financial aid for specific uses. The table on ©8 shows that over 80% of financial aid use is for programs compared to other uses. The Council could require that the Department target financial aid for particular priority purposes.
- **Provide for additional amounts for financial aid:** In order to accommodate increased amounts for financial aid, the Council would need to approve a reduction to the Department's revenue mark and increase other revenue for the Department by a corresponding amount. Executive staff explains that revenues support the Department's fix cost obligations and recommended program of services. Simply reducing the number that the Department is expected to bring in would leave it with insufficient revenue to support its operations.

### ***Fiscal Plan for Recreation***

The Committee also requested information about how recreation tax and other revenues are used. Total recommended FY14 revenue for the Department is \$40.596 million, \$12.580 million more than the Department's recommended operating budget expenditures of \$28.017 million. See ©6 in the April 16 PHED Committee packet. The FY14-19 Public Services Program: Fiscal Plan at ©9-11 shows recreation tax revenues and how the revenues are allocated for interfund transfers including debt service and facility maintenance and the Department's Operating Budget.

Hi All, I just wanted to send you follow up requests based on the meeting yesterday. Please let me know if you have any questions. I would like to discuss service changes between FY08 and FY14 on Friday during the PHED ED meeting, but the other items will likely be discussed in a follow up meeting on April 29.

By Friday:

1. How do you count or track the number of repeat participants in recreation programming? *Each client (registrant) has an identification number. When tracking the repeat participants, the CLASS data base is searched back to the original starting point, and all clients who have registered more than once are counted as a "repeat" registrant. Please describe how you come up with that number, any assumptions made, and whether the method for developing the measure has changed since FY08 to the present? The CLASS data base system tracks registrations for programs, leagues, and memberships. The method for developing this measure has not changed since FY08.*
2. How much would it cost to add a Manager III position to the Department? *Annualized cost = \$107,751 (includes benefits)*
3. Please describe the youth programs that were being provided in FY08 but are no longer being provided in FY14 and quantify the number of participants in each. Please describe the extent to which programs that were being delivered in FY08 and FY13 have changed or reduced their services as a result of budget reductions. If there are youth programs other than Sports Academies and RecExtra that were delivered both in FY08 and FY13.

*Teen Clubs: Primarily school-based clubs that included planned activities including special events such as ski trips, baseball games, amusement park visits, bowling, college visits, dances at the school, etc.*

*Under 21: summer Friday night pool party at MCRD outdoor pools, swimming, music, and food*

*Battle of Bands: high school student band competition where students compete on a Saturday evening, 6-8 bands performed, local dignitaries served as judges, DJ between sets, food and other activities*

*Summer Teen Centers: drop-in summer program for teens at six high schools; includes music, swimming, arts, crafts & field trips*

*Library Summer Concert Series: Aspen Hill library partnered to host concert series open mic night. MCRD provided staff supervision & sound equipment*

*Friday Night BBall: Praisner Recreation Center hosted high school summer teen basketball league.*

*MC Goals: 120 students from down county high schools, practiced 2 times a week, played games on Saturday for 8 weeks. Provided transportation, uniforms, supervision, referees, skill development instructions*

*Teen Leadership Students: high school students received 4 weeks of training, then become mentors and buddies for both Keen (Kids Enjoy Exercise Now) and Big Buddy, Little Buddy Program (mentors for elementary students living in shelters), Also participated in SADD (Students Against Destructive Decisions)*

*Half Day Events: Provided ½ day programs; ice skating visits, bowling, etc., for middle and high school students when school had an early release. Provided transportation, supervision,snacks, etc.*

*Rec Extra Sites: after school programming ranges from sports, arts, music, STEM, dance, yoga, etc., Recreation provides and schedules all programs via the after school activities coordinator, collects registration and attendance. Students take after school transportation home. Two to three days a week of programming. (Reduced number of locations from 38 to 12)*

*Sports Academy: High school based programming directly after school, includes games, sports, music, dance homework help, etc., Recreation provides all programming and staffing.(Reduced days of service and two locations)*

*Teen Leadership YAC (Youth Advisory Committee): Based regionally five groups of middle and high school students that meet twice a month. Community service projects, field trips, plan and organize activities such as poetry reading, open mic night, etc.. Provide all supervision, leadership, and programming support.(Reduced, YAC currently assists with teen events and cafés, no field trips or community service at this time)*

Teen Travel: Teens register and take coach bus to variety of locations, amusement parks, swimming, beach, etc., Four week program in summer, registration fees cover costs.

## Youth Programs

	FY 2008	FY 2013 YTD	STATUS
Program Name	# Students	# Students	Active
Teen Clubs	1,200	0	NO
Under 21 Pool Parties	1,160	0	NO
Battle of the Bands	350	0	NO
Summer Teen Centers	870	0	NO
Library Summer Concert Series	400	0	NO
Friday Night Bball	200	0	NO
MC GOALS Soccer Program	200	0	NO
Teen Leadership - Big Buddy/Little Buddy, MCSADD, KEEN, YAC <sup>3</sup>	155	80	NO
Early Release Days	550		NO
Teen Travel (6 wks summer) <sup>2</sup>	146	0	NO
FUTSAL	300	300	YES
* Rec Extra	3,565	951	YES
* Sports Academy (4 days/week) <sup>1</sup>	592	467	YES
STEP	0	60	YES
Teen Café/Teen Events	0	775	YES
Excel Beyond the Bell	0	767	YES
Summer Extended Learning Opportunity	0	60	YES
	<b>9,688</b>	<b>3,460</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Two sites active four days in FY 13

<sup>2</sup> Four weeks summer in FY 13

<sup>3</sup> YAC is still active in FY 13

\* Total Average daily attendance used

Services are offered fewer days per week at fewer locations, with higher staff per participant ratios. There are fewer field trips, fewer weekend and evening programs, and no programs offered on MCPS Early Released days.

Preferably by Friday, but we could put it off to Tuesday:

- How much in personnel costs would be required to add a staff person to manage the STEP program? \$80,142 annualized including benefits for a career Rec Specialist How much in seasonal staff costs would be required to support 13 additional participants? Total Seasonal salaries = \$67,759 (includes 13 participants PLUS seasonal staff levels S1 & S6) .How much in operating costs would be need to expand the program for 13 additional participants? OE = \$5000

By April 23 (next Tuesday):

- Please provide a monthly breakdown of (1) financial aid awards allocated; (2) amounts used; and (3) number of families served. Please provide annual use amounts could be broken down by use category (summer camp/summer fun centers, Club Rec programs, swimming passes, recreation facility memberships, classes, senior programs, etc.), if possible. See Attachment A

6. Can financial aid be targeted for specific uses? What would be required to do this? *Yes, financial assistance can be targeted to specific uses. We are doing that in part now by not allowing financial assistance to be used for items such as rentals. Significant front end communication would be required to state very clearly what can/cannot be used for financial assistance and staff would need to be trained and prepared to explain what would be covered.*
7. If the Council was interested in providing resources to increase the number of families who can access financial aid, what mechanisms could accomplish this? *We appreciate Council's offer to provide support in this area, however we have made a variety of changes to the program for this year and would like the opportunity to see what effects these changes may have on increasing usage of the allocations. Changes for the upcoming year include a much more aggressive community outreach, target marketing, community education component. All of these efforts are to help us ensure that the allocations are fully utilized by the families. If the Department's revenue mark was reduced to accommodate increased use of financial aid, would there need to be a corresponding increase in other revenue to support the Department's programs? Yes. The revenues support Recreation's fixed cost obligations (e.g., debt service) and recommended program of services. If more financial aid is provided and fees are reduced, other revenues need to be increased. The primary source of revenue is the property tax, and the property tax is at the Charter limit.*
8. What is the per unit costs for delivering the following services: summer camp, summer fun center, summer pool membership, school break camp (weekly), Club Rec (monthly), and weight room membership. *Additional time is needed for a more comprehensive analysis.*
9. Can you describe what the capabilities of the Active X software system (or other software options) in allowing a coordinated approach to centrally scheduling facilities and managing a single-entry registration system for all programs and classes operated by Recreation and Parks among CUPF, Recreation and Parks. What are anticipated costs related to use or adaptation of this software for these needs? What would be the timeline for accomplishing these tasks? Are Parks, CUPF, and Recreation approaching the decision to move from CLASS to another system/application in a coordinated, collaborative manner? To what extent have the Department/Agencies discussed these options? *Active software solution called Active.Net may provide the answer to our continued search for a viable "turnkey" single registration system. The new software is web-hosted – thus avoiding the problem of providing interagency access to a single shared server – and Active claims it is able to direct revenue to multiple accounting systems – thereby ensuring immediate access by each agency to its earned income. (More information can be found at: <http://www.activecommunities.com/technology-solutions.htm>.) Given that Active's CLASS software (the program registration and facility booking software currently used by Parks, MCRD and CUPF) is likely to become obsolete and no longer supported by Active as a result of the new software they've introduced, we are faced with an ideal opportunity to invest in the creation of one new, shared system for all agencies. We plan to come before the Council on April 29th to provide a more detailed session on the work both agencies are doing and the opportunities that exist with Active.Net.*

**Academic Ineligibility**

(% of Students Academically Ineligible Three out of Four Quarters)

Source: MCPS

**Table E-1: Middle School Ineligibility Rates by Subgroup**

Students	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-11 Change	
						Point	%
All Students	9.2	8.0	6.6	5.3	5.2	-4.0	-43%
White	2.8	2.3	2.0	1.6	1.5	-1.3	-46%
Asian	2.6	2.1	1.1	0.9	0.9	-1.7	-65%
Black	18.4	16.5	12.3	10.1	9.5	-8.9	-48%
Latino	18.1	15.3	13.7	10.4	10.0	-8.1	-45%
Multiracial	--	--	--	--	3.7	--	--
Special Education	20.6	18.6	15.7	12.4	13.5	-7.1	-34%
ESOL	14.4	11.9	7.9	9.5	10.2	-4.2	-2%
FARMS	22.1	19.0	15.7	12.1	12.0	-10.1	-46%

**Table E-2: Middle School Ineligibility Ratios by Subgroup**

Performance Ratios	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Asian/White	93%	91%	55%	56%	60%
Black/White	657%	717%	615%	631%	633%
Latino/White	646%	665%	685%	650%	667%
Multiracial/White	--	--	--	--	247%
Special Ed/All	224%	233%	238%	234%	260%
ESOL/All	157%	149%	120%	179%	196%
FARMS/All	240%	238%	238%	228%	231%

**Table E-3: Middle School Ineligibility Gap by Subgroup**

Students	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-11 Change	
						Point	%
White - Asian	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.4	200%
White - Black	-15.6	-14.2	-10.3	-8.5	-8.0	7.6	-49%
White - Latino	-15.3	-13.0	-11.7	-8.8	-8.5	6.8	-44%
All - Special Education	-11.4	-10.6	-9.1	-7.1	-8.3	3.1	-27%
All - ESOL	-5.2	-3.9	-1.3	-4.2	-5.0	0.2	-4%
All - FARMS	-12.9	-11.0	-9.1	-6.8	-6.8	6.1	-47%

**Table E-4: High School Ineligibility Rates by Subgroup**

Students	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-11 Change	
						Point	%
All Students	14.9	14.0	13.0	12.5	13.4	-1.5	-10%
White	6.3	5.8	5.6	4.8	5.0	-1.3	-21%
Asian	6.9	6.0	5.1	4.4	4.6	-2.3	-33%
Black	26.1	24.9	21.4	21.0	21.4	-4.7	-18%
Latino	30.4	27.2	26.1	25.0	26.5	-3.9	-13%
Special Education	30.3	28.0	27.0	25.9	25.1	-5.2	-17%
ESOL	22.8	20.5	20.3	20.8	22.2	-0.6	-3%
FARMS	31.1	29.4	26.9	25.2	27.6	-3.5	-11%

**Table E-5: High School Ineligibility Performance Ratios by Subgroup**

Performance Ratios	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Asian/White	110%	103%	91%	92%	92%
Black/White	414%	429%	382%	438%	428%
Latino/White	483%	469%	466%	521%	530%
Multiracial/White	--	--	--	--	184%
Special Education/All	203%	200%	208%	207%	187%
ESOL/All	153%	146%	156%	166%	166%
FARMS/All	209%	210%	207%	202%	206%

**Table E-6: High School Gap by Race and Ethnicity**

Students	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007-11 Change	
						Point	%
White - Asian	-0.6	-0.2	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.0	-167%
White - Black	-19.8	-19.1	-15.8	-16.2	-16.4	3.4	-17%
White - Latino	-24.1	-21.4	-20.5	-20.2	-21.5	2.6	-11%
All - Special Education	-15.4	-14.0	-14.0	-13.4	-11.7	-3.7	-24%
All - ESOL	-7.9	-6.5	-7.3	-8.3	-8.8	0.9	11%
All - FARMS	-16.2	-15.4	-13.9	-12.7	-14.2	-2.0	-12%



**MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND**

**OFFICE OF THE COUNCIL PRESIDENT**

**MEMORANDUM**

April 16, 2013

**TO:** Councilmember Floreen, Chair  
Councilmember Elrich  
Councilmember Leventhal  
Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee

**FROM:** Nancy Navarro *NV*  
Council President  
Chair, Government Operations and Fiscal Policy Committee

**SUBJECT:** Student Teen Employment Program

Unfortunately, I cannot attend the April 16 PHED meeting as the GO Committee is scheduled to meet at the same time. I would very much appreciate if the PHED committee would consider this proposal as it discusses the Department of Recreation's FY14 budget.

Last year, in the context of the debate over imposing a curfew on young residents in our County, I proposed a Youth and Families Enhancement Initiative to enhance services which would provide youth a positive outlet for their energies outside of school. As part of this program, County Executive Leggett created the Student Teen Employment Program, providing paid employment and job training to teens in exchange for the students providing valuable services to our community.

On April 8, I asked Council staff to obtain the cost per participant of the STEP program, whether there was a waiting list, and to estimate the cost of shortening or reducing the waiting list. Unfortunately, staff notes in the packet for the April 16 PHED meeting that this information was not yet available. Last year's STEP budget was \$315,296 and the County Executive has recommended increasing total STEP funding to \$330,508 for FY14. The packet does indicate on Circle 40 that 58 students were served by the STEP program last year with an operating budget (exclusive of personnel costs) of \$216,000, which implies an operating cost per participant of \$3,724.14 per student. It is my

understanding that the program is very popular, and that it could serve many more students if they had additional financial and staff resources. To expand this program, I propose increasing the STEP program by adding approximately \$50,000 for an additional position to help manage its growth and adding \$50,000 in operating funding to support about 13 additional students in the program.

Wrap-around services like STEP provide critical support to our most vulnerable students and help to mitigate the factors outside of the classroom which contribute to the academic achievement gap. While I understand that we have to work with limited resources, expanding programs that combat out-of-school factors that cause students to underachieve academically is one of the most cost-effective investments we can make with County dollars. These programs boost the earning potential of our future taxpayers in the long term, and make our streets safer in the short term. The STEP program provides students with invaluable job training, teaches them responsibility and organization, and provides them with a safe, supportive place to spend time outside of school.

# ATTACHMENT A

## Montgomery County Recreation Financial Assistance Program Summary Families Served

FY 11

Month	Year	\$ Awarded	# of Families	Programs \$	Programs #	Leagues \$	League #	Memberships \$	Memberships #	POS \$	POS #	Total \$ Used
July	2010	\$ -	0	\$ 7,474.68	84	-	0	\$ 3,494.88	46	\$ 1,513.00	327	\$ 12,482.56
Aug	2010	-	0	22,335.80	364	-	0	2,330.00	24	717.00	158	25,382.80
Sept	2010	-	0	17,577.29	274	120.00	2	6,077.79	45	192.00	41	23,967.08
Oct	2010	-	0	4,729.00	95	1,126.57	16	3,403.06	32	184.00	39	9,442.63
Nov	2010	-	0	5,433.20	79	2,400.00	29	3,078.00	38	99.50	17	11,010.70
Dec	2010	-	0	26,516.53	475	(128.00)	0	11,495.04	111	28.50	5	39,912.07
Jan	2011	505,200.00	932	46,957.17	268	600.00	8	8,465.00	68	111.00	17	56,133.17
Feb	2011	321,600.00	592	99,134.99	772	65.00	1	6,218.49	62	64.00	13	105,482.48
Mar	2011	223,600.00	402	107,160.67	779	390.00	6	9,359.32	80	251.00	22	117,160.99
Apr	2011	-	0	36,748.17	240	-	0	8,298.00	56	447.00	65	45,493.17
May	2011	-	0	50,041.64	553	-	0	12,484.96	70	531.00	96	63,057.60
June	2011	-	0	58,407.24	580	-	0	20,407.96	138	2,212.50	429	81,027.70
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$ 1,050,400.00</b>	<b>1,926</b>	<b>\$ 484,516.38</b>	<b>4,563</b>	<b>\$ 4,673.57</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>\$ 95,112.50</b>	<b>770</b>	<b>\$ 6,350.50</b>	<b>1,229</b>	<b>\$ 590,552.95</b>

FY 12

Month	Year	\$ Awarded	# of Families	Programs \$	Programs #	Leagues \$	League #	Memberships \$	Memberships #	POS \$	POS #	Total \$ Used
July	2011	-	0	\$ 6,010.59	72	-	0	4,936.53	59	3,121.00	566	14,068.12
Aug	2011	-	0	24,467.13	383	-	0	2,685.00	23	1,281.00	256	28,433.13
Sept	2011	-	0	15,613.95	216	425.00	5	9,132.00	35	324.00	56	25,494.95
Oct	2011	-	0	2,893.17	58	3,379.00	43	3,659.14	19	279.00	40	10,210.31
Nov	2011	-	0	5,252.83	77	1,900.00	25	2,425.00	18	86.00	18	9,663.83
Dec	2011	-	0	10,592.96	163	(100.00)	(1)	2,872.64	31	195.00	13	13,560.60
Jan	2012	-	0	17,554.50	177	8.00	2	4,364.00	35	153.00	33	22,079.50
Feb	2012	-	0	25,485.19	309	-	0	715.00	10	158.00	34	26,358.19
Mar	2012	-	0	19,880.60	214	(95.00)	(1)	1,466.00	8	174.00	37	21,425.60
Apr	2012	-	0	14,831.18	114	-	0	4,419.96	30	175.00	32	19,426.14
May	2012	5,400.00	27	40,803.36	523	-	0	24,157.56	178	1,118.00	199	66,078.92
June	2012	20,000.00	100	45,292.24	396	-	0	24,857.46	213	2,034.36	383	72,184.06
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$ 25,400.00</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>\$ 228,677.70</b>	<b>2,702</b>	<b>\$ 5,517.00</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>\$ 85,690.29</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>\$ 9,098.36</b>	<b>1,667</b>	<b>\$ 328,983.35</b>

Awarded Funding \$ 1,075,800  
 Unused Award \$ 156,264  
 Percent Used 85.5%

**NOTES:** This chart represents an 18 month allocation of 1million dollars, as we at that time were moving from a calendar year to fiscal year program. As we approached summer programming we recognized that not all of the allocation would be used, we reached out to Linkages, HOC and Child Welfare protective services and provided another \$25,000 in allocation to them. This represents a much higher per cent used due to those two factors.

**Footnotes:**

**Programs:** Recreation Department sponsored programs such as Camps, Summer Fun, classes, trips & Afterschool Programs

**Leagues:** All youth sports leagues

**POS:** Aquatics (just daily admissions for pools)

**Memberships:** A pool pass, weight room, open gym, family memberships, individual memberships



**FY14-19 PUBLIC SERVICES PROGRAM: FISCAL PLAN**

**Recreation**

<b>FISCAL PROJECTIONS</b>	<b>FY13 ESTIMATE</b>	<b>FY14 REC</b>	<b>FY15 PROJECTION</b>	<b>FY16 PROJECTION</b>	<b>FY17 PROJECTION</b>	<b>FY18 PROJECTION</b>	<b>FY19 PROJECTION</b>
<b>ASSUMPTIONS</b>							
Property Tax Rate: Real Property	0.021	0.020	0.022	0.021	0.019	0.019	0.017
Assessable Base: Real Property (000)	138,035,900	139,313,600	144,298,700	149,553,400	156,044,000	162,667,200	169,634,300
Property Tax Collection Factor: Real Property	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%
Property Tax Rate: Personal Property	0.053	0.050	0.055	0.053	0.048	0.048	0.043
Assessable Base: Personal Property (000)	2,994,500	2,994,500	2,994,500	2,994,500	2,994,500	2,994,500	2,994,500
Property Tax Collection Factor: Personal Property	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%
Indirect Cost Rate	12.13%	15.69%	15.69%	15.69%	15.69%	15.69%	15.69%
CPI (Fiscal Year)	2.3%	2.3%	2.4%	2.7%	3.2%	3.5%	3.7%
Investment Income Yield	0.16%	0.19%	0.36%	0.75%	1.35%	1.80%	2.15%
<b>BEGINNING FUND BALANCE</b>	<b>1,340,004</b>	<b>3,152,226</b>	<b>438,982</b>	<b>694,293</b>	<b>1,253,932</b>	<b>389,713</b>	<b>1,120,209</b>
<b>REVENUES</b>							
Taxes	30,201,486	29,016,049	33,002,312	32,593,555	30,709,056	31,953,621	29,761,461
Charges For Services	11,648,510	11,685,910	11,966,372	12,293,054	12,680,285	13,117,755	13,607,047
Miscellaneous	(105,360)	(105,360)	(105,360)	(105,360)	(105,360)	(105,360)	(105,360)
<b>Subtotal Revenues</b>	<b>41,744,636</b>	<b>40,596,599</b>	<b>44,863,324</b>	<b>44,781,249</b>	<b>43,283,981</b>	<b>44,966,016</b>	<b>43,263,148</b>
<b>INTERFUND TRANSFERS (Net Non-CIP)</b>							
Transfers To Debt Service Fund	(14,467,260)	(15,378,380)	(15,407,790)	(14,756,870)	(14,545,460)	(14,632,780)	(14,411,840)
GO Bonds	(9,266,570)	(8,918,420)	(9,832,780)	(9,162,780)	(8,953,370)	(9,040,290)	(8,821,550)
Long Term Leases	(2,323,020)	(1,834,050)	(1,834,300)	(1,836,050)	(1,834,050)	(1,834,450)	(1,832,250)
Transfers To The General Fund	(3,887,370)	(5,635,610)	(4,750,410)	(4,767,740)	(4,767,740)	(4,767,740)	(4,767,740)
Indirect Costs	(2,040,960)	(2,789,200)	(2,904,000)	(2,921,330)	(2,921,330)	(2,921,330)	(2,921,330)
Facility Maintenance - Custodial Cleaning	(611,360)	(611,360)	(611,360)	(611,360)	(611,360)	(611,360)	(611,360)
Facility Maintenance Costs	(1,151,850)	(1,151,850)	(1,151,850)	(1,151,850)	(1,151,850)	(1,151,850)	(1,151,850)
Other - DCM	(83,200)	(83,200)	(83,200)	(83,200)	(83,200)	(83,200)	(83,200)
Fund Balance Transfer	0	(1,000,000)	0	0	0	0	0
Transfers From The General Fund	1,009,700	1,009,700	1,009,700	1,009,700	1,009,700	1,009,700	1,009,700
Countywide Services	888,710	888,710	888,710	888,710	888,710	888,710	888,710
ASACs	120,990	120,990	120,990	120,990	120,990	120,990	120,990
<b>TOTAL RESOURCES</b>	<b>28,617,380</b>	<b>28,370,445</b>	<b>29,894,515</b>	<b>30,718,672</b>	<b>29,992,453</b>	<b>30,722,949</b>	<b>29,971,517</b>
<b>PSP OPER. BUDGET APPROP/ EXP'S.</b>							
Operating Budget	(25,465,154)	(27,931,463)	(27,931,463)	(27,931,463)	(27,931,463)	(27,931,463)	(27,931,463)
Labor Agreement	n/a	0	(731,671)	(842,124)	(842,124)	(842,124)	(842,124)
Annualizations and One-Time	n/a	n/a	70,137	70,137	70,137	70,137	70,137
JCA Senior Transportation Partnership			(318,750)	(318,750)	(318,750)	(318,750)	(318,750)
JCA Senior Mini Trips			(25,120)	(25,120)	(25,120)	(25,120)	(25,120)
Good Hope Neighborhood Recreation Center			0	(69,000)	(207,000)	(207,000)	(207,000)
Scotland Neighborhood Recreation Center			(235,000)	(235,000)	(235,000)	(235,000)	(235,000)
Ross Boddy Neighborhood Recreation Center	n/a	n/a	(28,355)	(113,420)	(113,420)	(113,420)	(113,420)
<b>Subtotal PSP Oper Budget Approp / Exp's</b>	<b>(25,465,154)</b>	<b>(27,931,463)</b>	<b>(29,200,222)</b>	<b>(29,464,740)</b>	<b>(29,602,740)</b>	<b>(29,602,740)</b>	<b>(29,602,740)</b>
<b>TOTAL USE OF RESOURCES</b>	<b>(25,465,154)</b>	<b>(27,931,463)</b>	<b>(29,200,222)</b>	<b>(29,464,740)</b>	<b>(29,602,740)</b>	<b>(29,602,740)</b>	<b>(29,602,740)</b>
<b>YEAR END FUND BALANCE</b>	<b>3,152,226</b>	<b>438,982</b>	<b>694,293</b>	<b>1,253,932</b>	<b>389,713</b>	<b>1,120,209</b>	<b>368,777</b>
<b>END-OF-YEAR RESERVES AS A PERCENT OF RESOURCES</b>							
	<b>11.0%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>

**Assumptions:**

1. The County's policy is to maximize tax supported reserves in the General Fund, which is limited by the County Charter to five percent of the prior year's General Fund revenues. Reserves in the property tax special funds have been minimized as much as possible consistent with this reserve policy.
2. Related revenues, debt service, and operating costs have been incorporated for new facilities opening between FY15 and FY19: Good Hope (Renovation/Expansion); Scotland (Renovation/Expansion); and Ross Boddy (Renovation/Expansion) Neighborhood Recreation Centers.
3. These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY15 to FY19 expenditures are based on the "major, known commitments" of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, the operating costs of capital facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. The projected future expenditures, revenues, and fund balances may vary based on changes not assumed here to fee or tax rates, usage, inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here.

**DEBT SERVICE - GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, LONG & SHORT TERM LEASES AND OTHER DEBT**

	Actual FY11	Actual FY12	Budget FY13	Estimated FY13	Recommended FY14	% Chg App/Bud	App % GO Bonds
<b>GO BOND DEBT SERVICE EXPENDITURES</b>							
General County	27,003,518	30,543,387	32,551,540	30,955,140	43,669,580		15.7%
Roads & Storm Drains	53,086,858	55,703,984	60,931,310	60,478,450	60,881,770		21.9%
Public Housing	34,920	-	62,080	-	8,430		0.0%
Parks	8,254,747	8,524,688	9,270,320	9,195,140	9,215,400		3.3%
Public Schools	111,502,816	115,105,587	122,423,790	122,137,830	124,466,930		44.7%
Montgomery College	10,912,757	13,544,588	15,129,550	14,912,250	15,783,460		5.7%
Bond Anticipation Notes/Commercial Paper	1,087,898	468,332	1,269,380	836,000	1,255,000		
Bond Anticipation Notes/Liquidity & Remarketing	2,950,530	2,457,131	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,000,000		
Cost of Issuance	1,457,453	1,463,839	1,146,200	1,146,200	1,180,600		
<b>Total General Fund</b>	<b>216,291,497</b>	<b>227,811,536</b>	<b>246,284,170</b>	<b>243,161,010</b>	<b>259,461,170</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>91.3%</b>
Fire Tax District Fund	5,488,984	6,686,464	7,201,560	6,891,430	7,084,290	-1.6%	2.5%
Mass Transit Fund	3,265,863	3,620,529	5,658,860	6,236,260	8,199,410	44.9%	2.9%
Recreation Fund	7,880,932	8,106,417	9,753,140	9,266,570	8,918,420	-8.6%	3.2%
Bradley Noise Abatement Fund	26,179	24,864	23,550	23,550	-	-100.0%	0.0%
Cabin John Noise Abatement Fund	7,776	7,388	7,000	7,000	-	-100.0%	0.0%
<b>Total Tax Supported Other Funds</b>	<b>16,669,734</b>	<b>18,445,662</b>	<b>22,644,110</b>	<b>22,424,810</b>	<b>24,202,120</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
<b>TOTAL TAX SUPPORTED</b>	<b>232,961,231</b>	<b>246,257,198</b>	<b>268,928,280</b>	<b>265,585,820</b>	<b>283,663,290</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>TOTAL GO BOND DEBT SERVICE EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>232,961,231</b>	<b>246,257,198</b>	<b>268,928,280</b>	<b>265,585,820</b>	<b>283,663,290</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>LONG-TERM LEASE EXPENDITURES</b>							
Revenue Authority - Conference Center	1,901,647	1,903,886	995,440	309,650	645,340		
Revenue Authority - HMS Piccard Drive	632,473	633,038	636,870	636,870	638,690		
Silver Spring Garages	5,544,329	5,554,164	5,574,890	5,070,660	-		
Revenue Authority - Recreation Pools	2,325,813	2,325,680	2,323,020	2,323,020	1,834,050		
Fire and Rescue Equipment	4,509,226	4,459,475	4,418,350	4,418,350	3,780,600		
<b>TOTAL LONG-TERM LEASE EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>14,913,488</b>	<b>14,876,243</b>	<b>13,948,570</b>	<b>12,758,550</b>	<b>6,898,680</b>	<b>-50.5%</b>	
<b>SHORT-TERM LEASE EXPENDITURES / FINANCING</b>							
Technology Modernization Project	3,666,170	4,645,524	5,948,090	5,660,200	6,347,200		
Libraries Phone System Modernization	-	-	-	-	53,000		
Ride On Buses	3,803,104	3,798,450	4,570,460	3,801,650	5,815,700		
Public Safety System Modernization	-	2,186,770	4,373,600	4,373,600	5,519,600		
Fire and Rescue Fuel Management System	-	-	329,340	-	165,000		
<b>TOTAL SHORT-TERM LEASE EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>7,469,274</b>	<b>10,630,744</b>	<b>15,221,490</b>	<b>13,835,450</b>	<b>17,900,500</b>	<b>17.6%</b>	
<b>OTHER LONG-TERM DEBT</b>							
Silver Spring Music Venue - Tax supported	-	244,712	293,700	293,700	294,000		
Site II Acquisition - Tax supported	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000		
MHI-HUD Loan - Non-Tax supported	73,572	71,725	69,770	69,770	67,730		
Water Quality Protection Bonds - Non-Tax supported	-	-	3,210,000	2,876,640	3,017,000		
MHI - Property Acquisition Fund - Non-Tax supported	2,502,130	4,088,162	5,643,610	4,409,100	7,510,400		
<b>TOTAL OTHER LONG-TERM DEBT</b>	<b>2,975,702</b>	<b>4,804,599</b>	<b>9,617,080</b>	<b>8,049,210</b>	<b>11,289,130</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	
<b>DEBT SERVICE EXPENDITURES</b>							
<b>Tax Supported</b>	<b>255,743,993</b>	<b>272,408,897</b>	<b>298,792,040</b>	<b>292,873,520</b>	<b>309,156,470</b>		
<b>Non-Tax Supported - Other Long-term Debt</b>	<b>2,575,702</b>	<b>4,159,887</b>	<b>8,923,380</b>	<b>7,355,510</b>	<b>10,595,130</b>		
<b>TOTAL DEBT SERVICE EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>258,319,695</b>	<b>276,568,784</b>	<b>307,715,420</b>	<b>300,229,030</b>	<b>319,751,600</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	
<b>GO BOND DEBT SERVICE FUNDING SOURCES</b>							
General Funds	207,864,998	219,829,713	239,970,440	235,715,560	253,612,440		
Other Interest: Installment Notes, Interest & Penalties	1,054,896	2,225,680	-	1,281,720	-		
BAN/Commercial Paper Investment Income	130,638	17,222	35,000	35,000	70,000		
Federal Subsidy on General Obligation Bonds	5,102,186	6,278,732	6,278,730	6,128,730	5,778,730		
Premium on General Obligation Bonds	3,122,734	642,202	-	-	-		
<b>Total General Fund Sources</b>	<b>217,275,452</b>	<b>228,993,549</b>	<b>246,284,170</b>	<b>243,161,010</b>	<b>259,461,170</b>		
Fire Tax District Funds	5,202,615	6,571,643	7,201,560	6,891,430	7,084,290		
Mass Transit Fund	2,806,196	2,816,245	5,658,860	6,236,260	8,199,410		
Recreation Fund	7,643,013	7,843,508	9,753,140	9,266,570	8,918,420		
Bradley Noise Abatement Fund	26,179	24,864	23,550	23,550	-		
Cabin John Noise Abatement Fund	7,776	7,388	7,000	7,000	-		
<b>Total Other Funding Sources</b>	<b>15,685,779</b>	<b>17,263,648</b>	<b>22,644,110</b>	<b>22,424,810</b>	<b>24,202,120</b>		
<b>TOTAL GO BOND FUNDING SOURCES</b>	<b>232,961,231</b>	<b>246,257,197</b>	<b>268,928,280</b>	<b>265,585,820</b>	<b>283,663,290</b>		
<b>NON GO BOND FUNDING SOURCES</b>							
General Funds	12,144,619	15,568,095	18,222,590	16,744,680	13,897,830		
MHI Fund - HUD Loan	73,572	71,725	69,770	69,770	67,730		
Water Quality Protection Bonds	-	-	3,210,000	2,876,640	3,017,000		
MHI - Property Acquisition Fund	2,502,130	4,088,162	5,643,610	4,409,100	7,510,400		
Mass Transit Fund	3,803,104	3,798,450	4,570,460	3,801,650	5,815,700		
Recreation Fund	2,325,813	2,325,680	2,323,020	2,323,020	1,834,050		
Fire Tax District Fund	4,509,226	4,459,475	4,418,350	4,418,350	3,945,600		
<b>TOTAL NON GO BOND FUNDING SOURCES</b>	<b>25,358,464</b>	<b>30,311,587</b>	<b>38,787,140</b>	<b>34,643,210</b>	<b>36,088,310</b>		
<b>TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES</b>	<b>258,319,695</b>	<b>276,568,784</b>	<b>307,715,420</b>	<b>300,229,030</b>	<b>319,751,600</b>		
<b>TOTAL GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND SALES</b>							
Actual and Estimated Bond Sales	250,000,000	320,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000		
Council SAG Approved Bond Funded Expenditures	325,000,000	320,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000		

10

**DEBT SERVICE - GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS AND LONG & SHORT TERM LEASES AND OTHER DEBT**

	Recommended FY14	Projected FY15	Projected FY16	Projected FY17	Projected FY18	Projected FY19
<b>GO BOND DEBT SERVICE EXPENDITURES</b>						
General County	43,669,580	48,421,790	55,935,540	61,255,510	62,650,620	66,697,520
Roads & Storm Drains	60,881,770	67,997,100	67,274,180	69,643,830	74,099,080	80,449,470
Public Housing	8,430	31,710	30,870	30,030	29,190	28,350
Paris	9,215,400	9,857,960	9,325,670	9,763,300	11,061,670	12,007,350
Public Schools	124,466,930	135,692,650	142,814,950	147,841,190	147,030,230	147,577,950
Montgomery College	15,783,460	18,335,990	20,719,880	22,495,400	24,387,610	24,864,630
Bond Anticipation Notes/Commercial Paper	1,255,000	2,807,500	4,578,000	7,149,000	8,662,700	10,073,000
Bond Anticipation Notes/Liquidity & Remarketing	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Cost of Issuance	1,180,600	1,212,500	1,244,100	1,277,700	1,312,200	1,347,700
<b>Total General Fund</b>	<b>299,461,170</b>	<b>287,357,200</b>	<b>304,923,190</b>	<b>322,455,960</b>	<b>332,233,300</b>	<b>346,045,970</b>
Fire Tax District Fund	7,084,290	7,835,840	6,816,550	6,976,020	7,543,660	7,809,260
Mass Transit Fund	8,199,410	8,688,350	11,083,080	11,469,960	12,540,860	15,096,680
Recreation Fund	8,918,420	9,832,780	9,162,780	8,953,370	9,040,290	8,821,550
<b>Total Tax Supported Other Funds</b>	<b>24,202,120</b>	<b>26,356,970</b>	<b>27,062,410</b>	<b>27,399,350</b>	<b>29,124,810</b>	<b>31,727,490</b>
<b>TOTAL TAX SUPPORTED</b>	<b>283,663,290</b>	<b>313,714,170</b>	<b>331,985,600</b>	<b>349,855,310</b>	<b>361,358,110</b>	<b>377,773,460</b>
<b>TOTAL GO BOND DEBT SERVICE EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>283,663,290</b>	<b>313,714,170</b>	<b>331,985,600</b>	<b>349,855,310</b>	<b>361,358,110</b>	<b>377,773,460</b>
<b>LONG-TERM LEASE EXPENDITURES</b>						
Revenue Authority - Conference Center	645,340	981,140	985,040	988,540	986,640	989,440
Revenue Authority - HHS Piccard Drive	638,690	638,580	641,520	642,500	-	-
Revenue Authority - Recreation Pools	1,834,050	1,834,300	1,836,050	1,834,050	1,834,450	1,832,250
Fire and Rescue Equipment	3,780,600	3,741,600	3,723,200	3,715,800	3,717,900	-
<b>TOTAL LONG-TERM LEASE EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>6,898,680</b>	<b>7,195,620</b>	<b>7,185,810</b>	<b>7,180,890</b>	<b>6,538,990</b>	<b>2,821,690</b>
<b>SHORT-TERM LEASE EXPENDITURES / FINANCING</b>						
Technology Modernization Project	6,347,200	6,784,200	7,360,200	7,360,200	3,729,000	2,714,500
Libraries Phone System Modernization	53,000	105,000	96,000	86,000	86,000	43,000
Ride On Buses	5,815,700	8,572,200	9,314,800	9,314,200	9,314,200	5,513,000
Public Safety System Modernization	5,519,600	6,665,500	8,957,400	6,770,600	4,583,800	2,291,000
Fire and Rescue Fuel Management System	165,000	643,000	956,000	956,000	956,000	791,000
<b>TOTAL SHORT-TERM LEASE EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>17,900,500</b>	<b>22,769,900</b>	<b>26,684,400</b>	<b>24,487,000</b>	<b>18,669,000</b>	<b>11,352,500</b>
<b>OTHER LONG-TERM DEBT</b>						
Silver Spring Music Venue - Tax supported	294,000	295,610	295,100	290,500	290,800	291,000
Site II Acquisition - Tax supported	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
MHI-HUD Loan - Non-Tax supported	67,730	65,630	63,500	61,280	59,030	56,730
Water Quality Protection Bonds - Non-Tax supported	3,017,000	3,019,200	3,020,250	7,432,400	7,430,100	7,431,200
MHI - Property Acquisition Fund - Non-Tax supported	7,510,400	7,508,510	7,512,510	7,513,810	7,515,910	7,511,110
<b>TOTAL OTHER LONG-TERM DEBT</b>	<b>11,289,130</b>	<b>11,288,950</b>	<b>11,291,360</b>	<b>15,697,990</b>	<b>15,695,840</b>	<b>15,690,040</b>
<b>DEBT SERVICE EXPENDITURES</b>						
Tax Supported	309,156,470	344,375,300	366,550,910	382,213,700	387,256,900	392,638,650
Non-Tax Supported - Other Long-term Debt	10,595,130	10,596,240	10,596,260	15,007,490	15,005,040	14,999,040
<b>TOTAL DEBT SERVICE EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>319,751,600</b>	<b>354,968,640</b>	<b>377,147,170</b>	<b>397,221,190</b>	<b>402,261,940</b>	<b>407,637,690</b>
<b>GO BOND DEBT SERVICE FUNDING SOURCES</b>						
General Funds	253,612,440	281,446,470	298,941,190	316,511,960	326,225,300	340,189,970
BAN/Commercial Paper Investment Income	70,000	132,000	275,000	494,000	658,000	786,000
Federal Subsidy on General Obligation Bonds	5,778,730	5,778,730	5,707,000	5,450,000	5,350,000	5,070,000
<b>Total General Fund Sources</b>	<b>259,461,170</b>	<b>287,357,200</b>	<b>304,923,190</b>	<b>322,455,960</b>	<b>332,233,300</b>	<b>346,045,970</b>
Fire Tax District Fund	7,084,290	7,835,840	6,816,550	6,976,020	7,543,660	7,809,260
Mass Transit Fund	8,199,410	8,688,350	11,083,080	11,469,960	12,540,860	15,096,680
Recreation Fund	8,918,420	9,832,780	9,162,780	8,953,370	9,040,290	8,821,550
<b>Total Other Funding Sources</b>	<b>24,202,120</b>	<b>26,356,970</b>	<b>27,062,410</b>	<b>27,399,350</b>	<b>29,124,810</b>	<b>31,727,490</b>
<b>TOTAL GO BOND FUNDING SOURCES</b>	<b>283,663,290</b>	<b>313,714,170</b>	<b>331,985,600</b>	<b>349,855,310</b>	<b>361,358,110</b>	<b>377,773,460</b>
<b>NON GO BOND FUNDING SOURCES</b>						
General Funds	13,897,830	15,870,030	18,735,260	16,538,340	10,076,240	6,728,940
MHI Fund - HUD Loan	67,730	65,630	63,500	61,280	59,030	56,730
Water Quality Protection Bonds	3,017,000	3,019,200	3,020,250	7,432,400	7,430,100	7,431,200
MHI - Property Acquisition Fund	7,510,400	7,508,510	7,512,510	7,513,810	7,515,910	7,511,110
Mass Transit Fund	5,815,700	8,572,200	9,314,800	9,314,200	9,314,200	5,513,000
Recreation Fund	1,834,050	1,834,300	1,836,050	1,834,050	1,834,450	1,832,250
Fire Tax District Fund	3,945,600	4,384,600	4,679,200	4,671,800	4,673,900	791,000
<b>TOTAL NON GO BOND FUNDING SOURCES</b>	<b>36,088,310</b>	<b>41,254,470</b>	<b>45,161,570</b>	<b>47,365,880</b>	<b>40,903,830</b>	<b>29,864,230</b>
<b>TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES</b>	<b>319,751,600</b>	<b>354,968,640</b>	<b>377,147,170</b>	<b>397,221,190</b>	<b>402,261,940</b>	<b>407,637,690</b>
<b>TOTAL GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND SALES</b>						
Estimated Bond Sales	295,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000
Council SAG Approved Bond Funded Expenditures	295,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000	295,000,000
<b>ESTIMATED INTEREST RATE</b>	<b>5.50%</b>	<b>5.50%</b>	<b>5.50%</b>	<b>5.50%</b>	<b>5.50%</b>	<b>5.50%</b>

11