

AGENDA ITEM #11  
December 1, 2009

**ADDENDUM**

**MEMORANDUM**

November 30, 2009

TO: County Council

FROM: Stephen B. Farber, Council Staff Director *SBF*

SUBJECT: Update on Economic Indicators and County Fiscal Plan

**This addendum packet focuses on the November 30 Fiscal Plan update transmitted by OMB Director Joseph Beach.** See ©1-11. The November 25 packet focused on the economic indicators update prepared by Chief Economist David Platt.<sup>1</sup>

Each update of the Fiscal Plan is a snapshot in time. This update reflects the increasingly heavy toll that the Great Recession has taken on State and County revenues, as it has for governments nationwide. The table on ©3 shows that the projected budget gap for FY11 has grown from **\$369.9 million** (the estimate for the Council's last update on September 29) to **\$608.3 million**, or 14 percent of projected expenditures. The table on ©4 outlines the factors that have increased the gap by nearly two-thirds.

**Revenues:** By far the largest factor is the change in Finance's November 2009 estimate of County revenues. The table on ©4 shows a decline of **\$269.7 million** for FY10-11 combined, including **\$208.3 million** for income tax and **\$48.5 million** for property tax. The former, as the Council discussed on November 24, stems both from the weak economy and from the reconciliation of the State's earlier overdistribution of income tax revenue to the counties for tax year 2008.<sup>2</sup> The latter stems from the current calculation of the Charter limit on property tax revenue, which is lower than the March 2009 calculation because the previously projected increase in the CPI has not occurred. The table also shows downward adjustments for several other taxes (transfer/recordation, telephone, and hotel/motel) and investment income. The only tax with an upward adjustment is fuel/energy.

---

<sup>1</sup> See [http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/content/council/pdf/agenda/col/2009/091201/20091201\\_11.pdf](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/content/council/pdf/agenda/col/2009/091201/20091201_11.pdf) for the November 25 packet.

<sup>2</sup> See [http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/content/council/pdf/agenda/col/2009/091124/20091124\\_3-1.pdf](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/content/council/pdf/agenda/col/2009/091124/20091124_3-1.pdf) for the packet on this issue.

This November 2009 revenue writedown of **\$269.7 million** is all the more notable because it comes on top of the March 2009 revenue writedown (following the economic collapse of the preceding months) of **\$342.2 million**.

**State aid:** The updated estimate of FY10 State aid, down another **\$17.4 million**, reflects further losses of highway user revenue and funds for police protection, health services, and the College. The estimate does **not** include any possible withholding of State education aid related to the Maintenance of Effort issue, nor does it project any local aid reductions that may be part of the Governor's FY11 budget, which must address a projected **\$2.0 billion** State budget gap. Bad news in either area would increase the County's projected **\$608.3 million** gap for FY11.

**FY10-11 expenditures:** The Fiscal Plan does not project FY11 agency expenditures on an average rate of growth, which is unrealistically high, but on an estimate of same services and specific major known commitments (MKCs). See the list on ©5. Note that the list includes general wage adjustments (COLAs) and step increases at the level originally bargained for FY10, as well as retiree health benefits pre-funding (OPEB), reserves, and PAYGO for the capital program at the scheduled or policy levels. For FY10, the table on ©4 shows that the FY11 gap is mitigated to some extent by the reduction of **\$24.3 million** in tax supported expenditures (**\$29.7 million** overall) in the FY10 savings plan approved by the Council on November 17.

### Next Steps

The County has enormous economic assets and strengths, but the fiscal impact of the downturn has been, and continues to be, corrosive. As large as the currently projected FY11 gap now is, **several potential factors could make it larger**, such as a further writedown of State revenues in December or County revenues in March, further local aid reductions in the Governor's FY11 State budget in January, and failure to resolve the Maintenance of Effort issue.

Revenue increases are not a likely solution because the County has little **"tax room."** Income and property tax, which together provide more than 80 percent of the County's own-source revenue, will not help. The income tax rate, 3.2 percent, is already at the maximum level allowed by the State. Exceeding the Charter limit on property tax revenue would require the support of all nine Councilmembers, which almost certainly will not occur. Other taxes have a relatively small yield, and in some cases (fuel/energy tax, telephone tax) they have been sharply increased or expanded in recent years.

### Possible next steps to address the FY11 gap include the following:

1. **FY10 savings plan – Round 2.** A second FY10 savings plan is clearly needed to start reducing the FY11 gap. It is also needed because, as Mr. Beach notes on ©2, the November writedown of County revenues has led to a **projected deficit of \$31.6 million in the FY10 undesignated reserve**. See line 3 on ©3. The Executive will transmit a proposed new savings plan in December. Council staff will analyze it during the recess so that Committees and the Council can take prompt action when they return in January.

The first FY10 savings plan did not call for structural changes. Most items involved increased lapse in filling positions, reduced operating expense for travel and other functions, or normal delays in implementing programs. (The additional \$1.3 million reduction in library materials was an exception.) Given the County's fiscal position, the second FY10 savings plan should be larger, in the range of **\$50-70 million** if possible. It will have to go beyond the relatively minor adjustments of the first plan.

- 2. Large but controversial steps in FY11.** For the Council's last fiscal update on September 29 we listed several possible measures:

	<b>\$ in millions</b>
1. No general wage adjustments (COLAs)	123.3
2. No step increases	27.6
3. No retiree health insurance (OPEB) pre-funding	64.5
4. Reduce reserves from 6 to 5 percent	40.0
5. Eliminate most PAYGO from the capital program	<u>30.0</u>
	<b>285.4</b>

All these measures are controversial, but the FY11 gap cannot be closed without large building blocks of this kind. The first two are subject to collective bargaining with agency employee organizations. (In FY10 there were steps for all agencies but no COLAs, except for Park Police.) The last two were used to balance the FY10 budget but are inconsistent with County policy. OPEB pre-funding, which was eliminated in FY10 except for \$12.0 million for MCPS, is important to ensure future resources for the agencies' retiree health insurance plans.

- 3. Furloughs.** Use of furloughs to achieve savings and avoid layoffs has been widespread across the nation by both governments and the private sector. The Governor implemented furloughs and/or temporary salary reductions for Executive Branch employees of 4 to 5 days in FY09 and 3 to 10 days in FY10, depending on their salary level. Prince George's County imposed 10 days of furloughs in both FY09 and FY10.<sup>3</sup> To date, ten Maryland counties have initiated furlough and/or salary reduction plans in FY10.

For County agencies, the savings for one furlough day would be \$2.3 million for MCG (\$1.3 million if Public Safety is excluded), \$6.7 million for MCPS, \$0.6 million for Montgomery College, and \$0.3 million for M-NCPPC, for a total of **\$9.9 million**. The Executive first discussed the option of furloughs in September 2008. He did not propose them in FY09 and has not proposed them to date in FY10, but he has said they remain an option in FY11. He wrote on July 24 that "any furlough should be implemented across all tax supported agencies to ensure equitable treatment of employees and to produce substantive savings." This would require the cooperation of all agencies, notably MCPS, which would account for third-thirds of any savings.

---

<sup>3</sup> The U.S. District Court held that the FY09 furloughs were unconstitutional. The issue has not yet been resolved.

**Even if all the steps outlined above were taken to reduce the FY11 gap as currently projected, a gap in the range of \$200-250 million would still remain.** Looking to FY12 and beyond, while the State and the County may have better prospects than many other governments, we will still face the end of federal stimulus funds and the likelihood of a slow recovery at best – one in which, as Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke said on November 24, jobs are “likely to remain scarce for some time.”

The County’s aggregate operating budget for FY07 – the final budget of the last Council – was up 11.1 percent over the FY06 budget. As the economy has weakened, the three budgets of this Council to date, FY08-10, have been up 7.6, 3.0, and 1.0 percent, respectively. Excluding the double appropriation of \$79.5 million for MCPS debt service, the FY10 aggregate operating budget was actually down 1.1 percent, the first County budget decline in 18 years.

Absent decisive action, the structural imbalance in the County’s budget is likely to persist. For budgets in FY11 and future years to be in balance, all stakeholders – unions, managers, and the community alike – will have to join in focusing more rigorously on what services County agencies should provide and how best to provide them.

f:\farber\10opbud\fiscal update 12-1-09 addendum.doc



OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET


Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

Joseph F. Beach  
Director

MEMORANDUM

November 30, 2009

TO: Stephen B. Farber, Staff Director, County Council

FROM: Joseph F. Beach, Director 

SUBJECT: Fiscal Plan Update

Attached please find the updated fiscal plan and supporting documents. As the attached documents indicate, the projected gap for FY11 is now estimated at over \$608 million including implementation of the recently approved FY10 Savings Plan. The various assumptions underlying this forecast are discussed below, but include the most recent revenue estimates prepared by the Department of Finance. A projected gap of this magnitude at this point in the budget cycle will present the County with significant challenges and many difficult choices. We are considering a variety of spending reduction solutions at this point, but we consider *all* services to be under consideration for significant reductions at this point. Please note the following concerning certain assumptions and issues in the fiscal plan:

1. **Revenues:** The latest revenue projections from the Department of Finance for tax revenues and investment income. All taxes are projected at current rates with the exception of property taxes, which are assumed to be at the charter limit through a rate cut.
2. **State Aid:** State Aid is projected at current formulas for FY10 and FY11 except in those cases where the Board of Public Works has approved reductions. Given the State's projected budget gap of \$2 billion, it is likely that the Governor's FY11 Operating Budget, which will be published in January 2009, may include significant reductions to local aid. School Aid is projected at legally approved levels and we have made no assumptions regarding the imposition of a penalty related to the calculation of K-12 Maintenance of Effort.
3. **FY10 Expenditures:** The FY11 projection of Agency Expenditures is based on a same services estimate of next year's expenditures, not an average rate of growth, and the specific major known commitments that are included in the estimate are attached. While the Executive will not recommend an operating budget at same services, this approach is used to indicate the level of existing personnel cost and programmatic commitments and challenges that exist in the budget. These challenges include the cost of existing labor contracts and those currently being negotiated, benefit cost increases, Retiree Health Insurance, the operating cost of new capital facilities, inflationary escalation in existing service contracts, annualization of approved positions, and other programmatic costs. The FY11 budget cannot be balanced, in the absence of dramatic tax increases, without many of these costs being eliminated or significantly reduced.

Office of the Director

4. **Fund Balance:** One of the most troubling implications of the revised revenue estimates is that the FY10 ending/FY11 beginning undesignated fund balance for the tax supported funds (excluding proprietary funds and grants) is now showing a current year deficit of \$31.6 million (line 3 of the fiscal plan summary). This is nearly \$108 million *less* than the \$76.2 million reserve the Council targeted when it approved the FY10 budget. The reduced reserve levels are due primarily to the write down in FY10 projected revenues of \$105 million (tax revenues, investment income, and State aid). As you know, the tax supported reserves shown in the fiscal plan is a combination of all of the tax supported funds of all of the agencies. We are analyzing the fund-by-fund impact of the revenue losses to determine which funds may end FY10 in a negative position.
5. **Supplemental Appropriations:** The fiscal plan includes an assumption of \$20 million in tax supported supplemental appropriations. The Council has approved only two such appropriations so far this year. The largest and most unpredictable item is for snow removal and storm response. The Executive Branch is strictly limiting the number and amount of any supplemental appropriations.
6. **Actions:** Given the gravity of the current challenges we face it is necessary to act quickly to address both the current year projected deficit and the projected FY11 budgetary gap. We will work collaboratively with the County Council on these solutions.

JFB:df

Attachments

- c: Timothy L. Firestine, Chief Administrative Officer  
Jennifer Barrett, Director, Department of Finance  
Kathleen Boucher, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer

# Fiscal Plan Update

## December 2009

### Tax Supported Fiscal Plan Summary

(\$ in Millions)

	App. FY10	Est. FY10	% Chg. FY10-11	% Chg. FY10-11	Rec. FY11
	5-21-09	12-1-09	Rec/Bud	Rec/Est	
<b>Total Resources</b>					
Revenues	3,804.9	3,700.1	-2.7%	0.1%	3,703.3
Beginning Reserves Undesignated	115.5	103.6	-127.4%	-130.5%	(31.6)
Beginning Reserves Designated	-	-	0.0%	0.0%	-
Net Transfers In (Out)	37.2	37.1	-79.4%	-79.4%	7.7
<b>Total Resources Available</b>	<b>3,957.7</b>	<b>3,840.8</b>	<b>-7.0%</b>	<b>-4.2%</b>	<b>3,679.3</b>
<b>Less Other Uses of Resources (Capital, Debt Service, Reserve)</b>	<b>362.2</b>	<b>269.5</b>	<b>25.1%</b>	<b>68.1%</b>	<b>453.1</b>
<b>Available to Allocate to Agencies</b>	<b>3,595.4</b>	<b>3,571.3</b>	<b>-10.3%</b>	<b>-9.7%</b>	<b>3,226.2</b>
<b>Agency Uses</b>					
Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS)	2,020.1	2,010.2	3.6%	4.1%	2,092.2
Montgomery College (MC)	217.5	216.5	7.5%	8.0%	233.9
MNCPPC (w/o Debt Service)	106.6	104.5	3.4%	5.5%	110.2
MCG	1,251.2	1,240.2	6.6%	7.5%	1,333.6
<b>Subtotal Agency Uses</b>	<b>3,595.4</b>	<b>3,571.3</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>3,769.9</b>
<b>Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding</b>					
Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS)					30.9
Montgomery College (MC)					0.8
MNCPPC (w/o Debt Service)					3.6
MCG					29.2
<b>Subtotal Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding</b>					<b>64.5</b>
<b>Subtotal Other Uses of Resources (Capital, Debt Service, Reserve)</b>	<b>362.2</b>	<b>269.5</b>	<b>25.1%</b>	<b>68.1%</b>	<b>453.1</b>
<b>Total Uses</b>	<b>3,957.7</b>	<b>3,840.8</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>11.6%</b>	<b>4,287.6</b>
<b>(Gap)/Available</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>			<b>(608.3)</b>

**Notes:**

1. FY11 property tax revenues are at the Charter Limit.
2. Projected agency spending is based on Major Known Commitments including compensation.
3. Retiree health insurance pre-funding is assumed at the scheduled FY11 amounts.
4. Reserves are restored to the policy level of 6% of total resources in FY11.
5. PAYGO is restored to the policy level of 10% of the planned bond issue in FY11.

## Reconciliation of the Gap from September to December 2009

Gap on September 29, 2009	\$ (369.886)
Revenue Update (FY10 and FY11)	(269.701)
Income Tax	(208.327)
Property Tax -- FY10	0.899
Property Tax -- reduced FY11 yield due to lower inflation	(48.467)
Transfer and Recordation Tax	(4.138)
Fuel/Energy Tax	6.093
Telephone Tax	(1.123)
Hotel/Motel Tax	(7.996)
Investment Income	(6.642)
State Aid (FY10)	(17.388)
Highway User Revenue	(9.285)
Police Protection	(4.855)
Health Services	(1.623)
Montgomery College	(1.625)
FY09 Year-End Closing	(11.878)
FY10 Savings Plan	24.316
County Government	11.165
MCPS	9.900
Montgomery College	1.071
MNCPPC	2.180
Other Adjustments	
Changes to FY11 revenues due to updated assumptions (CPI, population)	(1.058)
Shift supplemental set aside from FY11 to FY10	1.200
Impact of FY10 Savings Plan on Charges for Services	0.180
Updated FY10 MCPS revenues (November financial report)	0.400
Slippage of FY09 Mass Transit Aid to FY10	22.089
Slippage of FY09 Current Revenue reductions to FY10	4.631
Agency Spending -- MKC plus Compensation	
MCG	(6.100)
MCPS	0.000
Montgomery College	0.000
MNCPPC	0.000
Net Effect on Reserves of Resource Changes	14.905
Gap on December 1, 2009	\$ (608.291)

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	<b>Major Known Commitments by Agency</b>						
2							
3			<b>MCPS</b>	<b>MCG</b>	<b>College</b>	<b>MNCPPC</b>	<b>Total</b>
4	FY10 Appropriation		2,020,078,263	1,251,173,090	217,549,063	106,646,100	3,595,446,516
5	Debt Service Reimbursement		(79,537,322)				(79,537,322)
6	FY10 Appropriation (net)		1,940,540,941	1,251,173,090	217,549,063	106,646,100	3,515,909,194
7	Potential or Negotiated FY11 Compensation:						
8	(FY10 Level)						
9	General wage adjustment		84,775,000	28,847,581	6,984,015	2,682,200	123,288,796
10	Steps/service increments		18,859,068	5,513,250	2,313,659	910,900	27,596,877
11	Projected group insurance cost increases		26,048,866	16,000,000	828,500		42,877,366
12	Projected retirement cost increases		2,195,092	12,500,000			14,695,092
13	Retiree health insurance pre-funding		30,942,250	29,154,000	803,000	3,628,350	64,527,600
14	Other projected bargaining costs		400,000	593,820			993,820
15	Elimination of one-time items			(6,655,160)			(6,655,160)
16	Cost increase due to enrollment		6,537,580		1,236,305		7,773,885
17	Operating impact of new facilities		417,396	661,020	3,202,161		4,280,577
18	Annualizations						0
19	Annualization of FY10 increments			2,178,450			2,178,450
20	Other position annualizations			276,350	1,000,035		1,276,385
21	GE Facility Maintenance			717,440			717,440
22	MCFRS – FROMS contract			(306,630)			(306,630)
23	Programmatic set-asides						0
24	Master Lease payment reductions			(1,371,120)			(1,371,120)
25	Community Grants			3,226,520			3,226,520
29	Working Families Income Supplement			1,455,200			1,455,200
30	Election cycle changes			4,104,840			4,104,840
35	County Attorney Disparity Study			500,000			500,000
46	Inflation:						
47	Energy/utility costs			682,070	159,576		841,646
48	Fuel/rate increases			3,069,320			3,069,320
49	Contracts			560,830			560,830
50	Instructional materials/other		5,420,285				5,420,285
51	Nonpublic placements		2,105,578				2,105,578
52	Other				600,000		600,000
53	Other inescapable cost increases:						
54	Self-insurance, workers compensation		2,447,053	9,912,000	25,000		12,384,053
55	Maintenance, transportation, etc.		2,407,573				2,407,573
59			182,555,741	111,619,781	17,152,251	7,221,450	318,549,223
60							
61	<b>Total</b>		<b>2,123,096,682</b>	<b>1,362,792,871</b>	<b>234,701,314</b>	<b>113,867,550</b>	<b>3,834,458,417</b>
62	<b>Percent increase</b>		<b>9.4%</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>

**REVENUE SUMMARY  
TAX SUPPORTED BUDGETS  
(\$ Millions)**

A KEY REVENUE CATEGORIES	B App FY10	C Estimate FY10	D % Chg. FY10-11 Rec/Bud	E % Chg. FY10-11 Rec/Est	F Rec. FY11 12-1-09	G % Chg. FY11-12	H Projected FY12	I % Chg. FY12-13	J Projected FY13	K % Chg. FY13-14	L Projected FY14	M % Chg. FY14-15	N Projected FY15	O % Chg. FY15-16	P Projected FY16
<b>TAXES</b>	5-21-09	12-1-09													
1 Property Tax (less PDs)	1,440.9	1,441.8	-0.1%	-0.2%	1,438.9	2.8%	1,479.3	3.4%	1,529.4	3.5%	1,583.7	3.8%	1,644.2	3.2%	1,696.9
2 Income Tax	1,214.8	1,120.7	-4.1%	4.0%	1,165.5	5.8%	1,232.7	6.5%	1,312.5	7.3%	1,408.0	8.9%	1,533.1	7.6%	1,649.1
3 Transfer Tax	65.0	65.5	18.2%	17.2%	76.8	2.9%	79.0	0.3%	79.2	3.2%	81.8	2.0%	83.4	2.3%	85.3
4 Recordation Tax	51.9	40.6	-0.2%	27.6%	51.8	3.2%	53.4	-0.3%	53.3	2.9%	54.8	2.4%	56.1	2.3%	57.4
a Recordation Tax Premium	6.5	6.5	-100.0%	-100.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
5 Energy Tax	130.4	133.5	4.5%	2.1%	136.3	2.6%	139.8	2.8%	143.7	2.4%	147.2	2.1%	150.3	1.8%	153.0
5 Telephone Tax	32.8	31.6	3.2%	7.2%	33.9	6.8%	36.2	6.6%	38.6	6.4%	41.0	6.2%	43.6	6.1%	46.3
7 Hotel/Motel Tax	20.0	16.0	-12.4%	9.7%	17.5	1.7%	17.8	0.2%	17.9	-0.2%	17.8	0.1%	17.8	1.0%	18.0
3 Admissions Tax	2.1	2.1	-0.3%	-0.3%	2.1	-3.8%	2.0	-3.4%	2.0	-3.2%	1.9	-3.0%	1.9	-3.1%	1.8
<b>Total Local Taxes</b>	<b>2,964.4</b>	<b>2,858.4</b>	<b>-1.4%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>2,922.8</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>3,040.3</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>3,176.5</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>3,336.2</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>3,530.5</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>3,707.8</b>
<b>INTERGOVERNMENTAL AID</b>															
0 Highway User	10.3	1.0	113.1%	2157.5%	21.8	51.3%	33.0	0.0%	33.0	0.0%	33.0	0.0%	33.0	0.0%	33.0
1 Police Protection	13.5	8.6	1.2%	1.2%	13.7	1.1%	13.8	1.2%	14.0	1.2%	14.2	1.2%	14.3	1.0%	14.5
2 Libraries	5.4	5.4	1.2%	1.2%	5.5	1.1%	5.5	1.2%	5.6	1.2%	5.7	1.2%	5.8	1.0%	5.8
3 Health Services Case Formula	5.3	3.6	2.5%	2.5%	5.4	2.7%	5.5	3.0%	5.7	3.2%	5.9	3.4%	6.1	3.6%	6.3
4 Mass Transit	22.8	44.9	2.5%	2.5%	23.4	2.7%	24.0	3.0%	24.7	3.2%	25.5	3.4%	26.4	3.6%	27.3
5 Public Schools	440.1	441.1	1.2%	1.0%	445.5	1.2%	450.9	1.2%	456.4	1.2%	462.0	1.2%	467.7	0.0%	467.7
6 Community College	32.5	30.9	2.8%	8.2%	33.4	2.5%	34.2	2.5%	35.1	2.5%	36.0	2.5%	36.9	0.0%	36.9
7 Direct Reimbursements	27.8	27.8	3.1%	3.1%	28.7	3.3%	29.6	3.6%	30.7	3.8%	31.9	4.0%	33.1	4.1%	34.5
7a Direct Reimb: DSS Services	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0.0	n/a	0.0	n/a	0.0	n/a	0.0	n/a	0.0	n/a	0.0
8 Other	10.0	10.0	3.1%	3.1%	10.3	3.3%	10.7	3.6%	11.1	3.8%	11.5	4.0%	11.9	4.1%	12.4
<b>Subtotal State Aid</b>	<b>567.7</b>	<b>573.4</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>587.7</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>607.4</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>616.4</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>625.6</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>635.2</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>638.4</b>
9 Federal Aid	1.7	1.7	1.6%	1.6%	1.7	1.6%	1.7	1.8%	1.7	1.9%	1.8	2.0%	1.8	2.0%	1.8
<b>Total Intergovernmental Aid</b>	<b>569.3</b>	<b>575.0</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>589.3</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>609.1</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>618.1</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>627.4</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>637.0</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>640.3</b>
<b>FEES AND FINES</b>															
2 Licenses & Permits	11.8	11.8	1.5%	1.5%	12.0	1.5%	12.2	1.5%	12.4	1.5%	12.6	1.5%	12.8	1.5%	12.9
3 Charges for Services	48.8	48.3	2.0%	2.0%	49.3	2.2%	50.3	2.4%	51.5	2.6%	52.8	2.7%	54.3	2.9%	55.8
4 Fines & Forfeitures	38.0	38.0	1.6%	1.6%	38.7	1.6%	39.3	1.6%	39.9	1.6%	40.5	1.6%	41.2	1.6%	41.8
5 Montgomery College Tuition	71.1	71.1	1.6%	1.6%	72.3	0.6%	72.7	0.5%	73.0	0.2%	73.2	0.0%	73.2	0.0%	73.2
<b>Total Fees and Fines</b>	<b>169.8</b>	<b>169.3</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>172.2</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>174.5</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>176.9</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>179.1</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>181.4</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>183.8</b>
<b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>															
7 Investment Income	5.9	1.8	11.6%	261.5%	6.6	63.7%	10.8	47.3%	15.9	31.1%	20.8	13.1%	23.5	2.8%	24.2
8 Other Miscellaneous	95.5	95.5	2.5%	2.5%	12.3	2.7%	12.6	3.0%	13.0	3.2%	13.4	3.4%	13.9	3.6%	14.4
<b>Total Miscellaneous</b>	<b>101.4</b>	<b>97.3</b>	<b>-81.4%</b>	<b>-80.6%</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>23.4%</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>34.2</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>37.4</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>38.5</b>
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>3,804.9</b>	<b>3,700.1</b>	<b>-2.7%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>3,703.3</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>3,847.3</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>4,000.3</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>4,176.9</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>4,386.3</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>4,570.4</b>
11 \$ Change from prior Budget	96.3	(8.5)			3.2		144.1		153.0		176.6		209.3		184.1

2

**PROJECTED TOTAL USES OF RESOURCES (COMBINED USES)**

(\$ Millions)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
USE OF RESOURCES	App. FY10	Estimate FY10	% Chg. FY10-11	% Chg. FY10-11	Projected FY10	% Chg. FY11-12	Projected FY12	% Chg. FY12-13	Projected FY13	% Chg. FY13-14	Projected FY14	% Chg. FY14-15	Projected FY15	% Chg. FY15-16	Projected FY16
	5-21-09	12-1-09	Rec / Bud	Rec / Est	12-1-09										
<b>1 Total Resources</b>															
2 Revenues	3,804.9	3,700.1	-2.7%	0.1%	3,703.3	3.9%	3,847.3	4.0%	4,000.3	4.4%	4,176.9	5.0%	4,386.3	4.2%	4,570.4
3 Beginning Reserves Undesignated	115.5	103.6	-127.4%	-130.5%	(31.6)	-419.8%	101.1	16.4%	117.7	8.7%	127.9	8.8%	139.1	9.5%	152.4
4 Beginning Reserves Designated	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
5 Net Transfers In	37.2	37.1	-79.4%	-79.4%	7.7	2.7%	7.9	3.0%	8.1	3.2%	8.4	3.4%	8.6	3.6%	9.0
<b>6 Total Resources</b>	<b>3,957.7</b>	<b>3,840.8</b>	<b>-7.0%</b>	<b>-4.2%</b>	<b>3,679.3</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>3,956.3</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>4,126.2</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>4,313.2</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>4,534.1</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>4,731.8</b>
7 \$ Change from prior Budget	50.9	(66.0)			(161.5)		277.0		169.9		187.1		220.8		197.7
<b>8 Uses: Non-Agency</b>															
<b>9 Capital Investment ( a )</b>															
0 Debt Service: GO Bonds for all Agy's.	224.8	224.8	9.8%	9.8%	246.8	10.0%	271.4	9.2%	296.3	6.2%	314.7	3.4%	325.4	0.0%	325.4
1 Debt Service: Local Parks	5.0	5.0	0.0%	0.0%	5.0	0.0%	5.0	0.0%	5.0	0.0%	5.0	0.0%	5.0	0.0%	5.0
2 Debt Service: Leases	21.7	21.7	29.8%	29.8%	28.1	8.8%	30.6	-15.3%	25.9	-2.7%	25.2	-5.7%	23.8	0.0%	23.8
3 CIP Current Revenue	30.7	26.1	24.0%	46.0%	38.1	-21.2%	30.1	48.3%	44.6	43.7%	64.0	0.0%	64.0	0.0%	64.0
4 CIP Paygo	1.3	1.3	2293.6%	2293.6%	31.5	3.2%	32.5	-10.8%	29.0	3.4%	30.0	0.0%	30.0	0.0%	30.0
4a CIP Paygo Rec Tax	0.0	0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
<b>5 Sub-total Capital</b>	<b>283.5</b>	<b>278.9</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>25.3%</b>	<b>349.5</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>369.5</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>400.7</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>438.9</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>448.1</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>448.1</b>
<b>6 Other Uses</b>															
7 Set Aside: Potential Supplementals	0.0	19.7			0.0		20.0		20.0		20.0		20.0		20.0
8 Set Aside: Other Claims	2.5	2.5			2.5		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
9 Revenue Stabilization Fund	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
<b>10 Sub-total Other</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>22.2</b>			<b>2.5</b>		<b>20.0</b>								
<b>11 Reserves</b>															
12 Revenue Stabilization Fund	119.6	119.6	0.0%	0.0%	119.6	0.0%	119.6	0.0%	119.6	0.0%	119.6	0.0%	119.6	0.0%	119.6
13 Reserve Undesignated	76.2	(31.6)	32.7%	-419.8%	101.1	116.4%	117.7	8.7%	127.9	8.8%	139.1	9.5%	152.4	7.8%	164.3
14 Reserve Designated	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
<b>15 Sub-total Reserves</b>	<b>195.8</b>	<b>88.0</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>150.8%</b>	<b>220.8</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>237.4</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>247.6</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>258.8</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>272.0</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>283.9</b>
16 Less Revenue Stabilization Fund	(119.6)	(119.6)	0.0%	0.0%	(119.6)	0.0%	(119.6)	0.0%	(119.6)	0.0%	(119.6)	0.0%	(119.6)	0.0%	(119.6)
17 Less Designated Reserve	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
<b>18 Sub-total Undesignated Reserves</b>	<b>76.2</b>	<b>(31.6)</b>	<b>32.7%</b>	<b>-419.8%</b>	<b>101.1</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>117.7</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>127.9</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>139.1</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>152.4</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>164.3</b>
<b>19 Total Uses: Non-Agency</b>	<b>362.2</b>	<b>269.5</b>	<b>25.1%</b>	<b>68.1%</b>	<b>453.1</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>507.3</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>548.6</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>598.0</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>620.5</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>632.4</b>
<b>20 Uses: Available for Agency Services</b>	<b>3,595.4</b>	<b>3,571.3</b>	<b>-10.3%</b>	<b>-9.7%</b>	<b>3,226.2</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>3,449.1</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>3,577.6</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>3,715.2</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>3,913.5</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>4,099.4</b>
<b>21 \$ Change from prior Budget</b>	<b>86.0</b>	<b>61.8</b>			<b>(345.1)</b>		<b>222.9</b>		<b>128.5</b>		<b>137.7</b>		<b>198.3</b>		<b>185.8</b>

①

## FY09 4TH QUARTERLY ANALYSIS

Department				% Change	FY09	Variance
	Latest	Actual	Variance	Actual	Savings Plan	4th QA vs.
	Budget 4th Qtr (A)	4thQA (B)	to Budget (A-B)	to Budget (A-B)/A	(E)	Approved Savings Plan
<b>Tax Supported</b>						
<b>General Fund</b>						
Board of Appeals	617,790	611,910	5,880	1.0%	15,480	(9,600)
Board of Elections	10,410,870	9,916,836	494,034	4.7%	-	494,034
Circuit Court	10,627,870	10,128,771	499,099	4.7%	268,690	230,409
Commission for Women	1,309,350	1,273,461	35,889	2.7%	32,940	2,949
Consumer Protection	2,642,690	2,567,048	75,642	2.9%	66,560	9,082
Correction and Rehabilitation	65,595,320	66,640,253	(1,044,933)	-1.6%	655,700	(1,700,633)
County Attorney	5,621,240	5,819,342	(198,102)	-3.5%	147,960	(346,062)
County Council	9,408,610	8,940,756	467,854	5.0%	237,000	230,854
County Executive	6,778,076	6,471,550	306,526	4.5%	174,500	132,026
Economic Development	8,026,370	8,408,186	(381,816)	-4.8%	182,660	(564,476)
Emergency Management and Homeland Security	1,593,470	1,249,732	343,738	21.6%	16,220	327,518
Environmental Protection	4,269,250	4,012,226	257,024	6.0%	108,240	148,784
Ethics Commission	264,310	279,257	(14,947)	-5.7%	-	(14,947)
Finance	10,363,806	9,522,203	841,603	8.1%	264,840	576,763
General Services	30,849,080	32,367,787	(1,518,707)	-4.9%	708,030	(2,226,737)
Health and Human Services	198,297,600	189,997,470	8,300,130	4.2%	3,020,250	5,279,880
Housing and Community Affairs	5,643,880	5,275,278	368,602	6.5%	139,050	229,552
Human Resources	9,338,460	8,759,640	578,820	6.2%	262,970	315,850
Human Rights	2,320,770	2,300,427	20,343	0.9%	61,600	(41,257)
Inspector General	687,180	603,862	83,318	12.1%	17,520	65,798
Intergovernmental Relations	876,740	859,997	16,743	1.9%	22,070	(5,327)
Legislative Oversight	1,349,590	1,277,772	71,818	5.3%	27,400	44,418
Management and Budget	3,986,400	3,826,525	159,875	4.0%	100,880	58,995
Merit System Protection Board	153,800	148,765	5,035	3.3%	-	5,035
Non-Departmental Accounts	127,125,060	118,516,136	8,608,924	6.8%	6,085,030	2,523,894
People's Counsel	250,170	239,347	10,823	4.3%	-	10,823
Police	240,988,148	235,431,978	5,556,170	2.3%	2,397,300	3,158,870
Public Information	1,305,940	1,326,188	(20,248)	-1.6%	32,720	(52,968)
Public Libraries	-	-	-	-	-	-
Administration, Outreach, and Support	3,650,668	3,474,302	176,366	4.8%	112,400	63,966
Library Services to the Public	26,379,190	26,191,158	188,032	0.7%	80,000	108,032
Collection Management	8,725,980	8,033,333	692,647	7.9%	787,420	(94,773)
Regional Services Centers	4,354,840	4,145,101	209,739	4.8%	110,910	98,829
Sheriff	20,091,954	20,286,876	(194,922)	-1.0%	205,180	(400,102)
State's Attorney	12,595,950	12,684,217	(88,267)	-0.7%	125,960	(214,227)
Technology Services	33,243,660	32,389,997	853,663	2.6%	1,357,920	(504,257)
Transportation	54,162,210	52,997,996	1,164,214	2.1%	1,145,150	19,064
Utilities	25,866,880	25,521,020	345,860	1.3%	-	345,860
Zoning and Administrative Hearings	541,520	490,754	50,766	9.4%	13,800	36,966
<b>General Fund Total</b>	<b>950,314,692</b>	<b>922,987,457</b>	<b>27,327,235</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>18,984,350</b>	<b>8,342,885</b>

(P)

## FY09 4TH QUARTERLY ANALYSIS

Department				% Change	FY09	Variance
	Latest	Actual	Variance	Actual	Savings Plan	4th QA vs.
	Budget 4th Qtr (A)	4thQA (B)	to Budget (A-B)	to Budget (A-B)/A	(E)	Approved Savings Plan
<b>Special Funds</b>						
<u>Bethesda Urban District</u>						
Urban Districts	3,397,940	3,396,480	1,460	0.0%	-	1,460
<u>Silver Spring Urban District</u>						
Urban Districts	2,846,410	2,600,926	245,484	8.6%	72,270	173,214
<u>Wheaton Urban District</u>						
Urban Districts	1,628,710	1,540,063	88,647	5.4%	41,510	47,137
<u>Mass Transit</u>						
Transit Services	110,545,885	108,203,623	2,342,262	2.1%	1,417,760	924,502
<u>Fire</u>						
Fire and Rescue Service	191,930,731	190,365,610	1,565,121	0.8%	1,455,322	109,799
<u>Recreation</u>						
Recreation	31,843,467	30,112,053	1,731,414	5.4%	795,430	935,984
<u>Economic Development Fund</u>						
Economic Development Fund	1,886,350	674,192	1,212,158	64.3%	-	1,212,158
<b>Special Funds Total</b>	<b>344,079,493</b>	<b>336,892,947</b>	<b>7,186,546</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>3,782,292</b>	<b>3,404,254</b>
<b>TAX SUPPORTED TOTAL</b>	<b>1,294,394,185</b>	<b>1,259,880,404</b>	<b>34,513,781</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>22,766,642</b>	<b>11,747,139</b>

## Non-Tax Supported

### Special Funds

#### Grant Fund MCG

Circuit Court	2,642,031	2,642,031	-	0.0%		
Correction and Rehabilitation	75,000	75,000	-	0.0%		
County Executive	737,025	737,025	-	0.0%		
Economic Development	4,026,993	4,026,993	-	0.0%		
Environmental Protection	443,000	443,000	-	0.0%		
Emergency Management and Homeland Security	1,555,330	1,555,330	-	0.0%		
Fire and Rescue Service	7,298,911	7,298,911	-	0.0%		
Health and Human Services	75,071,134	75,071,134	-	0.0%		
Housing and Community Affairs	24,524,473	24,524,473	-	0.0%		
Intergovernmental Relations	34,000	34,000	-	0.0%		
Liquor Control	40,395	40,395	-	0.0%		
Non-Departmental Accounts	4,838,463	4,838,463	-	0.0%		
Police	4,967,124	4,967,124	-	0.0%		
Public Libraries	165,550	165,550	-	0.0%		
Recreation	133,155	133,155	-	0.0%		
Regional Services Center	150,000	150,000	-	0.0%		
Sheriff	2,157,740	2,157,740	-	0.0%		
State's Attorney	256,675	256,675	-	0.0%		
Technology Services	581,375	581,375	-	0.0%		
Transit Services	5,402,202	5,402,202	-	0.0%		
<b>Grant Fund MCG subtotal</b>	<b>135,100,576</b>	<b>135,100,576</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.0%</b>		

## FY09 4TH QUARTERLY ANALYSIS

Department				% Change	FY09	Variance
	Latest	Actual	Variance	Actual	Savings Plan	4th QA vs.
	Budget 4th Qtr (A)	4thQA (B)	to Budget (A-B)	to Budget (A-B)/A	(E)	Approved Savings Plan
<u>Cable Television</u>						
Cable Television	11,922,900	11,811,637	111,263	0.9%		111,263
<u>Montgomery Housing Initiative</u>						
Housing and Community Affairs	38,844,546	21,771,102	17,073,444	44.0%		17,073,444
<u>Water Quality Protection Fund</u>						
Environmental Protection	6,986,640	6,540,117	446,523	6.4%		446,523
<u>Restricted Donations</u>						
Restricted Donations	1,336,925	534,719	802,206	60.0%		802,206
<b>Special Funds Total</b>	<b>59,091,011</b>	<b>40,657,575</b>	<b>18,433,436</b>	<b>31.2%</b>	-	<b>18,433,436</b>
<b>Enterprise Funds</b>						
<u>Community Use of Public Facilities</u>						
Community Use of Public Facilities	9,092,570	8,628,171	464,399	5.1%	-	464,399
<u>Bethesda Parking District</u>						
Parking District Services	12,509,070	12,394,929	114,141	0.9%	-	114,141
<u>Montgomery Hills Parking District</u>						
Parking District Services	113,310	98,668	14,642	12.9%	-	14,642
<u>Silver Spring Parking District</u>						
Parking District Services	11,004,350	10,510,058	494,292	4.5%	-	494,292
<u>Wheaton Parking District</u>						
Parking District Services	1,232,040	1,123,112	108,928	8.8%	-	108,928
<u>Permitting Services</u>						
Permitting Services	29,657,730	26,445,622	3,212,108	10.8%	-	3,212,108
<u>Solid Waste Collection</u>						
Solid Waste Services	6,755,900	6,246,999	508,901	7.5%	-	508,901
<u>Solid Waste Disposal</u>						
Solid Waste Services	94,106,590	88,862,968	5,243,622	5.6%	-	5,243,622
<u>Vacuum Leaf Collection</u>						
Solid Waste Services	5,277,860	4,779,670	498,190	9.4%	-	498,190
<u>Liquor Control</u>						
Liquor Control	72,672,129	69,512,915	3,159,214	4.3%	969,480	2,189,734
<b>Enterprise Funds Total</b>	<b>242,421,549</b>	<b>228,603,112</b>	<b>13,818,437</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>969,480</b>	<b>12,848,957</b>
<b>NON-TAX SUPPORTED TOTAL</b>	<b>436,613,136</b>	<b>404,361,263</b>	<b>32,251,873</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>969,480</b>	<b>31,282,393</b>
<b>TAX and NON-TAX SUPPORTED TOTAL</b>	<b>1,731,007,321</b>	<b>1,664,241,667</b>	<b>66,765,654</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>23,736,122</b>	<b>43,029,532</b>
<b>Internal Service Funds</b>						
<u>Employee Health Benefit Self Insurance Fund</u>						
Human Resources	162,277,400	158,627,416	3,649,984	2.2%	-	3,649,984
<u>Motor Pool Internal Service Fund</u>						
Fleet Management Services	67,836,790	65,706,129	2,130,661	3.1%	1,499,540	631,121
<u>Printing and Mail Internal Service Fund</u>						
Public Works and Transportation	6,583,470	6,252,437	331,033	5.0%	162,650	168,383
<u>Self Insurance Internal Service Fund</u>						
Finance	43,430,390	48,122,807	(4,692,417)	-10.8%	-	(4,692,417)
<b>INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS TOTAL</b>	<b>280,128,050</b>	<b>278,708,789</b>	<b>1,419,261</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>1,662,190</b>	<b>(242,929)</b>

10

## FY09 4TH QUARTERLY ANALYSIS

Département				% Change	FY09	Variance
	Latest	Actual	Variance	Actual	Savings Plan	4th QA vs.
	Budget 4th Qtr (A)	4thQA (B)	to Budget (A-B)	to Budget (A-B)/A	(E)	Approved Savings Plan
<b>NDA: Tax Supported - General Fund</b>						
MISC. COMMUNITY GRANTS	5,783,460	5,636,892	146,568	2.5%	-	146,568
NDA - COUNTY LEASES	18,455,210	16,782,232	1,672,978	9.1%	461,380	1,211,598
NDA ARTS COUNCIL OF MONTGOMERY	5,315,480	5,306,781	8,699	0.2%	-	8,699
NDA BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS	20,000	22,959	(2,959)	-14.8%	-	(2,959)
NDA CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION	150	135	15	10.0%	-	15
NDA CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLEMENTATION	1,561,000	1,262,801	298,199	19.1%	-	298,199
NDA CLOSING COST ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	33,790	33,790	-	0.0%	-	-
NDA COMPENSATION ADJUSTMENT	1,618,620	996,321	622,299	38.4%	809,420	(187,121)
NDA CONFERENCE AND VISITOR'S BUREAU	695,450	695,450	-	0.0%	-	-
NDA CONFERENCE CENTER	567,090	411,964	155,126	27.4%	-	155,126
NDA CONTRIBUTION TO MOTOR POOL	1,380,830	1,214,928	165,902	12.0%	-	165,902
NDA CONTRIB TO SELF INS FUND-RISK MGMT	9,809,740	9,397,551	412,189	4.2%	-	412,189
NDA COUNTY ASSOCIATIONS	70,450	69,953	497	0.7%	-	497
NDA DESKTOP COMPUTER MODERNIZATION	7,136,360	6,848,283	288,077	4.0%	828,410	(540,333)
NDA GRANTS TO MUNI IN LIEU SHARES TAXES	28,020	28,012	8	0.0%	-	8
NDA GROUP INSURANCE RETIREES	26,039,330	26,039,330	-	0.0%	-	-
NDA HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES	355,340	355,340	-	0.0%	-	-
NDA HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION ROADS	337,700	337,549	151	0.0%	-	151
NDA HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES COMMISS.(HOC)	6,140,640	5,987,120	153,520	2.5%	153,520	-
NDA INDEPENDENT AUDIT	394,000	290,805	103,195	26.2%	-	103,195
NDA ITPCC	30,000	6,555	23,445	78.2%	-	23,445
NDA METRO WASH COUNCIL OF GOVTS	742,720	743,366	(646)	-0.1%	-	(646)
NDA MONTGOMERY COALITION FOR ADULT ENGLISH LITERACY (MCAEL)	745,000	745,000	-	0.0%	-	-
NDA MUNICIPAL TAX DUPLICATION	7,488,240	7,479,836	8,404	0.1%	-	8,404
NDA POLICE PRISONER MEDICAL	10,000	27,313	(17,313)	-173.1%	-	(17,313)
NDA PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCEMENTS AND PERSONNEL COST SAVINGS	-	-	-	0.0%	-	-
NDA PUBLIC TECHNOLOGIES, INC (PTI)	27,500	20,000	7,500	27.3%	-	7,500
NDA REBATE-TAKOMA PARK-POLICE PROTECTI	705,570	716,590	(11,020)	-1.6%	-	(11,020)
NDA RETIREE HEALTH BENEFITS TRUST	16,391,930	16,391,930	-	0.0%	-	-
NDA ROCKVILLE PARKING DISTRICT	377,500	485,109	(107,609)	-28.5%	-	(107,609)
NDA SPECIAL RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTNS-	3,740	3,749	(9)	-0.2%	-	(9)
NDA STATE POSITIONS SUPPLEMENT	144,950	114,954	29,996	20.7%	-	29,996
NDA STATE RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTION	934,920	934,919	1	0.0%	-	1
NDA -TAKOMA PARK-LIBRARIES TRANSITION	112,630	112,352	278	0.2%	-	278
NDA WORKING FAMILIES INCOME SUPPLEMENT	13,667,700	9,016,267	4,651,433	34.0%	3,832,300	819,133
<b>NDA: Tax Supported - General Fund Total</b>	<b>127,125,060</b>	<b>118,516,136</b>	<b>8,608,924</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>6,085,030</b>	<b>2,523,894</b>
<b>NDA: Non-Tax Supported - Grant Fund</b>						
NDA COMPENSATION ADJUSTMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
NDA FUTURE FEDERAL/STATE/OTHER GRANTS	4,813,463	4,813,463	-	0.0%	-	-
NDA HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES	25,000	25,000	-	0.0%	-	-
<b>NDA: Non-Tax Supported - Grant Fund Total</b>	<b>4,838,463</b>	<b>4,838,463</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

(11)