

---

# CIP Fiscal Policy

## DEFINITION AND PURPOSE OF FISCAL POLICY

Fiscal policy is the combined practices of government with respect to revenues, expenditures, and debt management. Fiscal policy for the Capital Improvements Program focuses on the acquisition, construction, and renovation of public facilities and on the funding of such activities, with special attention to both long-term borrowing, and increasingly, short-term debt.

The purposes of the CIP fiscal policy are:

- To encourage careful and timely decisions on the relative priority of programs and projects;
- To encourage cost effectiveness in the type, design, and construction of capital improvements;
- To assure that the County may borrow readily for essential public improvements; and
- To keep the cost of debt service and other impacts of capital projects at levels affordable in the operating budget.

The County Charter (Article 3, Sections 302 and 303) provides that the County Executive shall submit to the Council, not later than January 15 of each even-numbered calendar year, a comprehensive six-year program for capital improvements. This biennial Capital Improvements Program takes effect for the six-year period which begins in each odd-numbered fiscal year. The Charter provides that the County Executive shall submit a Capital Budget to the Council, not later than January 15 of each year.

The County Executive must also submit to the Council, not later than March 15 of each year, a proposed operating budget, along with comprehensive six-year programs for public services and fiscal policy. The Public Services Program (PSP)/Operating Budget and Capital Improvements Program (CIP)/Capital Budget constitute major elements in the County's fiscal planning for the next six years. Fiscal policies for the PSP and CIP are parts of a single consistent County fiscal policy.

In November 1990, the County's voters approved an amendment to Section 305 of the Charter to require that the Council annually adopt spending affordability guidelines for the capital and operating budgets. Spending affordability guidelines for the CIP are interpreted in subsequent County law to be limits on the amount of general obligation debt and Park and Planning debt that may be approved for expenditure for the first year and the second year of the CIP, and for the entire six years of the CIP. Spending affordability guidelines are adopted in odd-numbered calendar years. Since 1994, the Council, in conjunction with the Prince George's County Council, adopted one-year spending limits for WSSC. These

spending control limits include guidelines for new debt and annual debt service.

## CURRENT CIP FISCAL POLICIES

The fiscal policies followed by the Executive and Council are relatively stable, but not static. They evolve in response to changes in the local economy, revenues and funding tools available, and requirements for public services. Also, policies are not absolute; policies may conflict and must be balanced in their application. Presented here are the CIP fiscal policies currently in use by the County Executive.

### Policy on Eligibility for Inclusion in the CIP

Capital expenditures included as projects in the CIP should:

- Have a reasonably long useful life, or add to the physical infrastructure and capital assets of the County, or enhance the productive capacity of County services. Examples are roads, utilities, buildings, and parks. Such projects are normally eligible for debt financing.
- Generally have a defined beginning and end, as differentiated from ongoing programs in the PSP.
- Be related to current or potential infrastructure projects. Examples include facility planning or major studies. Generally, such projects are funded with current revenues.
- Be carefully planned to enable decision makers to evaluate the project based on complete and accurate information. In order to permit projects to proceed to enter the CIP once satisfactory planning is complete, a portion of "programmable expenditures" (as used in the Bond Adjustment Chart) is deliberately left available for future needs.

### Policy on Funding CIP with Debt

Much of the CIP should be funded with debt. Capital projects usually have a long useful life and will serve future taxpayers as well as current taxpayers. It would be inequitable and an unreasonable fiscal burden to make current taxpayers pay for many projects out of current tax revenues. Bond issues, retired over approximately 20 years, are both necessary and equitable.

Projects deemed to be debt eligible should:

- Have a useful life at least approximately as long as the debt issue with which they are funded.
- Not be able to be funded entirely from other potential revenue sources, such as intergovernmental aid or private contributions.
- Special Note: With a trend towards more public/private partnerships, especially regarding projects aimed at the revitalization or redevelopment of the County's central business districts, there are more instances when public monies leverage private funds. These instances; however, generally bring with them the "private activity" or private

benefit (to the County's partners) that make it necessary for the County to use current revenue as its funding source. It is County fiscal policy that financing in partnership situations ensure that tax-exempt debt is issued only for those improvements that meet the IRS requirements for the use of tax-exempt bond proceeds.

### **Policy on General Obligation Debt Limits**

General obligation debt usually takes the form of bond issues, and pledges general tax revenue for repayment. Paying principal and interest on general obligation debt is the first claim on County revenues. By virtue of prudent financial management and the long-term strength of the local economy, Montgomery County has maintained the highest quality rating of its general obligation bonds, AAA. This top rating by Wall Street rating agencies, assures Montgomery County of a ready market for its bonds and the lowest available interest rates on that debt.

### **Debt Capacity**

To maintain the AAA rating, the County adheres to the following guidelines in deciding how much additional County general obligation debt may be issued in the six-year CIP period:

Overall Debt as a Percentage of Assessed Valuation - This ratio measures debt levels against the property tax base, which generates the tax revenues that are the main source of debt repayment. Total debt, both existing and proposed, should be kept at about 1.5 percent of full market value (substantially the same as assessed value) of taxable real property in the County.

Debt Service as a percentage of the General Fund - This ratio reflects the County's budgetary flexibility to adapt spending levels and respond to economic condition changes. Required annual debt service expenditures should be kept at about ten percent of the County's total General Fund. The General Fund excludes other special revenue tax supported funds. If those special funds supported by all County taxpayers were to be included, the ratio would be below ten percent.

Overall Debt per Capita - This ratio measures the burden of debt placed on the population supporting the debt and is widely used as a measure of an issuers' ability to repay debt. Total debt outstanding and annual amounts issued, when adjusted for inflation, should not cause real debt per capita (i.e., after eliminating the effects of inflation) to rise significantly.

Ten year Payout Ratio - This ratio reflects the amortization of the County's outstanding debt. A faster payout is considered a positive credit attribute. The rate of repayment of bond principal should be kept at existing high levels and in the 60-75 percent range during any ten-year period.

Per Capita Debt to Per Capita Income - This ratio reflects a community's economic strength as an indicator of income levels relative to debt. Total debt outstanding and annual amounts proposed should not cause the ratio of per capita debt

to per capita income to rise significantly above about 3.5 percent.

These ratios will be calculated and reported each year in conjunction with the capital budget process, the annual financial audit and as needed for fiscal analysis.

### **Policy on Terms for General Obligation Bond Issues**

Bonds are normally issued in a 20-year series, with 5 percent of the series retired each year. This practice produces equal annual payments of principal over the life of the bond issue, which means declining annual payments of interest on the outstanding bonds, positively affecting the pay-out ratio (see Debt Limits, below). Thus annual debt service on each bond issue is higher at the beginning and lower at the end. When bond market conditions warrant, or when a specific project would have a shorter useful life, then different repayment terms may be used

### **Policy on Other Forms of General Obligation Debt**

The County may issue other forms of debt as appropriate and authorized by law. From time to time, the County issues Commercial Paper/Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs) for interim financing to take advantage of favorable interest rates within rules established by the Internal Revenue Service.

### **Policy on Use of Revenue Bonds**

Revenue bonds are secured by the pledge of particular revenues to their repayment in contrast to general obligation debt, which pledges general tax revenues. The revenues pledged may be those of a Special Revenue fund, or they may be derived from the funds or revenues received from or in connection with a project. Amounts of revenue debt to be issued should be limited to ensure that debt service coverage ratios shall be sufficient to ensure ratings at least equal to or higher than ratings on outstanding parity debt. Such coverage ratios shall be maintained during the life of any bonds secured by that revenue stream.

### **Policy on Use of Appropriation-backed Debt**

Various forms of appropriation backed debt may be used to fund capital improvements, facilities, or equipment issued directly by the County or using the Montgomery County Revenue Authority or another entity as a conduit issuer. Under such an arrangement, the County enters into a long-term lease with the conduit issuer and the County lease payments fund the debt service on the bonds. Appropriation-backed debt is useful in situations where a separate revenue stream is available to partially offset the lease payments, thereby differentiating the project from those typically funded with general obligation debt. Because these long-term leases constitute an obligation of the County similar to general debt, the value of the leases is included in debt capacity calculations.

---

## **Policy on Issuance of Taxable Debt**

Issuance of taxable debt may be useful in situations where private activity or other considerations make tax-exempt debt disadvantageous or ineligible due to tax code requirements or other considerations. The cost of taxable debt will generally be higher because investors are not able to deduct interest earnings from taxable income. Taxable debt may be issued in instances where the additional cost of taxable debt, including legal, marketing, and other up-front costs and the interest cost over the life of the bonds, is outweighed by the advantages in relation to the financing objectives to be achieved.

## **Policy on Use of Interim Financing**

Interim Financing may be useful in situations where project expenditures are eligible for long term debt, but permanent financing is delayed for specific reasons, other than affordability. Interim Financing should have an identified ultimate funding source, and should be repaid within the short term. An example for interim financing would be in a situation where an offsetting revenue will be available in the future to pay off a portion of the amounts borrowed, but the exact amounts and timing of the repayment are uncertain.

## **Policy on Use of Short Term Financing**

Short term financing (terms of seven years or less) may be appropriate for certain types of equipment or system financings, where the term of the financing correlates to the useful life of the asset acquired, or in other cases where the expected useful life is long, but due to the nature of the system, upgrades are frequent and long term financing is not appropriate. Short term financings in the CIP are also of a larger size or magnitude than smaller purchases typically financed with short term Master Lease financing in the Operating Budget.

## **Policy on Use of Current Revenues**

Use of current revenues to fund capital projects is desirable as it constitutes “pay-as-you-go” financing and, when applied to debt-eligible projects, reduces the debt burden of the County. Decisions to use current revenue funding within the CIP have immediate impacts on resources available to annual operating budgets, and require recognition that certain costs of public facilities should be supported on a current basis rather than paid for over time.

Current revenues from the General Fund are used for designated projects which have broad public use and which fall outside any of the specialized funds. Current revenues from the Special and Enterprise Funds are used if the project is associated with the particular function for which these funds have been established.

The County has the following policies on the use of current revenues in the CIP:

- Current revenues must be used for any CIP projects not eligible for debt financing by virtue of limited useful life.
- Current revenues should be used for CIP projects consisting of limited renovations of facilities, for

renovations facilities which are not owned by the County, and for planning and feasibility studies.

- Current revenues may be used when the requirements for capital expenditures press the limits of bonding capacity.
- Except for excess revenues which must go to the Revenue Stabilization Fund, the County will, whenever possible, give highest priority for the use of one-time revenues from any source to the funding of capital assets or other nonrecurring expenditures so as not to incur ongoing expenditure obligations for which revenues may not be adequate in future years.

## **Policy on Use of Federal and State Grants and Other Contributions**

Grants and other contributions should be sought and used to fund capital projects whenever they are available on terms that are to the County's long-term fiscal advantage. Such revenues should be used as current revenues for debt avoidance and not for debt service.

## **Policy on Minimum Allocation of PAYGO**

PAYGO is current revenue set aside in the operating budget, but not appropriated, and is used to replace bonds for debt eligible expenditures. To reduce the impact of capital programs on future years, the County will fund a portion of its CIP on a pay-as-you-go basis. Pay-as-you-go funding will save money by eliminating interest expense on the funded projects. Pay-as-you-go capital appropriations improve financial flexibility in the event of sudden revenue shortfalls or emergency spending. It is the County's policy to allocate to the CIP each fiscal year as PAYGO at least ten percent of the amount of general obligation bonds planned for issue that year.

## **Policy on Operating Budget Impacts**

In the development of capital projects, the County evaluates the impact of a project on the operating budget and displays such impacts on the project description form. The County shall not incur debt or otherwise construct or acquire a public facility if it is unable to adequately provide for the subsequent annual operation and maintenance costs of the facility.

## **Policy on Taxing New Private Sector Development**

As part of a fair and balanced tax system, new development of housing, commercial, office, and other structures should contribute directly toward the cost of the new and improved transportation and other facilities required to serve that development. To implement this policy, the County has established the following taxes:

Impact Tax – Transportation. The County Council established new rates and geographical boundaries for transportation impact taxes in December 2007. These taxes are levied at four rate schedules: for the majority of the County (the General impact tax area), for designated Metro station areas, for Clarksburg and for six designated MARC station areas.

Impact Tax - Schools. Most residential development in Montgomery County is subject to an impact tax for certain school facilities. The rates are the same Countywide but vary by housing type, commensurate with the average student generation rates of that type of residential development.

School Facilities Payment. A school facilities payment is applied at subdivision review to residential development projects located in a school cluster where enrollment exceeds adopted standards. The school facilities payment is made on a per-student basis, based upon standard student generation rates of that type of residential development.

Development Approval Payment (DAP). In November 1993, the Council created an alternative voluntary review procedure for Metro station policy areas as well as limited residential development. The DAP permits development projects to proceed in certain areas subject to development restrictions. Due to the voluntary nature of this payment, DAP revenue is an unpredictable funding source and is not programmed for specific transportation improvements until after the revenue has been collected. In October 2003, the County Council revised the Annual Growth Policy to replace the Development Approval Payment with an alternative payment mechanism based upon impact tax rates.

Expedited Development Approval Excise Tax (EDAET). The EDAET, also known as Pay-and-Go, enacted by the Council in October 1997, allows certain private development to proceed with construction in moratorium and non-moratorium policy areas after the excise tax has been paid. The tax is assessed on the project based on the intended use of the building, the square footage of the building, and whether the building is in a moratorium policy area. The purpose of the four-year EDAET is to act as a stimulus to residential and commercial construction within the County by making the development approval process more certain. A few subdivisions are permitted to retain the EDAET approval longer than four years. As of December 2003, no new subdivisions may use the EDAET procedure, but several projects previously approved under the procedure have not yet acquired building permits.

Development Districts. Legislation enacted in 1994 established a procedure by which the Council may create a development district. The creation of such a special taxing district allows the County to issue low-interest, tax-exempt bonds that are used to finance the infrastructure improvements needed to allow the development to proceed. Taxes or other assessments are levied on property within the district, the revenues from which are used to pay the debt service on the bonds. Development is, therefore, allowed to proceed, and improvements are built in a timely manner. Only the additional, special tax revenues from the development district are pledged to repayment of the bonds. The County's general tax revenues are not pledged. The construction of improvements funded with development district bonds is required by law to follow the County's usual process for constructing capital improvements and, thus, must be included in the Capital Improvements Program.

Transportation Improvement (Loophole) Credits. Under certain conditions, a developer may choose to pay a transportation improvement credit in lieu of funding or constructing transportation improvements required in order to obtain development approval. These funds are used to offset the cost of needed improvements in the area from which they are paid.

Systems Development Charge (SDC). This charge, enacted by the 1993 Maryland General Assembly, authorized WSSC to assess charges based on the number and type of plumbing fixtures in new construction, effective July 19, 1993. SDC revenues may only be spent on new water and sewerage treatment, transmission, and collection facilities.

## **DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF CIP FUNDING SOURCES**

Within each individual capital project, the funding sources for all expenditures are identified. There are three major types of funding for the capital improvements program: current revenues (including PAYGO); proceeds from bonds and other debt instruments; and grants, contributions, reimbursements, or other funds from intergovernmental and other sources.

### **Current Revenues**

Cash contributions used to support the CIP include: transfers from general revenues, special revenues, and enterprise funds; investment income on working capital or bond proceeds; proceeds from the sale of surplus land; impact taxes, development approval payments, systems development charges, and the expedited development approval excise tax; and developer contributions. The source and application of each are discussed below.

Current Revenue Transfers. When this source is used for a capital project, cash is allocated to the capital project directly from the General, Special, or Enterprise Funds to finance direct payment of some or all of the costs of the project. The General Fund is the general operating fund of the County and is used to account for all financial resources except those required to be accounted for in another fund. The Special Revenue Funds are used to account for the proceeds of specific revenue sources that are restricted to expenditures for specified purposes. The Enterprise Funds are used to account for operations that are financed and operated in a manner similar to private business enterprises, where the intent of the governing body is that the costs of providing goods or services to the general public on a continuing basis be financed primarily through user charges.

Use of current revenues is desirable as it constitutes "pay-as-you-go" financing and, when applied to debt-eligible projects, reduces the debt burden of the County. Decisions to use current revenue funding within the CIP have immediate impacts on resources available to annual operating budgets, and require recognition that certain costs of public facilities should be supported on a current basis rather than paid for over time. Current revenues from the General Fund are used for

designated projects which involve broad public use and which fall outside any of the specialized funds. Current revenues from the Special and Enterprise Funds are used if the project is associated with the particular function for which these funds have been established.

PAYGO is current revenue set aside in the operating budget, but not appropriated. PAYGO is used to replace bonds for debt-eligible expenditures. PAYGO is planned to be ten percent of bonds planned for issue.

Proceeds from the Sale of Public Property. When the County sells surplus land or other real property, proceeds from the sales are deposited into the Land Sale account, and are then used to fund projects in the CIP. By law, 25 percent of the revenue from land sales must be directed to the Montgomery Housing Initiative (MHI) Fund to promote a broad range of housing opportunities in the County. Properties may be excluded from the 25 percent requirement if they are within an area designated as urban renewal or by a waiver from the County Executive.

Impact Taxes are specific charges to developers to help fund improvements to transportation and public school infrastructure. School impact taxes are charged at one rate Countywide for each type of housing. There are three sets of rates for the transportation impact tax: the majority of the County (the general area), designated Metro station areas, and Clarksburg.

All new development (residential or commercial) within the designated areas is subject to payment of applicable impact taxes as a condition to receiving building permits. The tax rates are set by law to be calculated at the time a developer applies for a building permit.

Since revenues to be obtained from impact taxes are payable only when a developer applies for building permits (which may not occur for a number of years), other funding is sometimes required for funding project construction, predicated on eventual repayment from impact taxes.

Contributions are amounts provided to the County by interested parties such as real estate developers in order to support particular capital projects. Contributions are sometimes made as a way of solving a problem which is delaying development approval. A project such as a road widening or connecting road that specifically supports a particular new development may be fully funded (and sometimes built) by the developer. Other projects may have agreed-upon cost-sharing arrangements predicated on the relationship between public and private benefit that will exist as a result of the project. For stormwater management projects, developer contributions are assessed in the form of fees in lieu of on-site construction of required facilities. These fees are applied to the construction of regional facilities serving a particular area. They are separately designated and accounted for within the Capital Projects Fund.

## **Bond Issues and Other Public Agency Debt**

The County government and four of its Agencies are authorized by State law and/or County Charter to issue debt to finance CIP projects. This debt may be either general obligation or self-supporting debt. General obligation debt is characterized in credit analyses as being either "direct" or "overlapping." Direct debt is the sum of total bonded debt and any unfunded debt (such as short-term notes) of the government, and constitutes the direct obligations of the County government which impact its taxpayers. Overlapping debt includes all other borrowing of County agencies or incorporated municipalities within the County's geographic limits, which may impact those County taxpayers who are residents of those municipalities or those County taxpayers who are ratepayers or users of public utilities. More broadly, overlapping debt can help reveal the degree to which the total economy is being asked to support long-term fixed commitments for government facilities.

Direct General Obligation Debt is incurred by the issuance of bonds by the County government and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC). Payment of some bonded debt issued by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) and the Housing Opportunities Commission (HOC) is also guaranteed by the County government.

County government general obligation bonds are issued for a wide variety of functions such as transportation, public schools, community college, public safety, and other programs. These bonds are legally-binding general obligations of the County and constitute an irrevocable pledge of its full faith and credit and unlimited taxing power. The County Code provides for a maximum term of 30 years, with repayment in annual serial installments. Typically, County bond issues have been structured for repayment with level annual payments of principal. Bonds are commonly issued for 20 years. The money to repay general obligation debt comes primarily from general revenues, except that debt service on general obligation bonds, if any, issued for projects of Parking Districts, Liquor, or Solid Waste funds is supported from the revenues of those enterprises.

M-NCPPC is authorized to issue general obligation bonds, also known as Park and Planning bonds, for the acquisition and development of local and certain special parks and advance land acquisition, with debt limited to that supportable within mandatory tax rates established for the Commission. Issuance is infrequent, and because repayment is guaranteed by the County, it is considered a form of direct debt. Debt for regional, conservation, and special park facilities is included within County government general obligation bond issues, with debt service included within the County government's annual operating budget.

HOC bonds which support County housing initiatives such as the acquisition of low/moderate-income rental properties may be guaranteed by the County to an aggregate amount not to exceed \$50 million, when individually authorized by the

County and, as such, are considered direct debt of the County. The HOC itself has no taxing authority, and its projects are considered to be financed through self-supporting debt as noted below.

Overlapping debt is the debt of other governmental entities in the County that is payable in whole or in part by taxpayers of the County.

WSSC General Construction Bonds finance small diameter water distribution and sewage collection lines and required support facilities. They are considered general obligation bonds because they are payable from unlimited *ad valorem* taxes upon all the assessable property in the WSSC district. They are actually paid through assessments on properties being provided service and are considered to be overlapping debt rather than direct debt of the County government.

WSSC Water Supply and Sewage Disposal Bonds, which finance major system improvements, including large diameter water distribution and sewage collection lines, are paid from non-tax sources including user charges collected through water and sewer rates, which also cover all system operating costs. They are backed by unlimited *ad valorem* taxes upon all the assessable property within the WSSC district in addition to mandated rates, fees, and charges sufficient to cover debt service.

Self-Supporting Debt is authorized for the financing of CIP projects by the County government and its Agencies as follows:

County Revenue Bonds are bonds authorized by the County to finance specific projects such as parking garages and solid waste facilities, with debt service to be paid from pledged revenues received in connection with the projects. Proceeds from revenue bonds may be applied only to costs of projects for which they are authorized. They are considered separate from general obligation debt and do not constitute a pledge of the full faith and credit or unlimited taxing power of the County.

County revenue bonds have been used in the Bethesda and Silver Spring Parking Districts, supported by parking fees and fines together with parking district property taxes. County revenue bonds have also been issued for County Solid Waste Management facilities, supported with the revenues of the Solid Waste Disposal system.

HOC Mortgage Revenue Bonds are issued to support HOC project initiatives and are paid through mortgages and rents. HOC revenue bonds, including mortgage purchase bonds for single family housing, are considered fully self-supporting and do not add to either direct or overlapping debt of the County.

The Montgomery County Revenue Authority has authority to issue revenue bonds and to otherwise finance projects through notes and mortgages with land and improvements thereon serving as collateral. These are paid through revenues of the

Authority's several enterprises, which include golf courses and the Montgomery County Airpark.

The County has also used the Revenue Authority as a conduit for alternative CIP funding arrangements. For example, swim centers, a building to house County and State Health and Human Services functions, and the construction of the Montgomery County Conference Center are financed through revenue bonds issued by the Revenue Authority. The County has entered into long-term leases with the Revenue Authority, and the County lease payments fund the debt service on these Revenue Authority bonds. Because these long-term leases constitute an obligation of the County similar to general debt, the value of the leases is included in debt capacity calculations.

### **Intergovernmental Revenues**

CIP projects may be funded in whole or in part through grants, matching funds, or cost sharing agreements with the Federal government, the State of Maryland, regional bodies such as Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), or the County's incorporated municipalities.

Federal Aid. Major projects that involve Federal aid include Metro, commuter rail, interstate highway interchanges and bridges (noted within the CIP Transportation program), and various environmental construction or planning grants under WSSC projects in the Sanitation program. Most Federal aid is provided directly to the State, for redistribution to local jurisdictions.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). CDBG funds are a particular category of Federal aid received through annual formula allocations from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in response to County application and are identified as CIP revenues in the Housing and Community Development program. The County has programmed eligible projects for CDBG funding since 1976, with expenditures programmed within both capital and operating budgets. CDBG funds are used to assist in the costs of neighborhood improvements and facilities in areas where there is significant building deterioration, economic disadvantage, or other need for public intervention in the cycles of urban growth and change. In addition, CDBG funding is used as "seed money" for innovative project initiatives, including redevelopment and rehabilitation loans toward preserving and enhancing older residential and commercial areas and low/moderate-income housing stock.

State Aid. This funding source includes grants, matching funds, and reimbursements for eligible County expenditures for local projects in public safety, environmental protection, courts and criminal justice, transportation, libraries, parkland acquisition and development, mental health, community college, and K-12 public education, notably in school construction.

State aid consistently falls short of funding needs predicated on State mandates or commitments. Although the State of Maryland is specifically responsible for the construction and maintenance of its numbered highways and for the construction

and renovation of approved school projects, the County has in fact advance-funded projects in both categories either through cost-sharing agreements or in anticipation of at least partial reimbursements from the State. Because large County fiscal liabilities are taken on when assuming any or all project costs of State-mandated or obligated facilities, State reimbursement policies and formulas for allocation of funds are important to CIP fiscal planning.

State Aid for School Construction. State funding for school construction, initiated in FY72, is determined annually by the General Assembly on a Statewide basis.

State Aid for Higher Education. State aid is also a source of formula matching funds for community college facilities design, construction, and renovation. Funds are applied for through the Higher Education Commission for inclusion in the State Bond Bill. Approved projects may get up to 50 percent State funding for eligible costs. The total amount of aid available for all projects Statewide is determined based on yearly allocations of available bond proceeds to all Maryland jurisdictions.

State Aid for Transportation. Within the Transportation program, State contributions fund the County's local share of WMATA capital costs for Metrorail and Metrobus, as well as traffic signals and projects related to interconnecting State and local roads. Most State road construction is done under the State Consolidated Transportation Program and is not reflected in the CIP.

State Aid for Public Safety. Under Article 27, Sec. 705 of the Maryland Code, when the County makes improvements to detention and correctional centers resulting from the adoption of mandatory or approved standards, the State, through the Board of Public Works, pays for 50 percent of eligible costs of approved construction or improvements. In addition, financial assistance may be requested from the State for building or maintenance of regional detention centers, and, under 1986 legislation, the State will fund up to half the eligible costs to construct, expand, or equip local jails in need of additional capacity.

Municipal Financing. Some projects with specific benefits to an incorporated municipality within the County may include funding contributions or other financing assistance from that jurisdiction. These include road construction agreements such as with the City of Rockville, wherein the County and City share costs of interconnecting or overlapping road projects. Incorporated towns and municipalities within the County, specifically Rockville, Gaithersburg, and Poolesville, have their own capital improvements programs and may participate in County projects where there is shared benefit. The use of municipal funding in County CIP projects depends upon the following:

- Execution of cost-sharing or other agreements between the County and the municipality, committing each jurisdiction to specific terms, including responsibilities, scheduling,

and cost-shares for implementation and future operation or maintenance of the project;

Approval of appropriations for the project by the legislative body of each jurisdiction; and

- Resolution of any planning or zoning issues affecting the project.

### **Other Revenue Sources**

The use of other revenue sources to fund CIP projects are normally conditioned upon specific legislative authority or project approval, including approval of appropriations for the projects. Approval of a project may be contingent upon actual receipt of the revenues planned to fund it, as in the case of anticipated private contributions that are not subject to particular law or agreement. Other CIP funding sources and eligibility of projects for their use include:

Revolving funds include the revolving loan fund authorized to cover HOC construction loans until permanent financing is obtained. Funds are advanced from County current revenues and repaid at interest rates equivalent to those the County earns on its investments. The Advance Land Acquisition Revolving Fund (ALARF) is used to acquire land in advance of project implementation. Revolving fund appropriations are then normally repaid from the actual project after necessary appropriation is approved.

Agricultural land transfer tax receipts payable to the State but authorized to be retained by the County. These are used to cover local shares in the State purchase of agricultural land easements and for County purchase of or loan guarantees backed by transferable development rights (TDRs).

Private grants such as were provided under profit-sharing agreements with the County's Cable TV corporation, for use in developing public access facilities; and

Insurance or self-insurance proceeds, for projects being renovated or replaced as a result of damage covered by the County's self-insurance system.

## **THE FRAMEWORK OF FISCAL POLICY**

This section presents information on a variety of information sources and factors that are considered in developing and applying fiscal policy for the CIP.

### **Legal Mandates**

State Law. The Annotated Code of Maryland provides the basis for fiscal policy related to debt, real property assessments, and other matters:

- Article 25A (Section 5P) authorizes borrowing of funds and issuance of bonds up to a maximum of the sum of six percent of the assessed valuation of all real property and 15 percent of the assessed valuation of all personal property within the County. Article 25A, Section 5(P) provides that obligations having a maturity not in excess of

twelve months shall not be subject to, or be included in, computing the County's legal debt limitation. However, the County includes its BANs/Commercial Paper in the calculation because it intends to repay the notes with the proceeds of long-term debt to be issued in the near future.

- State of Maryland Chapter 693 of the Laws of 2009 requires that each local government adopt a debt policy and submit it to the State Treasurer. In October 2009 the County Council for Montgomery County adopted resolution 16-1173 outlining the County's debt policy
- Section 8-103 provides for updated assessments of property in three-year (triennial) cycles. The amount of the change in the established market value of the one-third of the properties reassessed each year is phased in over a three-year period. State law also created a ten percent assessment limitation tax credit. This program provides an automatic credit against property taxes equal to the applicable tax rate (including the State rate) times that portion of the current assessment which exceeds the previous year's assessment increased by ten percent. This benefit only applies to owner-occupied residential property.
- Other provisions of State law mandate requirements for environmental review, permits, and controls for public facilities, such as solid waste disposal sites, affecting both the cost and scheduling of these facilities.
- State law mandates specific facility standards such as requirements for school classroom space to be provided by the County for its population and may also address funding allocations to support such requirements.
- State law provides for specific kinds of funding assistance for various CIP projects. In the area of public safety, for example, Article 27, Section 705 of the Maryland Code, provides for matching funds up to 50 percent of the cost of detention or correctional facilities.
- The Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act requires the County to certify that all construction projects financed with any type of State funding are in compliance with local land use plans, including specific State-mandated environmental priorities.

County Law. Article 3 of the County Charter provides for the issuance of public debt for other than annual operating expenditures and imposes general requirements for fiscal policy:

- The capital improvements program must provide an estimate of costs, anticipated revenue sources, and an estimate of the impact of the program on County revenues and the operating budget.
- Bond issues may not be for longer than 30 years.
- Capital improvement projects which are estimated to cost in excess of an annually-established amount (for FY11, \$12.9 million) or which have unusual characteristics or importance, must be individually authorized by law, and are subject to referendum.
- In November 1990, County voters approved an amendment to the Montgomery County Charter, Section 305, to require that the County Council annually adopt

spending affordability guidelines for the capital and operating budgets. Spending affordability guidelines for the CIP have been interpreted in subsequent County law to be limits on the amount of County general obligation debt which may be approved for the first and second years of the CIP and for the entire six-year period of the CIP. Similar provisions apply to debt of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC). These limits may be overridden by a vote of seven of the nine Councilmembers.

- In April 1994, the Council adopted Resolution No. 12-1558 establishing a spending affordability process for WSSC. The process limits WSSC new debt, debt service, water/sewer operating expenses, and rate increases.
- The Charter amendment to Section 305, known as "Question F," limits the annual increase in property tax revenues to the rate of inflation plus the revenue associated with the assessed value of new construction. The limit may be overridden by a vote of seven of the nine Councilmembers. This revenue limit affects CIP fiscal policy by constraining revenue available for future debt service on bond issues and for current revenue contributions to capital projects.
- Chapter 20 of the Montgomery County Code sets various financial guidelines in law such as the deposit of funds, the borrowing of money generally, the activities of the Department of Finance, revenue bonds, and spending affordability.

Federal Law. Policies of the Federal Government affect County fiscal policies relative to debt issuance, revenue expectations, and expenditure controls. Examples of Federal policies that impact County fiscal policy include:

- Internal Revenue Service rules under the Tax Reform Act of 1986, as amended, provide limits on the tax-exempt issuance of public debt, and limit the amount of interest the County can earn from investment of the bond proceeds.
- County shares of costs for some major projects, such as those relating to mass transit and highway interchanges, are dependent upon Federal appropriations and allocations.
- Federal Office of Management and Budget circular A-87 prescribes the nature of expenditures that may be charged to Federal grants.
- Federal legislation will influence the planning and expenditures of specific projects, such as requirements for environmental impact statements for Federally-assisted road projects; and the Davis-Bacon Act, which requires local prevailing wage scales in contracts for Federally-assisted construction projects.
- The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) created a number of additional tax-advantaged forms of governmental debt. These forms of debt are expected to result in lower costs and therefore savings to taxpayers. The County will utilize beneficial provisions of the act and issue these new forms of debt where appropriate and advantageous to the County.

## **Fiscal Planning Projections and Assumptions**

Several different kinds of trends and economic indicators are reviewed, projected, and analyzed each year for their impacts on County programs and services and for their impact on fiscal policy as applied to the Capital Improvements Program. Among these are:

Inflation, which is important as an indicator of future project costs or the costs of delaying capital expenditures;

Population growth, which provides an indicator of the size or scale of required facilities and services, as well as the timing of population-driven project requirements;

Demographic change in the numbers or location within the County of specific age groups or other special groups, which provides an indication of requirements and costs of specific public facilities;

Annual Growth Policy thresholds and other land use indicators, which are a determinant of major public investment in the infrastructure required to enable implementation of land use plans and authorized development within the County;

The assessable property tax base of the County, which is a major indicator for projections of revenue growth to support funding for public facilities and infrastructure;

Residential construction activity and related indicators, which provide early alerts to the specific location and timing of future public facilities requirements. It is also the most important base for projecting growth in the County's assessable property tax base and estimating property tax levels;

Nonresidential construction activity, which is the indicator of jobs, commuters, and requirements for housing and transit-related public investment. It is also one of the bases for projecting the growth of the County's assessable tax base and property tax revenues;

Employment and job growth within the County, which provide indicators for work-related public facilities and infrastructure;

Personal income earned within the County, which is the principal basis for projecting income tax revenues as one of the County's major revenue sources; and

Implementation rates for construction of public facilities and infrastructure. As measured through actual expenditures within programmed and authorized levels, implementation rates are important in establishing actual annual cash requirements to fund the CIP, and thus are a chief determinant of required annual bond issuance.

## **Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)**

The application of fiscal policy in the financial management of the CIP must be in conformity with GAAP standards. This involves the separate identification and accounting of the

various funds which cover CIP expenditures; adherence to required procedures, such as transfers between funds and agencies; and regular audits of CIP transactions, such as the disbursement of bond proceeds and other funds to appropriate projects.

## **Credit Markets and Credit Reviews**

The County's ability to borrow at the lowest cost of funds depends upon its credit standing as assessed by major credit rating agencies such as Moody's Investors Service, Standard & Poor's, and Fitch. Key aspects of the County's continued AAA credit ratings include:

- Adherence to sound fiscal policy relative to expenditures and funding of the CIP;
- Appropriate levels of public investment in the facilities and infrastructure required for steady economic growth;
- Effective production of the necessary revenues to fund CIP projects and support debt service generated by public borrowing;
- Facility planning, management practices and controls for cost containment, and effective implementation of the capital program;
- Planning and programming of capital projects to allow consistent levels of borrowing;
- Appropriate use and levels of revenues other than general obligation bond proceeds to fund the capital program;
- Appropriate levels of CIP funding from annual current tax revenues in order to reduce borrowing needs; and
- Assurances through County law and practice of an absolute commitment to timely repayment of debt and other obligations related to public facilities and infrastructure.

## **Intergovernmental Agreements**

Fiscal policy for the CIP must provide guidance for and be applied within the context of agreements made between the County and other jurisdictions or levels of government. Examples include:

- Agreements with municipalities for cost shares in the construction of inter-jurisdictional roads and bridges;
- Agreements with adjacent jurisdictions related to mass transit or water supply and sewerage; and
- Agreements with Federal agencies involving projects related to Federal facilities within the County.

## **Past County Practice and Principles**

Fiscal policy not only guides but is conditioned by the results of past as well as current County practice. Examples include:

- The former use of general obligation bond funding for the construction of parking garages, which are now more appropriately funded through revenue bond issues;
- The development of more stringent criteria for project funding through debt, with projects once considered eligible for bond-financing now being funded through current revenues or other funding sources;
- The practice of early identification within the CIP of likely projects and requirements for capital expenditure, to avoid sudden program expansion and peaks in debt issuance; and

- 
- The principle of programming projects and expenditure schedules within their most realistic implementation time frames, rather than either inflating the early years of the program or deferring known project requirements to later years of the CIP.

### **Compatibility with Other County Objectives**

Fiscal policy, to be effective, must be compatible with other policy goals and objectives of government. For example:

- Growth management within the County reflects a complex balance among the rights of property owners; the cost of providing infrastructure and services to support new development; and the jobs, tax revenues, and benefits that County growth brings to its residents. Fiscal policy provides guidance for the allocation of public facility costs between the developer and the taxpayer, as well as for limits on debt-supported costs of development relative to increasing County revenues from a growing assessable tax base.
- Government program and service delivery objectives range from conveniently located libraries, recreation centers, and other amenities throughout the County to comprehensive transportation management and advanced waste management systems. Each of these involves differing kinds and mixes of funding and financing arrangements that must be within the limits of County resources as well as acceptable in terms of debt management.
- Planning policies of the County affect land use, zoning and special exceptions, and economic development, as well as the provision of public services. All are interrelated, and all have implications both in their fiscal impacts (cost/revenue effects on government finances) and in economic impacts (effects on the economy of the County as a whole).

## **EXPLANATION OF CHARTS WHICH FOLLOW**

### **EXPENDITURES BY AGENCY**

This chart compares total expenditures for the FY09-14 Amended CIP, including the Biennial amendments, as approved by the County Council as of May 2009 with total expenditures for the County Executive's Recommended CIP for FY11-16. The data is sorted by implementing agency and by program for MCG programs. Percent change between the six-year periods and percentage of each agency's budget to the whole are also compared. This chart also compares WSSC expenditures as approved by the County Council as of May 2009 for FY10-15 with expenditures as recommended for FY11-16. The total CIP based on the latest six-year period as approved by the County Council is compared to the total CIP as recommended in the upcoming six-year period.

### **EXPENDITURES TAX AND NON-TAX SUPPORTED**

This chart compares total expenditures for the FY09-14 Amended CIP, including the Biennial amendments, as approved by the County Council as of May 2009 with total expenditures for the County Executive's Recommended CIP for FY11-16. The chart separates tax supported and non-tax supported expenditures, and then sorts by implementing agency and by program for MCG programs. Percent change between the six-year periods and percentage of each agency's budget to the whole are also compared. This chart also compares WSSC expenditures as approved by the County Council as of May 2009 for FY10-15 with expenditures as recommended for FY11-16. The total CIP based on the latest six-year period as approved by the County Council is compared to the total CIP as recommended in the upcoming six-year period.

### **FUNDING BY MAJOR CATEGORIES**

This chart compares total funding for the FY09-14 Amended CIP, including the Biennial amendments, as approved by the County Council as of May 2009 with total funding for the County Executive's Recommended CIP for FY11-16. The major funding sources are listed separately, and the smaller sources are grouped together within the "Other" category. Percent change between the six-year periods and percentage of each funding source to the whole are also compared. This chart also compares total funding for WSSC as approved by the County Council for FY10-15 with the FY11-16 recommendation. The total CIP based on the latest six-year period as approved by the County Council is compared to the total CIP as recommended in the upcoming six-year period.

### **FISCAL COMPARISONS: EXPENDITURES BY AGENCY AND SOURCE OF FUND**

This chart compares agency expenditures and funding for the FY09-14 Amended CIP, including the Biennial amendments, as approved by the County Council as of May 2009 with agency expenditures and funding for the County Executive's Recommended CIP for FY11-16. The chart separates total expenditures and tax supported expenditures; total G.O. bond

and current revenue funding; and total expenditures, G.O. bond, current revenue, and State aid funding by agency. Dollar amount and percent changes between the six-year periods and percentage of each agency's budget to the whole are also compared. This chart excludes WSSC, because it is a bi-county agency governed by State law. It is the only agency for which the County Council adopts an annual CIP.

### **FISCAL COMPARISONS: GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS AND TAX SUPPORTED CURRENT REVENUES**

This chart compares information contained in the G.O. Bond Adjustment and Current Revenue Adjustment charts for the FY09-14 Amended CIP, including the Biennial amendments, as approved by the County Council as of May 2009 with the County Executive's Recommended CIP for FY11-16. Dollar amount and percent changes between the six-year periods and percentage of G.O. bonds and current revenues budgeted to the whole are also compared.

### **DEBT CAPACITY ANALYSIS**

This chart displays the performance of the G.O. bond funded portion of the Capital Improvements Program, various long term leases primarily funded through the Revenue Authority, and short term lease financing for public safety radios against a variety of economic and fiscal indicators.

### **GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND ADJUSTMENT CHART**

This chart compares the General Obligation bonds available for programming, with recommended programmed bond funded expenditures for the FY11-16 year program. Amounts in the line labeled "Less Set Aside: Future Projects" indicate the amount available for possible future expenditures not yet programmed in individual projects. Zeros in the line labeled "Available or (Gap) to be Solved" indicate a balanced capital budget and Capital Improvements Program.

### **GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND – PROGRAMMING ADJUSTMENT UNSPENT PRIOR YEAR'S CHART**

This chart displays the amount of unspent prior year's General Obligation (GO) Bond funded expenditures (slippage) by category and project. The total amount of slippage from this chart is included on the GO Bond Adjustment Chart.

### **TAX SUPPORTED CURRENT REVENUES ADJUSTMENT CHART**

This chart compares the tax supported current revenues available for programming, with programmed current revenue funded expenditures for the recommended FY11-16 program. Zeros in the line labeled "Available or (Gap) to be Solved" indicate a balanced capital budget and Capital Improvements Program.

---

**PARK AND PLANNING BOND ADJUSTMENT  
CHART**

This chart compares the Park and Planning bonds available for programming, with recommended programmed bond funded expenditures for the FY11-16 year program. Amounts in the line labeled “Less Set Aside: Future Projects” indicate the amount available for possible future expenditures not yet programmed in individual projects. Zeros in the line labeled “Available or (Gap) to be Solved” indicate a balanced capital budget and Capital Improvements Program.

**BUDGETARY ASSUMPTIONS OF STATE AID  
FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION**

This chart displays the intended uses of State aid for the school construction program. Budget year (the first year of this CIP) reflects the County’s request for State Aid. Outyear expenditures rely on support from the State in the amounts shown on the line labeled “Grand Total: All Projects”. Individual school construction and modernizations are shown for each of the fiscal years of the FY11-16 recommended CIP.

**SIX-YEAR CIP EXPENDITURES**

**BY AGENCY**

	FY09-14 AMENDED EXCLUDES WSSC (\$000s)	FY11-16 RECOMMENDED EXCLUDES WSSC (\$000s)	PERCENT CHANGE	PERCENT OF TOTAL RECOMMENDED
<b>COUNTY GOVERNMENT</b>				
GENERAL GOVERNMENT	252,172	270,067	7.1%	6.8%
PUBLIC SAFETY	344,181	352,146	2.3%	8.8%
TRANSPORTATION	996,632	1,064,975	6.9%	26.6%
Roads, Bridges, Traffic Improvements		318,647		333,380
Mass Transit - County Programs		247,585		294,467
Parking Facilities		115,116		101,812
Other Transportation		315,284		335,316
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT	22,351	0	-100.0%	0.0%
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES	12,109	18,433	52.2%	0.5%
LIBRARIES AND RECREATION	142,147	151,102	6.3%	3.8%
CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES	47,591	128,472	170.0%	3.2%
HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	56,924	60,591	6.4%	1.5%
<b>SUBTOTAL: COUNTY GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>1,874,107</b>	<b>2,045,786</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>51.1%</b>
<b>OTHER AGENCIES</b>				
MCPS	1,270,842	1,484,647	16.8%	37.1%
MONTGOMERY COLLEGE	340,184	260,009	-23.6%	6.5%
M-NCPPC	198,980	161,502	-18.8%	4.0%
HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES COMMISSION	15,795	13,629	-13.7%	0.3%
REVENUE AUTHORITY	41,341	35,328	-14.5%	0.9%
WASHINGTON METRO AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY	2,582	0	-100.0%	0.0%
<b>SUBTOTAL: OTHER AGENCIES</b>	<b>1,869,724</b>	<b>1,955,115</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>48.9%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL: ALL AGENCIES (excludes WSSC)</b>	<b>3,743,831</b>	<b>4,000,901</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>NOTE: After reducing FY11-16 Recommended expenditures for unspent prior year's General Obligation Bonds (slippage):</b>				
	SLIPPAGE AMOUNT	FY11-16 EXPENDITURES EXCLUDING SLIPPAGE	PERCENT CHANGE	
County Government	80,907	1,964,879	6.1%	
Montgomery College	7,614	252,395	-25.8%	
M-NCPPC	1,545	159,957	-19.6%	
All Agencies	90,066	3,910,835	4.5%	
	FY10-15 APPROVED WSSC ONLY	FY11-16 APPROVED WSSC ONLY	PERCENT CHANGE	
<b>WSSC</b>	980,895	1,656,597	68.9%	
WASHINGTON SUBURBAN SANITARY COMMISSION				
<b>NOTE: WSSC is governed by State law and is the only agency for which the County Council adopts an annual CIP.</b>				

**SIX-YEAR CIP EXPENDITURES**

**TAX SUPPORTED AND NON-TAX SUPPORTED**

	FY09-14 AMENDED EXCLUDES WSSC (\$000s)	FY11-16 RECOMMENDED EXCLUDES WSSC (\$000s)	PERCENT CHANGE	PERCENT OF TOTAL RECOMMENDED
<b>TAX SUPPORTED COUNTY GOVERNMENT</b>				
GENERAL GOVERNMENT	252,172	270,067	7.1%	6.8%
PUBLIC SAFETY	344,181	352,146	2.3%	8.8%
TRANSPORTATION	996,632	1,064,975	6.9%	26.6%
Roads, Bridges, Traffic Improvements	318,647	333,380		
Mass Transit - County Programs	247,585	294,467		
Parking Facilities	115,116	101,812		
Other Transportation	315,284	335,316		
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES	12,109	18,433	52.2%	0.5%
LIBRARIES AND RECREATION	142,147	151,102	6.3%	3.8%
CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES	47,591	128,472	170.0%	3.2%
HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	56,924	60,591	6.4%	1.5%
<b>SUBTOTAL: COUNTY GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>1,851,756</b>	<b>2,045,786</b>	<b>10.5%</b>	<b>51.1%</b>
<b>OTHER TAX SUPPORTED AGENCIES</b>				
MCPS	1,270,842	1,484,647	16.8%	37.1%
MONTGOMERY COLLEGE	340,184	260,009	-23.6%	6.5%
M-NCPPC	198,980	161,502	-18.8%	4.0%
WASHINGTON METRO AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY	2,582	0	-100.0%	0.0%
<b>SUBTOTAL: OTHER AGENCIES</b>	<b>1,812,588</b>	<b>1,906,158</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>47.6%</b>
<b>TOTAL: TAX SUPPORTED AGENCIES</b>	<b>3,664,344</b>	<b>3,951,944</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>98.8%</b>
<b>NON-TAX SUPPORTED AGENCIES AND FUNDS:</b>				
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT	22,351	0	-100.0%	0.0%
HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES COMMISSION	15,795	13,629	-13.7%	0.3%
REVENUE AUTHORITY	41,341	35,328	-14.5%	0.9%
<b>TOTAL: NON-TAX SUPPORTED</b>	<b>79,487</b>	<b>48,957</b>	<b>-38.4%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL: ALL AGENCIES</b>	<b>3,743,831</b>	<b>4,000,901</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>NOTE: After reducing FY11-16 Recommended expenditures for unspent prior year's General Obligation Bonds (slippage):</b>				
	<b>SLIPPAGE AMOUNT</b>	<b>FY11-16 EXPENDITURES EXCLUDING SLIPPAGE</b>	<b>PERCENT CHANGE</b>	
County Government	80,907	1,964,879	6.1%	
Tax-Supported Agencies	90,066	3,861,878	5.4%	
Montgomery College	7,614	252,395	-25.8%	
M-NCPPC	1,545	159,957	-19.6%	
All Agencies	90,066	3,910,835	4.5%	
	<b>FY10-15 AMENDED WSSC ONLY</b>	<b>FY11-16 RECOMMENDED WSSC ONLY</b>	<b>PERCENT CHANGE</b>	
<b>WSSC</b>				
WASHINGTON SUBURBAN SANITARY COMMISSION	980,895	1,656,597	68.9%	
<b>NOTE: WSSC is governed by State law and is the only agency for which the County Council adopts an annual CIP.</b>				

**SIX-YEAR CIP**

**MAJOR FUNDING CATEGORIES**

	FY09-14 AMENDED EXCLUDES WSSC (\$000s)	FY11-16 RECOMMENDED EXCLUDES WSSC (\$000s)	PERCENT CHANGE	PERCENT OF TOTAL APPROVED
<b>FUNDING SOURCE</b>				
GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS	1,839,996	2,094,796	13.8%	52.4%
GENERAL PAYGO	129,722	164,474	26.8%	4.1%
AGENCY BONDS	25,181	29,220	16.0%	0.7%
REVENUE BONDS	126,825	185,151	46.0%	4.6%
CURRENT REVENUE - GENERAL FUND	219,933	279,418	27.0%	7.0%
CURRENT REVENUE - OTHER TAX-SUPPORTED	33,700	62,735	86.2%	1.6%
CURRENT REVENUE - NON-TAX SUPPORTED	82,621	46,572	-43.6%	1.2%
RECORDATION TAX	161,600	148,846	-7.9%	3.7%
RECORDATION TAX - PREMIUM	29,932	26,051	-13.0%	0.7%
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	560,117	466,441	-16.7%	11.7%
IMPACT TAXES - Transportation	71,192	29,472	-58.6%	0.7%
IMPACT TAXES - Schools	109,993	55,500	-49.5%	1.4%
SHORT & LONG-TERM FINANCING	48,979	64,524	31.7 %	1.6%
INTERIM FINANCE	109,083	210,324	92.8 %	5.3%
LAND SALE	60,855	35,500	-41.7%	0.9%
HIF REVOLVING PROGRAM	50,000	50,000	0.0%	1.2%
CONTRIBUTIONS	18,665	8,335	-55.3%	0.2%
OTHER	65,437	43,542	-33.5%	1.1%
<b>TOTAL SIX-YEAR CIP</b>	<b>3,743,831</b>	<b>4,000,901</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

NOTE: After reducing FY11-16 Recommended expenditures for unspent prior year's General Obligation Bonds (slippage):

	SLIPPAGE AMOUNT	FY11-16 EXPENDITURES EXCLUDING SLIPPAGE	PERCENT CHANGE
All Agencies	90,066	3,910,835	4.5%

	FY10-15 APPROVED WSSC ONLY	FY11-16 RECOMMENDED WSSC ONLY	PERCENT CHANGE	PERCENT OF TOTAL APPROVED
<b>WSSC (Note)</b>				
AGENCY BONDS	460,463	1,086,211	135.9%	65.6%
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	320,284	396,902	23.9%	24.0%
CONTRIBUTIONS	12,389	11,686	-5.7%	0.7%
OTHER	187,759	161,798	-13.8%	9.8%
<b>TOTAL SIX-YEAR CIP</b>	<b>980,895</b>	<b>1,656,597</b>	<b>68.9%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

NOTE: WSSC is governed by State law and is the only agency for which the County Council adopts an annual CIP.

## FISCAL COMPARISONS

### EXPENDITURES BY AGENCY AND SOURCE OF FUND RECOMMENDED FY11-16 vs. AMENDED FY09-14 (\$000)

	AMENDED FY09-14	RECOMMENDED FY11-16	\$ CHANGE	% CHANGE		AMENDED FY09-14	RECOMMENDED FY11-16	\$ CHANGE	% CHANGE
<b>TOTAL ALL AGENCY EXPENDITURES (a),(c),(d)</b>	3,743,831	4,000,901	257,070	6.9%	<b>PROGRAMMED BOND FUNDED EXPENDITURES(d)</b>	1,961,398	2,251,374	289,976	14.8%
<b>TAX SUPPORTED EXPENDITURES (b),(c),(d)</b>	3,864,344	3,951,944	287,600	7.6%	<b>PROGRAMMED CURRENT REVENUE FUNDED APPROPRIATIONS</b>	233,793	262,898	29,105	12.4%
<b>PUBLIC SCHOOLS (MCPS)</b>					<b>MCG - TRANSPORTATION w/o WMATA</b>				
<b>TOTAL TAX SUPPORTED EXPENDITURES</b>	1,270,842	1,484,647	213,805	16.8%	<b>TOTAL TAX SUPPORTED EXPENDITURES</b>	996,632	1,064,975	68,343	6.9%
% of all agency expenditures	33.9%	37.1%			% of all agency expenditures	26.6%	26.6%		
% of tax supported expenditures	34.7%	37.6%			% of tax supported expenditures	27.2%	26.9%		
<b>G.O. BOND FUNDED</b>	739,911	957,748	217,837	29.4%	<b>G.O. BOND FUNDED</b>	496,388	578,094	81,706	16.5%
% of Programmed G.O.Bonds	37.7%	42.5%			% of Programmed G.O.Bonds	25.3%	25.7%		
<b>STATE AID</b>	234,673	230,000	-4,673	-2.0%	<b>STATE AID</b>	59,900	50,551	-9,349	-15.6%
<b>CURRENT REVENUE FUNDED</b>	86,978	124,452	37,474	43.1%	<b>CURRENT REVENUE FUNDED</b>	36,262	45,979	9,717	26.8%
% of Programmed Current Revenues	37.2%	47.3%			% of Programmed Current Revenues	15.5%	17.5%		
<b>MONTGOMERY COLLEGE</b>					<b>WMATA</b>				
<b>TOTAL TAX SUPPORTED EXPENDITURES</b>	340,184	260,009	-80,175	-23.6%	<b>TOTAL TAX SUPPORTED EXPENDITURES</b>	2,582	0	-2,582	-100.0%
% of all agency expenditures	9.1%	6.5%			% of all agency expenditures	0.1%	0.0%		
% of tax supported expenditures	9.3%	6.6%			% of tax supported expenditures	0.1%	0.0%		
<b>G.O. BOND FUNDED</b>	165,297	108,718	-56,579	-34.2%	<b>G.O. BOND FUNDED</b>	0	0	0	N/A
% of Programmed G.O.Bonds	8.4%	4.8%			% of Programmed G.O.Bonds	0.0%	0.0%		
<b>STATE AID</b>	84,776	55,718	-29,058	-34.3%	<b>STATE AID</b>	0	0	0	N/A
<b>CURRENT REVENUE FUNDED</b>	19,407	53,466	34,059	175.5%	<b>CURRENT REVENUE FUNDED</b>	1,582	0	-1,582	-100.0%
% of Programmed Current Revenues	8.3%	20.3%			% of Programmed Current Revenues	0.0%	0.0%		
<b>M-NCPPC PARKS</b>					<b>MCG - OTHER (excludes Solid Waste)</b>				
<b>TOTAL TAX SUPPORTED EXPENDITURES</b>	198,980	161,502	-37,478	-18.8%	<b>TOTAL TAX SUPPORTED EXPENDITURES</b>	855,124	980,811	125,687	14.7%
% of all agency expenditures	5.3%	4.0%			% of all agency expenditures	22.8%	24.5%		
% of tax supported expenditures	5.4%	4.1%			% of tax supported expenditures	23.3%	24.8%		
<b>G.O. BOND FUNDED</b>	72,191	64,159	-8,032	-11.1%	<b>G.O. BOND FUNDED</b>	487,611	542,655	55,044	11.3%
% of Programmed G.O.Bonds	3.7%	2.8%			% of Programmed G.O.Bonds	24.9%	24.1%		
<b>PARK BONDS FUNDED</b>	24,709	29,220	4,511	18.3%	<b>STATE AID</b>	12,783	12,622	-161	-1.3%
<b>STATE AID FUNDED</b>	65,959	38,999	-26,960	-40.9%	<b>CURRENT REVENUE FUNDED (GENERAL, FIRE, RECREATION, &amp; URBAN DISTRICT)</b>	70,026	25,865	-44,161	-63.1%
<b>CURRENT REVENUE FUNDED PARKS AND GEN FUND</b>	19,538	13,136	-6,402	-32.8%	% of Programmed Current Revenues	30.0%	9.8%		
% of Programmed Current Revenues	8.4%	5.0%							

**NOTES:**

- a. "Total Expenditures" includes the self-supporting Revenue Authority, HOC, and Solid Waste Management, as well as all "Tax Supported" expenditures.
- b. "Tax Supported Expenditures" excludes Revenue Authority, WSSC, HOC, and Solid Waste Management and are funded with a variety of funding sources, such as G.O. bonds, current revenues, and State Aid, most of which are eventually paid for by the taxpayers.
- c. Excludes WSSC expenditures.
- d. FY11-16 Recommended expenditure totals include unspent prior year's General Obligation Bonds (slippage). Total All Agency Expenditures less slippage equals \$3,910,835; Tax Supported Expenditures less slippage equals \$3,861,878; Programmed Bond Funded Expenditures less slippage equals \$2,161,308.

G-16

**FISCAL COMPARISONS**

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS AND TAX SUPPORTED CURRENT REVENUES**

**FY09-14 AMENDED VS. FY11-16 RECOMMENDED**

(\$ millions)

	AMENDED FY09-14	RECOMMENDED FY11-16	\$ CHANGE	% CHANGE		AMENDED FY09-14	RECOMMENDED FY11-16	\$ CHANGE	% CHANGE
TOTAL ALL AGENCY EXPENDITURES (d)	3,743.8	4,000.9	257.1	6.9%	TAX SUPPORTED EXPENDITURES (d)	3,664.3	3,951.9	287.6	7.8%
G.O. BONDS (refer to Bond Adjustment Chart)					TAX SUPPORTED CURRENT REVENUES (refer to Current Revenue Adjustment Chart) (c)				
SPENDING AFFORDABILITY LIMITS (SAG)	1,840.0	1,950.0	110.0	6.0%	TOTAL AVAILABLE TAX SUPPORTED CURRENT REVENUES	241.4	333.1	91.7	38.0%
PAYGO (Current Revenues)	129.7	164.5	34.8	26.8%	SET ASIDE FOR FUTURE PROJECTS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
AVAILABLE FOR DEBT ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES (GO BONDS) (a)	2,137.5	2,358.1	220.6	10.3%	AVAILABLE FOR CURRENT REVENUE FUNDED APPROPRIATIONS	241.4	333.1	91.7	38.0%
SET ASIDE FOR FUTURE PROJECTS	167.8	188.9	21.1	12.6%					
PROGRAMMED DEBT ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES (b)	1,969.7	2,259.3	289.6	14.7%	PROGRAMMED CURRENT REVENUE FUNDED EXPENDITURES	241.4	333.1	91.7	38.0%
% of all agency expenditures	52.6%	56.5%			% of all agency expenditures	6.4%	8.3%		
% of tax supported expenditures	53.8%	57.2%			% of tax supported expenditures	6.6%	8.4%		

Notes:

- a. "Available for Debt Eligible Expenditures" is the total of bonds planned for issue and PAYGO, after adjustments for inflation and implementation.
- b. "Programmed Debt Eligible Expenditures" is the total of G.O. Bond funded expenditures allocated to specific projects on Project Description Forms (PDFs).
- c. "Tax Supported Current Revenues" includes revenues of the General, Economic Development Fund (EDF), Mass Transit, Fire, Urban District and Park Funds.
- d. FY11-16 Recommended expenditure totals include unspent prior year's General Obligation Bonds (slippage). Total All Agency Expenditures less slippage equals \$3,910,835; Tax Supported Expenditures less slippage equals \$3,861,878.

<b>DEBT CAPACITY ANALYSIS</b>							
<b>FY11-16 Capital Improvements Program</b>							
<b>COUNTY EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDED</b>							
<b>JANUARY 15, 2010</b>							
<b>GO BOND 6 YR TOTAL = 1,950.0 MILLION</b>							
<b>GO BOND FY11 TOTAL = 325.0 MILLION</b>							
<b>GO BOND FY12 TOTAL = 325.0 MILLION</b>							
	<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>	<b>FY12</b>	<b>FY13</b>	<b>FY14</b>	<b>FY15</b>	<b>FY16</b>
1 New GO Debt Issued (\$000s)	310,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
2 GO Debt/Assessed Value	1.24%	1.31%	1.38%	1.43%	1.47%	1.48%	1.48%
3 Debt Service + LTL + Short-Term Leases/Revenues (GF)	8.75%	9.43%	10.21%	10.90%	11.25%	11.26%	11.18%
4 \$ Debt/Capita	2,239	2,498	2,639	2,762	2,872	2,969	3,058
5 \$ Real Debt/Capita (FY10=100%)	2,239	2,437	2,507	2,548	2,567	2,566	2,551
6 Capita Debt/Capita Income	3.11%	3.36%	3.42%	3.46%	3.47%	3.48%	3.45%
7 Payout Ratio	69.56%	68.59%	68.12%	67.91%	67.95%	68.17%	68.47%
8 Total Debt Outstanding (\$000s)	2,163,274	2,442,635	2,610,455	2,765,125	2,909,660	3,042,940	3,164,765
9 Real Debt Outstanding (FY10=100%)	2,163,274	2,383,059	2,479,830	2,550,253	2,600,345	2,630,036	2,640,280
10 Note: OP/PSP Growth Assumption (2)	4.6%	0.1%	3.9%	4.0%	4.4%	5.0%	4.2%
<b>Notes:</b>							
(1) This analysis is used to determine the capacity of Montgomery County to pay debt service on long-term GO Bond debt, long-term leases, and substantial short-term financing.							
(2) OP/PSP Growth Assumption equals change in revenues from FY10 approved budget to FY11 budget for FY11 and budget to budget for FY12-16.							

## GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND ADJUSTMENT CHART

### FY11-16 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM COUNTY EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDED JANUARY 15, 2010

(\$ millions)	6 YEARS	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16
BONDS PLANNED FOR ISSUE	1,950.000	325.000	325.000	325.000	325.000	325.000	325.000
Plus PAYGO Funded	164.474	1.974	32.500	32.500	32.500	32.500	32.500
Adjust for Implementation **	350.979	61.905	61.905	59.921	57.871	55.765	53.612
Adjust for Future Inflation **	(107.358)	-	-	(10.413)	(21.175)	(32.234)	(43.537)
<b>SUBTOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR DEBT ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (after adjustments)</b>	<b>2,358.095</b>	<b>388.879</b>	<b>419.405</b>	<b>407.009</b>	<b>394.196</b>	<b>381.031</b>	<b>367.575</b>
Less Set Aside: Future Projects	188.891	10.238	12.516	10.167	35.750	53.698	66.522
	8.01%						
<b>TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR PROGRAMMING</b>	<b>2,169.204</b>	<b>378.641</b>	<b>406.889</b>	<b>396.842</b>	<b>358.446</b>	<b>327.333</b>	<b>301.053</b>
MCPS	(957.748)	(187.818)	(171.979)	(175.743)	(183.011)	(119.359)	(119.838)
MONTGOMERY COLLEGE	(108.718)	(36.427)	(20.856)	(14.831)	(17.385)	(10.755)	(8.464)
M-NCPPC PARKS	(64.159)	(12.483)	(12.564)	(15.637)	(8.403)	(7.536)	(7.536)
TRANSPORTATION	(578.094)	(96.842)	(75.604)	(72.895)	(74.894)	(125.927)	(131.932)
MCG - OTHER	(550.551)	(112.453)	(146.005)	(119.938)	(75.116)	(63.756)	(33.283)
Programming Adjustment - Unspent Prior Years*	90.066	67.382	20.119	2.202	0.363	-	-
<b>SUBTOTAL PROGRAMMED EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>(2,169.204)</b>	<b>(378.641)</b>	<b>(406.889)</b>	<b>(396.842)</b>	<b>(358.446)</b>	<b>(327.333)</b>	<b>(301.053)</b>
<b>AVAILABLE OR (GAP)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
NOTES:							
* See additional information on the GO Bond Programming Adjustment for Unspent Prior Year Detail Chart							
** Adjustments Include:							
Inflation =		2.50%	2.70%	3.00%	3.20%	3.40%	3.60%
Implementation Rate =		84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND - PROGRAMMING ADJUSTMENT FOR UNSPENT PRIOR YEAR'S  
FY11-16 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM  
COUNTY EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDED: JANUARY 15, 2010**

PDF #	PDF Name	Total	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16
<b>Montgomery College</b>								
036603	Macklin Towers Alterations	3.200	2.200	1.000	-	-	-	-
046602	Computer Science Alterations	0.814	0.814	-	-	-	-	-
056601	Commons Renovation	0.100	0.100	-	-	-	-	-
096602	Rockville Parking Lot & Tennis Court Relocation	1.100	1.100	-	-	-	-	-
096603	Health Sciences Expansion	1.200	0.600	0.600	-	-	-	-
096604	Germantown Observation Drive Reconstruction	0.600	0.600	-	-	-	-	-
956645	Germantown Child Care Center	0.600	0.600	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>7.614</b>	<b>6.014</b>	<b>1.600</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>M-NCPPC Parks</b>								
038703	Laytonia Recreational Park	0.045	0.045	-	-	-	-	-
058701	Black Hill Renovation & Extension	1.301	1.301	-	-	-	-	-
078708	Wheaton Tennis Bubble Renovation	0.024	0.024	-	-	-	-	-
098703	Woodlawn Barn Visitors Center	0.175	0.175	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1.545</b>	<b>1.545</b>	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Transportation</b>								
500505	White Ground Road Bridge No. M-138	0.765	0.765	-	-	-	-	-
500900	Clarksburg Rd Bridge No. M-009B	0.522	0.522	-	-	-	-	-
509132	Facility Planning: Bridges	0.159	0.159	-	-	-	-	-
509928	Brookville Service Park	4.011	3.065	0.946	-	-	-	-
500723	Northern Damascus Park & Ride Lot**	0.176	0.023	0.076	0.077	-	-	-
500933	Equipment Maintenance & Operation Center	0.157	0.157	-	-	-	-	-
509974	Silver Spring Transit Center	11.551	11.551	-	-	-	-	-
500119	Bethesda Bikeway & Pedestrian Facilities**	1.012	-	-	1.012	-	-	-
500600	Shady Grove Access Bike Path	0.646	0.646	-	-	-	-	-
500718	MacArthur Blvd Bikeway Improvements	0.753	0.498	0.255	-	-	-	-
500904	Dale Drive Sidewalk	0.172	0.172	-	-	-	-	-
500102	Bethesda CBD Streetscape	0.898	0.513	0.385	-	-	-	-
500151	Woodfield Rd Extended	3.632	3.632	-	-	-	-	-
500311	Montrose Parkway West	0.629	0.629	-	-	-	-	-
500401	Nebel Street Extended	0.368	0.368	-	-	-	-	-
500516	Father Hurley Blvd Extended	3.839	3.839	-	-	-	-	-
500717	Montrose Parkway East	0.889	0.889	-	-	-	-	-
500719	Chapman Ave Extended	0.101	0.101	-	-	-	-	-
500912	Thompson Rd Connection	0.281	0.281	-	-	-	-	-
508000	Subdivision Rds Participation	2.252	1.861	0.391	-	-	-	-
507310	Public Facilities Roads	0.702	0.350	0.352	-	-	-	-
508716	Silver Spring Traffic Improvements	0.754	0.754	-	-	-	-	-
500722	State Transportation Participation	0.900	-	0.900	-	-	-	-
500338	Highway Noise Abatement	0.400	0.200	0.200	-	-	-	-
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>35.569</b>	<b>30.975</b>	<b>3.505</b>	<b>1.089</b>	-	-	-
<b>MCG - Other</b>								
710300	Gaithersburg Library Renovation	0.706	0.706	-	-	-	-	-
710301	Olney Library Renovation & Addition	1.249	1.249	-	-	-	-	-
710703	Davis Library Renovation**	0.665	-	0.487	0.178	-	-	-
720100	N. Bethesda Community Recreation Center**	1.001	0.355	0.250	0.396	-	-	-
720102	N. Potomac Community Recreation Center	0.443	0.443	-	-	-	-	-
720800	Wheaton Community Recreation Center	0.038	0.038	-	-	-	-	-
720905	Plum Gar Neighborhood Recreation Center	0.402	0.402	-	-	-	-	-
720918	Good Hope Neighborhood Recreation Center	0.112	0.112	-	-	-	-	-
720919	Ross Boddy Neighborhood Recreation Center	0.438	0.258	0.180	-	-	-	-
500705	401 Hungerford Drive Garage	0.271	0.271	-	-	-	-	-
640400	School Based Health & Linkages to Learning Centers	0.024	0.024	-	-	-	-	-
640902	High School Wellness Center	0.235	0.235	-	-	-	-	-

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND - PROGRAMMING ADJUSTMENT FOR UNSPENT PRIOR YEAR'S  
FY11-16 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM  
COUNTY EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDED: JANUARY 15, 2010**

PDF #	PDF Name	Total	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16
450300	Clarksburg Fire Station	3.086	1.559	0.625	0.539	0.363	-	-
450305	Female Facility Upgrade	0.025	0.025	-	-	-	-	-
450500	Cabin John Fire Station #30 Addition/Renovation	0.176	0.176	-	-	-	-	-
450504	Travilah Fire Station	3.428	2.078	1.350	-	-	-	-
450702	Glen Echo Fire Station Renovation	0.709	0.467	0.242	-	-	-	-
450900	Glenmont FS 18 Replacement	1.088	0.459	0.629	-	-	-	-
450903	Kensington FS25 Addition	0.346	0.346	-	-	-	-	-
450906	Public Safety Headquarters	0.974	0.974	-	-	-	-	-
470302	3rd District Police Station	0.339	0.339	-	-	-	-	-
470400	Animal Shelter	10.191	-	10.191	-	-	-	-
451000	Fire Station Alerting	0.500	0.200	0.300	-	-	-	-
450302	Fire Stations: Life Safety Systems	0.320	0.160	0.160	-	-	-	-
458429	Resurfacing Fire Stations	0.600	0.300	0.300	-	-	-	-
458629	Roof Replacements: Fire Stations	0.630	0.330	0.300	-	-	-	-
450700	FS Emergency Power System Upgrades	0.750	0.750	-	-	-	-	-
509923	Elevator Modernization	0.900	0.900	-	-	-	-	-
507834	Energy Conservation	0.225	0.225	-	-	-	-	-
509970	Life Safety Systems: MCG	0.575	0.575	-	-	-	-	-
508331	Roof Replacements: MCG	2.000	2.000	-	-	-	-	-
429755	Detention Center Reuse*	12.892	12.892	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>45.338</b>	<b>28.848</b>	<b>15.014</b>	<b>1.113</b>	<b>0.363</b>	-	-
	<b>Total Programming Adjustment</b>	<b>90.066</b>	<b>67.382</b>	<b>20.119</b>	<b>2.202</b>	<b>0.363</b>	-	-
	* Project recommended for closeout							
	**Projects delayed							



## M-NCPPC BOND ADJUSTMENT CHART

### FY11-16 Capital Improvements Program

#### COUNTY EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDED

January 15, 2010

(\$ millions)	6 YEARS	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16
BONDS PLANNED FOR ISSUE Assumes Council SAG	37.500	7.500	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
Adjust for Implementation *	5.334	1.121	0.896	0.870	0.843	0.816	0.787
Adjust for Future Inflation *	(1.802)	-	-	(0.175)	(0.355)	(0.541)	(0.731)
<b>SUBTOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR DEBT ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (after adjustments)</b>	<b>41.033</b>	<b>8.621</b>	<b>6.896</b>	<b>6.696</b>	<b>6.488</b>	<b>6.275</b>	<b>6.057</b>
Less Set Aside: Future Projects	11.813 28.8%	0.100	0.018	3.141	2.591	3.014	2.949
<b>TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR PROGRAMMING</b>	<b>29.220</b>	<b>8.521</b>	<b>6.878</b>	<b>3.555</b>	<b>3.897</b>	<b>3.261</b>	<b>3.108</b>
Programmed P&P Bond Expenditures	(29.220)	(8.521)	(6.878)	(3.555)	(3.897)	(3.261)	(3.108)
<b>SUBTOTAL PROGRAMMED EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>(29.220)</b>	<b>(8.521)</b>	<b>(6.878)</b>	<b>(3.555)</b>	<b>(3.897)</b>	<b>(3.261)</b>	<b>(3.108)</b>
<b>AVAILABLE OR (GAP) TO BE SOLVED</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

**NOTES:**

\* Adjustments Include:

Inflation =	2.50%	2.70%	3.00%	3.20%	3.40%	3.60%
Implementation Rate =	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%

**FY11-16 Budgetary Assumptions of State Aid for School Construction (\$000s)**

<b>Projects by Category &amp; Priority</b>	<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11-16</b>	<b>FY11</b>	<b>FY12</b>	<b>FY13</b>	<b>FY14</b>	<b>FY15</b>	<b>FY16</b>
<b>Construction Funding</b>								
Francis Scott Key MS	4,979	10,822	10,822					
<i>Subtotal, Construction</i>	4,979	10,822	10,822	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Planning &amp; Construction</b>								
T.W. Pyle MS	121	-						
Galway ES	4,795	-						
Walter Johnson HS	13,595	-						
Bells Mill ES		8,335	8,335					
Brookhaven ES		1,192	1,192					
Cabin John MS		18,486	18,486					
Cannon Road ES		7,713	3,857	3,856				
Carderock Springs ES		5,876	5,876					
Cashell ES		6,710	6,710					
Cresthaven ES		7,586	7,586					
East Silver Spring ES		1,718	1,718					
Fairland ES		1,852	1,852					
Farmland ES		12,090	12,090					
Fox Chapel ES		3,444	3,444					
Garrett Park ES		6,831	3,416	3,415				
Harmony Hills ES		2,348	2,348					
Jackson Road ES		2,487	2,487					
Montgomery Knolls ES		2,474	2,474					
Paint Branch HS		36,756	18,378	18,378				
Poolesville HS		3,081	3,081					
Redland MS		4,044	4,044					
Rock View ES		1,938	1,938					
Seven Locks ES		5,447	5,447					
Sherwood ES		966	966					
Takoma Park		4,622	4,622					
Whetstone ES		1,795	1,795					
Downcounty Consortium ES #29		8,329		4,165	4,164			
Beverly Farms ES		8,527		4,264	4,263			
Glenallen ES		9,208		4,604	4,604			
Herbert Hoover MS		17,351		8,676	8,675			
Weller Road ES		6,907		3,454	3,453			
Gaithersburg HS		37,003		18,502	18,501			
Bel Pre ES		12,833			6,417	6,416		
Candelwood ES		12,955			6,478	6,477		
Rock Creek Forest ES		14,438			7,219	7,219		
Wheaton HS		54,175			27,088	27,087		
William H. Farquhar MS		26,533			13,267	13,266		
Brown Station ES		12,850				6,425	6,425	
Wayside ES		10,580				5,290	5,290	
Wheaton Woods ES		13,704				6,852	6,852	
Seneca Valley HS		56,814				28,407	28,407	
Luxmanor ES		13,810					6,905	6,905
Maryvale ES		30,842					15,421	15,421
Potomac ES		13,074					6,537	6,537
Tilden @ Woodward MS		27,010					13,505	13,505
Wootton HS		28,271						28,271
<i>Subtotal, Planning and Construction</i>	18,511	563,005	122,142	69,314	104,129	107,439	89,342	70,639
<b>Countywide Projects</b>								
Roof Replacement	2,961	2,197	2,197					
HVAC/Electrical Replacement	1,899	3,966	3,966					
Systemic Projects (Outyears)	-	15,000	-	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
<i>Subtotal, Countywide</i>	4,860	21,163	6,163	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
<b>Total, All Projects</b>	<b>28,350</b>	<b>594,990</b>	<b>139,127</b>	<b>72,314</b>	<b>107,129</b>	<b>110,439</b>	<b>92,342</b>	<b>73,639</b>
<b>Offset [*]</b>	-	<b>(364,990)</b>	<b>(109,127)</b>	<b>(32,314)</b>	<b>(67,129)</b>	<b>(70,439)</b>	<b>(52,342)</b>	<b>(33,639)</b>
<b>Total State Aid Assumed</b>	<b>28,350</b>	<b>230,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>

**Notes:**

[1] This chart reflects outyear State aid estimates from the MCPS November 2009 request to the State. Future annual request levels for State aid will be based on State eligibility requirements and may exceed the amounts shown. In addition, anticipated changes to State funding formulas will affect amounts requested.

[2] Projects shown beyond FY11 do not yet have construction dollars approved. Expected funding requests are shown here.

[\*] Offset reconciles specified project total costs with assumed State funding levels.