

T&E COMMITTEE #1
April 24, 2014

MEMORANDUM

April 22, 2014

TO: Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy & Environment Committee

FROM: Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Administrator

SUBJECT: FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program – Parking District and Mass Transit projects;
Resolution on FY15 transportation fees, charges, and fares;
FY15 Operating Budget: Mass Transit Fund, Parking Lot District Funds, Rockville
Parking District NDA, and General Fund follow-up

Those anticipated to attend this worksession include:

Arthur Holmes, Jr., Director, Department of Transportation (DOT)
Edgar Gonzalez, Deputy Director for Transportation Policy, DOT
Al Roshdieh, Deputy Director, DOT
Carolyn Biggins, Chief, Division of Transit Services, DOT
Rick Siebert, Chief, Division of Parking Management, DOT
Tony Alexiou, Chief, Management Services, DOT
Alicia Thomas, Budget Analyst, DOT
Phil McLaughlin, Manager of Operations Planning, Division of Transit Services, DOT
Sandra Brecher, Chief, Commuter Services Section, Division of Transit Services, DOT
Brady Goldsmith and Deborah Lambert, Budget Analysts, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

I. FY15 Operating Budget: General Fund follow-up

The Committee wished to consider adding to the Reconciliation List funding for the following infrastructure maintenance items. All of the data below is from the latest Report of the Infrastructure Maintenance Task Force (March 2014). For each item the amount proposed by the Executive is compared to the “Annual Requirement”: how much funding is needed for all the work that should be conducted, optimally. The table also displays the Task Force’s “Criticality Rating” for each item, on a 1-to-5 scale (5 is the highest rating).

Infrastructure Element	Component	Maintenance Activity	Annual Requirement In FY15 \$	Approved Budget FY14	Proposed Budget FY15	Criticality Rating
Resurfacing	Residential Roadways	Crack seal, slurry seal, other preventive maintenance	\$4,015,200	\$1,789,410	\$1,789,410	4
Patching	All roadways maintained	Includes pothole repair, emergency, spot, skin and patching.	\$1,618,557	\$1,521,322	\$1,612,825	4
Curb & Gutter Repair	Curb & gutter within right of way	Preventive maintenance and repair of curb and gutters	\$300,000	\$173,887	\$173,887	3
Sidewalk Repair	Sidewalks within right of way	Preventive maintenance and repair of sidewalks	\$300,000	\$116,874	\$116,874	3
Tree Maintenance	Trees within County easements	Emergency pruning, tree removal, and stump removal	\$7,950,000	\$4,530,898	\$4,530,898	5
Crosswalk Maintenance	Crosswalks in County system	Three-year cycle per Pedestrian Safety Committee guidance	\$370,500	\$276,990	\$276,990	5
Streetlight Maintenance	Streetlights on County roadways	Re-lamping and servicing	\$512,200	\$454,300	\$454,300	5
Sign Repair & Replacement	Signs on County roadways	Repair and replacement of signs	\$800,000	\$368,660	\$368,660	5
Centerline Paint Program	Roadways throughout the County	Paint centerline on roadways	\$900,000	\$550,420	\$550,420	4
Signal Maintenance	County signals	Repairs and service, to signal devices	\$1,687,600	\$1,398,936	\$1,398,936	5

Correction. In the April 21 packet Council staff reported that the distribution of Highway User Revenue would be \$38,029 higher than noted in the Recommended Operating Budget. In reviewing this subsequently with OMB, Council staff recognizes that, in fact, the distribution will be exactly what appears in the Recommended Budget. Council staff regrets the error.

II. FY15 Transportation Fees, Charges, and Fares

According to Section 2-57A of the Montgomery County Code, all fees, charges, and fares for any transportation or transportation-related service or product provided by the Department of Transportation must be set by Council resolution adopted after a public hearing and approved by the Executive, unless any law expressly requires a different process. If the Executive disapproves a resolution within 10 days after it is adopted and the Council readopts it by a vote of six Councilmembers, or if the Executive does not act within 10 days after the Council adopts it, the resolution takes effect. The fees, charges, and fares currently in effect are those in Council Resolution 17-746 adopted on May 15, 2013 and approved by the Executive on May 23, 2013.

On March 17 the Executive submitted his FY15 Operating Budget predicated on revising some Ride On fares to comport with WMATA's potential Metrobus fares. However, on March 27 the WMATA adopted Metrobus fares that were somewhat lower; consequently, the Executive transmitted an updated set of recommendations in the afternoon on April 1. A resolution incorporating his most recent recommendations is on ©1-8. His new Ride On fare proposals would:

- Equalize the regular cash and SmarTrip fares at \$1.75, and for seniors at \$0.85.
- Increase the Route 70 (Germantown-to-Bethesda) Express fare to \$4.00.
- Increase transfer charges commensurately.
- Extend the eligible hours for Kids Ride Free to 8:00 pm (from 7:00 pm) weeknights.

For FY15 the Executive recommends no changes to parking fees, fines, or charging hours, nor does he recommend changes to the residential permit parking fee or transportation management district fees.

Council staff recommendation: Concur with the Executive. Typically, the County sets Ride On fares to match Metrobus fares for simplicity for bus patrons and also for an equity reason: most of the bus service in the East County is provided by Metrobus, and County residents there should not be paying more or less than residents elsewhere.

III. FY15 Operating Budget: Rockville Parking District NDA

The Executive is recommending \$376,600 for this non-departmental account, which is \$5,650 less than the \$382,250 budgeted for FY14 (©9-10). This NDA pays for three categories of costs associated with parking in the Rockville core:

- There is an annual payment in lieu of taxes to share in the overall expenses of the Parking District, which for FY15 is \$123,130, \$4,255 higher than the \$118,875 budgeted for FY14. This is due to the slightly higher value assessed to this property.
- There is an annual payment of \$180,000 as the County's share in the repayment of outstanding debt for the garages in the Parking District. This commitment will continue for the life of the 30-year bonds issued by the City to fund construction of the garages.
- There is a reimbursement due to the Parking District for revenue lost due to free parking being provided for County employees in the Rockville Library building. The estimate of revenue that will be lost in FY15 is \$73,470: \$9,905 less than the \$83,375 budgeted in FY14. This is due to a more accurate accounting of charges to the NDA.

Council staff recommendation: Concur with the Executive.

IV. FY15-20 CIP – Parking Lot District projects

1. "Consent" projects. These are continuing projects about which there are no specific changes recommended to the Executive's recommendations by public hearing testimony, the Planning Board, or Council staff. Each project would be recommended for approval unless a Committee member specifically asks for it to be discussed. Two information items are presented for each project:

- **Funding Change:** the percentage difference in cost from the Approved or Amended FY13-18 CIP to the Recommended FY15-20 CIP.
- **Timing Change:** the acceleration or delay of the project’s completion, comparing the completion in the Approved or Amended FY13-18 CIP to that in the Recommended FY15-20 CIP.

Consent bridge projects (page)	Funding Change	Timing Change
Bethesda Lot 31 Parking Garage (20-2)	None	none
Facility Planning Parking: Bethesda PLD (20-4)	None	not applicable
Facility Planning Parking: Silver Spring PLD (20-5)	None	not applicable
Facility Planning Parking: Wheaton PLD (20-6)	None	not applicable
Parking Bethesda Facility Renovations (20-7)	None	not applicable
Parking Silver Spring Facility Renovations (20-9)	None	not applicable
Parking Wheaton Facility Renovations (20-11)	None	not applicable
Silver Spring Lot 3 Parking Garage (20-13)	None	none

Council staff recommendation: Concur with the Executive.

2. **Parking Lot Districts Services Facility** (©11). On March 17 the Executive recommended this new project that would consolidate the meter maintenance shop (currently on the ground floor of Silver Spring’s Garage 4 on Fenton Street north of Sligo Avenue) and the existing parking maintenance office (currently in leased space on Spring Street). Garage 4 will likely have to undergo a major rehabilitation or, alternatively, be demolished as part of a potential redevelopment. The maintenance office lease will not be renewed, although the landlord would likely grant an extension until this new facility is completed. The facility will be 11,500 sf of offices and maintenance shop space, and be sited at the rear of Silver Spring Lot 2, the parking lot behind the current Park & Planning Commission building.

This new building is warranted, not only because of the circumstances at the existing maintenance office and shop, but because of the management efficiency of combining the two functions into one building. The Department of General Services found that the net annualized cost of buying or leasing another building exceeded that of constructing a new building by 35-40%.

The project’s design and construction is anticipated to be \$3,585,000. Since the building would be sited on an existing County parking lot, there is no land acquisition cost. (Historically this lot is underutilized, so it does not take away spaces that are used by Silver Spring employees or customers.) The Executive recommends funding the project entirely with Current Revenue from the Silver Spring PLD. However, since the facility serves all the PLDs, it should be funded by all four districts proportionately.

Council staff recommendation: Concur with the Executive, except to allocate the funding across all PLDs in proportion to their respective Operating Budgets (see below). The budget shares are as follows: Bethesda, 45%; Montgomery Hills, 0.5%; Silver Spring, 48.5%; Wheaton, 6%. The recommended allocation is shown below (\$000):

	Total	FY15	FY16	FY17
Current Revenue Parking – Bethesda	1,613	0	0	1,613
Current Revenue Parking – Mont. Hills	18	18	0	0
Current Revenue Parking – Silver Spring	1,739	407	1,089	0
Current Revenue Parking – Wheaton	215		215	0
Total	3,585	425	1,304	1,856

V. FY15 Operating Budget: Parking Lot District Funds

Overview. The Executive’s recommendations for the Parking Lot District (PLD) Funds are attached on ©12-24. For FY15, the Executive recommends total expenditures of \$28,461,931 for the Parking Lot District Funds, a \$2,605,536 (10.1%) increase from the FY14 approved budget. Operating Budget FTEs would increase by a net of 1.3 FTEs (+2.7%), to 49.89 FTEs. The most significant increases in the budget are to fund installation of 1,200 Smart Meters in Silver Spring (\$1,300,200) and the operational cost for the new Garage 31 in Bethesda starting in January 2015 (\$607,000). Offsetting this latter cost is an anticipated revenue of \$875,000 from Garage 31 in the latter six months of FY15.

Security. With one exception, the Executive’s recommends exactly the same spending for parking garage and lot security as in FYs12-14. All the security again will be provided by contract security guards, with the exception of 6,000 hours in the Silver Spring PLD, which will be provided by the Clean & Safe Team. The only change would be to add \$77,000 (+13.7%) for the cost of 3,616 more contract security patrol hours in the Bethesda PLD, associated with the opening of Garage 31. The costs/hour for contract security and Silver Spring’s Clean & Safe Team are unchanged, and the number of annual patrol hours is also unchanged. A chart detailing the security in each district is on ©25.

South Silver Spring residential permit pilot. Two years ago the Council piloted a special Parking Convenience Sticker (PCS) for residents of South Silver Spring (the area bounded by Blair Mill Road, Georgia Avenue, and Eastern Avenue) whereby they could pay for a pass for unlimited parking in Garages 9 or 16 for \$95/month, \$28/month less than the regular \$123/month Silver Spring PCS. The first permits were sold in November 2012; since the program went into full swing in 2013, 68 permits have been sold on average each month, about a third less than was anticipated. On average about 15% of the eligible households are acquiring these permits (©26-27).

Last July the Parking Division surveyed those who acquired the South Silver Spring residential permit. Of the surveys received, 84% had used the regular PCS in the past at some point, and 19% noted that, prior to acquiring the discounted South Silver Spring permit they had parked in a private garage (©28). The private garages in the neighborhood charge \$125/month, virtually the same as the \$123/month for the regular PCS.

This spring the South Silver Spring Neighborhood Association conducted a survey of three of the residential buildings in South Silver Spring, representing 308 of the 434 units in the area. It found that most of those owning cars are not parking on the street; most are using the new South Silver Spring permit or one of the other permits sold by the County. The Association also asked respondents if the permit cost even less, how much less would the cost need to be for them to buy them. The median response was \$50/month (©29-32).

The main reason why the program was piloted in 2012 was the concern if there were too many users there would be a significant drain on revenue to the Silver Spring PLD. The foregone revenue to the PLD under the current program and current use levels is just under \$23,000 annually: a \$336 annual subsidy for each participant. This is not a high draw on resources, which is why the Executive recommends continuing the discount. As with every parking fee, the South Silver Spring residential permit will be reviewed annually by the Council.

Advertising in parking garages. Two years ago the Council urged DOT to develop a program to display advertising in PLD garages. During FY14 DOT piloted display ads in Garages 7 and 11 in Bethesda, and Garages 57 and 61 in Silver Spring. The full program will be initiated in FY15, but because of the uncertainty associated with this startup, the Executive has not assumed any net revenue from it in his PLD fiscal plans.

Fiscal health of the PLDs. A reasonable objective is to have each PLD’s end-of-year available fund balance exceed 25% of resources. Each of the PLDs is measured against this standard in the analyses and recommendations that follow.

Montgomery Hills. This PLD is in satisfactory fiscal shape. Even with assigning \$18,000 of the Parking Services Facility project cost to it, the year-end fund balance as a percent of resources will remain above 25% through FY18, and be above 20% in FYs19-20.

Year-end balance as % of resources	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
Executive’s fiscal plan (©22)	36.88%	36.04%	34.86%	32.94%	30.12%	26.49%
Council staff’s fiscal plan (©33)	28.78%	30.63%	29.45%	27.44%	24.40%	20.40%

Wheaton. Council asked DOT and OMB to create a new fiscal plan that makes some corrections and changes:

- **Account for the \$292,320 annual transfer to the Wheaton Urban District.** The Executive’s fiscal plan showed this transfer out of the PLD only in FY15, but his Wheaton Urban District fiscal plan assumes receiving a \$292,320 from the PLD every year.
- **Show the battery backup item in FY20 as a \$22,000 savings, not as a \$22,000 cost.**
- **Reflect the opening of the new parking garage beneath the new County building on Lot 13 by the start of FY19, which DOT estimates will generate \$336,288 more in fee revenue and \$81,900 more in fine revenue, offset by \$122,111 more in operating costs, resulting in a net additional annual revenue of \$296,077 beginning in FY19.**
- **Assign \$215,000 of the cost of the Parking Services Facility project to the Wheaton PLD in FY16.**

The resulting changes from the Executive’s fiscal plan are shown below. The year-end fund balances as a percent of resources will remain above 25% through FY20.

Year-end balance as % of resources	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
Executive’s fiscal plan (©24)	35.22%	43.15%	47.78%	51.86%	53.81%	54.84%
Council staff’s fiscal plan (©34)	35.22%	27.50%	29.70%	29.51%	33.55%	38.22%

Bethesda. The fiscal health appears much worse than last year. In the FY14 Fiscal Plan, the projection was that there would be an end-of-FY15 balance of \$9,984,213, or 36.4% of reserves. The changes between last year's projection for FY15 and this year's are not significant: the end-of-FY15 balance is now forecasted to be \$8,329,563, 32.5% of resources. The main change is that the fiscal plan now explicitly recognizes that a large portion of Bethesda's balance is the Revenue Bond Restricted Reserve: \$7,088,062 in FY15, and slightly higher amounts in later years. These are funds that cannot be used for the regular Bethesda PLD operating budget. Therefore, the "available" end-of-FY15 fund balance for the Bethesda PLD is only 4.84% of resources.

Therefore, the Bethesda PLD's fiscal situation now is quite tenuous. The Executive's fiscal plan shows an "available" end-of-year balance below 12%—less than half of the 25% objective—every year, and less than 1% in two of the years. A positive balance in FY15 was only achievable because of the Executive's recommendation to transfer \$1.5 million from the Silver Spring PLD in FY15, to be returned in an equal transfer in FY16. A Council Attorney has reviewed the County Code and finds no authority for such a transfer (see ©35-36). Therefore, Council staff does not recommend these transfers.

Alternatively, Council staff recommends doubling the Bethesda PLD real property tax rate for the next three years to 24.8¢/\$100 (and doubling the associated PLD tax rates as well), returning to the current 12.4¢/\$100 rate in FY18. The rates in FYs15-17 would still be lower than long-time rate of 28.0¢/\$100 that was assessed prior to the Council-approved tax reductions over the past few years. **The other recommended change is to assign \$1,613,000 of the cost of the Parking Services Facility project to the Bethesda PLD in FY17.**

The resulting change from the Executive's fiscal plan is shown below. The year-end fund balance will still be low in FY15, but be at sustainable levels in FYs16-20.

Year-end balance as % of resources	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
Executive's fiscal plan (©21)	4.84%	8.46%	0.67%	10.39%	11.48%	0.88%
Council staff's fiscal plan (©37)	11.02%	25.81%	22.22%	28.92%	29.16%	22.06%

Silver Spring. Conversely, the fiscal health forecast of the Silver Spring PLD is excellent, despite the fact that the Executive is now recommending that the debt service remaining in FYs15-17 on MEDCO bonds used to build the two Town Center garages that is being paid by the General Fund be reimbursed by the PLD over the next 15 years, starting in FY15. The reimbursement would be \$1,108,650 annually, so the total draw on the Silver Spring PLD between FY15 and FY29 would be \$16,629,750.

Council staff agrees with the Executive that this is an appropriate draw on the PLD. The PLDs, as enterprise funds, are supposed to be self-supporting. In the 1990s, when the finances of the Silver Spring PLD were at a low ebb, some of the basic renovations in the existing garages were paid by the General Fund, with the condition that it would be reimbursed when the PLD's fiscal condition improved; the improvement was enough over the first decade of the century for the PLD to make that reimbursement. Now that the PLD's fortunes are even brighter, it should be assuming the balance of the debt service on its Town Center garages, from which it is drawing revenue. In fact, it could be argued

that the PLD should also reimburse the General Fund for the MEDCO debt service payments it has been making through FY14.

Instead, Council staff has a different proposal to deal with a more pressing concern. Without a countervailing action, raising the Bethesda PLD rates would cause the tax-supported budget to exceed the Charter’s limitation on property tax collections. **In order not to impact the Charter limit, the real property tax rate in the Silver Spring PLD should be lowered in FYs15-17, from 31.7¢/\$100 to 21.0¢/\$100, and the associated PLD rates lowered in the same proportion.** This will roughly balance the additional revenue generated from the higher rates in Bethesda, thus assuring no impact on the other tax-supported funds in the budget. **The fiscal plan should also assume:**

- **Not transferring \$1,500,000 to the Bethesda PLD in FY15 or receiving a transfer from the Bethesda PLD in FY16 (see above).**
- **\$6,825,000 in revenue from the sale of Garage 21 to United Therapeutics in FY16.** According to the General Development Agreement between the County and United Therapeutics, a payment of \$9,100,000 will be made by April 2015 for the sale of the garage. However, the agreement allows for up to two successive six-month extensions, so conservatively the funds should not be anticipated until FY16. Furthermore, in any land sale 25% of the proceeds are allocated to the Housing Initiative Fund, so the HIF would receive \$2,275,000 in FY16 and the Silver Spring PLD would receive the \$6,825,000 balance.
- **Spreading the cost of the Parking Services Facility project across all four PLDs, and not ascribing the entire cost to the Silver Spring PLD.** As noted above, this would be accomplished by reducing this PLD’s contribution to the project cost by \$18,000 in FY15, by \$215,000 in FY16, and by \$1,613,000 in FY17.

The resulting changes from the Executive’s fiscal plan are shown below. The year-end fund balances will still be well above 25% of available resources through FY20 and beyond.

Year-end balance as % of resources	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
Executive’s fiscal plan (©23)	43.64%	43.95%	37.29%	38.35%	35.57%	33.04%
Council staff’s fiscal plan (©38)	41.23%	51.51%	43.54%	42.22%	39.64%	37.32%

VI. FY 15-20 CIP: Mass Transit budget adjustments

1. **Ride On Bus Fleet** (©39). This project funds replacement and added buses to Ride On’s fleet. The Executive’s January 15 recommendations for funding in FYs15-18 were identical to that in the amended CIP approved last spring; with his proposed funding for FYs19-20, the six-year total recommended was \$87,930,000. His March 17 budget adjustment would increase funding by \$7,212,000 over the period. The adjustment recognizes \$14 million of State aid that is coming to the County for bus acquisition, another consequence of the General Assembly’s passage of the transportation revenue increase last year. The net result is that the \$13,732,000 contribution from the Mass Transit Fund to this project can be zeroed out in FY15. The Executive is recommending an increase of \$6,994,000 from the Mass Transit Fund in FYs16-20s.

Unfortunately, these additional funds will pay only for the same number of buses each year as had already been assumed in the January PDF, with the exception that in FY15 it will fund the replacement of one less bus. Bid prices in the industry have increased since the January PDF was developed. **Council staff recommendation: Concur with the Executive.**

2. **Montgomery Mall Transit Center** (©40). This project will construct a new transit center in concert with the redevelopment of Westfield Shoppingtown Montgomery (Montgomery Mall). The project has been delayed by another year once again, to FY15. The cost has remained at \$1,342,000.

Westfield's contact now believes that it will not undertake its expansion until calendar year 2016, at the earliest. Therefore, the County funds should be shown in FY16 instead of FY15. Earlier this spring the Committee (and later, the Council) tentatively decided to defer the \$1,311,000 spending balance from FY15 to FY16. In this March 17 budget adjustment, the Executive concurs.

3. **Rapid Transit System and Purple Line-related projects.** The Executive is expected to transmit shortly budget adjustments to the Rapid Transit System, Bethesda Metro Station South Entrance, Capital Crescent Trail, and Silver Spring Green Trail projects. Depending upon when they are transmitted, these projects will either be reviewed in an addendum to this packet or will be scheduled for review at the Committee's May 1 meeting.

VII. FY15 Operating Budget: Mass Transit Fund

Overview. The Executive's recommendations for the Mass Transit Fund are attached on ©41-47. The Executive recommends total expenditures of \$125,013,667 for the Mass Transit Fund, a \$3,659,766 (3.0%) increase from the FY14 approved budget. Operating Budget workyears would increase by 9.56 Full Time Equivalents (FTEs), to 825.62 FTEs, a net 1.2% increase.

Revenue. In his March 17 transmittal the Executive assumed \$24,100,000 in fare revenue for Ride On. However, this estimate was based on Ride On's fares rising to the levels then being considered by WMATA for Metrobus. As noted above, when WMATA reduced the magnitude of its fare increase on March 27, the Executive revised his recommendation so as to have Ride On's fares be consistent with the smaller fare increase for Metrobus. DOT has recalculated its estimated FY15 fare revenue to \$23,555,492, a \$544,508 reduction. **Council staff recommendation: Assume \$544,508 less revenue for Ride On than stated in the March 17 recommended budget.**

Bus service. There are no significant additions or reductions proposed. An additional cost of \$104,370 is for the annualization of Clarksburg Meet-the-MARC service (Route 94) initiated in January. The table on ©48-49 displays—in descending order—the effectiveness of existing Ride On routes on weekdays, Saturdays and Sundays. Most routes meet Ride On's minimum performance standards: 15 riders per platform hour for peak-period-only routes that are served by full-size Ride On buses; 12 riders per platform hour for peak-period-only routes served by small buses; and 10 riders per platform hour for all-day routes.¹ Those routes that fall consistently or significantly below these minimum standards should be curtailed or eliminated. The buses on consistently underperforming routes would be better deployed to supplement other routes that are currently oversubscribed.

¹ The Ride On system's average in October 2013 was 23.6 riders/hour.

Adding new peak-period routes or increasing the frequency of peak-period service will not be possible in FY15, given that all the buses in the fleet are either already committed to existing routes, in extensive repair, or on call to fill in should there be a breakdown. However, should the Council wish, it could provide funds to expand the frequency and/or duration (i.e., span) of service in the off-peak: middays, late evenings, weekends, and holidays.

Council staff asked DOT to prepare good candidates for expanding the span of service. From these candidates, Council staff has identified 15 routes where the extension of service earlier in the morning or later in the evening on weekdays would be relatively cost effective (©50). On six routes, weekday service would be extended one hour later in the evening. On four routes, weekday service would be extended two hours further into the evening. On four routes weekday service would start an hour earlier in the morning. And on Route 11, a peak-period-only service, the route would run one hour later in the morning. DOT estimates the annualized cost of adding this service at \$559,692, offset by \$166,402 in fare revenue, for a net cost of \$393,290. The fiscal impact in FY15 would be reduced by half if these service improvements were initiated as part of the January 2015 pick.

Council staff recommendation: Add to the Reconciliation List \$279,846 (offset by \$83,101 in additional fare revenue) for the span improvements on ©50, starting in January 2015.

Bus cost allocation. More than a decade ago the Council hired an independent consultant to develop a means of comparing Ride On and Metrobus costs so that the Council could follow how they tracked from year to year. Ride On costs have usually been lower than those of Metrobus.

Following the directives from the consultant, DOT calculated the recommended partially allocated cost of Ride On for FY15 to be \$92.11/hour, compared to \$89.31/hour in FY14. This is the rate that should be used in deciding whether it would be more cost effective to add Ride On or Metrobus service. The corresponding partially-allocated rate for Metrobus is \$118.89/hour for FY15, which is up from \$110.19 from FY14. Therefore, at the margin, it is still generally more cost-effective for the County to add Ride On service rather than Metrobus service. DOT has provided a more detailed breakdown of Ride On's \$92.11/hour partially allocated and \$110.88/hour fully allocated costs (©51).

Call 'N' Ride. The Call 'N' Ride Program provides subsidized taxi service for low-income seniors (age 67 or older) and low-income persons with disabilities (age 18 or older). Through FY14, an individual has had to earn \$25,000 per year or less for a household of one to buy up to \$120 worth in taxi fares per month. Over 85% of program participants earn less than \$14,000 annually. Traditionally the subsidy levels for one-person households have been as follows:

- A person earning less than \$14,000 pays \$5.25 for \$60 of rides (91.3% subsidy).
- A person earning \$14,001-\$17,000 pays for \$10 for \$60 of rides (83.3% subsidy).
- A person earning \$17,001-\$20,000 pays for \$20 for \$60 of rides (66.7% subsidy).
- A person earning \$20,001-\$25,000 pays for \$30 for \$60 of rides (50.0% subsidy).

Council staff has long advocated revising these income criteria to reflect inflation. For FY15 the Executive is recommending just that. For FY15 he recommends, for one-person households:

- A person earning less than \$15,857 pay \$5.25 for \$60 of rides (91.3% subsidy).
- A person earning \$15,857-\$21,403 pay for \$10 for \$60 of rides (83.3% subsidy).
- A person earning \$21,404-\$26,951 pay for \$20 for \$60 of rides (66.7% subsidy).
- A person earning \$26,952-\$32,499 pay for \$30 for \$60 of rides (50.0% subsidy).

A table showing both the existing and proposed income ranges for one-, two-, three-, and four-person households is on ©52. The number of participants by household size and subsidy level is on ©53.

DOT estimates that about 500 of the program customers will shift from a higher to a lower income category, thus reducing their co-payments, and that there will be approximately 430 additional applicants who will become customers. Nevertheless, even with a full-time FTE assigned to this program, the Executive estimates that the cost will be reduced by \$85,000 from the FY14 level, due to the relative efficiency—and the reduced fraud—by replacing the former coupon system to the new swipe card system, which went into effect last spring.

Kids Ride Free and Seniors Ride Free. Kids Ride Free allows for students to ride free on Metrobus and Ride On within the county between 2-7 pm on weekdays. The corollary program in the District of Columbia is changing to 2-8 pm weekdays and WMATA is revising its tracking system to account for this longer period; extending this benefit within Montgomery County could be done without further administrative cost. Therefore, the Executive is recommending increasing the benefit until 8 pm weekdays as well. In FY14 about 335,000 annual riders on Metrobus and about 409,000 annual riders on Ride On are anticipated; with the additional hour DOT estimates these figures will grow by another 30,000-31,000 on each system in FY15.

The costs for Kids Ride Free are two-fold: foregone fare revenue to Ride On and an appropriation to reimburse WMATA for its foregone revenue on Metrobus. DOT estimates lost revenue to Ride On of \$33,813 due to extending Kids Ride Free to 8 pm. DOT estimates the reimbursement to WMATA in FY15 to be \$68,240 higher than in FY14. However, only \$30,970 of this amount would be due to extending the hours; the balance is due to an underestimate of the Metrobus reimbursement. Kids Ride Free on Metrobus has been about 12% higher than was anticipated.

Seniors Ride Free allows seniors to ride free on Metrobus and Ride On weekdays during the middle of the day: 9:30 am-3:00 pm. (At other times, every senior fare is half the regular fare.) The Executive is not recommending a change to this program for FY15. However, again due to an underestimation of Metrobus use, the appropriation for this program is proposed to be increased: by \$56,763 in FY15. Seniors Ride Free on Metrobus has been about 49% higher than was anticipated.

A detailed breakdown of these cost changes is on ©54.

Safety program. The Executive is recommending creating eight more positions in the Division of Transit Services—two program managers and six instructors (two each for the Crabbs Branch, Brookeville, and Nicholson depots)—to beef up the training program for Ride On. These positions are proposed to enhance the safety training for Ride On operators and maintenance workers, as well as to meet new FTA requirements stemming from provisions in Congress’s MAP-21 (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century) transit authorizations. The additional cost in FY15 for these eight positions is \$629,785, and the duties of these positions are outlined on ©55.

Climate Survey and Assessment Report. Last year DOT and the Office of Human Resources (in collaboration with MCGEO), hired John Antonishak, an independent program evaluator, to survey Ride On employees to gauge their opinion on Ride On leadership, communication, supervision, safety, work place policies, job satisfaction, advancement, and morale. The report was shared with Ride On employees last December. The Executive Summary and recommendations in the report are attached (©56-68).

DOT will explain what steps it has taken and plans to take in response to the report's recommendations.

f:\orlin\fy14\te\fy15op\140424te.doc

Resolution: _____
Introduced: April 1, 2014
Adopted: _____

**COUNTY COUNCIL
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**

By: County Council

SUBJECT: Setting transportation fees, charges, and fares

Background

1. Under Section 2-57A of the Montgomery County Code, as of July 22, 2004 all fees, charges, and fares for any transportation or transportation-related service or product provided by the Department of Transportation must be set by Council resolution adopted after a public hearing and approved by the Executive, unless any law expressly requires a different process. If the Executive disapproves a resolution within 10 days after it is adopted and the Council readopts it by a vote of six Councilmembers, or if the Executive does not act within 10 days after the Council adopts it, the resolution takes effect.
2. The fees, charges, and fares currently in effect are those in Council Resolution 17-746 adopted on May 15, 2013 and approved by the Executive on May 23, 2013.
3. In order to be consistent with action approved by the Metro Board of Directors, the County Executive recommends decreasing the price of the regular cash fare/token charge for local bus fare from \$1.80 to \$1.75 and increasing the regular SmarTrip fare for local bus charge from \$1.60 to \$1.75; the Senior/Disabled cash/token fare decreases from \$0.90 to \$0.85 and Senior/Disabled SmarTrip fare for local bus increases from \$0.80 to \$0.85; the Express Route 70 SmarTrip fare increases from \$3.65 to \$4.00 and the Senior/Disabled SmarTrip fare for Express Route 70 increases to \$2.00. The Kids Ride Free Program will expand service hours (by an additional hour), Monday through Friday from 2:00 pm to 8:00 pm. No changes are recommended in parking rates.
4. A public hearing on this resolution was held by the Council on April 22, 2014.

Action

The County Council for Montgomery County approves the following resolution:

Transportation fares, fees, and charges in Resolution 17-746 are amended as described in Table 1, attached.

The amendments increase the cash and SmarTrip fares and expand the Kids Ride Free service hours. All amendments will be effective July 1, 2014.

Resolution No.: _____

This is a correct copy of Council action.

Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council

Date

Approved

Isiah Leggett, County Executive

Date

TABLE 1: TRANSPORTATION FARES, FEES, AND CHARGES**I. Transit Fares**

Regular cash fare or token	[\$1.80]	<u>\$1.75</u>
Regular fare paid with SmarTrip	[\$1.60]	<u>\$1.75</u>
Route 70 cash fare or token	\$4.00	
Route 70 fare paid with SmarTrip	[\$3.65]	<u>\$4.00</u>
VanGo Route 28 and Route 94 shuttle[s]	Free	
Designated routes in Free-Wheeling Days promotion	Free	
Kids ride Free Program [(2- 7 8 pm weekdays)]	Free	
Give and Ride Program	Free	
MetroAccess Certified and/or Conditional Customer with ID	Free	
MetroAccess – Companion of Certified and/or Conditional customer with ID	Free	
Children under age 5	Free	
Local bus-to-bus transfer (SmarTrip only)	Free	
Metrorail-to-Ride On bus transfer with SmarTrip	[\$1.10]	<u>\$1.25</u>
Metrorail-to-Route 70 transfer with SmarTrip	[\$3.15]	<u>\$3.50</u>
Local bus-to-Route 70 transfer <u>with SmarTrip</u>	[\$2.05]	<u>\$2.25</u>
Metrobus Weekly pass	Free	
MARC weekly, monthly, TLC passes transfer to Ride On	Free	
MTA Commuter Bus Pass transfer to Ride On	Free	
Ride On Monthly Pass	\$45.00	
Boarding Route 70 with weekly or monthly pass	[\$2.05]	<u>\$2.25</u>
Youth Cruiser Pass	\$11.00	Per Month
Youth SmarTrip Card (one-time fee)	\$2.00	
Summer Youth Cruiser pass (for 3-month period of June, July, and August)	\$18.00	
'C' Pass (for current County employees)	Free	
'U' Pass (for Montgomery College transportation fee-paying students)	Free	
except express <u>Route 70</u> bus	[Free]	<u>\$2.25</u>
Senior* with identification card from 9:30 am-3:00 pm weekdays	Free	
Senior* with identification card except from 9:30 am-3:00 pm weekdays		
with cash fare or token	[\$0.90]	<u>\$0.85</u>
with SmarTrip card	[\$0.80]	<u>\$0.85</u>
Metrorail-to-Ride On bus transfer (SmarTrip only)	[\$0.30]	<u>\$0.35</u>
Local bus transfer (SmarTrip only)	Free	
Senior* with identification card for express Route 70 except from 9:30 am-3:00 pm		
weekdays with cash fare or token	\$2.00	
with SmarTrip card	[\$1.80]	<u>\$2.00</u>
Metrorail-to-Route 70 with SmarTrip	[\$1.30]	<u>\$1.50</u>
Local bus-to-Route 70 with SmarTrip	[\$1.00]	<u>\$1.15</u>
Boarding with weekly or monthly pass <u>with SmarTrip</u>	[\$1.00]	<u>\$1.15</u>

* For the purposes of this resolution, a person with disabilities not certified for MetroAccess with no condition service is treated the same as a senior.

II. Parking Fees (Note: No payment is required for motorcycles in spaces or areas where only motorcycle parking is permitted. No payment is required for any vehicle at all public parking spaces on Sundays and County holidays.)

A. Bethesda Parking Lot District

1. Meters on-street from 9 am to 10 pm, Monday through Saturday, and in lots from 7 am to 10 pm, Monday through Friday, and in garages from 7 am to 10 pm, Monday through Friday

Parking in spaces within the right of way of public streets	\$2.00 Per hour
Parking in spaces on a surface parking lot	\$1.25 Per Hour
Parking in spaces in a parking garage	\$0.80 Per Hour

2. Garage 49

Daily Maximum	\$12.00 Per Day
Lost Ticket	\$12.00 Per Day

3. Special Permits
 - a. Parking permits

Parking Convenience Sticker	\$150.00 Per Month
Daily Parking Permit	\$12.00 Per Day
“AM/PM” Parking Permit	\$20.00 Per Month
 - b. Carpool Permits

2 Persons	\$107.00 Per Month
3 and 4 Persons	\$58.00 Per Month
5 or More Persons	\$15.00 Per Month
 - c. Townhouse Resident Permit

	\$2.00 Per Month
--	------------------

4. Bethesda Library parking lot

	\$1.00 Per Hour
--	-----------------

B. Silver Spring Parking Lot District

1. Meters on-street from 9 am to 6 pm, Monday through Friday, and in lots and garages from 7 am to 7 pm, Monday through Friday, and in garages (except Garages 60 and 61) from 7 am to 7 pm, Monday through Friday

Short-Term (First 4 hours)	\$1.00 Per Hour
Long-Term (More than 4 hours)	\$0.65 Per Hour

2. Special Permits
 - a. Parking permits

Parking Convenience Sticker	\$123.00 Per Month
Daily Parking Permit	\$7.80 Per Day
“AM/PM” Parking Permit	\$20.00 Per Month
 - b. Carpool Permits

2 Persons	\$87.00 Per Month
3 and 4 Persons	\$49.00 Per Month
5 or More Persons	\$11.00 Per Month

- c. Townhouse Resident Permit \$2.00 Per Month
- d. Permit in Garages 9 and 16 for residents in the area bounded by Blair Mill road, Eastern Avenue and Georgia Avenue \$95.00 Per Month
- 3. Garages 60 and 61 \$1.00 Per Hour
 Monthly Permit \$189.00 Per Month

C. Wheaton Parking Lot District

- 1. Meters on-street from 9 am to 6 pm, Monday through Saturday, and in lots from 9 am to 6 pm, Monday through Saturday, and in garages from 9 am to 6pm, Monday through Friday
 - Short-Term (First 4 hours) \$0.75 Per Hour
 - Long-Term (More than 4 hours) \$0.60 Per Hour
- 2. Special Permits
 - Parking Convenience Sticker \$113.00 Per Month
 - Townhouse Resident Permit \$2.00 Per Month

D. Montgomery Hills Parking Lot District

- 1. Meters on-street from 9 am to 6 pm, Monday through Friday, and in lots from 9 am to 6 pm, Monday through Friday
 - Short-Term (First 4 hours) \$0.50 Per Hour
 - Long-Term (More than 4 hours) \$0.50 Per Hour
- 2. Special Permits
 - Parking Convenience Sticker \$90.00 Per Month
 - Townhouse Resident Permit \$2.00 Per Month

E. Areas Outside Parking Lot Districts

- 1. Meters on-street and in lots from 7 am to 7 pm, Monday through Friday
 - Short-Term (First 4 hours) \$1.00 Per Hour
 - Long-Term (More than 4 hours) \$0.65 Per Hour
- 2. Special Permits
 - Parking Convenience Sticker \$123.00 Per Month

III. Parking Fines and Other Charges (with County Code Section Citations)**A. Motor vehicles, traffic control and highways, generally**

31-6(b)(2)	Snow emergency – Parked in Right-of-Way	\$85.00
31-7	Unregistered vehicle/parking prohibited	\$60.00
31-8	Impeding traffic, threaten public safety	\$60.00

B. Parking regulations generally – on-street

31-11(b)	Emergency/Temporary no parking sign	\$60.00
31-12	Violation of official sign (except residential permit parking)	\$60.00
31-12	Residential permit parking violation	\$50.00
31-13	Parking of vehicle – snow accumulation	\$60.00
31-14	Parking of heavy commercial vehicles, recreational vehicles, or buses	\$75.00
31-16	Over 24 hours	\$60.00
31-17	Within 35 feet of intersection	\$60.00
31-18	Posted time limit	\$60.00
31-19	Obstructing driveways (within 5 feet)	\$60.00
31-20	No person will:	
	(a) Stop, stand or park a vehicle whether occupied or not:	
	(1) Impeding traffic	\$60.00
	(2) On a sidewalk	\$60.00
	(3) Within an intersection	\$60.00
	(4) On a crosswalk	\$60.00
	(5) Alongside street repair	\$60.00
	(6) On bridge/ in tunnel	\$60.00
	(7) On any highway ramp	\$60.00
	(8) Official school board/Montgomery College sign	\$60.00
	(9) Rush hour restriction	\$60.00
	(10) Behind Official sign in Right-of-Way	\$60.00
	(b) Stand or park a vehicle, whether occupied or not, except momentarily to pick up or discharge a passenger:	
	(1) within 15 feet of fire hydrant	\$60.00
	(2) within 20 feet of painted crosswalk	\$60.00
	(3) within 30 feet of traffic control signal/device	\$60.00
	(4) at a firehouse entrance clearance	\$60.00
	(5) at a No Standing sign	\$60.00
	(6) double parking	\$60.00
	(7) at a posted/marked fire lane	\$250.00
	(8) in front of theaters, posted	\$60.00
	(9) more than 12 inches from curb	\$60.00
	(10) opposite the flow of traffic	\$60.00
	(11) blocking another vehicle	\$60.00
	(12) not within designated parking space	\$60.00
	(13) at a posted bus stop	\$60.00

- (14) at a posted taxi stand \$60.00
- (15) in a handicapped parking space \$250.00
- (c) Park a vehicle, whether occupied or not, except temporarily for the purpose of and while actually engaged in loading or unloading merchandise or passenger:
 - (1) within 50 feet of a railroad crossing \$60.00
 - (2) at an official No Parking sign \$60.00

C. Off-street public parking regulations

- 31-26 (a) No person shall park a vehicle on a public parking facility:
 - (1) in violation of an official sign \$60.00
 - (2) in a No Parking zone \$60.00
 - (3) not within a designated parking space \$60.00
 - (4) in or on driving aisle/driveway/signwalks \$60.00
 - (5) at a bagged meter/temporary sign/barricade \$60.00
 - (6) blocking another vehicle \$60.00
 - (7) over 24 hours where not authorized \$60.00
 - (8) vehicle unregistered/inoperative \$60.00
 - (9) in violation, front-in-only, posted \$60.00
 - (10) straddling marked parking spaces \$60.00
 - (11) unattended/running \$60.00
 - (12) impeding traffic \$60.00
- 31-27 (b) Prohibited vehicle/weight/size/type \$60.00
- 31-30(c) (c) Snow/ice emergency \$60.00

D. Parking meters generally

- 31-35 Expired parking meter \$45.00
- 31-36 Overtime parking at parking meter \$50.00
- 31-37 More than 3 feet from parking meter \$45.00
- 31-38 More than 1 vehicle in parking space except motorcycles \$45.00

E. Administration, enforcement, penalties, and collection

- 31-62 (c) Impoundment or immobilization fee \$115.00
- 31-52 (e) Fee for withholding the registration of a vehicle \$10.00
- 31-57(a) First late penalty for failure to fully pay fine or appeal citation within 15 days \$25.00
- 31-59 Second late penalty for failure to fully pay the original fine and penalties within 45 days of the original issuance of the citation \$25.00

F. Residential Parking Permits

- 31-48(h) Annual fee \$20.00

IV. Transportation Management District (TMD) annual fees

In this section Gross Floor Area (GFA) is defined as described in Section 52-47 of the County Code.

A. Bethesda Transportation Management District

Commercial space occupied before July 1, 2006 where payment of TMD fee was a condition of subdivision or optional method approval	\$0.10/square foot GFA
Commercial space first occupied on or after July 1, 2006*	\$0.10/square foot GFA

B. Friendship Heights Transportation Management District

Commercial space occupied before July 1, 2006 where payment of TMD fee was a condition of subdivision or optional method approval	\$0.10/square foot GFA
Commercial space first occupied on or after July 1, 2006*	\$0.10/square foot GFA

C. North Bethesda Transportation Management District

Commercial space occupied before July 1, 2006 where payment of TMD fee was a condition of subdivision or optional method approval	\$0.10/square foot GFA
Commercial space first occupied on or after July 1, 2006*	\$0.10/square foot GFA

D. Silver Spring Transportation Management District

Commercial space occupied before July 1, 2006 where payment of TMD fee was a condition of subdivision or optional method approval	\$0.10/square foot GFA
Commercial space first occupied on or after July 1, 2006*	\$0.10/square foot GFA

E. Greater Shady Grove Transportation Management District

Commercial space occupied before July 1, 2011 where payment of TMD fee was a condition of subdivision or optional method approval	\$0.10/square foot GFA
Commercial space first occupied on or after July 1, 2011*	\$0.10/square foot GFA

* Between July 1, [2013] 2014 and June 30, [2014] 2015, 2.5 cents/sf GFA will be charged for each full quarter after a use and occupancy permit has been issued.

As a first step in addressing the future costs of retiree health benefits, County agencies developed current estimates of the costs of health benefits for current and future retirees. These estimates, made by actuarial consultants, concluded that the County's total future cost of retiree health benefits if paid out today, and in today's dollars, is \$1.5 billion – approximately twenty-nine percent of the total FY15 budget for all agencies.

One approach used to address retiree health benefits funding is to determine an amount which, if set aside on an annual basis and actively invested through a trust vehicle, will build up over time and provide sufficient funds to pay future retiree health benefits and any accrued interest on unfunded liability. This amount, known as an Annual OPEB Cost or "AOC", is estimated at \$104.9 million. This amount consists of two pieces – the annual amount the County would usually pay out for health benefits for current retirees (the pay as you go amount), plus the additional amount estimated as needed to fund retirees' future health benefits (the pre-funding portion). The pay as you go amount can be reasonably projected based on known facts about current retirees, and the pre-funding portion is estimated on an actuarial basis.

The County has committed to an approach of "ramping up" to the AOC amount over several years, with the amount set aside each year increasing steadily until the full AOC is reached. A total of \$31.9 million for all tax supported agencies was budgeted for this purpose in FY08. In May 2008, the County Council passed resolution No. 16-555 which confirmed an eight-year phase-in approach to the AOC. Consistent with this approach and based on the County's economic situation, the County contributed \$14.0 million to the Trust in FY08, \$19.7 million in FY09, \$3.3 million in FY10, and \$7.3 million in FY11. Due to fiscal constraints, the County did not budget a contribution for the General Fund in FY10 and FY11, but did resume contributions in FY12. For FY12, the County contributed \$26.1 million from the General Fund to the Retiree Health Benefits Trust. In addition, on June 26, 2011, the County Council enacted Bill 17-11 which established the Consolidated Retiree Health Benefits Trust. The bill amended existing law and provided a funding mechanism to pay for other post employment benefits for employees of Montgomery County Public Schools and Montgomery County College. In FY12, the County appropriated \$20 million and \$1 million for contributions on behalf of MCPS and the College, respectively. In FY13, these contributions were \$41.4 million (County General Fund), \$58.9 million (MCPS Consolidated Trust), and \$1.8 million (Montgomery College Consolidated Trust). In FY14, these contributions were \$51.3 million (County General Fund), \$87.8 million (MCPS Consolidated Trust), and \$2.5 million (Montgomery College Consolidated Trust). The Council and the Executive have mutually committed to the County's rating agencies to achieve full pre-funding by FY15. These contributions satisfy that commitment. In FY15, the County and all other agencies will implement the Medicare Part D Employer Group Waiver Program for Medicare eligible retirees/survivors effective January 1, 2015. This will reduce retiree drug insurance costs and the County's OPEB liability.

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	48,902,589	0.00
Decrease Cost: Implementation of Medicare Part D Employer Group Waiver Program for Medicare eligible retirees/survivors effective January 1, 2015	-10,325,109	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	38,577,480	0.00

Risk Management (General Fund Portion)

This NDA funds the General Fund contribution to the Liability and Property Coverage Self-Insurance Fund. The Self-Insurance Fund, managed by the Division of Risk Management in the Department of Finance, provides comprehensive insurance coverage to contributing agencies. Contribution levels are based on the results of an annual actuarial study. Special and Enterprise Funds, as well as outside agencies and other jurisdictions, contribute to the Self-Insurance Fund directly. A listing of these member agencies and the amounts contributed can be found in the Department of Finance, Risk Management Budget Summary.

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	20,564,342	0.00
Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment	-1,016,402	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	19,547,940	0.00

Rockville Parking District

This NDA provides funding towards the redevelopment of the City of Rockville Town Center and the establishment of a parking district. The funding reflects a payment from the County to the City of Rockville for County buildings in the Town Center development and is based on the commercial square footage of County buildings.

Also included are funds to reimburse the City for the cost of library employee parking and the County's capital cost contribution for the garage facility as agreed in the General Development Agreement.

9

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>FTEs</i>
FY14 Approved	382,250	0.00
Decrease Cost: Revised Estimate	-5,650	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	376,600	0.00

Snow Removal and Storm Cleanup

This NDA funds the snow removal and storm clean up costs for the Department of Transportation and General Services above the budgeted amounts in these departments for this purpose. This program includes the removal of storm debris and snow from County roadways and facilities. This includes plowing, applying salt and sand, equipment preparation and cleanup from snow storms, and wind and rain storm cleanup.

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>FTEs</i>
FY14 Approved	5,884,990	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	5,884,990	0.00

State Positions Supplement

This NDA provides for the County supplement to State salaries and fringe benefits for secretarial assistance for the resident judges of the Maryland appellate courts.

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>FTEs</i>
FY14 Approved	44,662	0.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of FY14 Personnel Costs	16,094	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	60,756	0.00

State Property Tax Services

This NDA reimburses the State for three programs that support the property tax billing administration conducted by the Department of Finance: the Montgomery County's Homeowners Credit Supplement, the Homestead Credit Certification Program, and County's share of the cost of conducting property tax assessments by the State Department of Assessments and Taxation (SDAT).

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>FTEs</i>
FY14 Approved	3,333,398	0.00
Increase Cost: SDAT Reimbursement	85,912	0.00
Increase Cost: Homestead Tax Credit Certification	45,300	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	3,464,610	0.00

State Retirement Contribution

This NDA provides for the County's payment of two items to the State Retirement System:

- Maryland State Retirement System: Unfunded accrued liability, as established by the Maryland State Retirement System (MSRS), for employees hired prior to July 1, 1984, who are members of the MSRS (including former Department of Social Services employees hired prior to July 1, 1984), and for those who have retired (all County employees participated in the State Retirement System until 1965.) The County's contribution for this account is determined by State actuaries. Beginning in FY81, the amount due was placed on a 40-year amortization schedule.
- State Library Retirement: Accrued liability for retirement costs for three Montgomery County Public Library retirees who are receiving a State retirement benefit. These were County employees prior to 1966 who opted to stay in the State plan.

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>FTEs</i>
FY14 Approved	1,192,180	0.00
Increase Cost: Adjustment to Reflect Actuarial Schedule	59,423	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	1,251,603	0.00

Takoma Park Library Annual Payment

The annual amount provided in this NDA is a function of County expenditures for the Montgomery County Public Libraries (as a share of property tax-funded spending) and the City of Takoma Park's assessable base. The payment is authorized by Section 2-53 of

Parking Lot Districts Service Facility (P501551)

Category Transportation
 Sub Category Parking
 Administering Agency Transportation (AAGE30)
 Planning Area Silver Spring

Date Last Modified 2/26/14
 Required Adequate Public Facility No
 Relocation Impact None
 Status Preliminary Design Stage

	Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Planning, Design and Supervision	729	0	0	729	425	114	190	0	0	0	0
Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilities	227	0	0	227	0	210	17	0	0	0	0
Construction	2,514	0	0	2,514	0	980	1,534	0	0	0	0
Other	115	0	0	115	0	0	115	0	0	0	0
Total	3,585	0	0	3,585	425	1,304	1,856	0	0	0	0

FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Current Revenue: Parking - Silver Spring	3,585	0	0	3,585	425	1,304	1,856	0	0	0	0
Total	3,585	0	0	3,585	425	1,304	1,856	0	0	0	0

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (\$000s)											
Energy				200	0	0	50	50	50	50	
Maintenance				268	0	0	67	67	67	67	
Program-Other				-1,036	0	0	-259	-259	-259	-259	
Net Impact				-568	0	0	-142	-142	-142	-142	

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	3,585
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	0
Supplemental Appropriation Request		0
Transfer		0
Cumulative Appropriation		0
Expenditure / Encumbrances		0
Unencumbered Balance		0

Date First Appropriation	FY 15
First Cost Estimate	
Current Scope	FY 15 3,585
Last FY's Cost Estimate	0

Description

The PLD Service Facility is proposed to include offices for the meter and maintenance teams, shops for meter repair and cleaning, dry storage and staff facilities for everyday use and emergency service callbacks. The facility will allow consolidation of the existing Parking Maintenance office directly across Spring Street (currently in leased space) and the Meter Maintenance Shop currently located on the ground floor of Garage 4 near Thayer Avenue and Fenton Street.

Location

1200 Spring Street (adjacent to the northern wall of Garage 2), Silver Spring. Garage 2 has sufficient capacity to fully meet the needs of parkers displaced by the project.

Capacity

The facility will consist of 11,500 gross square feet of office, shop, and staff facilities space to support approximately 30 to 35 staff members and contractual employees.

Estimated Schedule

Design will be performed in FY15 and construction during FY16 and FY17

Justification

Moving the Meter Maintenance Shop will allow the future sale/redevelopment of the property. The existing lease for the Parking Maintenance Office is located in a building that has been purchased by a new owner. The County has been put on notice that the lease will not be renewed at its scheduled termination. The Meter Shop currently is located in Garage 4 in South Silver Spring. This facility will either need extensive rehabilitation for continued use or may be the subject of a future demolition and redevelopment. Combining these teams in one location will allow space saving for conference rooms, kitchen and break room. Garage 2 also has space for additional employee parking and secure parking for Meter Maintenance vehicles. An analysis by the Leasing Office of the Department of General Services has determined that leasing or buying an existing building will cost significantly more than the construction of a new facility on PLD owned land. Operating expenses are expected to decrease by combining the two current facilities into one.

Fiscal Note

There will be no land costs since the facility will be built on a surface lot owned by the Parking Lot District. Full appropriation is being requested in FY15 in order to accomplish a design/build contract.

Disclosures

A pedestrian impact analysis has been completed for this project.

Coordination

PEPCO, WSSC, Department of Technology Services, OMB, MNCPPC

(11)

Parking District Services

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of Parking District Services is to:

- Support the role of public parking in commercial areas throughout the County. Parking management is an important tool for achieving public objectives of economic development and transportation management;
- Support the comprehensive development of the Silver Spring, Bethesda, Wheaton, and Montgomery Hills central business districts and promote their economic growth and stability by supplying a sufficient number of parking spaces to accommodate that segment of the public demand which is neither provided for by developers nor served by alternative travel modes;
- Promote and complement a total transportation system through the careful balance of rates and parking supply to encourage the use of the most efficient and economical transportation modes available; and
- Develop and implement parking management strategies designed to maximize the usage of the available parking supply in order to enhance the economic development of specific central business districts.

BUDGET OVERVIEW

The total recommended FY15 Operating Budget for the Parking Districts Funds is \$28,461,931, an increase of \$2,605,536 or 10.1 percent from the FY14 Approved Budget of \$25,856,395. Personnel Costs comprise 17.0 percent of the budget for 52 full-time positions, and a total of 49.89 FTEs. Total FTEs may include seasonal or temporary positions and may also reflect workforce charged to or from other departments or funds. Operating Expenses and Debt Service account for the remaining 83.0 percent of the FY15 budget.

In addition, this department's Capital Improvements Program (CIP) requires Current Revenue funding.

LINKAGE TO COUNTY RESULT AREAS

While this program area supports all eight of the County Result Areas, the following are emphasized:

- ◆ ***A Responsive, Accountable County Government***
- ◆ ***An Effective and Efficient Transportation Network***
- ◆ ***Strong and Vibrant Economy***

DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance measures for this department are included below, with multi-program measures displayed at the front of this section and program-specific measures shown with the relevant program. The FY14 estimates reflect funding based on the FY14 approved budget. The FY15 and FY16 figures are performance targets based on the FY15 recommended budget and funding for comparable service levels in FY16.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND INITIATIVES

- ◆ ***Began the roll-out of a license plate based virtual permit system to replace paper permits in residential parking permit areas. This system allows registration and renewal on-line or through a 24-hour call center as well as through traditional mail or in-person methods. Accuracy and efficiency of parking enforcement is also enhanced.***
- ◆ ***Replace the parking meters on-street and in public parking lots in Silver Spring with a combination of new customer friendly Smart meters and Pay By Space systems.***
- ◆ ***Select a vendor for a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) for the solar generation of electricity. The PPA vendor will own, install and maintain solar panels on the rooftops of selected County owned garages and would provide the generated power to the County at negotiated below market rates under a 20 to 30 year agreement.***

- ❖ **Open the Capital Crescent Garage (Public Parking Garage 31) in Bethesda at Woodmont and Bethesda Avenues.** This new, state of the art, 950 space public parking facility will include 60 foot clear spans and raised ceilings, a security system with video cameras and call stations, electric vehicle charging stations and enhanced bicycle parking for easy access to the adjacent Capital Crescent Trail.
- ❖ **Completed a conversion of parking citation revenue recordation from the former County financial system (FAMIS) to the current Oracle accounting system.** This was a major effort involving the County's citation management system vendor, the Department of Finance, the Department of Technology Services, the Enterprise Resources Planning unit and staff of the Division of Parking Management. Also implemented a new automated revenue reconciliation process that improved the efficiency of the reconciliation.
- ❖ **Instituted a new parking rate structure based on demand instead of length of stay.** This system aligns the most desirable parking spaces with the highest rate and allows people to make an individual decision on cost versus convenience.
- ❖ **Replaced the individual on-street Bethesda parking meters with new Smart meters.** The new meters provide an easy to read video screen that displays parking rates, time purchased and any specific meter restrictions. They accept credit cards and include an in-street sensor that allows parking availability to be displayed on the County website and available to private application developers.

PROGRAM CONTACTS

Contact Rick Siebert of the Parking Districts Funds at 240.777.8732 or Brady Goldsmith of the Office of Management and Budget at 240.777.2793 for more information regarding this department's operating budget.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Management Services and Property Development

This program supports the overall Parking Services program objectives through the management of Information Technology, Budget, Human Resources and Planning staff to optimize organizational effectiveness. The Program strategically plans for the re-development of Parking Lot District real property to promote the economic growth and stability of associated urban districts. responsible for the drafting and coordination of Requests for Proposals for property development and provides support in negotiation and execution of General Development Agreements.

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	2,784,445	10.50
Decrease Cost: Garage 5B Rental Lease - Silver Spring	-200,000	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	205,026	0.10
FY15 CE Recommended	2,789,471	10.60

Financial Management Program

The Financial Management Program has overall responsibility for recording and reconciling all parking district revenue and the administration of the Ad Valorem tax program.

It is also responsible for the management of the encumbrance and invoice payment process. Within this process it is directly responsible for revenue bond debt, fixed costs and utilities programs.

Program Performance Measures	Actual FY12	Actual FY13	Estimated FY14	Target FY15	Target FY16
Parking Management Revenue Generated (\$ millions)	40.3	42.1	43.0	44.4	44.4
Parking Operating Expenditures (\$ millions)	25.9	25.7	25.8	28.4	28.4
Parking Management Cost Efficiency (ratio of expenses to revenues) ¹	\$0.64	\$0.61	\$0.60	\$0.64	\$0.64
Parking Customer Service Survey Ranking ²	NA	3.28	NA	TBD	NA

¹ The increasing cost ratio is a result of increasing debt service to support capital projects.

² This measure reports the average customer satisfaction rating for both permit holders and visitor parkers along the following scale (1. Poor; 2. Fair; 3. Good; 4. Excellent) for Montgomery County Public Parking Facilities. A survey will be conducted semiannually.

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>FTEs</i>
FY14 Approved	7,642,393	5.31
Increase Cost: Debt Service - Bethesda	948,850	0.00
Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment - Bethesda	690	0.00
Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment- Montgomery Hills	510	0.00
Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment- Wheaton	50	0.00
Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment - Silver Spring	10	0.00
Decrease Cost: Utilities - Silver Spring	-500,000	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	104,443	-0.10
FY15 CE Recommended	8,196,946	5.21

Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering

This program provides the maintenance of all parking lots, garages, and surrounding grounds. Facilities maintenance is programmed at a level which is designed to ensure the operational integrity of the facilities and the safety of parking patrons. Maintenance of parking facilities includes: snow and ice removal; housekeeping services; equipment maintenance for elevators, electrical systems, and Heating, Ventilation, and Air- Conditioning systems (HVAC); facility repairs for maintenance of damaged glass, asphalt, concrete, plumbing, painting, space stripes, graffiti, doorframes, brick and block, meter posts, and woodwork due to vandalism, use and age; and grounds-keeping services.

Additionally, the program supports a balanced system of public parking which promotes the economic stability and growth of the County's central business districts. This is implemented through the design and construction of new parking facilities, including mixed-use projects. The program also includes renovating and improving existing parking facilities to ensure the preservation and integrity of the parking system and its continued service to the public. This program also evaluates energy usage and recommends and implements improvements that reduce the amount of energy used by off-street facilities.

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>FTEs</i>
FY14 Approved	5,221,932	16.68
Increase Cost: Emergency Back Up Batteries in Garages - Silver Spring	57,200	0.00
Increase Cost: Emergency Battery Back Up in Garages - Bethesda	38,500	0.00
Increase Cost: Emergency Back Up Batteries in Garages- Wheaton	22,000	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14 - Montgomery Hills	-620	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14 - Wheaton	-2,350	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14 - Bethesda	-18,850	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14 - Silver Spring	-27,730	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	203,188	1.30
FY15 CE Recommended	5,493,270	17.98

Parking Operations

This unit has overall responsibility for the collection and processing of all parking revenue, including revenue from individual meters, automated pay stations, cashiered facilities, parking permits, and parking fines. Additionally it provides support to the Mass Transit Fund in the processing of bus revenue for deposit.

The program is also responsible for the management of the parking citation database and provides management of the appeal process for all parking tickets written within the County. Parking Operations maintains regularly scheduled parking enforcement patrols in all Parking Lot Districts (PLD), residential permit areas outside the PLD's and other designated County facilities. In addition, this program provides a comprehensive meter maintenance program to ensure all meter devices function properly.

Augmenting the public safety mission of the County Police, this unit also provides contract security guard services for parking facilities to detect and report theft, vandalism, and threats to personal security. Security support is also provided by the Silver Spring Clean and Safe Team.

Parking Operations also manages and executes the Parking Outside the Parking Districts Program funded by the County's General Fund.

14

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	10,207,625	16.1
Enhance: 1,200 On-Street Single Space Smart Meters - Silver Spring	1,300,200	0
Increase Cost: Garage 31 Maintenance, Operations, and Utilities	607,000	0.00
Increase Cost: Hosted Centralized Server for Silver Spring Garages 60 and 61 and Bethesda Garage 11	100,600	0.00
Increase Cost: Debit/Credit Card Bank Fees for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Machines - Bethesda	84,890	0.00
Increase Cost: Debit/Credit Card Bank Fees for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Machines - Silver Spring	84,890	0.00
Enhance: Six Multi-Space Machines in Kennett Street Garage 9 - Silver Spring	69,960	0.00
Increase Cost: Hosted Centralized Server for Silver Spring Garages 60 and 61 and Bethesda Garage 11	50,300	0.00
Enhance: Four Multi-Space Machines on Two Surface Lots - Silver Spring	44,600	0.00
Enhance: 40 IPS Single Smart Meters on Surface Lots - Silver Spring	43,340	0.00
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services - Silver Spring	31,910	0.00
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services - Bethesda	16,750	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increase for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Maintenance - Silver Spring	6,510	0.00
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services- Wheaton	3,150	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increases for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Maintenance - Bethesda	2,870	0.00
Increase Cost: Printing and Mail - Bethesda	2,157	0.00
Increase Cost: Debit/Credit Card Bank Fees for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-by-Space Machines- Montgomery Hills	1,210	0.00
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services- Montgomery Hills	530	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increases for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Maintenance- Wheaton	240	0.00
Decrease Cost: Debit/Credit Card Bank fees for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Machines- Wheaton	-510	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding Adjustment- Wheaton	-11,300	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding Adjustment - Silver Spring	-75,300	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding Adjustment - Bethesda	-109,190	0.00
Decrease Cost: Meter Lease Purchase - Silver Spring	-166,530	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	-313,658	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	11,982,244	16.10

15

BUDGET SUMMARY

	Actual FY13	Budget FY14	Estimated FY14	Recommended FY15	% Chg Bud/Rec
BETHESDA PARKING DISTRICT					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	1,364,954	1,382,866	1,426,822	1,567,412	13.3%
Employee Benefits	473,802	529,231	530,716	569,313	7.6%
Bethesda Parking District Personnel Costs	1,838,756	1,912,097	1,957,538	2,136,725	11.7%
Operating Expenses	10,842,972	7,376,145	7,336,145	7,915,640	7.3%
Debt Service Other	0	4,010,939	4,010,939	4,959,789	23.7%
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	—
Bethesda Parking District Expenditures	12,681,728	13,299,181	13,304,622	15,012,154	12.9%
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	20	29	29	29	—
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	24.23	20.40	20.40	21.12	3.5%
REVENUES					
Investment Income	9,358	55,300	11,710	22,720	-58.9%
Miscellaneous Revenues	-582,864	33,455,620	33,455,620	284,120	-99.2%
Parking Fees	12,355,800	12,998,730	12,998,730	13,673,730	5.2%
Parking Fines	5,162,831	4,829,000	4,829,000	4,829,000	—
Property Rentals	687,890	40,000	40,000	40,000	—
Property Tax	2,568,464	2,478,318	2,568,146	2,629,783	6.1%
Residential Parking Permits	-57	0	0	0	—
Smart Meters	0	316,000	116,000	316,000	—
Bethesda Parking District Revenues	20,201,422	54,172,968	54,019,206	21,795,353	-59.8%
MONTGOMERY HILLS PARKING DISTRICT					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	32,867	32,716	31,105	35,602	8.8%
Employee Benefits	9,308	11,951	9,710	12,431	4.0%
Montgomery Hills Parking District Personnel Costs	42,175	44,667	40,815	48,033	7.5%
Operating Expenses	87,329	92,232	92,233	92,339	0.1%
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	—
Montgomery Hills Parking District Expenditures	129,504	136,899	133,048	140,372	2.5%
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	3	0	0	0	—
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	3.39	0.47	0.47	0.47	—
REVENUES					
Miscellaneous Revenues	-2,963	0	0	0	—
Parking Fees	27,376	52,000	52,000	52,000	—
Parking Fines	26,136	25,000	25,000	25,000	—
Property Tax	81,917	78,955	80,381	82,762	4.8%
Montgomery Hills Parking District Revenues	132,466	155,955	157,381	159,762	2.4%
SILVER SPRING PARKING DISTRICT					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	1,451,480	1,505,965	1,506,910	1,675,668	11.3%
Employee Benefits	506,214	581,991	529,697	617,237	6.1%
Silver Spring Parking District Personnel Costs	1,957,694	2,087,956	2,036,607	2,292,905	9.8%
Operating Expenses	7,809,001	9,009,878	9,009,878	9,667,874	7.3%
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	—
Silver Spring Parking District Expenditures	9,766,695	11,097,834	11,046,485	11,960,779	7.8%
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	29	20	20	20	—
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	20.70	24.23	24.23	24.78	2.3%
REVENUES					
Investment Income	5,583	58,100	6,980	13,540	-76.7%
Miscellaneous Revenues	-454,435	0	0	0	—
Parking Fees	10,167,443	10,550,000	10,550,000	10,550,000	—
Parking Fines	3,049,057	2,256,250	2,256,250	2,256,250	—
Property Tax	6,935,865	6,641,556	7,589,621	7,808,396	17.6%
Residential Parking Permits	-87	0	0	0	—
Silver Spring Parking District Revenues	19,703,426	19,505,906	20,402,851	20,628,186	5.8%

	Actual FY13	Budget FY14	Estimated FY14	Recommended FY15	% Chg Bud/Rec
WHEATON PARKING DISTRICT					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	239,515	240,190	231,467	261,559	8.9%
Employee Benefits	87,293	94,522	91,439	99,708	5.5%
Wheaton Parking District Personnel Costs	326,808	334,712	322,906	361,267	7.9%
Operating Expenses	926,352	987,769	987,769	987,359	0.0%
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	—
Wheaton Parking District Expenditures	1,253,160	1,322,481	1,310,675	1,348,626	2.0%
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	0	3	3	3	—
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	0.47	3.49	3.49	3.52	0.9%
REVENUES					
Investment Income	196	0	250	490	—
Miscellaneous Revenues	-97,088	0	0	0	—
Parking Fees	996,197	925,200	925,200	925,200	—
Parking Fines	595,370	546,000	546,000	546,000	—
Property Tax	477,628	413,542	467,763	480,795	16.3%
Wheaton Parking District Revenues	1,972,303	1,884,742	1,939,213	1,952,485	3.6%
DEPARTMENT TOTALS					
Total Expenditures	23,831,087	25,856,395	25,794,830	28,461,931	10.1%
Total Full-Time Positions	52	52	52	52	—
Total Part-Time Positions	0	0	0	0	—
Total FTEs	48.79	48.59	48.59	49.89	2.7%
Total Revenues	42,009,617	75,719,571	76,518,651	44,535,786	-41.2%

FY15 RECOMMENDED CHANGES

	Expenditures	FTE
BETHESDA PARKING DISTRICT		
FY14 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	13,299,181	20.40
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Increase Cost: Debt Service - Bethesda [Financial Management Program]	948,850	0.00
Increase Cost: Garage 31 Maintenance, Operations, and Utilities [Parking Operations]	607,000	0.00
Increase Cost: Debit/Credit Card Bank Fees for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Machines - Bethesda [Parking Operations]	84,890	0.00
Increase Cost: FY15 Compensation Adjustment - Bethesda	79,522	0.05
Increase Cost: Hosted Centralized Server for Silver Spring Garages 60 and 61 and Bethesda Garage 11 [Parking Operations]	50,300	0.00
Increase Cost: Emergency Battery Back Up in Garages - Bethesda [Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering]	38,500	0.00
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services - Bethesda [Parking Operations]	16,750	0.00
Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment	5,601	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	3,883	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increases for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Maintenance - Bethesda [Parking Operations]	2,870	0.00
Increase Cost: Printing and Mail - Bethesda [Parking Operations]	2,157	0.00
Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment - Bethesda [Financial Management Program]	690	0.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of FY14 Personnel Costs	0	0.67
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14 - Bethesda [Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering]	-18,850	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding Adjustment - Bethesda [Parking Operations]	-109,190	0.00
FY15 RECOMMENDED:	15,012,154	21.12
MONTGOMERY HILLS PARKING DISTRICT		
FY14 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	136,899	0.4
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Increase Cost: FY15 Compensation Adjustment- Montgomery Hills	1,663	0.00
Increase Cost: Debit/Credit Card Bank Fees for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Machines- Montgomery Hills [Parking Operations]	1,210	0.00

	Expenditures	FTEs
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services- Montgomery Hills [Parking Operations]	530	0.00
Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment- Montgomery Hills [Financial Management Program]	510	0.00
Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment	99	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	81	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14 - Montgomery Hills [Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering]	-620	0.00
FY15 RECOMMENDED:	140,372	0.47
SILVER SPRING PARKING DISTRICT		
FY14 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	11,097,834	24.23
Changes (with service impacts)		
Enhance: 1,200 On-Street Single Space Smart Meters - Silver Spring [Parking Operations]	1,300,200	0.00
Enhance: Six Multi-Space Machines in Kennett Street Garage 9 - Silver Spring [Parking Operations]	69,960	0.00
Enhance: Four Multi-Space Machines on Two Surface Lots - Silver Spring [Parking Operations]	44,600	0.00
Enhance: 40 IPS Single Smart Meters on Surface Lots - Silver Spring [Parking Operations]	43,340	0.00
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Increase Cost: Hosted Centralized Server for Silver Spring Garages 60 and 61 and Bethesda Garage 11 [Parking Operations]	100,600	0.00
Increase Cost: Debit/Credit Card Bank Fees for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Machines - Silver Spring [Parking Operations]	84,890	0.00
Increase Cost: FY15 Compensation Adjustment - Silver Spring	83,483	0.00
Increase Cost: Emergency Back Up Batteries in Garages - Silver Spring [Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering]	57,200	0.00
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services - Silver Spring [Parking Operations]	31,910	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increase for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Maintenance - Silver Spring [Parking Operations]	6,510	0.00
Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment	5,768	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	4,034	0.00
Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment - Silver Spring [Financial Management Program]	10	0.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of FY14 Personnel Costs	0	0.55
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14 - Silver Spring [Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering]	-27,730	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding Adjustment - Silver Spring [Parking Operations]	-75,300	0.00
Decrease Cost: Meter Lease Purchase - Silver Spring [Parking Operations]	-166,530	0.00
Decrease Cost: Garage 58 Rental Lease - Silver Spring [Management Services and Property Development]	-200,000	0.00
Decrease Cost: Utilities - Silver Spring [Financial Management Program]	-500,000	0.00
FY15 RECOMMENDED:	11,960,779	24.78
WHEATON PARKING DISTRICT		
FY14 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	1,322,481	3.49
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Increase Cost: Emergency Back Up Batteries in Garages- Wheaton [Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering]	22,000	0.00
Increase Cost: FY15 Compensation Adjustment- Wheaton	13,210	0.00
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services- Wheaton [Parking Operations]	3,150	0.00
Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment	1,010	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	645	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increases for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Maintenance- Wheaton [Parking Operations]	240	0.00
Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment- Wheaton [Financial Management Program]	50	0.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of FY14 Personnel Costs	0	0.03
Decrease Cost: Debit/Credit Card Bank fees for Pay-On-Foot and Pay-By-Space Machines- Wheaton [Parking Operations]	-510	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14 - Wheaton [Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering]	-2,350	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding Adjustment- Wheaton [Parking Operations]	-11,300	0.00
FY15 RECOMMENDED:	1,348,626	3.52

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Program Name	FY14 Approved		FY15 Recommended	
	Expenditures	FTEs	Expenditures	FTEs
Management Services and Property Development	2,784,445	10.50	2,789,471	10.60
Financial Management Program	7,642,393	5.31	8,196,946	5.21
Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering	5,221,932	16.68	5,493,270	17.98
Parking Operations	10,207,625	16.10	11,982,244	16.10
Total	25,856,395	48.59	28,461,931	49.89

FUTURE FISCAL IMPACTS

Title	CE REC.					
	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20

This table is intended to present significant future fiscal impacts of the department's programs.

BETHESDA PARKING DISTRICT

	(\$000's)					
	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
Expenditures						
FY15 Recommended	15,012	15,012	15,012	15,012	15,012	15,012
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY15	0	-30	-30	-30	-30	-30
Items approved for one-time funding in FY15, including a server for Garage 11, will be eliminated from the base in the outyears.						
Labor Contracts	0	21	21	21	21	21
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and associated benefits.						
Labor Contracts - Other	0	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2
These figures represent other negotiated items included in the labor agreements.						
Bethesda Lot 31 Parking Garage	0	70	70	70	70	70
Maintenance, operations, and utilities cost of new garage scheduled to open in FY15.						
Debt Service	0	1	3	4	5	-1
These figures represent costs associated with debt service including new debt, pay down of existing debt, and fluctuations due to interest rate assumptions.						
Emergency Battery Backup in Garages	0	-39	0	-39	0	-31
Replacement every two years.						
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	0	-6	-13	-20	-28	-36
These figures represent the estimated cost of the multi-year plan to pre-fund retiree health insurance costs for the County's workforce.						
Subtotal Expenditures	15,012	15,028	15,061	15,017	15,049	14,996

MONTGOMERY HILLS PARKING DISTRICT

	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
Expenditures						
FY15 Recommended	140	140	140	140	140	140
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Subtotal Expenditures	140	140	140	140	140	140

SILVER SPRING PARKING DISTRICT

	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
Expenditures						
FY15 Recommended	11,961	11,961	11,961	11,961	11,961	11,961
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY15	0	-1,294	-1,294	-1,294	-1,294	-1,294
Items approved for one-time funding in FY15, including smart meters and a server for Garages 60 and 61, will be eliminated from the base in the outyears.						
Labor Contracts	0	22	22	22	22	22
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and associated benefits.						
Labor Contracts - Other	0	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2
These figures represent other negotiated items included in the labor agreements.						
Emergency Backup Batteries in Garages	0	-57	0	-57	0	-57
Replacement every two years.						
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	0	-4	-9	-14	-19	-25
These figures represent the estimated cost of the multi-year plan to pre-fund retiree health insurance costs for the County's workforce.						
Subtotal Expenditures	11,961	10,626	10,678	10,617	10,668	10,607

19

Title	CE REC.					
	FY15	FY16	FY17	(S000's)		
	FY18	FY19	FY20			
WHEATON PARKING DISTRICT						
Expenditures						
FY15 Recommended	1,349	1,349	1,349	1,349	1,349	1,349
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Labor Contracts	0	3	3	3	3	3
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and associated benefits.						
Emergency Backup Batteries in Garages	0	-22	0	-22	0	-22
Replacement every two years.						
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	0	-1	-1	-2	-3	-4
These figures represent the estimated cost of the multi-year plan to pre-fund retiree health insurance costs for the County's workforce.						
Subtotal Expenditures	1,349	1,330	1,351	1,328	1,349	1,326

FY15-20 Public Services Program: Fiscal Plan Bethesda Parking Lot District							
	Estimated	Recommended	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Assumptions							
Property Tax Rate Real/Improved	0.124	0.124	0.124	0.124	0.124	0.124	0.124
Assessable Base Real/Improved (000)	1,522,200	1,576,500	1,634,100	1,716,600	1,817,200	1,921,600	2,034,100
Property Tax Collection Factor Real Property	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%
Property Tax Rate Personal/Improved	0.310	0.310	0.310	0.310	0.310	0.310	0.310
Assessable Base Personal/Improved (000)	167,500	164,200	158,600	154,200	150,200	146,400	142,500
Property Tax Collection Factor Personal Property	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%
Indirect Cost Rate	15.69%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%
CPI (Fiscal Year)	1.80	2.20	2.50	2.90	3.30	3.70	4.10
Investment Income Yield	0.30%	0.55%	1.25%	1.75%	2.25%	2.75%	3.25%
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 16,716,696	\$ 9,906,665	\$ 8,329,563	\$ 9,200,217	\$ 7,257,077	\$ 9,880,233	\$ 10,309,095
Revenues							
Taxes	\$ 2,568,146	\$ 2,629,783	\$ 2,688,236	\$ 2,783,693	\$ 2,904,583	\$ 3,031,134	\$ 3,168,201
Charges for Services	\$ 13,114,730	\$ 13,989,730	\$ 14,247,730	\$ 14,247,730	\$ 14,247,730	\$ 14,247,730	\$ 14,247,730
Fines & Forfeits	\$ 4,829,000	\$ 4,829,000	\$ 4,829,000	\$ 4,829,000	\$ 4,829,000	\$ 4,829,000	\$ 4,829,000
Miscellaneous	\$ 33,507,330	\$ 346,840	\$ 4,428,280	\$ 435,770	\$ 5,312,260	\$ 3,551,920	\$ 614,600
Subtotal Revenues	\$ 54,019,206	\$ 21,795,353	\$ 26,193,246	\$ 22,296,193	\$ 27,293,573	\$ 25,659,784	\$ 22,859,531
Transfers							
Transfers to General Fund	\$ (8,021,335)	\$ (6,039,300)	\$ (9,375,135)	\$ (7,949,535)	\$ (8,025,467)	\$ (8,094,302)	\$ (8,160,020)
Indirect Costs	\$ (317,640)	\$ (359,291)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)
Transfers to Special Funds : Tax Supported	\$ (300,010)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)
Transportation Management District	\$ (7,770,920)	\$ (7,180,009)	\$ (7,536,037)	\$ (7,610,437)	\$ (7,686,369)	\$ (7,755,204)	\$ (7,820,922)
Bethesda Urban District	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)
Mess Transit (Fine Revenue)	\$ (2,932,000)	\$ (2,823,989)	\$ (3,180,017)	\$ (3,254,417)	\$ (3,330,349)	\$ (3,399,184)	\$ (3,464,902)
Transfer from General Fund - Shady Grove Meters	\$ (4,346,100)	\$ (3,863,200)	\$ (3,863,200)	\$ (3,863,200)	\$ (3,863,200)	\$ (3,863,200)	\$ (3,863,200)
Transfer from Silver Spring PLD	\$ 67,225	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Resources	\$ 62,714,567	\$ 25,662,718	\$ 25,147,675	\$ 23,546,875	\$ 26,525,184	\$ 27,445,715	\$ 25,008,605
CIP Current Revenue Appropriation Expenditure							
	\$ (6,343,280)	\$ (2,321,000)	\$ (625,000)	\$ (590,000)	\$ (590,000)	\$ (590,000)	\$ (590,000)
Other CIP Revenue Appropriation Expenditure							
	\$ (33,160,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriations/Expenditures							
Operating Budget	\$ (9,293,683)	\$ (10,052,365)	\$ (10,346,355)	\$ (10,690,995)	\$ (11,090,575)	\$ (11,550,175)	\$ (12,075,785)
Existing Debt Service	\$ (4,010,939)	\$ (4,959,789)	\$ (4,960,917)	\$ (4,963,007)	\$ (4,963,470)	\$ (4,965,220)	\$ (4,958,970)
Annualize and One-Time Annualization	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Garage 31	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (70,000)	\$ (70,000)	\$ (70,000)	\$ (70,000)	\$ (70,000)
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,530	\$ 13,420	\$ 19,810	\$ 27,990	\$ 35,880
Battery Backup	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38,500	\$ -	\$ 38,500	\$ -	\$ 38,500
Labor Agreement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (19,215)	\$ (19,215)	\$ (19,215)	\$ (19,215)	\$ (19,215)
Subtotal PSP Operating Budget Appropriation	\$ (13,304,622)	\$ (15,012,154)	\$ (15,322,457)	\$ (15,699,797)	\$ (16,054,950)	\$ (16,546,620)	\$ (17,019,590)
Total Use of Resources	\$ (52,807,902)	\$ (17,333,154)	\$ (15,947,457)	\$ (16,289,797)	\$ (16,644,950)	\$ (17,136,620)	\$ (17,609,590)
Year End Fund Balance	\$ 9,906,665	\$ 8,329,563	\$ 9,200,217	\$ 7,257,077	\$ 9,880,233	\$ 10,309,095	\$ 7,399,015
Bond Restricted Reserve	\$ (6,091,794)	\$ (7,088,062)	\$ (7,108,514)	\$ (7,134,057)	\$ (7,156,688)	\$ (7,189,058)	\$ (7,212,759)
Year End Available Fund Balance	\$ 3,814,871	\$ 1,241,501	\$ 2,091,704	\$ 123,021	\$ 2,723,546	\$ 3,120,037	\$ 186,256
End-of-Year Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Resources	6.08%	4.84%	8.32%	0.52%	10.27%	11.37%	0.74%

Assumptions:

- The cash balance includes funds required to be held by the District to cover Bond Covenants.
- Bond coverage (annual net revenues over debt service requirements) is maintained at about 322 percent in FY15. The minimum requirement is 125 percent.
- Real/Improved property tax revenue is assumed to increase over the six years based on an improved assessable base.
- Revenue for the air rights lease for Garage 49 is assumed in FY14 through FY20.
- These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY16-20 expenditures are based on the "major, known commitments" of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, estimates of compensation and inflation cost increases, the operating costs of facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. They do not include unapproved service improvements. The project expenditures, revenues, and fund balance may vary based on changes to fee or tax rates, usage, inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here.

21

FY15-20 Public Services Program: Fiscal Plan Montgomery Hills Parking Lot District		Estimated	Recommended	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Assumptions								
Property Tax Rate Real/Improved		0.240	0.240	0.240	0.240	0.240	0.240	0.240
Assessable Base Real/Improved (000)		27,500	28,500	29,500	31,000	32,800	34,700	36,700
Property Tax Collection Factor Real Property		99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%
Property Tax Rate Personal/Improved		0.600	0.600	0.600	0.600	0.600	0.600	0.600
Assessable Base Personal/Improved (000)		2,400	2,400	2,300	2,200	2,100	2,000	1,900
Property Tax Collection Factor Personal Property		99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%
Indirect Cost Rate		15.69%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%
CPI (Fiscal Year)		2.25	2.32	2.40	2.73	3.15	3.45	3.73
Investment Income Yield		0.16%	0.19%	0.36%	0.75%	1.35%	1.80%	2.15%
Beginning Fund Balance		\$ 63,542	\$ 75,465	\$ 82,008	\$ 83,229	\$ 81,954	\$ 78,238	\$ 71,619
Revenues								
Taxes	\$	80,381	82,762	84,546	87,521	91,210	95,137	99,302
Charges for Services	\$	52,000	52,000	52,000	52,000	52,000	52,000	52,000
Fines & Forfeits	\$	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Miscellaneous	\$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal Revenues	\$	157,381	159,762	161,546	164,521	168,210	172,137	176,302
Transfers								
Transfers to General Fund	\$	(12,410)	(12,846)	(12,623)	(12,623)	(12,623)	(12,623)	(12,623)
Indirect Costs	\$	(7,010)	(7,381)	(7,623)	(7,623)	(7,623)	(7,623)	(7,623)
Technology Modernization CIP Project	\$	(400)	(465)	-	-	-	-	-
Regional Services Center	\$	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)
Total Resources	\$	208,513	222,380	230,932	235,127	237,541	237,752	235,298
Appropriations/Expenditures								
Operating Budget	\$	(133,048)	(140,372)	(147,272)	(152,742)	(158,872)	(165,702)	(172,532)
Labor Agreement	\$	-	-	(431)	(431)	(431)	(431)	(431)
Subtotal PSP Operating Budget Appropriation	\$	(133,048)	(140,372)	(147,703)	(153,173)	(159,303)	(166,133)	(172,963)
Total Use of Resources	\$	(133,048)	(140,372)	(147,703)	(153,173)	(159,303)	(166,133)	(172,963)
Year End Available Fund Balance	\$	75,465	82,008	83,229	81,954	78,238	71,619	62,335
End-of-Year Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Resources		36.19%	36.88%	36.04%	34.86%	32.94%	30.12%	26.49%

Assumptions:

- Property tax revenue is assumed to increase over the six years based on an improved assessable base.
- These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY 16-20 expenditures are based on the major, known commitments of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, estimates of compensation and inflation cost increases, the operating costs of capital facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. They do not include unapproved service improvements. The projected future expenditures, revenues, and fund balance may vary based on changes to fee or tax rates, usage, inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here.

FY15-20 Public Services Program: Fiscal Plan Silver Spring Parking Lot District							
	Estimated	Recommended	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Assumptions							
Property Tax Rate Real/Improved	0.317	0.317	0.317	0.317	0.317	0.317	0.317
Assessable Base Real/Improved (000)	1,955,500	2,025,300	2,099,300	2,205,300	2,334,500	2,468,600	2,613,100
Property Tax Collection Factor Real Property	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%
Property Tax Rate Personal/Improved	0.7925	0.7925	0.7925	0.7925	0.7925	0.7925	0.7925
Assessable Base Personal/Improved (000)	120,000	117,700	113,700	110,600	107,700	105,000	102,200
Property Tax Collection Factor Personal Property	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%
Indirect Cost Rate	15.69%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%
CPI (Fiscal Year)	2.25	2.32	2.40	2.73	3.15	3.45	3.73
Investment Income Yield	0.16%	0.19%	0.36%	0.75%	1.35%	1.80%	2.15%
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 13,935,972	\$ 14,769,051	\$ 11,724,685	\$ 11,746,288	\$ 9,501,731	\$ 9,034,553	\$ 8,335,112
Revenues							
Taxes	\$ 7,589,621	\$ 7,808,396	\$ 8,028,085	\$ 8,363,485	\$ 8,779,215	\$ 9,213,184	\$ 9,681,734
Charges for Services	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000
Fines & Forfeits	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250
Miscellaneous	\$ 6,980	\$ 13,540	\$ 38,710	\$ 66,530	\$ 97,210	\$ 135,740	\$ 173,090
Subtotal Revenues	\$ 20,402,851	\$ 20,628,186	\$ 20,873,045	\$ 21,236,265	\$ 21,682,675	\$ 22,155,174	\$ 22,661,074
Transfers							
Transfers to General Fund	\$ (5,753,287)	\$ (8,451,773)	\$ (8,824,626)	\$ (7,444,346)	\$ (7,569,267)	\$ (7,693,919)	\$ (7,815,539)
Indirect Costs	\$ (348,236)	\$ (1,478,797)	\$ (1,472,534)	\$ (1,472,534)	\$ (1,472,534)	\$ (1,472,534)	\$ (1,472,534)
Technology Modernization CIP Project	\$ (20,636)	\$ (23,984)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other Transfers to General Fund	\$ -	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)
Other Transfers to General Fund	\$ -	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)
Transfers to Special Funds : Tax Supported							
Transportation Management District	\$ (5,437,430)	\$ (6,972,976)	\$ (4,352,092)	\$ (5,971,812)	\$ (6,096,733)	\$ (6,221,385)	\$ (6,343,005)
Silver Spring Urban District	\$ (776,180)	\$ (776,180)	\$ (776,180)	\$ (802,301)	\$ (831,784)	\$ (864,044)	\$ (896,304)
Mass Transit (Fine Revenue)	\$ (2,405,000)	\$ (2,440,546)	\$ (2,819,662)	\$ (2,913,261)	\$ (3,008,699)	\$ (3,101,091)	\$ (3,190,451)
Transfers From General Fund	\$ 32,379	\$ -					
Shady Grove Meters	\$ 32,379	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Resources	\$ 28,585,536	\$ 26,945,464	\$ 26,773,104	\$ 25,538,207	\$ 23,615,139	\$ 23,495,808	\$ 23,180,647
CIP Current Revenue Appropriation Expenditure							
	\$ (2,770,000)	\$ (3,260,000)	\$ (4,054,000)	\$ (4,556,000)	\$ (2,700,000)	\$ (2,700,000)	\$ (2,700,000)
Appropriations/Expenditures							
Operating Budget	\$ (9,946,486)	\$ (10,860,779)	\$ (11,201,159)	\$ (11,601,069)	\$ (12,062,779)	\$ (12,591,329)	\$ (13,039,049)
Annualize and One-Time Annualization	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,294,060	\$ 1,294,060	\$ 1,294,060	\$ 1,294,060	\$ 1,294,060
Operating Leases	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,810	\$ 9,260	\$ 13,660	\$ 19,300	\$ 24,740
Battery Backup	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 57,200	\$ -	\$ 57,200	\$ -	\$ 57,200
Labor Agreement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (20,727)	\$ (20,727)	\$ (20,727)	\$ (20,727)	\$ (20,727)
Lot 3 Parking Garage	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (6,000)	\$ (62,000)	\$ (62,000)	\$ (62,000)	\$ (62,000)
Subtotal FSP Operating Budget Appropriation	\$ (11,046,485)	\$ (11,960,779)	\$ (10,972,816)	\$ (11,480,476)	\$ (11,888,586)	\$ (12,460,696)	\$ (12,845,776)
Total Use of Resources	\$ (13,816,485)	\$ (15,220,779)	\$ (15,026,816)	\$ (16,036,476)	\$ (14,580,586)	\$ (15,160,696)	\$ (15,545,776)
Year End Available Fund Balance	\$ 14,769,051	\$ 11,724,685	\$ 11,746,288	\$ 9,501,731	\$ 9,034,553	\$ 8,335,112	\$ 7,634,871
End-of-Year Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Resources	51.67%	43.51%	43.87%	37.21%	38.26%	35.47%	32.94%

Assumptions:

1. Property tax revenue is assumed to increase over the six years based on an improved assessable base.
2. Large assessable base increases are due to economic growth and new projects coming online.
3. These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY16-20 expenditures are based on the "major, known commitments" of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, estimates of compensation and inflation cost increases, the operating costs of capital facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. They do not include unapproved service improvements. The projected future expenditures, revenues, and fund balance may vary based on changes to fee or tax rates, usage, inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here.

FY15-20 Public Services Program: Fiscal Plan Wheaton Parking Lot District							
	Estimated	Recommended	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Assumptions							
Property Tax Rate Real/Improved	0.240	0.240	0.240	0.240	0.240	0.240	0.240
Assessable Base Real/Improved (000)	172,100	178,200	184,700	194,000	205,400	217,200	229,900
Property Tax Collection Factor Real Property	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%	99.20%
Property Tax Rate Personal/Improved	0.600	0.600	0.600	0.600	0.600	0.600	0.600
Assessable Base Personal/Improved (000)	8,200	8,000	7,700	7,500	7,300	7,100	6,900
Property Tax Collection Factor Personal Property	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%
Indirect Cost Rate	15.69%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%
CPI (Fiscal Year)	2.25	2.32	2.40	2.73	3.15	3.45	3.73
Investment Income Yield	0.16%	0.19%	0.36%	0.75%	1.35%	1.80%	2.15%
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 1,049,317	\$ 948,128	\$ 818,734	\$ 1,177,123	\$ 997,213	\$ 768,771	\$ 574,671
Revenues							
Taxes	\$ 467,763	\$ 480,795	\$ 494,183	\$ 514,833	\$ 540,603	\$ 567,324	\$ 596,188
Charges for Services	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200
Fines & Forfeits	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000
Miscellaneous	\$ 250	\$ 490	\$ 1,400	\$ 2,410	\$ 3,520	\$ 4,920	\$ 6,270
Subtotal Revenues	\$ 1,939,213	\$ 1,952,485	\$ 1,966,783	\$ 1,988,443	\$ 2,015,323	\$ 2,043,444	\$ 2,073,658
Transfers							
Transfers to General Fund	\$ (572,727)	\$ (576,253)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)
Indirect Costs	\$ (55,407)	\$ (58,933)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)
Technology Modernization CIP Project	\$ (2,887)	\$ (3,455)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Transfers to Special Funds: Tax Supported	\$ (517,320)	\$ (517,320)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Wheaton Urban District	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Mass Transit (Fine Revenue)	\$ (225,000)	\$ (225,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Resources	\$ 2,415,803	\$ 2,324,360	\$ 2,728,184	\$ 3,108,234	\$ 2,955,202	\$ 2,754,882	\$ 2,590,996
CIP Current Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (645,000)	\$ (686,000)	\$ (595,000)	\$ (545,000)
Appropriations/Expenditures							
Operating Budget	\$ (1,310,675)	\$ (1,348,626)	\$ (1,418,981)	\$ (1,469,761)	\$ (1,526,831)	\$ (1,590,461)	\$ (1,654,091)
Annualize and One-Time Annualization	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,350	\$ 2,350	\$ 2,350	\$ 2,350	\$ 2,350
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 570	\$ 1,390	\$ 2,050	\$ 2,900	\$ 3,710
Battery Backup	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,000	\$ -	\$ 22,000	\$ -	\$ (22,000)
Labor Agreement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (3,205)	\$ (3,205)	\$ (3,205)	\$ (3,205)	\$ (3,205)
Subtotal PSP Operating Budget Appropriation	\$ (1,310,675)	\$ (1,348,626)	\$ (1,394,061)	\$ (1,466,021)	\$ (1,500,431)	\$ (1,585,211)	\$ (1,670,031)
Total Use of Resources	\$ (1,467,675)	\$ (1,505,626)	\$ (1,551,061)	\$ (2,111,021)	\$ (2,186,431)	\$ (2,180,211)	\$ (2,215,031)
Year End Available Fund Balance	\$ 948,128	\$ 818,734	\$ 1,177,123	\$ 997,213	\$ 768,771	\$ 574,671	\$ 375,965
End-of-Year Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Resources	39.25%	35.22%	43.15%	32.08%	26.01%	20.86%	14.51%

Assumptions:

- Property tax revenue is assumed to increase over the six years based on an improved assessable base.
- These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY16-20 expenditures are based on the "major, known commitments" of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, estimates of compensation and inflation cost increases, the operating costs of capital facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. They do not include unapproved service improvements. The projected future expenditures, revenues, and fund balance may vary based on changes to fee or tax rates, usage, inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here.

24

FY14 Adopted Parking Security Patrol Budget				
Sworn Officer Patrols	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Total County Police Hours	0	0	0	0
Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Park Police	0	0	0	0
Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Sworn Officer Patrol Hours	0	0	0	0
Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contract Security Guards	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Scheduled Patrol Hours	25,519	38,402	8,085	72,006
Cost	\$563,971	\$848,684	\$178,672	\$1,591,327
Clean & Safe Team	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Total Patrol Hours	0	6,000	0	6,000
Cost	\$0	\$104,703	\$0	\$104,703
Total	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Total Patrol Hours	25,519	44,402	8,085	78,006
PLD Cost	\$563,971	\$953,387	\$178,672	\$1,696,030

Change from FY14 Adopted to FY15 CE Recommended Parking Security Patrol Budget				
Sworn Officer Patrols	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Total County Police Hours-Change	0	0	0	0
Cost-Change	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Park Police-Change	0	0	0	0
Cost-Change	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Sworn Officer Patrol Hours-Change	0	0	0	0
Cost-Change	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contract Security Guards	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Scheduled Patrol Hours-Change	3,616	0	0	0
Cost-Change	\$77,000	\$0	\$0	\$77,000
Clean & Safe Team	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Total Patrol Hours-Change	0	0	0	0
Cost-Change	\$0	\$162	\$0	\$162
Total	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Total Patrol Hours-Change FY14 to FY15	3,616	-	-	0
PLD Cost-Change FY14 to FY15	\$77,000	\$162	\$0	\$77,162

OBI funding for Garage J1

PC Adjustment

FY15 CE RECOMMENDED PARKING SECURITY BUDGET				
Sworn Officer Patrols	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Total County Police Hours	0	0	0	0
Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Park Police	0	0	0	0
Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Sworn Officer Patrol Hours	0	0	0	0
Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contract Security Guards	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Scheduled Patrol Hours (estimated)	29,135	38,402	8,085	75,622
Cost	\$640,971	\$848,684	\$178,672	\$1,668,327
Clean & Safe Team	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Total Patrol Hours	0	6,000	0	6,000
Cost	\$0	\$104,865	\$0	\$104,865
Total	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	Total
Total Patrol Hours	29,135	44,402	8,085	81,622
PLD Cost	\$640,971	\$953,549	\$178,672	\$1,773,192

* Silver Spring Total Cost includes \$9,019 of Montg Hills Cost

*cost of 3.0 WY

25

South Silver Spring CBD Residential Permit

Background

In conjunction with the approval of the FY13 Silver Spring PLD Operating Budget, Council approved a pilot project to allow discounted monthly parking in the Kennett St and King St Garages for residents of the surrounding area. The pilot provided for a special monthly parking on a calendar basis in the two garages for \$95 per month from Oct 1, 2012 through June 30, 2014. Eligible residents were defined as those living within the boundaries of Eastern Avenue, Blair Mill Road and Georgia Avenue.

Program Operation

The program is operated similarly to the current parking outside the PLDs Residential Permit Program. Silver Spring PCS permits with a special over stamp are sold on a monthly basis. The special permit is only valid for parking at the Kennett or King St Garages. A list of eligible addresses has been identified and created. The eligible list was uploaded into the Duncan AutoProcess cashiering system similarly to the Residential Permit Program. October 2012 permit sales were available in person at the Silver Spring Sales Store. Sales required payment in advance by cash, check or credit card with proof of residency similar to the Residential Permit Program. Examples of proof of residency are: a Maryland driver's license, vehicle registration, lease contract or current utility bill in the name of the permit purchaser at an eligible address. Once an account was created, new permits were available for purchase in person at the Silver Spring Sales Store, by mail or on-line (when the on-line permit sales system went live on November 1, 2012). Permit sales are limited to one permit per vehicle registered at an eligible address or one permit per registered vehicle for County residents not required to register vehicles in Maryland.

Publicity

About 434 eligible addresses were identified. Letters were mailed to all eligible addresses on August 31, 2012. Fliers were also provided to the South Silver Spring Neighborhood Association for distribution and listing for listserv. The letter and information outlined the operation of the Program and notified the addressees of October permit sales available at the Sales Store as of September 17, 2012.

South Silver Spring Permits sold

Year/Month	Permits Sold	Revenue \$95 per permit	Eligible households	% usage
2012				
Oct	0		434	0.00
Nov	49	4655	434	0.11
Dec	56	5320	434	0.13
2013				
Jan	60	5700	434	0.14
Feb	66	6270	434	0.15
Mar	65	6175	434	0.15
April	69	6555	434	0.16
May	67	6365	434	0.15
June	67	6365	434	0.15
July	68	6460	434	0.16
Aug	70	6650	434	0.16
Sept	76	7220	434	0.18
Oct	71	6745	434	0.16
Nov	73	6935	434	0.17
Dec	65	6175	434	0.15
2014				
Jan	69	6555	434	0.16
Feb	69	6555	434	0.16
Mar	71	6745	434	0.16
April*	27	2565	434	0.06
May			434	0.00
June			434	0.00
Total:	1158	110010		

*Current month not complete

(27)

South Silver Spring Survey

A survey was conducted in July 2013 for the South Silver Spring residential parking permit. This area includes two separate private parking facilities managed by Atlantic Parking with a monthly rate of \$125 per month. Atlantic does not collect user and occupancy data, but does have capacity for 8 zip cars. The survey consisted of five questions. Survey was distributed to all eligible addresses, hard copy fliers to residences and electronic links to a listserv. 100 total responses were received.

Questions/Answers

1. How long have you lived at your current residence?
Answers: 50 % of the respondents have been there less than 6 years
2. How many vehicles do you own?
Answers: 77 % of the respondents own 1 car and 23% have 2 cars
3. Have you ever used a Parking Convenience Sticker (PCS PERMIT)?
Answers: 84% of the respondents have used PCS Permit.
4. If you have a South Silver Spring Residential Parking Permit (SSSRPP), where do you park? (check all that apply)
Answers: 81% of the respondents park in Garage 9
5. Where did you park prior to the creation of SSSRPP? Thank you for investing your time in helping improve our service to you.
Answers: Before the Special Permit, only 19 respondents parked in private garage*

*Private garage rates \$125 per month

South Silver Spring Neighborhood Association
March/April 2014 Parking Survey

Executive Summary

Since becoming available in November 2012, the Residential Parking Permit has been highly utilized by the core constituency for which it was intended with nearly 57% of Eastern Village Cohousing car owners using it. Eastern Village residents represent about half of the programs utilization, slightly less than half come from the Aurora, with a small percentage come from 8045 Newell Street.

While the program has reached its intended audience, the car owners that still park on the street indicate that price is the only reason for not using the municipal facilities.

Survey responses indicate that non-participants would likely begin purchasing the RPP if the price was lowered to between \$60 and \$75.

Overview

In 2012, The Montgomery County Council established a Residential Parking Permit pilot program. This program began in November of 2012 and was established to solve a number of neighborhood problems in the South Silver Spring neighborhood.

Objective:

The pilot program was established without any parameters for success. Therefore, the main objective of this survey was to determine the activity of residents with respect to this pilot program.

Methodology

A census survey was distributed to the residents of Eastern Village Cohousing, 8045 Newell Street, and the Aurora Condominium. While the Residential Parking Permit program is available to all residents within a designated zone (South Silver Spring), the core constituents for the program reside in those three condos.

Furthermore, we wanted to be able to minimize the non-response bias that could be problematic with this type of survey.

Response Rate

The response rate from the three properties surveyed varied widely. Therefore, the responses are going to be aggregated at times and broken out at other times.

Property	Units	Respondents	Response Rate
Eastern Village	65	63	97%
Aurora	123	25	20.3%
8045 Newell	120	31	25.8%

Number of Cars in South Silver Spring

Since the council saw South Silver Spring as a transit hub and an area for smart growth, we wanted to determine what percentage of units in our area had cars.

For the property at Eastern Village Cohousing (where we had a near 100% response rate) there are approximately 0.8 cars per unit. This agrees with figures provided to the county by The Blairs in their justification for their Master Plan parking scheme. This is a figure that would be expected for a smart growth oriented neighborhood.

Utilization of the Residential Parking Permit

NEARLY ALL PERMIT SALES ARE FROM THE 3 TARGETED BUILDINGS

Based on figures provided by the county DOT, we know that approximately 60 residential parking permits are purchased each month. Fifty-two (52) of the respondents to this survey reported purchasing the Residential Parking Permit. This supports the contention that the core constituents for the South Silver Spring RPP reside at the three surveyed properties.

PERCENTAGE OF CAR OWNERS USING THE RPP

More than half (57%) of car owners at Eastern Village Cohousing indicate that they use the Residential Parking Permit. While that is a strong percentage, why isn't everyone using the Residential Parking Permit?

11 car owners (21%) report utilizing other types of permits (handicapped, AM/PM, etc.) that allow them the ability to park in one of the county parking facilities.

According to the survey, 17 car owners (33%) at Eastern Village Cohousing report parking on the street. 12% of Aurora car owners are street parkers, while only 3% of

8045 Newell car owners are street parkers. One of the goals of the program was to move long term street parking off of the streets and into the under-utilized garage. While the RPP program appears to have achieved that goal, we could do more.

WHY ARE CAR-OWNERS STILL PARKING ON THE STREET?

One hundred percent (100%) of the 17 car owners that park on the street at Eastern Village (some of these purchase permits sometimes) indicate the reason they do so is due to the cost of the permit.

The average South Silver Spring street parker indicated that they would begin to purchase the RPP if it was priced at \$51.66 (A median of \$50 per month, Max \$80, Min \$25). While the utilization rate for the pilot program appears to be high, if the council wanted to increase utilization a rate of somewhere between \$60 and \$75 would appear to do just that without impacting overall revenue for the program.

WOULD OWNERS ABANDON PRIVATE LOTS IF THE RPP PERMIT PRICE WAS TOO LOW?

One of the concerns raised by council staff when the RPP was instituted was the potential for the RPP to stifle commerce at private garages by setting the market at a rate that was lower than what private garages could compete with.

Only one user comment across the three buildings surveyed indicated that price would be a factor in switching from their current private garage to the county garage. The resident of 8045 Newell (which does have a private garage serving some residents) indicated that if the price fell below \$50 per month that they would stop parking in their private garage and move their vehicle to the county facility.

Survey Questions

1. **Do you own a car?** Yes/No
2. **If yes, how many cars?** (Open Ended)
3. **Do you know about the residential parking permits?**
Yes/No
4. **Buy the RPP:** Always, Never, Occasionally
5. **If you do not buy the permit, where do you park?**
6. **If RPP cost less, would you use it?** Yes/No/Maybe
 - a. **If yes or maybe to buying the RPP, what would the price need to be?** (Open Ended)
7. **Do you Know about the AM/PM Permit?** Yes/No
 - a. **Would buy AM/PM Permit?** Yes/No

Montgomery County, Maryland
Parking Fund Financial Planning Model

	B	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
	Actual	Budget	Estimated	Projected						
	2013	2014	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2020
5	Montgomery Hills Parking District									
6										
7										
8	Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 64,407	\$ 33,214	\$ 63,542	\$ 75,465	\$ 64,088	\$ 65,229	\$ 63,954	\$ 60,238	\$ 53,619
9										
10	Revenues									
11	Taxes	\$ 81,917	\$ 78,955	\$ 80,381	\$ 82,762	\$ 84,546	\$ 87,521	\$ 91,210	\$ 95,137	\$ 99,382
12	Real Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ 63,449	\$ 66,067	\$ 68,448	\$ 70,829	\$ 74,400	\$ 78,685	\$ 83,209	\$ 87,971
13	Personal Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ 15,506	\$ 14,314	\$ 14,314	\$ 13,717	\$ 13,121	\$ 12,524	\$ 11,928	\$ 11,332
14										
15	Charges for Services	\$ 27,376	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000
16	Parking Fees Base	\$ 27,376	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 52,000
17	Redefining Short Term Meters	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
18	Garage 31	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
19	Increased Rates	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
20	Other Charge for Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
21	Other Charge for Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
22										
23	Fines & Forfeits	\$ 26,136	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
24	Parking Fines	\$ 26,136	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
25	Other Fines & Forfeits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
26	Other Fines & Forfeits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
27										
28	Miscellaneous	\$ (2,963)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
29	Investment Income	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
30	Property Rentals	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
31	Miscellaneous Revenues	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
32	Boat Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
33	Land Sales	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
34	G-49 Air Rights	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
35	Adjustment for FY13 Actual Tax Revenue	\$ (2,963)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
36	Other Miscellaneous	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
37										
38	Subtotal Revenues	\$ 132,466	\$ 155,955	\$ 157,381	\$ 159,762	\$ 161,546	\$ 164,521	\$ 168,210	\$ 172,137	\$ 176,302
39										
40										
41	Transfers	\$ (23,350)	\$ (12,410)	\$ (12,410)	\$ (12,846)	\$ (12,623)	\$ (12,623)	\$ (12,623)	\$ (12,623)	\$ (12,623)
42	Transfers to General Fund	\$ (23,350)	\$ (12,410)	\$ (12,410)	\$ (12,846)	\$ (12,623)	\$ (12,623)	\$ (12,623)	\$ (12,623)	\$ (12,623)
43	Indirect Costs	\$ (5,350)	\$ (7,010)	\$ (7,010)	\$ (7,381)	\$ (7,623)	\$ (7,623)	\$ (7,623)	\$ (7,623)	\$ (7,623)
44	Saving Plan & MARC Reduction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
45	Technology Modernization CIP Project	\$ -	\$ (400)	\$ (400)	\$ (465)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
46	Regional Services Center	\$ (18,000)	\$ (5,000)	\$ (5,000)	\$ (5,000)	\$ (5,000)	\$ (5,000)	\$ (5,000)	\$ (5,000)	\$ (5,000)
47	Other Transfers to General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
48										
49	Transfers to Special Funds - Tax Supported	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
50	Transportation Management District	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
51	Montgomery Hills Urban District	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
52	Mass Transit (Fine Revenue)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53	Other Transfers to Special Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
54	Other Transfers to Special Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
55										
56	Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
57	Shady Grove Meters	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
58	Other Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
59	Other Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
60	Other Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
61										
62	Total Resources	\$ 173,623	\$ 176,759	\$ 208,513	\$ 222,380	\$ 212,932	\$ 217,127	\$ 219,541	\$ 219,752	\$ 217,298
63										
64										
65	CIP Current Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (18,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
66	Other CIP Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
67										
68	Appropriations/Expenditures									
69	Operating Budget	\$ (129,504)	\$ (136,899)	\$ (133,048)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)
70	Personnel Costs	\$ (42,175)	\$ (44,667)	\$ 40,816	\$ (48,033)	\$ (48,033)	\$ (48,033)	\$ (48,033)	\$ (48,033)	\$ (48,033)
71	Operating Expenses	\$ (87,329)	\$ (92,232)	\$ (92,232)	\$ (92,339)	\$ (92,339)	\$ (92,339)	\$ (92,339)	\$ (92,339)	\$ (92,339)
72	Existing Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
73	New Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
74	Amortize and One-Time Amortization	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
75	Garage 31	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
76	Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
77	Utilities	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
78	Battery Backup	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
79	CPI Fiscal Year for OI	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (4,790)	\$ (7,850)	\$ (11,300)	\$ (15,160)	\$ (19,020)	\$ (23,350)
80	Compensation Adjustment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (2,110)	\$ (4,520)	\$ (7,300)	\$ (10,170)	\$ (13,140)	\$ (16,330)
81	Labor Agreement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (431)	\$ (431)	\$ (431)	\$ (431)	\$ (431)	\$ (431)
82	Other Expenditure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
83	Debit/Credit Card Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
84	Adjustment for PY Encumbrances/Reserves	\$ 19,523	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
85										
86	Subtotal PSP Operating Budget Appropriation	\$ (109,981)	\$ (136,899)	\$ (133,048)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)
87										
88	Total Use of Resources	\$ (109,981)	\$ (136,899)	\$ (133,048)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)	\$ (140,372)
89	Year End Fund Balance	\$ 63,542	\$ 39,860	\$ 75,465	\$ 64,808	\$ 65,229	\$ 63,954	\$ 60,238	\$ 53,619	\$ 44,335
90	Board Restricted Reserve	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
91	Year End Available Fund Balance	\$ 63,542	\$ 39,860	\$ 75,465	\$ 64,808	\$ 65,229	\$ 63,954	\$ 60,238	\$ 53,619	\$ 44,335
92	End-of-Year Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Resources	36.62%	22.55%	36.19%	28.78%	30.63%	29.45%	27.44%	24.40%	20.40%

33

	B	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
	Actual	Budget	Estimated	Projected						
	2013	2014	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2020
5 Wheaton Parking District										
6										
7										
8 Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 873,873	\$ 842,307	\$ 1,849,317	\$ 948,128	\$ 818,734	\$ 669,803	\$ 685,573	\$ 693,811	\$ 941,468	\$ 941,468
9										
10 Revenues										
11 Taxes	\$ 477,628	\$ 413,542	\$ 467,763	\$ 480,795	\$ 494,183	\$ 514,833	\$ 540,683	\$ 567,324	\$ 596,188	\$ 596,188
12 Real Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ 355,692	\$ 410,807	\$ 425,330	\$ 440,805	\$ 462,947	\$ 490,307	\$ 518,419	\$ 548,774	\$ 548,774
13 Personal Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ 57,851	\$ 56,956	\$ 55,465	\$ 53,378	\$ 51,887	\$ 50,396	\$ 48,905	\$ 47,414	\$ 47,414
14										
15 Charges for Services	\$ 996,197	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 1,261,488	\$ 1,261,488	\$ 1,261,488
16 Parking Fees Base	\$ 996,197	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200	\$ 925,200
17 Garage 13	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
18 Other Charge for Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
19 Other Charge for Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
20 Other Charge for Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
21 Other Charge for Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
22										
23 Fines & Forfeits	\$ 595,378	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 627,900	\$ 627,900	\$ 627,900
24 Parking Fines	\$ 595,378	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 546,000	\$ 627,900	\$ 627,900	\$ 627,900
25 Other Fines & Forfeits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
26 Other Fines & Forfeits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
27										
28 Miscellaneous	\$ (96,892)	\$ -	\$ 250	\$ 490	\$ 1,400	\$ 2,410	\$ 3,520	\$ 4,920	\$ 6,370	\$ 6,370
29 Investment Income	\$ 196	\$ -	\$ 250	\$ 490	\$ 1,400	\$ 2,410	\$ 3,520	\$ 4,920	\$ 6,370	\$ 6,370
30 Property Rentals	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
31 Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
32 Bond Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
33 Land Sales	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
34 G-49 Air Rights	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
35 Adjustment for FY13 Actual Tax Revenue	\$ (97,088)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
36 Other Miscellaneous	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
37										
38 Subtotal Revenues	\$ 1,972,303	\$ 1,884,742	\$ 1,939,213	\$ 1,957,485	\$ 1,966,783	\$ 1,988,443	\$ 2,015,323	\$ 2,461,632	\$ 2,491,846	\$ 2,491,846
39										
40										
41 Transfers	\$ (508,680)	\$ (572,727)	\$ (572,727)	\$ (576,253)	\$ (549,653)	\$ (549,653)	\$ (549,653)	\$ (549,653)	\$ (549,653)	\$ (549,653)
42 Transfers to General Fund	\$ (43,280)	\$ (55,497)	\$ (55,497)	\$ (58,933)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)
43 Indirect Costs	\$ (39,330)	\$ (52,520)	\$ (52,520)	\$ (55,478)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)	\$ (57,333)
44 Savings Plan & MARC Reduction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
45 Technology Modernization CIP Project	\$ (5,930)	\$ (2,887)	\$ (2,887)	\$ (3,455)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
46 Other Transfers to General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
47 Other Transfers to General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
48										
49 Transfers to Special Funds - Tax Supported	\$ (517,320)	\$ (517,320)	\$ (517,320)	\$ (517,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)
50 Transportation Management District	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
51 Wheaton Urban District	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)	\$ (292,320)
52 Mass Transit (Fare Revenue)	\$ (225,000)	\$ (225,000)	\$ (225,000)	\$ (225,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
53 Other Transfers to Special Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
54 Other Transfers to Special Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
55										
56 Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
57 Shade Grove Malaria	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
58 Other Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
59 Other Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
60 Other Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
61										
62 Total Resources	\$ 2,285,576	\$ 2,154,322	\$ 2,415,803	\$ 2,324,340	\$ 2,435,864	\$ 2,308,594	\$ 2,351,342	\$ 2,885,796	\$ 3,083,661	\$ 3,083,661
63										
64										
65 CIP Current Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ (145,633)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (372,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)
66 Other CIP Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
67										
68 Appropriation/Expenditures										
69 Operating Budget	\$ (1,253,160)	\$ (1,322,481)	\$ (1,310,675)	\$ (1,348,626)	\$ (1,348,626)	\$ (1,348,626)	\$ (1,348,626)	\$ (1,348,626)	\$ (1,348,626)	\$ (1,348,626)
70 Personnel Costs	\$ (326,807)	\$ (334,712)	\$ (322,906)	\$ (361,267)	\$ (361,267)	\$ (361,267)	\$ (361,267)	\$ (361,267)	\$ (361,267)	\$ (361,267)
71 Operating Expenses	\$ (926,353)	\$ (987,769)	\$ (987,769)	\$ (987,359)	\$ (987,359)	\$ (987,359)	\$ (987,359)	\$ (987,359)	\$ (987,359)	\$ (987,359)
72 Existing Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
73 New Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
74 Amortize and One-Time Amortization	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,350	\$ 2,350	\$ 2,350	\$ 2,350	\$ 2,350	\$ 2,350
75 Compensation Adjustment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (115,836)	\$ (83,880)	\$ (83,870)	\$ (76,240)	\$ (98,510)	\$ (98,510)
76 Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Paiding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 570	\$ 1,390	\$ 2,650	\$ 2,900	\$ 3,710	\$ 3,710
77 EFT-Paid Year For OE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (51,320)	\$ (84,050)	\$ (121,630)	\$ (162,390)	\$ (203,760)	\$ (203,760)
78 Battery Backup	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,000	\$ -	\$ 22,000	\$ -	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000
79 Labor Agreement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (3,205)	\$ (3,205)	\$ (3,205)	\$ (3,205)	\$ (3,205)	\$ (3,205)
80 Garage 13	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (122,111)	\$ (122,111)	\$ (122,111)
81 Other Expenditure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
82 Other Expenditure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
83 Debt/Credit Card Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
84 Adjustment for FY Encumbrances/Reserves	\$ 162,534	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
85										
86 Subtotal PSP Operating Budget Appropriation	\$ (1,090,626)	\$ (1,322,481)	\$ (1,310,675)	\$ (1,348,626)	\$ (1,394,061)	\$ (1,466,021)	\$ (1,590,431)	\$ (1,797,322)	\$ (1,748,142)	\$ (1,748,142)
87										
88 Total Use of Resources	\$ (1,236,289)	\$ (1,479,481)	\$ (1,467,675)	\$ (1,505,626)	\$ (1,766,061)	\$ (1,623,021)	\$ (1,637,431)	\$ (1,864,322)	\$ (1,905,442)	\$ (1,905,442)
89 Year End Fund Balance	\$ 1,049,317	\$ 674,841	\$ 948,128	\$ 818,734	\$ 669,803	\$ 685,573	\$ 693,811	\$ 941,468	\$ 1,178,519	\$ 1,178,519
90 Bond Restricted Reserve	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
91 Year End Available Fund Balance	\$ 1,049,317	\$ 674,841	\$ 948,128	\$ 818,734	\$ 669,803	\$ 685,573	\$ 693,811	\$ 941,468	\$ 1,178,519	\$ 1,178,519
92 End-of-Year Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Resources	45.91%	31.32%	39.25%	35.23%	27.50%	29.70%	29.51%	33.55%	38.22%	38.22%

34

Orlin, Glenn

From: Faden, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2014 3:55 PM
To: Orlin, Glenn
Subject: Use of parking district funds

You asked whether the current law would allow funds from one parking lot district to be temporarily transferred or "loaned" to another parking lot district, assuming an operating budget resolution would authorize that transfer.

I don't see anything in the parking lot district law, County Code Chapter 60, that would allow any such transfer or loan. The relevant provision of that Chapter, §60-16, is quite explicit in limiting the use of parking lot district funds to the district where the funds originated. Note the various examples, highlighted below, of limiting language in that section:

Sec. 60-16. Purpose of parking lot funds.

(a) **The Director of Finance must keep the special taxes and parking fees collected from each district in a separate fund for each district, and each fund must be used so that enough funds are available to pay the principal and interest, as they become due, upon any bonds issued to acquire, build, restore, or improve the off-street parking facilities in the particular district from which the money in that fund is collected.** The balance must be used to acquire, build, maintain, or operate off-street parking facilities **in that district** and to reimburse the County for **general revenues advanced to that district** under subsection (b). If in any fiscal year any balance remains after those payments, the Director of Finance must hold it until the following fiscal year and apply it as provided in this subsection.

(b) On-site expenses in connection with the acquisition, improvement, operation, or maintenance of the off-street parking facilities must not be paid from the general revenues of the County. However, the Director of Finance may temporarily advance general revenues to acquire, build, restore, or improve those facilities. Any transfer that will not be repaid before the end of the fiscal year must be expressly approved by the County Council in an annual budget resolution or a separate resolution, and is subject to any condition imposed in either resolution. The County Executive may, by regulations issued under method (2), regulate the amount of general revenues and parking lot district funds transferred under this subsection.

(c) (1) Notwithstanding the limits in subsection (a) or (b) or any other provision of this Chapter, the County Council may **transfer revenue from parking fees** to:

(A) the fund of **any urban district from which the fees are collected**, as limited by Section 68A-4(a)(2)b;

(B) fund activities of the Department of Transportation to implement transportation system management under Section 42A-13 and Section 42A-23. Parking fee revenue transferred to fund activities in a transportation system management district **must not exceed parking fees collected in that transportation system management district**; and

(C) fund activities of the Department of Transportation in a parking lot district, other than any parking lot district where a transportation system management district is operating to:

(i) promote, develop, and implement transit and ridesharing incentive programs; and

(ii) establish cooperative County and private sector programs to increase ridesharing and transit usage.

Parking fee revenue transferred to fund these activities must derive only from parking fees collected in that parking lot district.

(2) In this subsection, "parking fee" means revenue from parking meters, parking permits, or any other user charge for parking.

(d) Notwithstanding the limitations in subsection (a) or (b) or any other provision of this Chapter, the County Council may **transfer district funds** from the unencumbered balance of the district fund set up under subsection (a) **to assist mixed-use parking facility projects in the district** as contemplated by Section 60-2(b). In this subsection, a mixed-use parking facility project means a mixed-use project that includes a significant public parking component and is approved in the County capital improvements program. Unless the County Council in the capital improvements program waives all or part of the repayment, each transfer of funds must be conditioned on a reasonable repayment agreement that is based on the nature of the mixed-use project.

(e) Notwithstanding the limits in subsection (a) or (b) or any other provision of this Chapter, the County Council may transfer revenue from the Montgomery Hills Parking Lot District parking tax:

(1) to fund activities of the Silver Spring Regional Services Center in the Montgomery Hills Parking District, an amount in Fiscal Year 2005 that does not exceed \$15,000, and in each succeeding fiscal year does not exceed the maximum amount for the previous fiscal year increased by the annual average increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers in the Washington-Baltimore metropolitan area, or any successor index, for the previous calendar year, to:

(A) provide and maintain amenities, façade improvements, streetscape improvements, and property in public rights-of-way;

(B) promote and implement activities that benefit residential and commercial interests in the district. These activities may incidentally benefit neighboring communities; and

(C) enhance the safety and security of persons and property in public areas; and

(2) to fund projects in the Capital Improvements Program that improve the street and sidewalk infrastructure serving the Montgomery Hills Parking Lot District.

Let me know if you need anything else.

Michael E. Faden
Senior Legislative Attorney
Montgomery County Council
240-777-7905
mike.faden@montgomerycountymd.gov
I am frequently out of the office on Wednesdays and Fridays.

36

Montgomery County, Maryland
Parking Fund Financial Planning Model

	B	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
	Actual	Budget	Estimated	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	2013	2014	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2020
5 Bethesda Parking District										
6										
7										
8 Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 33,057,753	\$ 3,733,399	\$ 16,716,696	\$ 9,906,665	\$ 10,117,346	\$ 15,147,843	\$ 14,312,083	\$ 16,871,766	\$ 17,237,234	
9										
10 Revenue										
11 Taxes	\$ 2,568,484	\$ 2,478,218	\$ 2,508,146	\$ 5,259,566	\$ 5,376,473	\$ 5,567,385	\$ 2,904,583	\$ 3,831,134	\$ 3,168,281	
12 Real Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ 1,905,640	\$ 2,035,204	\$ 4,194,942	\$ 4,348,210	\$ 4,567,779	\$ 2,417,722	\$ 2,556,598	\$ 2,706,299	
13 Personal Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ 572,678	\$ 542,943	\$ 1,064,624	\$ 1,028,263	\$ 999,606	\$ 486,861	\$ 474,536	\$ 461,982	
14										
15 Charges for Services	\$ 12,355,808	\$ 13,314,736	\$ 13,114,730	\$ 13,989,738	\$ 14,247,730	\$ 14,247,730	\$ 14,247,730	\$ 14,247,730	\$ 14,247,730	
16 Parking Fees Base	\$ 12,355,808	\$ 12,998,730	\$ 12,998,730	\$ 12,998,730	\$ 12,998,730	\$ 12,998,730	\$ 12,998,730	\$ 12,998,730	\$ 12,998,730	
17 Redefine Short Term Meters	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
18 Garage 31	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 675,000	\$ 933,000	\$ 933,000	\$ 933,000	\$ 933,000	\$ 933,000	
19 Increased Rates	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20 Smart Meters	\$ -	\$ 316,000	\$ 116,000	\$ 316,000	\$ 316,000	\$ 316,000	\$ 316,000	\$ 316,000	\$ 316,000	
21 Other Charge for Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
22										
23 Fines & Forfeits	\$ 5,162,831	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	
24 Parking Fines	\$ 5,162,831	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	\$ 4,829,808	
25 Other Fines & Forfeits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
26										
27										
28 Miscellaneous	\$ 114,327	\$ 33,558,920	\$ 33,507,330	\$ 1,804,849	\$ 4,428,288	\$ 435,770	\$ 5,312,260	\$ 3,551,920	\$ 614,608	
29 Investment Income	\$ 9,398	\$ 53,300	\$ 11,710	\$ 22,720	\$ 64,960	\$ 111,630	\$ 163,140	\$ 227,800	\$ 290,430	
30 Property Rentals	\$ 682,890	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	
31 Miscellaneous Revenues	\$ (582,864)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
32 Bond Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 658,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
33 Used Sales	\$ -	\$ 33,171,500	\$ 33,171,500	\$ -	\$ 4,099,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
34 G-19 Air Rights	\$ -	\$ 284,120	\$ 284,120	\$ 284,120	\$ 284,120	\$ 284,120	\$ 284,120	\$ 284,120	\$ 284,120	
35 Extraordinary	\$ (47)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,825,000	\$ 3,000,000	
36 Adjustment for FY13 Actual Tax Revenues	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
37										
38 Subtotal Revenues	\$ 20,201,422	\$ 54,172,969	\$ 54,019,286	\$ 25,083,136	\$ 38,881,483	\$ 25,079,885	\$ 37,293,573	\$ 25,659,784	\$ 22,859,531	
39										
40										
41 Transfers	\$ (8,610,335)	\$ (8,621,335)	\$ (8,621,335)	\$ (7,539,308)	\$ (7,575,135)	\$ (7,949,535)	\$ (8,825,467)	\$ (8,094,382)	\$ (8,160,820)	
42 Transfers to General Fund	\$ (260,840)	\$ (317,640)	\$ (317,640)	\$ (359,251)	\$ (339,499)	\$ (339,499)	\$ (339,499)	\$ (339,499)	\$ (339,499)	
43 Indirect Costs	\$ (236,560)	\$ (300,010)	\$ (300,010)	\$ (439,098)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)	\$ (339,098)	
44 Saving Plan & MARC Reduction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
45 Technology Modernization MC CIP Project	\$ (74,280)	\$ (17,630)	\$ (17,630)	\$ (20,193)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
46 Other Transfers to General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
47 Other Transfers to General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
48										
49 Transfers to Special Funds - Tax Supported	\$ (8,392,820)	\$ (7,770,920)	\$ (7,770,920)	\$ (7,180,059)	\$ (7,236,037)	\$ (7,610,437)	\$ (7,684,369)	\$ (7,285,204)	\$ (7,820,922)	
50 Transportation Management District	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	\$ (492,820)	
51 Bethesda Urban District	\$ (2,815,000)	\$ (2,932,000)	\$ (2,932,000)	\$ (2,829,989)	\$ (3,180,017)	\$ (3,254,417)	\$ (3,330,349)	\$ (3,399,184)	\$ (3,464,902)	
52 Mass Transit (Fine Revenue)	\$ (5,085,000)	\$ (4,346,100)	\$ (4,346,100)	\$ (5,863,200)	\$ (3,863,200)	\$ (3,863,200)	\$ (3,863,200)	\$ (3,863,200)	\$ (3,863,200)	
53 Other Transfers to Special Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
54 Other Transfers to Special Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
55										
56 Transfers From Other Funds	\$ 43,325	\$ 67,225	\$ 67,225	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
57 Transfer from General Fund - Shady Grove Meters	\$ 43,325	\$ 67,225	\$ 67,225	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
58 Cedar Lane Meters	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
59 Other Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
60 Other Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
61										
62 Total Resources	\$ 44,648,840	\$ 49,825,032	\$ 62,714,567	\$ 27,450,808	\$ 31,123,604	\$ 32,278,193	\$ 33,580,109	\$ 34,437,247	\$ 31,936,744	
63										
64										
65 CIP Current Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ (18,146,795)	\$ 10,130,000	\$ (6,343,280)	\$ (1,669,000)	\$ (590,000)	\$ (2,203,000)	\$ (590,000)	\$ (590,000)	\$ (590,000)	
66 Other CIP Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ -	\$ (33,160,000)	\$ (33,160,000)	\$ (698,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
67										
68 Appropriations/Expenditures										
69 Operating Budget	\$ (12,081,729)	\$ (9,288,342)	\$ (9,289,683)	\$ (10,052,365)	\$ (10,052,365)	\$ (10,052,365)	\$ (10,052,365)	\$ (10,052,365)	\$ (10,052,365)	
70 Personnel Costs	\$ (1,838,756)	\$ (1,912,097)	\$ (1,927,538)	\$ (2,136,725)	\$ (2,136,725)	\$ (2,136,725)	\$ (2,136,725)	\$ (2,136,725)	\$ (2,136,725)	
71 Operating Expenses	\$ (10,842,973)	\$ (7,376,145)	\$ (7,336,145)	\$ (7,915,640)	\$ (7,915,640)	\$ (7,915,640)	\$ (7,915,640)	\$ (7,915,640)	\$ (7,915,640)	
72 Existing Debt Service	\$ -	\$ (4,010,939)	\$ (4,010,939)	\$ (4,959,789)	\$ (4,960,917)	\$ (4,963,007)	\$ (4,963,470)	\$ (4,963,220)	\$ (4,958,970)	
73 New Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (63,393)	\$ (63,393)	\$ (63,393)	\$ (63,393)	\$ (63,393)	\$ (63,393)	
74 Amortize and One-Time Amortization	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	
75 Garage 31	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (70,000)	\$ (70,000)	\$ (70,000)	\$ (70,000)	\$ (70,000)	
76 Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,530	\$ 13,420	\$ 19,810	\$ 77,990	\$ 35,880	
77 Utilities	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
78 Battery Backup	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38,500	\$ -	\$ 38,500	\$ -	\$ 38,500	
79 CPI - Fiscal Year for OE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (197,840)	\$ (433,070)	\$ (708,510)	\$ (1,027,520)	\$ (1,394,100)	
80 Compensation Adjustment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (96,150)	\$ (205,560)	\$ (329,700)	\$ (470,290)	\$ (629,320)	
81 Labor Agreements	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (19,215)	\$ (19,215)	\$ (19,215)	\$ (19,215)	\$ (19,215)	
82 Other Expenditures	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
83 Debt/Credit Card Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
84 Adjustment for PY Encumbrances/Reserves	\$ 2,896,290	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
85										
86 Subtotal FSP Operating Budget Appropriation	\$ (9,785,439)	\$ (13,299,181)	\$ (13,304,623)	\$ (15,012,154)	\$ (15,385,850)	\$ (15,763,190)	\$ (16,118,343)	\$ (16,610,815)	\$ (17,882,983)	
87										
88 Total Use of Resources	\$ (27,932,144)	\$ (26,339,181)	\$ (52,897,902)	\$ (17,333,154)	\$ (15,973,850)	\$ (17,966,199)	\$ (16,768,343)	\$ (17,200,615)	\$ (17,672,983)	
89 Year End Fund Balance	\$ 16,716,696	\$ 15,545,851	\$ 9,906,665	\$ 18,117,346	\$ 15,147,843	\$ 14,312,083	\$ 16,871,766	\$ 17,237,234	\$ 14,263,761	
90 Bond Restricted Reserve	\$ (6,101,111)	\$ (6,091,454)	\$ (6,091,794)	\$ (7,893,345)	\$ (7,113,796)	\$ (7,130,339)	\$ (7,161,971)	\$ (7,194,343)	\$ (7,218,842)	
91 Year End Available Fund Balance	\$ 10,615,585	\$ 7,454,397	\$ 3,814,871	\$ 3,024,001	\$ 8,034,047	\$ 7,172,663	\$ 9,709,795	\$ 10,042,939	\$ 7,044,919	
92 End-of-Year Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Resources	23.78%	14.94%	6.08%	11.82%	25.81%	22.22%	28.92%	29.16%	22.06%	

37

Montgomery County, Maryland
 Parking Fund Financial Planning Model

	B	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
	Actual	Budget	Estimated	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	2013	2014	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2020
5 Silver Spring Parking District										
8 Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 11,685,114	\$ 12,288,261	\$ 13,925,972	\$ 14,769,051	\$ 10,639,889	\$ 14,576,463	\$ 11,121,555	\$ 10,654,912	\$ 9,955,993	
10 Revenues										
11 Fines	\$ 6,935,865	\$ 6,641,256	\$ 7,589,621	\$ 5,170,606	\$ 5,316,056	\$ 5,538,134	\$ 8,779,751	\$ 9,213,706	\$ 9,082,242	
12 Real Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ 5,758,134	\$ 6,638,830	\$ 4,552,730	\$ 4,719,081	\$ 4,957,535	\$ 7,925,317	\$ 8,380,555	\$ 8,871,161	
13 Personal Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ 893,422	\$ 950,791	\$ 617,850	\$ 596,976	\$ 580,798	\$ 854,435	\$ 833,151	\$ 811,080	
14 Charges for Services	\$ 10,167,443	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	
15 Parking Fees Base	\$ 10,167,443	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	\$ 10,550,000	
16 Redefine Short Term Meters	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
17 Other Charge for Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
18 Increased Rates	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
19 Other Charge for Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
20 Other Charge for Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
21 Other Charge for Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
22										
23 Fines & Forfeits	\$ 3,049,057	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	
24 Parking Fines	\$ 3,049,057	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	\$ 2,256,250	
25 Other Fines & Forfeits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
26 Other Fines & Forfeits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
27										
28 Miscellaneous	\$ (448,939)	\$ 58,100	\$ 6,980	\$ 13,540	\$ 6,863,710	\$ 66,538	\$ 97,210	\$ 135,740	\$ 173,090	
29 Investment Income	\$ 5,383	\$ 58,100	\$ 6,980	\$ 13,540	\$ 38,710	\$ 66,538	\$ 97,210	\$ 135,740	\$ 173,090	
30 Property Rentals	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
31 Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
32 Bond Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
33 Land Sales	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,825,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
34 G-49 Air Rights	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
35 Adjustment for FY13 Actual Tax Revenue	\$ (454,455)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
36 Other Miscellaneous	\$ (87)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
37										
38 Subtotal Revenue	\$ 19,703,426	\$ 19,585,906	\$ 20,402,851	\$ 17,990,390	\$ 24,986,016	\$ 18,410,914	\$ 21,693,211	\$ 22,155,696	\$ 22,661,582	
39										
40										
41 Transfers	\$ (4,410,751)	\$ (5,753,287)	\$ (5,753,287)	\$ (6,951,773)	\$ (7,324,626)	\$ (7,444,346)	\$ (7,549,267)	\$ (7,693,919)	\$ (7,815,539)	
42 Transfers to General Fund	\$ (282,700)	\$ (348,236)	\$ (348,236)	\$ (1,478,797)	\$ (1,472,534)	\$ (1,472,534)	\$ (1,472,534)	\$ (1,472,534)	\$ (1,472,534)	
43 Indirect Costs	\$ (234,260)	\$ (327,600)	\$ (327,600)	\$ (346,163)	\$ (363,884)	\$ (363,884)	\$ (363,884)	\$ (363,884)	\$ (363,884)	
44 Saving Plan & MARC Reduction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
45 Technology Modernization CIP Project	\$ (28,440)	\$ (20,636)	\$ (20,636)	\$ (23,984)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
46 Other Transfers to General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	\$ (1,108,650)	
47 Other Transfers to General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
48										
49 Transfers to Special Funds - Tax Supported	\$ (1,156,480)	\$ (5,437,430)	\$ (5,437,430)	\$ (5,472,976)	\$ (5,852,092)	\$ (5,971,812)	\$ (6,096,733)	\$ (6,221,385)	\$ (6,343,085)	
50 Transportation Management District	\$ (249,400)	\$ (776,180)	\$ (776,180)	\$ (776,180)	\$ (802,301)	\$ (831,784)	\$ (864,044)	\$ (896,304)	\$ (896,304)	
51 Silver Spring Urban District	\$ (1,582,000)	\$ (2,405,000)	\$ (2,405,000)	\$ (2,440,546)	\$ (2,819,662)	\$ (2,913,261)	\$ (3,008,699)	\$ (3,101,091)	\$ (3,190,451)	
52 Mass Transit (Fines Revenue)	\$ (2,375,000)	\$ (2,256,250)	\$ (2,256,250)	\$ (2,256,250)	\$ (2,256,250)	\$ (2,256,250)	\$ (2,256,250)	\$ (2,256,250)	\$ (2,256,250)	
53 Other Transfers to Special Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
54 Other Transfers to Special Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
55										
56 Transfers From General Fund	\$ 28,349	\$ 32,379	\$ 32,379	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
57 Study Queue Meters	\$ 28,349	\$ 32,379	\$ 32,379	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
58 Other Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
59 Other Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
60 Other Transfers From General Fund	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
61										
62 Total Resources	\$ 16,977,789	\$ 26,040,880	\$ 28,585,536	\$ 25,807,608	\$ 28,301,279	\$ 25,545,031	\$ 25,235,498	\$ 25,116,089	\$ 24,802,036	
63										
64										
65 CIP Current Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ (2,402,425)	\$ (2,770,000)	\$ (2,770,000)	\$ (3,207,000)	\$ (2,750,000)	\$ (2,943,000)	\$ (2,700,000)	\$ (2,700,000)	\$ (2,700,000)	
66 Other CIP Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
67										
68 Appropriations/Expenditures										
69 Operating Budget	\$ (9,766,695)	\$ (9,997,834)	\$ (9,946,485)	\$ (10,860,779)	\$ (10,860,779)	\$ (10,860,779)	\$ (10,860,779)	\$ (10,860,779)	\$ (10,860,779)	
70 Personnel Costs	\$ (1,957,694)	\$ (2,037,956)	\$ (2,036,607)	\$ (2,292,905)	\$ (2,292,905)	\$ (2,292,905)	\$ (2,292,905)	\$ (2,292,905)	\$ (2,292,905)	
71 Operating Expenses	\$ (7,809,001)	\$ (7,909,878)	\$ (7,909,878)	\$ (8,567,874)	\$ (8,567,874)	\$ (8,567,874)	\$ (8,567,874)	\$ (8,567,874)	\$ (8,567,874)	
72 Existing Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
73 New Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
74 Amortize and One-Time Amortization	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,294,060	\$ 1,294,060	\$ 1,294,060	\$ 1,294,060	\$ 1,294,060	
75 Operating Leases	\$ -	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	
76 Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,810	\$ 9,260	\$ 13,660	\$ 19,300	\$ 24,740	
77 Utilities	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 57,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
78 Brewery Backup	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 57,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
79 CIP - Final Year for OE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (241,620)	\$ (528,910)	\$ (865,310)	\$ (1,254,930)	\$ (1,702,630)	
80 Competition Adjustment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (98,260)	\$ (211,380)	\$ (336,690)	\$ (475,630)	\$ (475,630)	
81 Labor Increases	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (20,727)	\$ (20,727)	\$ (20,727)	\$ (20,727)	\$ (20,727)	
82 Lot & Parking Garage	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (6,000)	\$ (62,000)	\$ (62,000)	\$ (62,000)	\$ (62,000)	
83 Debt/Cash/Cont Res	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
84 Adjustment for FY Encumbrances/Reserves	\$ (872,697)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
85										
86 Subtotal PSP Operating Budget Appropriation	\$ (10,639,393)	\$ (11,897,834)	\$ (11,046,485)	\$ (11,960,779)	\$ (10,972,816)	\$ (11,480,476)	\$ (11,880,586)	\$ (12,460,696)	\$ (12,845,776)	
87										
88 Total Use of Resources	\$ (13,041,817)	\$ (13,867,834)	\$ (13,816,485)	\$ (15,167,779)	\$ (13,722,816)	\$ (14,423,476)	\$ (14,580,586)	\$ (15,160,696)	\$ (15,545,776)	
89 Year End Fund Balance	\$ 13,935,972	\$ 12,173,046	\$ 14,769,051	\$ 10,639,889	\$ 14,576,463	\$ 11,121,555	\$ 10,654,912	\$ 9,955,993	\$ 9,256,260	
90 Bond Restricted Reserves	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
91 Year End Available Fund Balance	\$ 13,935,972	\$ 12,173,046	\$ 14,769,051	\$ 10,639,889	\$ 14,576,463	\$ 11,121,555	\$ 10,654,912	\$ 9,955,993	\$ 9,256,260	
92 End-of-Year Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Resources	51.66%	46.75%	51.67%	41.23%	51.51%	43.54%	42.22%	39.64%	37.32%	

38

Ride On Bus Fleet (P500821)

Category Transportation
 Sub Category Mass Transit
 Administering Agency Transportation (AAGE30)
 Planning Area Countywide

Date Last Modified 3/6/14
 Required Adequate Public Facility No
 Relocation Impact None
 Status Ongoing

	Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Planning, Design and Supervision	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	188,002	39,893	52,967	95,142	16,000	14,171	8,873	17,247	21,591	17,260	0
Total	188,002	39,893	52,967	95,142	16,000	14,171	8,873	17,247	21,591	17,260	0

	Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Bond Premium	956	0	956	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contributions	475	0	475	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fed Stimulus (State Allocation)	6,550	6,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Aid	28,165	3,344	15,221	9,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	0
Mass Transit Fund	71,853	1,621	1,090	69,142	0	12,171	6,873	15,247	19,591	15,260	0
Short-Term Financing	57,663	23,638	34,025	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Aid	22,340	4,740	1,200	16,400	14,400	400	400	400	400	400	0
Total	188,002	39,893	52,967	95,142	16,000	14,171	8,873	17,247	21,591	17,260	0

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	16,000
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	14,171
Supplemental Appropriation Request		0
Transfer		0
Cumulative Appropriation		92,860
Expenditure / Encumbrances		59,648
Unencumbered Balance		33,212

Date First Appropriation	FY 09
First Cost Estimate	
Current Scope	FY 15 188,002
Last FY's Cost Estimate	143,913
Partial Closeout Thru	0
New Partial Closeout	0
Total Partial Closeout	0

Description

This project provides for the purchase of replacement and additional buses in the Ride On fleet in accordance with the Division of Transit Services' bus replacement plan and the Federal Transportation Administration's service guidelines.

Estimated Schedule

FY15: 10 full-size CNG, 21 full-size diesel, and 1 small diesel; FY16: 23 full-size CNG and 2 full-size diesel; FY17: 15 full-size CNG; FY18: 23 full-size CNG and 5 full-size hybrid, FY19: 9 full-size hybrid and 31 small diesel, FY20: 32 large diesel

Cost Change

Includes updated bus prices, additional bus in FY15 for Clarksburg service that began in FY14, deferral of 2 full-size diesels from FY15 to FY16, and the addition of FY19 and FY20 bus replacements.

Justification

The full-size transit buses have an expected useful life of twelve years. Smaller buses have an expected useful life of ten years.

Fiscal Note

In FY15, additional state aid from gas tax proceeds will be applied to bus replacement costs.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

The Executive asserts that this project conforms to the requirements of relevant local plans, as required by the Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act.

Coordination

Department of General Services

Montgomery Mall Transit Center (P500714)

Category	Transportation	Date Last Modified	3/6/14
Sub Category	Mass Transit	Required Adequate Public Facility	No
Administering Agency	General Services (AAGE29)	Relocation Impact	None
Planning Area	Potomac-Travilah	Status	Final Design Stage

	Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Planning, Design and Supervision	175	29	0	146	0	146	0	0	0	0	0
Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	1,167	2	0	1,165	0	1,165	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1,342	31	0	1,311	0	1,311	0	0	0	0	0

FUNDING SCHEDULE (\$000s)											
Mass Transit Fund	1,342	31	0	1,311	0	1,311	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1,342	31	0	1,311	0	1,311	0	0	0	0	0

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (\$000s)											
Energy				56	0	0	14	14	14	14	
Maintenance				60	0	0	15	15	15	15	
Net Impact				116	0	0	29	29	29	29	

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	-1,311
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	1,311
Supplemental Appropriation Request		0
Transfer		0
Cumulative Appropriation		1,342
Expenditure / Encumbrances		31
Unencumbered Balance		1,311

Date First Appropriation	FY 07
First Cost Estimate	
Current Scope	FY 13 1,342
Last FY's Cost Estimate	1,342

Description

This project provides for the County portion of the new Montgomery Mall Transit Center. Mall owners will develop the land and construct all bus and passenger foundation structures including utilities. The County will design and fund construction, as well as maintain the patron waiting area with weather/wind protected sides, passenger seating, a transit center canopy to protect patrons, and a driver restroom. This project also includes construction oversight.

Estimated Schedule

The Montgomery Mall Transit Center project construction is scheduled to start in FY15 along with Montgomery Mall expansion by the developer.

Justification

On January 27, 2005, the Planning Board granted Westfield Montgomery Mall conditional approval for a 500,000 square foot mall expansion. This expansion requires Westfield to participate in construction of a new and expanded Montgomery Mall Transit Center adjacent to the I-270 right-of-way. Westfield will provide construction of all base infrastructure, valued at \$2 million. Westfield will pay for design and construction of drives, ramps, platform pads, and utility access. The County will pay for the transit center canopy and all passenger and bus operator amenities on the passenger waiting pad.

Other

The construction of the County portion is expected to start in FY 15 in order to coordinate with the Montgomery Mall expansion by the developer. The design of this project has been completed through Facility Planning: Transportation.

Fiscal Note

Project is funded based on an agreement with the site owner. Work will proceed as the site owner develops, at which time the County will fund a portion of the improvements. Changes are made based upon the site owner's schedule.

Disclosures

A pedestrian impact analysis will be performed during design or is in progress.

Coordination

Department of Transportation, Westfield, Inc., Utilities, Department of Permitting Services, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Department of Economic Development, Facility Planning: Transportation

Transit Services

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Division of Transit Services is to provide an effective mix of public transportation services in Montgomery County.

BUDGET OVERVIEW

The total recommended FY15 Operating Budget for the Division of Transit Services is \$125,013,667, an increase of \$3,659,766 or 3.0 percent from the FY14 Approved Budget of \$121,353,901. Personnel Costs comprise 54.6 percent of the budget for 815 full-time positions, and a total of 825.62 FTEs. Total FTEs may include seasonal or temporary positions and may also reflect workforce charged to or from other departments or funds. Operating Expenses account for the remaining 45.4 percent of the FY15 budget.

The general obligation bond Debt Service for the Mass Transit Fund is appropriated in the Debt Service Fund and is not displayed in this section. To pay for the Debt Service, a transfer of funds from the Mass Transit Fund to the Debt Service Fund of \$14,015,110 is required.

In addition, this department's Capital Improvements Program (CIP) requires Current Revenue funding.

LINKAGE TO COUNTY RESULT AREAS

While this program area supports all eight of the County Result Areas, the following are emphasized:

- ◆ *An Effective and Efficient Transportation Network*
- ▶ *Healthy and Sustainable Neighborhoods*
- ◆ *Vital Living for All of Our Residents*

DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance measures for this department are included below, with multi-program measures displayed at the front of this section and program-specific measures shown with the relevant program. The FY14 estimates reflect funding based on the FY14 approved budget. The FY15 and FY16 figures are performance targets based on the FY15 recommended budget and funding for comparable service levels in FY16.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND INITIATIVES

- ◆ *Enhance Call-n-Ride eligibility requirements to increase subsidies of the monthly payments for 500 current participants, and add 431 new participants to the program.*
- ◆ *Will replace 31 buses in FY15 and add one bus for "Meet the MARC" bus service.*
- ◆ *Enhanced safety program to provide focused approach on reducing accidents and injuries, safe work methods, proactive safety awareness, and compliance training in defensive driving and safe work methods.*
- ◆ *Extended hours for Kids Ride Free Program Monday through Friday from 2pm until 8pm (previously 7pm) and supported increased ridership.*
- ◆ *Over 100 Ride On bus operators were certified in five different languages (Spanish, French, Amharic, Chinese, and Vietnamese) to better serve our passengers.*
- ◆ *Added Ride On Facebook page and Twitter account to enhance communication.*
- ◆ *Received 40 new buses and accelerated bus replacement plan with retirement of Champion buses.*
- ◆ *Implemented customer service refresher training for bus operators ("We Care" Program); all employees will have received training in FY14.*

- ❖ **A translation service for Call-n-Ride with multiple language capability has been made available to assist Limited or non-English speaking participants when scheduling Call-n-Ride trips with taxicab companies' dispatch.**
- ❖ **A new Call-n-Ride website portal was developed where participants can view their account information, including card usage and balance.**
- ❖ **Developed and implemented new Youth Cruiser SmarTrip card.**
- ❖ **Implemented new "Meet the MARC" bus service from Clarksburg to Germantown in January 2014.**
- ❖ **Productivity Improvements**
 - **On April 1, 2013 the Call-n-Ride program eliminated the use of coupons which has made the program more user-friendly for both participants and transportation providers, eliminating the bulky coupon vouchers and replacing them with an automated swipe card. This new system has reduced the time it takes to add value to participants' cards from 10 to 5 business days after their copayment is received.**
 - **Moved paper monthly passes and youth monthly and summer paper passes to electronic SmarTrip card. Sales can be activated via the Internet.**
 - **Implemented schedule remediation to 35 routes to improve schedule reliability with scheduling efficiencies realized from new Scheduling Software**
 - **Restructured bus service in Olney to provide expanded service area, faster service, and improved reliability**

PROGRAM CONTACTS

Contact Darlene Flynn of the Division of Transit Services at 240.777.5807 or Brady Goldsmith of the Office of Management and Budget at 240.777.2793 for more information regarding this department's operating budget.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Medicaid and Senior Programs

Special Transportation Programs provide: Medicaid transportation to and from Medical appointments for eligible participants; a user-side subsidy program (Call-n-Ride) that provides travel options for low-income elderly and disabled; and information on public private transportation programs available to seniors and persons with disabilities.

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	8,225,840	7.85
Technical Adj: Adjustment for workyears charged to Commuter Services and Medicaid grants	9,393	-0.18
Enhance: Call-n-Ride by expanding eligibility to serve approximately 431 more residents	-85,000	1.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	109,647	2.18
FY15 CE Recommended	8,259,880	10.85

Ride On

Fixed-route bus service is provided by the Ride On system throughout the County. Ride On operates primarily in neighborhoods and provides a collector and distributor service to the major transfer points and transit centers in the County. Ride On supplements and coordinates the County's mass transit services with Metrobus and Metrorail service which is provided by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The Ride On transit system operates and manages more than 78 routes; maintains a strategic plan for replacement of the bus fleet; trains new bus operators and provides continuing safety, remedial and refresher instruction for existing operators; and coordinates activities with a state of the art Central Communications Center, which also operates Ride On's computer-aided dispatch/automatic vehicle location system.

Program Performance Measures	Actual FY12	Actual FY13	Estimated FY14	Target FY15	Target FY16
Number of Reported Collisions Between Ride On Buses and a Person or Object, per 100,000 miles driven	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	
Scheduled Ride On Roundtrip Circuits Missed, in Whole or in Part, per 1,000 Roundtrip Circuits ¹	8.30	8.3	5.56	5.12	5.12
Passengers Transported Per Capita (Ratio of the Number of Passengers Boarding a Ride On bus Within the Fiscal Year and the County Population)	27.9	27.1	27.26	27.42	27.58

	Actual FY12	Actual FY13	Estimated FY14	Target FY15	Target FY16
Percent of Ride On Customers Who Report a Satisfactory Customer Service Experience ²	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Passengers Per Hour of Service ³	25.40	24.54	24.54	24.78	24.81
Hours of Service ⁴	1,072,287	1,083,876	1,095,518	1,096,643	1,107,609
Reported Ride On Complaints Per 100,000 Bus Riders	27.1	27	25	24	23
Passengers Transported (millions) ⁵	27.90	26.603	26.88	27.176	27.475

¹ Ride On will be fully staffed in operator positions.

² New measure; data to be collected in the future.

³ Service hours are defined as platform hours. These are hours that the bus is providing service including non-revenue trips

⁴ FY14-Annualized new service implemented in FY13; "Meet the MARC" Clarksburg service began mid-year

⁵ Assume annualization of FY14 new service in FY15 and growth of 1.1% in FY15 and FY16

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	98,032,331	748.18
Enhance: System Safety	629,785	8.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of Clarksburg to Germantown MARC Station Service	104,370	1.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	2,836,404	-4.27
FY15 CE Recommended	101,602,890	752.91

Commuter Services

The Commuter Services Section promotes alternatives to the single occupant vehicle -- including transit, car/vanpooling, biking, walking and telework--to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality. Programs and services are concentrated in the County's five Transportation Management Districts: Silver Spring, Friendship Heights, Bethesda, North Bethesda and Greater Shady Grove, and in the Wheaton Transportation Planning & Policy area. Commuting information and assistance is also provided to businesses, employees, and residents throughout the County. Programs are developed to support use of transportation options and the section coordinates with other local, state and regional agencies on efforts to improve effectiveness of those options.

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	3,331,740	16.60
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	8,464	1.20
FY15 CE Recommended	3,340,204	17.80

Taxi Regulation

The Taxi Regulation program is responsible for issuance, enforcement, renewal, and management of passenger vehicle licenses and taxicab driver IDs. This program administers the taxicab regulation, licensing, and permit activities of chapter 53 of the Montgomery County Code.

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	798,290	7.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	13,496	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	811,786	7.00

Customer Service

The Customer Service program is the interface between Ride On's service delivery and customer information. In addition to managing the distribution of paper transit timetables, web sites are maintained and updated as well as real time information is provided through various media (phone, web, mobile apps and signs). In addition, system information is provided by way of electronic system maps and informational displays inside and outside of buses and bus stop shelters. As needed, public forums are arranged for proposed service changes.

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	1,460,220	6.00
Increase Cost: Kids and Seniors Ride Free	125,003	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14- Quadrennial Review	-90,000	0.00

	Expenditures	FTEs
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	130,811	0.13
FY15 CE Recommended	1,626,034	6.

Transit Parking Facility Maintenance

The Transit Parking Facility Maintenance program funds the operation and maintenance of the Park & Ride Lots as well as Transit Centers. The Division of Parking Management Operations section provides and manages the maintenance services.

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	293,120	1.32
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	8,224	-0.21
FY15 CE Recommended	301,344	1.11

Transit Operations Planning

The Transit Operations Planning program provides comprehensive, coordinated, and integrated services to assure the County's transit needs are met. To accomplish this objective, the program plans and schedules Ride On service; evaluates and develops Ride On routes; and coordinates bus service with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	2,185,070	17.70
Increase Cost: Maintenance for Trapezé Plan and Past software programs	37,540	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	216,418	1.00
FY15 CE Recommended	2,439,028	18.70

Passenger Facilities

The Passenger Facilities program provides for the safe, comfortable, clean, and accessible entry for transit customers into the transit system. The program is responsible for supervising the construction and maintenance of bus shelters and the collection of the County's share of revenues generated through advertising sales, as provided under a 15-year franchise agreement. It is also responsible for the purchase, installation, maintenance and replacement of all equipment, including but not limited to bus benches, trash receptacles, transit information display units, and other passenger amenities. The program installs and maintains all system signage, including poles and bus stop flags.

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	959,870	4.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	58,090	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	1,017,960	4.00

Fixed Costs

The Fixed Costs program contains certain cost items that involve long-term funding commitments independent of the annual scope of program costs. Fixed costs included in this category are utility payments and insurance. Casualty insurance for Ride On is provided through the Division of Risk Management. The costs are required or "fixed" based on the existence of the programs, but the actual amount is based on anticipated rates and the proposed size and scope of the related unit or program.

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	3,476,450	0.67
Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment	-359,934	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	-15,245	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	3,101,271	0.6

44

Administration

The Administration program provides general management, planning, supervision, and support for the Division. It performs financial management tasks, administers contracts, manages grants, provides personnel management functions, and provides Montgomery County's financial support to the Washington Suburban Transit Commission.

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	2,590,970	6.74
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	-77,700	-0.29
FY15 CE Recommended	2,513,270	6.45

BUDGET SUMMARY

	Actual FY13	Budget FY14	Estimated FY14	Recommended FY15	% Chg Bud/Rec
MASS TRANSIT					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	44,770,071	46,447,330	46,067,853	48,790,656	5.0%
Employee Benefits	15,059,155	17,082,566	16,831,939	17,677,586	3.5%
Mass Transit Personnel Costs	59,829,226	63,529,896	62,899,792	66,468,242	4.6%
Operating Expenses	53,159,389	53,135,836	53,276,560	53,847,863	1.3%
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	—
Mass Transit Expenditures	112,988,615	116,665,732	116,176,352	120,316,105	3.1%
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	789	791	791	800	1.1%
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	799.25	800.95	800.95	810.69	1.2%
REVENUES					
Bus Advertising	982,104	520,000	520,000	520,000	—
Investment Income	734	0	920	1,790	—
Miscellaneous Revenues	19,745	0	0	0	—
Motor Pool Charges/Fees	956,035	0	0	0	—
Parking Fees	641,982	1,315,645	651,610	661,385	-49.7%
Parking Fines	376,534	300,000	395,000	405,000	35.0%
Property Tax	79,577,448	70,071,096	70,066,417	65,474,509	-6.6%
Ride On Fare Revenue	21,977,926	21,358,898	22,068,194	24,100,000	12.8%
State Aid: Call N' Ride	508,909	379,110	379,110	379,110	—
State Aid: Damascus Fixed Route	589,437	309,950	309,950	309,950	—
State Aid: Ride On	27,302,214	33,785,768	33,785,768	38,674,612	14.5%
Taxi Licensing Fees	565,090	531,000	531,000	531,000	—
Other Charges/Fees	1,374,786	1,068,174	878,194	878,194	-17.8%
Other Fines/Forfeitures	15,345	0	0	0	—
Mass Transit Revenues	134,888,289	129,639,641	129,586,163	131,935,550	1.8%
GRANT FUND MCG					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	1,184,191	1,321,898	1,321,898	1,367,200	3.4%
Employee Benefits	493,250	393,251	393,251	381,597	-3.0%
Grant Fund MCG Personnel Costs	1,677,441	1,715,149	1,715,149	1,748,797	2.0%
Operating Expenses	1,670,713	2,973,020	2,973,020	2,948,765	-0.8%
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	—
Grant Fund MCG Expenditures	3,348,154	4,688,169	4,688,169	4,697,562	0.2%
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	15	15	15	15	—
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	15.16	15.11	15.11	14.93	-1.2%
REVENUES					
Federal Grants	491,282	1,763,357	1,763,357	1,763,357	—
Miscellaneous Revenues	90,000	0	0	0	—
State Grants	2,401,354	2,924,812	2,924,812	2,934,205	0.3%
Other Intergovernmental	100,000	0	0	0	—
Grant Fund MCG Revenues	3,082,636	4,688,169	4,688,169	4,697,562	0.2%

	Actual FY13	Budget FY14	Estimated FY14	Recommended FY15	% Chg Bud/Rec
DEPARTMENT TOTALS					
Total Expenditures	116,336,769	121,353,901	120,864,521	125,013,667	1.0
Total Full-Time Positions	804	806	806	815	1.0
Total Part-Time Positions	0	0	0	0	—
Total FTEs	814.41	816.06	816.06	825.62	1.2%
Total Revenues	137,970,925	134,327,810	134,274,332	136,633,112	1.7%

FY15 RECOMMENDED CHANGES

	Expenditures	FTEs
MASS TRANSIT		
FY14 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	116,665,732	800.95
Changes (with service impacts)		
Enhance: System Safety [Ride On]	629,785	8.00
Enhance: Call-n-Ride by expanding eligibility to serve approximately 431 more residents [Medicaid and Senior Programs]	-85,000	1.00
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Increase Cost: FY15 Compensation Adjustment	2,620,704	0.00
Increase Cost: Motor Pool Rate Adjustment	990,592	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	151,629	0.00
Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment	127,294	0.00
Increase Cost: Kids and Seniors Ride Free [Customer Service]	125,003	0.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of Clarksburg to Germantown MARC Station Service [Ride On]	104,370	1.00
Increase Cost: Maintenance for Trapeze Plan and Post software programs [Transit Operations Planning]	37,540	0.00
Increase Cost: Printing and Mail	32,817	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14- Quadrennial Review [Customer Service]	-90,000	0.00
Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment [Fixed Costs]	-359,934	0.00
Decrease Cost: Annualization of FY14 Personnel Costs	-634,427	-0.1
FY15 RECOMMENDED:	120,316,105	810.69
GRANT FUND MCG		
FY14 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	4,688,169	15.11
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Technical Adj: Adjustment for workyears charged to Commuter Services and Medicaid grants [Medicaid and Senior Programs]	9,393	-0.18
FY15 RECOMMENDED:	4,697,562	14.93

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Program Name	FY14 Approved		FY15 Recommended	
	Expenditures	FTEs	Expenditures	FTEs
Medicaid and Senior Programs	8,225,840	7.85	8,259,880	10.85
Ride On	98,032,331	748.18	101,602,890	752.91
Commuter Services	3,331,740	16.60	3,340,204	17.80
Taxi Regulation	798,290	7.00	811,786	7.00
Customer Service	1,460,220	6.00	1,626,034	6.13
Transit Parking Facility Maintenance	293,120	1.32	301,344	1.11
Transit Operations Planning	2,185,070	17.70	2,439,028	18.70
Passenger Facilities	959,870	4.00	1,017,960	4.00
Fixed Costs	3,476,450	0.67	3,101,271	0.67
Administration	2,590,970	6.74	2,513,270	6.45
Total	121,353,901	816.06	125,013,667	825.62

46

CHARGES TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Charged Department	Charged Fund	FY14		FY15	
		Totals	FTEs	Totals	FTEs
MASS TRANSIT					
Health and Human Services	County General Fund	425,194	0.00	282,694	0.00
GRANT FUND MCG					
Health and Human Services	Grant Fund MCG	0	0.00	127,000	0.00

FUTURE FISCAL IMPACTS

Title	CE REC.		(S000's)			
	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
This table is intended to present significant future fiscal impacts of the department's programs.						
MASS TRANSIT						
Expenditures						
FY15 Recommended	120,316	120,316	120,316	120,316	120,316	120,316
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Labor Contracts	0	766	766	766	766	766
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and associated benefits.						
Labor Contracts - Other	0	-57	-57	-57	-57	-57
These figures represent other negotiated items included in the labor agreements.						
Subtotal Expenditures	120,316	121,025	121,025	121,025	121,025	121,025

47

FY14 Route Profile

Route	Ser	Route Description	AM Avg	Base Day	PM Avg	Evening	1st Trip	Last AM	First PM	Last Trip	# of Trips	Avg Daily Riders	Annual Platform Hours	Riders Per Plat Hour
1	Wkdy	Silver Spring-Leland St.-Friendship Heights	28	20	23	30	507			2325	80	2,459	12,878	48.7
65	Wkdy	Montgomery Village-Shady Grove	30		30	555	827	1650	1850	11	245	1,530	40.8	
55	Wkdy	GTC-Milestone-MC,G-Lakeforest-Shady Grove-MC,R-Rockville	12	10	12	30	450			2435	163	8,083	51,204	40.3
16	Sat	Langley Park-Wayne Ave.-Silver Spring	12	12	12	20	420			2505	148	2,717	3,578	40.3
16	Wkdy	Langley Park-Wayne Ave.-Silver Spring	6	15	7	20	420			2505	174	3,280	21,267	39.3
16	Sun	Langley Park-Wayne Ave.-Silver Spring	20	15	15	25	450			2505	116	1,952	2,975	37.4
11	Wkdy	Silver Spring-East/West Hwy-Friendship Heights	9		15		554	927	1405	1945	36	884	6,044	37.3
48	Sat	Wheaton-Bauer Dr.-Rockville	30	25	25		620			2100	68	1,809	2,602	36.8
1	Sun	Silver Spring - Friendship Heights	30	30	30		540			2055	60	1,105	1,761	35.8
1	Sat	Silver Spring-Leland St.-Friendship Heights	30	30	30	30	525			2155	66	1,299	1,966	35.0
61	Wkdy	GTC-Lakeforest-Shady Grove	20	30	20	30	430			2350	83	3,003	22,109	34.6
59	Wkdy	Montgomery Village-Lakeforest-Shady Grove-Rockville	15	30	15	30	449			2455	101	3,924	29,555	33.9
20	Wkdy	Hillandale-Northwest Park-Silver Spring	8	15	10	20	426			2430	129	3,291	25,271	33.2
55	Sun	GTC-Milestone-Lakeforest-Shady Grove	30	20	20	30	530			2411	88	2,863	4,931	33.1
61	Sat	GTC-Lakeforest-Shady Grove	30	30	30	30	600			2215	66	2,264	3,638	33.0
49	Wkdy	Glenmont-Layhill-Rockville	15	30	20	30	500			2345	89	2,155	16,805	32.7
55	Sat	GTC-Milestone-Lakeforest-Shady Grove-Rockville	20	15	15	30	500			2442	115	5,014	8,252	32.2
20	Sat	Hillandale-Northwest Park-Silver Spring	15	20	15	30	500			2430	94	2,461	4,055	32.2
67	Wkdy	Lakeforest-Washington Grove-Shady Grove	20	20	20	30	445			2402	98	2,224	17,774	31.9
48	Wkdy	Wheaton-Bauer Dr.-Rockville	25	25	20	30	510			2230	83	2,165	17,468	31.6
24	Wkdy	Hillandale-Northwest Park-Takoma	20		30		525	830	1545	1900	15	321	2,801	31.5
20	Sun	Hillandale-Northwest Park-Silver Spring	25	25	20	30	500			2430	84	1,927	3,682	29.8
46	Wkdy	Shady Grove-Montgomery College-Rockville Pike-Medical Center	15	15	15	30	452			2510	126	3,719	32,258	29.4
12	Wkdy	Takoma-Flower Avenue-Wayne Avenue-Silver Spring	15	30	15	30	434			2439	105	1,770	15,530	29.1
34	Wkdy	Aspen Hill-Wheaton-Bethesda-Friendship Heights	15	30	15	30	500			2440	94	2,946	26,112	28.8
2	Wkdy	Lyttonville-Silver Spring	25	30	23	30	432			2249	78	850	7,625	28.4
16	Sat	Takoma-Langley Park-Silver Spring	15	15	15	30	501			2450	122	3,118	6,878	28.1
100	Sat	GTC-Shady Grove	30	30	30	30	630			2200	63	790	1,500	27.9
60	Wkdy	Montgomery Village-Flower Hill-Shady Grove	30		30		515	845	1535	1935	17	379	3,468	27.9
58	Wkdy	Lakeforest-Montgomery Village-East Village-Shady Grove, Watkins Mill & MD355	25	30	25	30	445			2200	73	1,680	16,402	27.8
67	Sat	Lakeforest-Washington Grove-Shady Grove	30	20	20	30	530			2303	87	1,543	2,957	27.7
49	Sat	Glenmont-Layhill-Rockville	30	30	30	30	540			2140	85	1,172	2,253	27.6
16	Wkdy	Takoma-Langley Park-Silver Spring	12	20	12	20	427			2460	130	3,349	30,983	27.6
54	Wkdy	Lakeforest-Washingtonian Blvd-Rockville	20	30	20	30	457			2220	77	2,078	19,278	27.5
49	Sun	Glenmont-Lay Hill-Rockville	30	30	30	30	640			2110	58	1,069	2,206	27.4
54	Sat	Lakeforest-Washingtonian Boulevard-Rockville	30	30	30	30	617			2132	61	1,439	2,788	27.4
59	Sun	Montgomery Village-Lakeforest-Shady Grove-Rockville	30	30	30	30	525			2435	73	2,052	4,326	27.0
59	Sat	Montgomery Village-Lakeforest-Shady Grove-Rockville	30	30	30	30	517			2425	73	2,233	4,468	26.5
64	Wkdy	Montgomery Village-Quail Valley-Emory Grove-Shady Grove	25	30	25	30	450			2217	71	1,412	13,821	26.1
100	Wkdy	GTC-Shady Grove	6	15	6	30	445			2400	193	2,245	21,981	26.0
48	Sun	Wheaton-Bauer Dr.-Rockville	30	30	30	30	720			2030	53	1,030	2,263	25.9
17	Wkdy	Langley Park-Maple Ave.-Silver Spring	20	25	20	30	441			2410	84	1,279	12,623	25.6
54	Sun	Lakeforest-Washingtonian Boulevard-Rockville	30	30	30	30	702			1947	52	1,073	2,394	25.5
58	Sat	Lakeforest-Montgomery Village-East Village-Shady Grove	30	30	30	30	640			2040	56	998	2,141	24.7
10	Wkdy	Twinbrook-Glenmont-White Oak-Hillandale	30	30	25	30	441			2217	72	2,333	24,098	24.7
97	Wkdy	GTC, Germantown MARC, Waring Station, GTC	15	30	15	30	430			2330	52	763	7,956	24.5
26	Wkdy	Glenmont-Aspen Hill-Twinbrook-Montgomery Mall	15	30	15	30	456			2419	89	3,127	32,742	24.4
10	Sun	Twinbrook-Glenmont-White Oak-Hillandale	30	30	30	649			2018	54	1,474	3,466	24.2	
2	Sun	Lyttonville-Silver Spring	30	30	30	704			2019	53	446	1,049	24.2	
16	Sun	Takoma-Langley Park-Silver Spring	20	15	15	30	510			2420	110	2,391	5,643	24.2
12	Sat	Takoma-Flower Avenue-Wayne Avenue-Silver Spring	30	30	30	30	500			2435	78	1,041	2,295	24.0
2	Sat	Lyttonville-Silver Spring	30	30	30	30	638			2119	59	493	1,092	23.9
26	Sat	Glenmont-Aspen Hill-Twinbrook-Montgomery Mall	30	30	30	30	517			2416	72	2,133	4,749	23.8
14	Wkdy	Takoma-Piney Branch Road-Franklin Ave.-Silver Spring	30	30	30	510			2040	64	887	9,537	23.7	
56	Wkdy	Lakeforest-Quince Orchard-Shady Grove Hospital-Rockville	20	30	20	30	445			2155	79	2,120	22,797	23.7
13	Wkdy	Takoma-Manchester Rd.-Three Oaks Dr.-Silver Spring	25		30		620	920	1605	1835	20	301	3,239	23.7
9	Wkdy	Wheaton-Four Corners-Silver Spring	20	30	20	30	446			2232	81	1,302	14,127	23.5
9	Sun	Wheaton-Four Corners-Silver Spring	30	30	30	638			2000	54	851	2,103	23.1	
23	Wkdy	Sibley Hospital-Brookmont-Sangamore Road-Friendship Heights	25	30	30	30	540			1957	60	743	8,262	22.9
34	Sat	Wheaton-Bethesda-Friendship Heights	30	30	30	30	550			2440	72	1,573	3,662	22.8
61	Sun	GTC-Lakeforest-Shady Grove	30	30	30	30	630			2145	61	1,436	3,608	22.7
78	Wkdy	Kingsview-Richter Farm-Shady Grove	30		30		501	631	1600	1933	16	367	4,106	22.2
57	Sun	Lakeforest-Washington Grove-Shady Grove	30	25	25		700			2103	65	993	2,576	22.0
41	Sun	Aspen Hill-Weiler Rd.-Glenmont	30	30	30	938			1838	37	358	941	21.7	
17	Sat	Langley Park-Maple Ave.-Silver Spring	30	30	30	30	613			2340	67	772	1,903	21.5
12	Sun	Takoma-Flower Avenue-Wayne Avenue-Silver Spring	30	30	30	30	526			2435	76	865	2,297	21.5
43	Wkdy	Traville TC-Shady Grove-Hospital-Shady Grove	20	30	25	30	545			2150	72	815	9,690	21.4
97	Sat	GTC, Gunner's Lake, GTC	30	30	30	30	630			2130	31	398	991	21.3
47	Wkdy	Rockville-Montgomery Mall-Bethesda	25	30	25	30	514			2210	72	1,576	18,998	21.2
17	Sun	Langley Park-Maple Ave.-Silver Spring	30	30	30	30	717			2122	58	664	1,790	21.1
5	Wkdy	Twinbrook-Kensington-Silver Spring	10	30	12	30	605			2428	98	1,918	23,180	21.1
46	Sat	Shady Grove-Montgomery College-Rockville Pike-Medical Center	25	20	20	30	615			2431	92	1,987	5,062	20.8
58	Sun	Lakeforest-Montgomery Village-East Village-Shady Grove	30	30	30	710			1930	49	755	2,069	20.8	
58	Sun	Lakeforest-Quince Orchard-Shady Grove Hospital-Rockville	30	30	30	704			2007	53	1,198	3,317	20.6	
100	Sun	GTC-Shady Grove	30	30	30	630			2130	61	613	1,699	20.6	
41	Wkdy	Aspen Hill-Weiler Rd.-Glenmont	30	30	30	30	518			2258	71	697	8,670	20.5
46	Sun	Shady Grove-Montgomery College-Rockville Pike-Medical Center	30	20	20	30	505			2409	86	1,806	5,073	20.3
63	Wkdy	Shady Grove-Gaither Road-Piccard Dr.-Rockville	30	30	30	552			2005	57	651	8,262	20.1	
38	Wkdy	Wheaton-White Flint	20	30	20	30	513			2212	74	884	11,322	19.9
71	Wkdy	Kingsview-Dwison Farm-Shady Grove	30		30		514	819	1518	1920	16	306	3,978	19.6
10	Sat	Twinbrook-Glenmont-White Oak-Hillandale	30	30	30	30	644			2218	62	1,474	3,991	19.6
56	Sat	Lakeforest-Quince Orchard-Shady Grove Hospital-Rockville	30	30	30	604			2034	58	1,301	3,525	19.6	
74	Wkdy	GTC-Great Seneca Hwy.-Shady Grove	30	30	30	500			2010	60	1,006	13,158	19.5	
96	Wkdy	Montgomery Mall-Rock Spring-Grosvenor	10	30	10		640			1944	57	557	7,472	19.0
41	Sat	Aspen Hill-Weiler Rd.-Glenmont	30	30	30	30	616			2235	64	540	1,516	18.9

48

FY14 Route Profile

Route	Ser	Route Description	AM Avg Hhwy	Base Day 1200n	PM Avg Hhwy	Evng 900p	1st Trip	Last AM Trip	First PM Trip	Last Trip	# of Trips	Avg Daily Riders	Annual Platform Hours	Riders Per Plat Hour
6	Sat	Twinbrook-Kensington-Silver Spring	30	30	30	30	530			2428	73	1,072	3,063	18.5
34	Sun	Wheaton-Bethesda-Friendship Heights	30	30	30	30	550			2440	72	1,202	3,705	18.5
67	Wkdy	Traville TC-North Potomac-Shady Grove	30	30	30	30	557	827	1609	1643	12	147	2,040	16.4
26	Sun	Glenmont-Aspen Hill-Twinbrook-Montgomery Mall	30	30	30	30	517			2416	72	1,688	5,364	17.9
66	Wkdy	Shady Grove-Piccard Drive-Shady Grove Hospital-Traville TC	30	30	30	30	602	832	1541	1811	12	109	1,581	17.6
64	Sat	Montgomery Village-Quail Valley-Emory Grove-Shady Grove	30	30	30	30	645			2117	58	808	2,449	17.5
97	Sun	GTC, Gurner's Lake, GTC	30	30	30	30	700			2100	29	259	969	17.0
25	Wkdy	Langley Park-Washington Adventist Hosp-Maple Ave-Takoma	15		15		503	911	1504	1929	45	454	6,860	16.9
28	Wkdy	Silver Spring Downtown (VanGo)	7.5	7.5	7.5		700			1900	97	678	10,353	16.7
30	Wkdy	Medical Center-Pooks Hill-Bethesda	30	30	30		540			2035	59	710	10,889	16.6
38	Sat	Wheaton-White Flint	30	30	30	30	640			2112	57	599	1,913	16.6
38	Sun	Wheaton-White Flint	30	30	30		644			1942	52	510	1,761	16.5
9	Sat	Wheaton-Four Corners-Silver Spring	30	30	30	30	630			2130	59	663	2,173	16.2
18	Wkdy	Langley Park-Takoma-Silver Spring	30	30	30	30	625			2352	69	798	12,648	16.1
90	Wkdy	Damascus-Woodfield Rd-Airpark Shady Grove	20	30	20		451			2035	73	889	14,178	16.0
45	Wkdy	Falls Grove-Rockville Senior Center-Rockville-Twinbrook	15	30	15		525			1955	78	1,004	16,116	15.9
47	Sat	Rockville-Montgomery Mall-Bethesda	30	30	30	30	645			2117	59	997	3,397	15.6
51	Wkdy	Norbeck P&R-Hewitt Ave-Glenmont	30	30	30		545	854	1522	1922	28	258	4,259	15.4
22	Wkdy	Hillandale-White Oak-PDA-Silver Spring	17		20		545	909	1502	1845	34	419	6,962	15.3
75	Wkdy	Clarksburg-Correctional Facility-Milestone-GTC	30	30	30		514			1915	56	444	7,421	15.3
8	Wkdy	Wheaton-Forest Glen-Silver Spring	30	30	30		603			1925	54	685	11,603	15.1
76	Wkdy	Poolesville-Kentlands-Shady Grove	15	30	15		501			1958	66	709	12,011	15.1
8	Sat	Wheaton-Forest Glen-Silver Spring	30	30	30		751			1813	42	587	2,067	15.1
39	Wkdy	Briggs Chaney-Glenmont	30	30	30		607	837	1558	1930	20	262	4,463	15.0
29	Wkdy	Bethesda-Glen Echo-Friendship Heights	30	30	30	35	535			2213	65	689	12,266	14.3
L8	Sat	Grand Pre-Bel Pre, Connecticut, Friendship Hts Station	30	30	30	30	600			2305	68	843	3,132	14.3
5	Sun	Twinbrook-Kensington-Silver Spring	30	30	30	30	530			2428	73	807	3,260	14.1
T2	Sat	Friendship Hts, River Rd, Falls Rd, Rockville W.	30	30	30		640			1945	52	705	2,650	14.1
33	Wkdy	Glenmont-Kensington-Medical Center	25		25		548	843	1438	1848	32	329	6,069	13.8
32	Wkdy	Naval Ship R&D-Cabin John-Bethesda	30	30	30		630	900	1519	1920	27	246	4,641	13.5
70	Wkdy	Milestone-Medical Center-Bethesda Express	12		15		445	930	1430	1955	60	730	14,000	13.3
23	Sat	Sibley Hospital-Brookmont-Sangamore Road-Friendship Heights	30	30	30		625			1930	53	375	1,516	13.1
36	Wkdy	Potomac-Bradley Blvd.-Bethesda	30	30	30		558			1940	54	440	8,594	13.1
79	Wkdy	Clarksburg-Siyark-Scenery-Shady Grove	30	30	30		506	906	1512	1912	18	281	5,508	13.0
19	Wkdy	Northwood-Four Corners-Silver Spring	30	30	30		614	820	1448	1945	14	135	2,729	12.6
37	Wkdy	Potomac-Tuckerman La.-Grosvenor-Wheaton	30	30	30		600	920	1559	1929	27	309	6,299	12.5
4	Wkdy	Kensington-Silver Spring	30	30	30		606	940	1336	1836	37	250	5,202	12.3
64	Sun	Montgomery Village-Quail Valley-Emory Grove-Shady Grove	30	30	30	700				2030	54	482	2,257	12.2
43	Sat	Traville TC-Shady Grove-Hospital-Shady Grove	30	30	30		648			1916	50	310	1,394	11.8
7	Wkdy	Forest Glen-Wheaton	30	30	30		630	800	1645	1825	8	67	1,454	11.8
29	Sun	Glen Echo-Friendship Heights	35	35	35		730			1945	43	186	906	11.7
47	Sun	Rockville-Montgomery Mall-Bethesda	30	30	30		715			2015	53	696	3,437	11.5
L8	Sun	Grand Pre-Bel Pre, Connecticut, Friendship Hts Station	30	30	30		600			2040	59	574	2,839	11.5
31	Wkdy	Glenmont-Kemp Mill Rd.-Wheaton	30	30	30		611	844	1603	1848	22	131	2,907	11.5
14	Sat	Takoma-Piney Branch Road-Franklin Ave.-Silver Spring	30	30	30		731			1840	45	308	1,489	11.0
44	Wkdy	Twinbrook-Hungerford-Rockville	30	30	30		613	854	1614	1917	25	110	2,576	10.9
81	Wkdy	Rockville-Tower Oaks-White Flint	30	30	30		600	900	1515	1915	31	181	4,259	10.8
6	Wkdy	Grosvenor-Parkside-Montgomery Mall Loop	30	30	30		606			2019	58	285	7,166	10.1
29	Sat	Bethesda-Glen Echo-Friendship Heights	30	30	30		725			2100	55	204	1,118	9.7
21	Wkdy	Briggs Chaney-Tamarack-Dumont Oaks-Silver Spring	30	30	30		536	846	1530	1910	15	233	6,401	9.3
45	Sat	Falls Grove-Rockville-Twinbrook	30	30	30		642			1925	52	413	2,369	9.2
83	Wkdy	Germentown MARC-GTC-Waters Landing-Milestone	20	30	20	30	430			2400	86	491	13,668	9.2
T2	Sun	Friendship Hts, River Rd, Falls Rd, Rockville W.	30	30	30		640			1945	52	510	3,175	9.2
42	Wkdy	White Flint-Montgomery Mall	30	30	30	30	536			2208	67	453	12,980	8.9
83	Sat	GTC-Waters Landing-Milestone	30	30	30	30	630			2130	62	318	1,908	8.8
18	Sat	Langley Park-Takoma-Silver Spring	30	30	30	30	653			2222	63	366	2,279	8.5
3	Wkdy	Takoma-Dale Dr.-Silver Spring	35		36		702	815	1708	1821	6	48	1,479	8.3
18	Sun	Langley Park-Takoma	30	30	30		655			1952	52	214	1,596	7.6
93	Wkdy	Twinbrook-HHS-Twinbrook	30	30	30		606	906	1537	1837	14	34	1,173	7.4
83	Sun	GTC-Waters Landing-Milestone	30	30	30		700			2100	58	256	2,052	7.1
52	Wkdy	MGH-Olney-Rockville	30	30	30		530	830	1545	1855	21	146	5,355	7.0
98	Wkdy	GTC, Kingsview, GCC, Cinnamon Woods	30	30	30	30	443			2330	74	411	16,295	6.4
53	Wkdy	Shady Grove-MGH-Olney-Glenmont	30	30	30		515	835	1540	1925	31	240	9,920	6.2
42	Sat	White Flint-Montgomery Mall	30	30	30		707			2046	56	215	2,408	4.7
98	Sat	GTC, Kingsview, Soccerplex	30	30	30	30	613			2130	62	228	2,978	4.1
42	Sun	White Flint-Montgomery Mall	30	30	30		712			1942	50	185	2,611	4.0
98	Sun	GTC, Kingsview, Soccerplex	30	30	30		643			2100	58	135	2,924	2.6
94	Wkdy	Germentown MARC-Clarksburg Meet the MARC January 2014	25		25		538	746	1621	2012	14	14	3,162	1.1

1,140,833 23.6

All resources are as of October 2013

Partial Ridership
Routes 38, 42, 94, 98 partial year ridership

49

Increase Span of Ride On Service

Route	Service	Category	Annual Hours	Annual Cost	Projected Annual Riders	Annual Rev	Bus Ops Reqd	FY15 Cost- January 2015 Start	FY15 Projected Rider-January 2015 Start	FY15 Revenue- January 2015 Start	Exleting Freq	Proposed Freq	Proposed Added Span	Service Area
54	Wkdy	Span	1,288	\$ 102,770	34,700	\$ 28,107	0.8	\$ 51,385	17,350	\$ 14,054	N/A	30	10p-12a	Rockville, Research, Washingtonian, Muddy Branch, Perry, Lakeforest
74	Wkdy	Span	1,288	\$ 102,770	31,396	\$ 25,431	0.8	\$ 51,385	15,698	\$ 12,715	N/A	30	8p-10p	Shady Grove, Washingtonian, Great Seneca, Kentlands, Germantown, GTC
48	Wkdy	Span	1,104	\$ 88,088	29,743	\$ 24,092	0.7	\$ 44,044	14,872	\$ 12,046	N/A	30	10p-12a	Wheaton, Parkland, Bauer, Lincoln Park, Rockville
23	Wkdy	Span	773	\$ 61,678	26,438	\$ 21,415	0.5	\$ 30,839	13,219	\$ 10,707	N/A	30	8p-10p	Sibley Hospital, Brookmont, Sangamore, Westbard, Friendship Heights
43	Wkdy	Span	386	\$ 30,799	17,350	\$ 14,054	0.2	\$ 15,399	8,675	\$ 7,027	N/A	30	5a-6a	Shady Grove, Shady Grove Hospital, Traville
11	Wkdy	Span	156	\$ 12,447	9,914	\$ 8,030	0.1	\$ 6,224	4,957	\$ 4,015	N/A	30	9a-10a	Silver Spring, East-West, Connecticut, Friendship Heights
13	Wkdy	Span	230	\$ 18,352	9,228	\$ 7,473	0.1	\$ 9,176	4,613	\$ 3,737	N/A	30	6p-7p	Takoma Park, Carroll, Flower, Manchester, Silver Spring
24	Wkdy	Span	248	\$ 19,788	7,849	\$ 6,358	0.2	\$ 9,894	3,925	\$ 3,179	N/A	30	7p-8p	Takoma Park, Piney Branch, Northampton, Hillandale
25	Wkdy	Span	350	\$ 27,927	7,684	\$ 6,224	0.2	\$ 13,963	3,842	\$ 3,112	N/A	30	7p-8p	Takoma Park, Maple, Carroll, Langley Park
33	Wkdy	Span	267	\$ 21,304	7,574	\$ 6,135	0.2	\$ 10,652	3,787	\$ 3,067	N/A	30	7p-8p	Medical Center, Kensington, Newport Mill, Glenmont
96	Wkdy	Span	294	\$ 23,489	7,436	\$ 6,023	0.2	\$ 11,745	3,718	\$ 3,012	N/A	20	5a-6a	Grosvenor, Tuckerman, Rock Spring, Montgomery Mall
66	Wkdy	Span	193	\$ 15,399	5,921	\$ 4,796	0.1	\$ 7,700	2,961	\$ 2,398	N/A	30	6p-7p	Shady Grove, King Farm, Piccard, Medical Center, Traville
39	Wkdy	Span	244	\$ 19,452	5,659	\$ 4,584	0.1	\$ 9,726	2,830	\$ 2,292	N/A	30	5a-6a	Glenmont, Layhill, Bonifant, Good Hope, Briggs Chaney
67	Wkdy	Span	129	\$ 10,293	2,892	\$ 2,343	0.1	\$ 5,146	1,446	\$ 1,171	N/A	30	6p-7p	Traville, Travilah, Duffel Mill, King Farm, Shady Grove
7	Wkdy	Span	64	\$ 5,138	1,652	\$ 1,338	0.1	\$ 2,569	826	\$ 669	N/A	30	5a-6a	Forest Glen, inwood, Wheaton

Span 7,014 \$ 559,692 205,434 \$ 166,402 4.4 \$ 279,846 102,718 \$ 83,201

50

FY15 CE Recommended Budget Operating Cost of Ride On Bus Service

<u>Cost Element</u>	Cost/Hour FY15 Dollars		
	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>	
Bus Operators	\$46.43	\$46.43	
Motor Pool	\$35.49	\$81.92	→ Rate for any new service added
Coordinators	\$3.09	\$85.01	
Other Operating Labor	\$3.72	\$88.73	
Schedule/Communications	\$3.38	\$92.11	→ WMATA Non-Regional Rate \$118.89 (FY15)
Customer Service/Safety	\$2.85	\$94.96	
Other Non-labor Oper/Mgmt Svcs/ General Administration/Other	\$6.30	\$101.26	
Indirect	\$9.62	\$110.88	
Fully Allocated Cost	<u>\$110.88</u>		

Breakdown of New Categories for Call 'n Ride Proposed Changes for FY 15 Budget

Categories		Cost Per \$60 value	Income Limits by Household Size			
			1-Person	2-Person	3-Person	4-Person
Level 1	Current	\$ 5.25	up to \$14,000	\$14,001 - \$16,999	\$17,000 - \$20,249	\$20,250 - \$23,499
	Proposed		up to \$15,856	\$15,857 - \$21,403	\$21,404 - \$26,950	\$26,951 - \$32,498
Level 2	Current	\$ 10.00	\$14,001 - \$17,000	\$17,001 - \$21,200	\$20,250 - \$25,750	\$23,500 - \$30,300
	Proposed		\$15,857 - \$21,403	\$21,404 - \$24,404	\$26,950 - \$31,404	\$32,499 - \$37,489
Level 3	Current	\$ 20.00	\$17,001 - \$20,000	\$21,201 - \$25,100	\$25,751 - \$30,625	\$30,301 - \$36,150
	Proposed		\$21,404 - \$26,951	\$24,405 - \$29,951	\$31,405 - \$36,725	\$37,490 - \$42,500
Level 4	Current	\$ 30.00	\$20,001 - \$25,000	\$25,101 - \$31,400	\$30,626 - \$38,300	\$36,151 - \$45,200
	Proposed		\$26,952 - \$32,499	\$29,952 - \$32,951	\$36,726 - \$42,800	\$42,501 - \$47,102

52

Call-n-Ride Participants by Household Size							
Categories	Cost Per \$60 Value	Household Size					
		1-Person	2-Person	3-Person	4-Person	5-Person	
Subsidy Level 91.3%	\$5.25	2958	1219	26	13	9	
Subsidy Level 83.3%	\$10	254	61	7	3	3	
Subsidy Level 66.7%	\$20	152	25	10	1	1	
Subsidy Level 50%	\$30	115	26	1	3	3	
TOTAL		3479	1331	44	20	16	4890
Percentage of Total		71.15%	27.22%	0.90%	0.40%	0.33%	100.00%

53

Kids Ride Free and Seniors Ride Free Program Data and Costs

WMATA Costs
Kids Ride Free

	FY 13	FY14	FY15
Budget	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 321,730.00	\$ 389,970.00
Actual	\$ 382,781.00	\$ 359,000.00	
Billing Rate	\$ 1.07	\$ 1.07	\$ 1.07
Ridership	356,088	334,964	364,458

Seniors Ride Free

Budget	\$ 79,220.00	\$ 128,240.00	\$ 185,003.00
Actual	\$ 182,845.00	\$ 190,812.00	
Billing Rate	\$ 0.80	\$ 0.80	\$ 0.80
Ridership	228,557	238,515	231,254

Ride On Lost Revenue
Kids Ride Free

Ridership	379,776	409,111	440,712
average cost/trip	\$ 1.07	\$ 1.07	\$ 1.07
Ride On revenue impact	\$ 406,360.32	\$ 437,748.77	\$ 471,561.75

Seniors Ride Free

Ridership	758,680	640,684	640,684
1/2 price cost/trip	\$ 0.80	\$ 0.80	\$ 0.80
Ride On revenue impact	\$ 606,944.00	\$ 512,547.20	\$ 512,547.20

Safety Program – Ride On

- Safety Instruction
 - Depot level: 2 instructors (grade 19)/depot + 2 program managers (grade 21);
- Follow up re-training on all accidents. Training will be conducted the first day after the accident occurs. This will be an all day observation where practical while the operator is in revenue service. First split if the run is the run is split.
- Follow up re-training on all injuries. Training will be conducted the first day the operator returns to work. This will be an all day observation where practical while the operator is in revenue service.
- Annual Safety Ride (Concentration on Defensive Driving) with all operators
- Annual Safety Work Methods training (Using ergonomically correct methods for lifting and lowering, pushing and pull, etc.) with all operators
- Certify all management in Defensive Driving and Safe Work Methods
- Conduct depot safety meetings and co-chair the committee. The safety supervisor is responsible for posting daily safety statistics and creating safety awareness in the depot.
- Safety Recognition as appropriate
- Conduct Facility Audits as required
- Track Safety Driving points for each depot and recommend operators for safety awards
- Conduct annual training on ADA accommodations
- Conduct fire drills in each depot annually
- Conduct Customer Service Training annually
- Weekly and Monthly Audits - On VCR's usage, use safe work methods, on road observations (following an operator while they are in revenue service), seat belt and idling policy, etc.
- Any additional compliance training that may be required in the future

55

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

JDA & Associates was retained by the Montgomery County, Maryland, Office of the County Executive, in June 2013, to assist the Office of Human Resources, Department of Transportation (DOT), and in collaboration with UFCW Local 1994 MCGEO, to conduct a climate survey and assessment for the Department of Transportation, Transit Services Division, Ride On program.

This survey request was conducted due to a significant amount of concern among the DOT Ride On employees regarding future direction and changes of Ride On. The primary purposes of the Climate Survey and Assessment are to: ascertain employees' perception of Ride On; provide the County with information regarding employee satisfaction of Ride On operational methods; identify desired improvements as a result of this survey; and, to gather information that could assist in policy decisions.

The survey was designed to measure satisfaction on a broad range of issues considered to be important to Ride On employees in areas of leadership, communication, supervision, safety, work place policies, job satisfaction, advancement and morale. The results of the survey are based on the respondents' perceptions of the effectiveness and quality of service that were secured from the respondents' responses to specific focus group discussion questions, online questions, email comments and phone conversations. These results should serve as informative data for improvement efforts and for creating a pathway to successfully move forward.

Of the approximately 737 Ride On employees invited to participate in this climate survey, 194 submitted valid responses for a response rate of 26%. Of these Ride On respondents, 86% (44 out of 51) of the non-union representative employees, which include: Senior Leadership, Depot and Central Chiefs, Program Managers and Specialists, Transit Services Supervisors, Transit Communication Supervisors, Transit Operations Supervisors and Trainers participated in the survey; whereas, 17% (114 out of 686) of MCGEO members participated. Specifically, Transit Coordinators, Information Technicians, and Principle Administrative Aides participated and represented 67% (30 out of 45), while Bus Operators which are the largest group of Ride On employees given an opportunity to participate, actually represented the smallest percentage of respondents with a response rate of 13% (84 out of 641). Of the 194 submitted responses, 39 respondents did not provide their position or demographic data, or elected not to give it, or the consultant was unable to collect it. (For specific job position participation data, refer to pages 30-32).

The collected demographic data, indicating employees' length of service with DOT and time in current position, divulged noteworthy findings. Of the 38 Depot and Central Chiefs, Transit Services Supervisors, Transit Communication Supervisors, Transit Operations Supervisors, Program Managers, Specialists, and Trainers who responded,

58% (22 out of 38) have been in their current position less than 5 years and 95% (36 out of 38) have been in their position less than 8 years. Furthermore, 47% (14 out of 30) of Transit Coordinators, Information System Technicians, and Principle Administrative Aides have been in their position less than 5 years and 70% (21 out of 30) have been in their position less than 8 years. Of the 84 Bus Operator respondents, 33% (28 out of 84) have been in their position less than 5 years, and 71% (61 out of 84) have been in their position less than 10 years.

The analysis of the data collected across-the-board overwhelmingly reveals:

- Most employees lack confidence, respect and trust in the Chief of Operations and in the direction in which the organization is moving;
- The Chief of Operations and three of the four Depot and Central Chiefs are negatively affecting employee job satisfaction and performance; and
- A majority of MCGEO Local 1994 members express dissatisfaction with the Union's lack of best interest commitment to transit service needs; additionally, non-members reflect that the Union has too much control and decision-making power.

Regardless of the position the employee holds, it is important for employees to feel respected and valued by his/her supervisor and by the organization(s), and that is not the current experience for any of the survey groups.

Compensation can be interpreted as an objective measure of an employee's worth to the organization. Employees who have seen their compensation erode and the salary differentials they have earned through job experience taken away from them perceive this action as a lack of respect. Although these factors are outside of DOT control, employees indicate that it makes them feel as though their efforts are not appreciated, and thus their job satisfaction is diminished.

Employees feel respected when they perceive that the organization values their health and safety by providing clean and professional workspaces and equipment. Poorly maintained vehicles and equipment signals to employees that the work taking place is not important. Although fleet maintenance falls outside of DOT responsibilities, many employees express a lackadaisical and non-caring attitude because they believe that the organization doesn't care enough to provide clean and properly working equipment and workspace. This, too, has resulted in diminished productivity.

The data show that the employees who strive for excellence in job performance become disheartened because they know that there are those who do not perform to standard, yet face little or no consequences. Employees who perceive this lack of accountability for poor performance are made to believe that their efforts are of little value to the organization. They state that if excellence were valued by the organization, those who do not perform would face consequences. Moreover, many depot and central respondents expressed resentment by the amount of favoritism, preference and unfairness taking place across the organization by supervisors and managers at all levels.

Comments about accountability primarily focus on respondents' desires to see changes in incentives for safe behavior or in disciplinary practices for unsafe behavior. Numerous respondents stated that they would like the current safety awards program expanded so that all individuals who work safely and perform would be rewarded more frequently than once a year. These respondents especially favor an opportunity to have incentives and receive rewards for safe behavior practices. Meanwhile, respondents express disapproval over the current disciplinary system for employees whose behavior is/was unsafe and underperforming. They believe that harsher punishments, including termination, are needed for employees who violate serious safety regulations. Respondents who made comments on accountability also frequently note that service and morale will be improved if all employees – regardless of management level, position, union membership, or whistleblower status – are held to the same consistent standards, expectations, and system of positive and negative consequences.

Numerous responses note that pressure to meet route schedules and deadlines is undermining safety regulations and places employees and customers at risk. Respondents state that leadership, including immediate supervisors, often talk about prioritizing safety, but do not consistently follow through with this commitment while work is in progress, particularly when timelines and budgets are tight. Incentives for managers to meet budget and schedule demands are regarded as detrimental to workforce safety. This leaves employees feeling that leadership does not genuinely value their personal safety.

Numerous respondents discuss personally experiencing, witnessing or hearing about retaliation taken against employees who bring safety concerns and personnel issues to the attention of management. Comments vary in where they place blame – senior leadership, middle management, or supervisors, and sometimes all levels of management. Some respondents indicate that the retaliation is more than subtle and leads to strained relationships with Senior Leadership, Operations Chief and a few Depot and Central Chiefs who reportedly view or treat the employee who raises a concern or issues a stop work as a "trouble maker." Numerous respondents state that raising safety concerns and personnel issues makes them vulnerable to transfer from their current position or even termination. Workforce restructuring created a climate in which employees were less willing to raise concerns so that they can keep their jobs.

Comments also note that incentives to management for meeting production goals or having no accidents or infractions within Ride On leads employees to feel a backlash if they report a problem that interfered with achieving these goals.

Employees made clear their desire to know that Senior Leadership is listening to them. Most importantly they want to see management take action now that they know what employees need.

One survey respondent put it this way:

"This survey is our last hope. However, if we aren't made aware of what the findings and recommendations are, how to address them and take action, then this survey was another waste of time, energy, resources and money. If we don't see any real or honest changes, then there is no hope for Ride On."

RECOMMENDATIONS

JDA & Associates recommends that Ride On take a multi-pronged approach to address the findings, issues and concerns revealed by the survey results; and, to identify specific actions and strategies for organizational improvement and employee satisfaction.

The recommendations are categorized into five areas:

- I. Trust, Communication and Collaboration
- II. Leadership, Organizational Structure and Accountability
- III. Policies, Procedures, Planning and Personnel Performance
- IV. Customer Service, Safety and Maintenance
- V. Recognition, Accomplishments, Advancement and Evidence of Success

Each of the five categories contains several defined recommendations pertaining to that area. However, all of the recommendations must be viewed holistically to successfully plan and implement the necessary changes for organizational improvement. Some recommendations will require further study and entail more long-term planning than others, while many can be implemented immediately.

I. Trust, Communication and Collaboration

Rationale:

Effective communication between senior management, middle management and employees is extremely important especially during times of uncertainty and during times of economic downturns. Effective and timely communication reminds employees and provides employees with understanding of the organizations' goals, policies, and vision and keeps them informed about what is going on in the organization. Open and honest communication provides the workforce with direction, dispels rumors, institutes commitment and promotes trust. Employees should not feel uncomfortable or afraid to pose questions, suggestions or concerns to management. Organizations should ask the question, "Can employees question the decisions of management without fear of repercussions?"

Recommendations:

1. Increase occasions for Division, Operations, Depot and Central Chiefs to be more visible by informally visiting depots and work areas to dialog with employees

2. Expand and refine the methods for communicating Ride On news and items to all employees
3. Have senior management improve communications with direct reports and employees, verbally and in written form
4. Have employees practice Trust Behaviors (refer to pages 33-34)
5. Create transparency among Ride On employees
6. Utilize a variety of means to inform and solicit input from employees
7. Convey trust and communication as a shared responsibility of all employees
8. Keep employees informed
9. Build and develop deeper trust and rapport opportunities among employees
10. Have Division, Operations, Depot and Central Chiefs hold town hall meetings with employees to provide direction, clarify priorities and procedures, and answer questions
11. Create a work environment to encourage employee creativity and openness to make suggestions
12. Promote a “we” and “our” organizational mentality and verbalization, and discourage the organizational “I” and “mine” attitude and verbalization
13. Conduct quarterly “all depot” meetings to inform, deliver consistent messages and provide opportunities to build relationships
14. Create opportunities for employees to meet face-to-face to develop trust and rapport and to eliminate the barriers of separate depots, buildings and floors
15. Build and develop deeper trust and rapport opportunities among employees, managers, supervisors and leadership
16. Cultivate a team attitude and a commitment of “shared responsibility”

Keyword Findings – Trust, Communication and Collaboration	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accuracy of Communication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Morale
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communication Barriers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Motivation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent Message	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recognition
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Empowerment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reputation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group Dynamics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Respect
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Listening	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Loyalty	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transparency

“Few things can help an individual more than to place responsibility on him, and to let him know that you trust him.”

—Booker T. Washington

II. Leadership, Organizational Structure and Accountability

Rationale:

Leadership is often seen as a key factor in coordinating and aligning organizational processes. As with any aspect of organizational functioning, it should focus on organizational performance, and most importantly, it should focus on effectiveness in achieving desired outcomes. An effective leader of an organization initiates action, motivates employees, provides guidance, creates confidence, builds morale and strengthens working environments.

Accountability is a critical and challenging aspect of leadership. It is especially challenging for an organization, which serves a broad array of constituencies, is devoted to public service and in which outputs can be difficult to measure.

Recommendations:

1. Create an environment of leading by empowering employees and eliminate leading by dictating, intimidating, neglecting and favoritism
2. Have employees with supervisory responsibilities create an open door approach and a safe environment for employees to share thoughts, concerns and ideas
3. Assess the effectiveness of the current organizational structure
4. When announcing decisions, include how the decision is consistent with the mission of Ride On and the process followed in arriving at the decision
5. Develop, revise or make available written expectations for items such as:
 - a. work performance
 - b. job responsibilities
 - c. work schedules
6. Provide training for employees with supervisory responsibilities on policies and procedures, effectively acknowledging employees, and leadership and management competencies
7. Foster an attitude with supervisory staff that knowledge is power, but keeping and not sharing, or micromanaging the knowledge with employees is, destructive and detrimental to organizational success
8. Hold employees accountable for their actions
9. Promote, encourage and reward employees' positive behaviors, actions, and ideas
10. Stay true to commitments and accomplish them in a timely manner
11. Improve and mend relationships and trust behaviors between county and union representatives
12. Provide union members with the opportunity to select transit representatives and establish a limit to the length of term in office for representatives

13. Improve accountability procedures for achieving assigned tasks, responsibilities and timelines
14. Incorporate opportunities for feedback from direct reports regarding supervisor competencies of all employees with supervisory responsibilities
15. Expand supervisor autonomy and decision-making practices
16. Utilize the talents and skills of employees
17. Explain how budget allocations and spending decisions are made at various levels
18. Identify future funding opportunities and challenges
19. Designate, assign or hire a project manager to carry out the recommendations, actions, and implementation of this climate assessment

Keyword Findings – Leadership, Organizational Structure and Accountability	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▣ Alignment▣ Accountability▣ Confidence▣ Decision-making Skills▣ Empowerment▣ Evaluation▣ Integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▣ Involvement▣ Mission▣ Priorities▣ Responsibilities▣ Structure▣ Transparency▣ Vision

“Leadership is solving problems. The day soldiers stop bringing you their problems is the day you have stopped leading them. They have either lost confidence that you can help or concluded you do not care. Either case is a failure of leadership.”

—Colin Powell

III. Policies, Procedures, Planning and Personnel Performance

Rationale:

Organizational planning is paramount to achieving desired results. Strategic planning is the process by which an organization develops the most desirable vision of the future, taking into account the constraints it is likely to work within, and how it can realize that vision. Planning sets the direction and establishes priorities for an organization. It defines the organization's view of success and prioritizes the activities that will make this view a reality. Without clearly defined and articulated strategies, organizations discover that priority initiatives—the ones that will drive the highest success—are often given secondary treatment or never achieved.

Most successful organizations have recognized that functional and enforceable policies and procedures are the arteries to guide the organization and streamline effectiveness and efficiency. Policies and procedures are always put in writing to help in governance, compliance and smooth continuity of processes within an organization. Developing clearly written policies and procedures that are documented, updated and followed, brings structure to an organization and assists in the day-to-day decision-making processes. Policies and procedures also serve as an internal control method so that supervisors and managers cannot take free license to make creative or unauthorized decisions.

Recommendations:

1. Update existing policies, procedures and regulations
2. Adhere to and be consistent with enforcing policies, procedures and regulations
3. Develop a comprehensive strategic plan to reach the goals of Ride On
4. Review, amend or develop operational processes
5. Amend or develop a more effective attendance policy for bus operators and coordinators
6. Establish procedures for disseminating accurate information to all employees about what decisions were made and what topics were discussed at the senior level meetings
7. Develop processes to reduce communication layers to deliver relevant information to employees
8. Modify and revise the attendance policy for bus operators and transit coordinators
9. Improve processes for employees to ask questions and check for understanding before decisions are implemented that effect them

10. Refine and improve the processes for disseminating information bi-directionally to eliminate the breakdowns in the communications flow or the filtering of information
11. Strengthen the philosophy of a “one transit service” organizational model that focuses and aligns human and capital resources.
12. Continuously share the vision, mission and goals of Ride On
13. Offer those closest to the work the opportunity to take the lead in providing solutions to improve processes and results
14. Create, unify and enforce processes consistently among depots
15. Assess the method and effectiveness of the current employee performance evaluation process
16. Reevaluate the criteria for measuring effective job performance
17. Establish transparency in how overtime is allocated and leave is approved

Keyword Findings – Policies, Procedures, Planning and Personnel Performance	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">☒ Change Management☒ Consistency☒ Duties and Responsibilities☒ Employee Involvement☒ Enforcement☒ Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">☒ Levels of Decision-making☒ Priorities Processes☒ Project Management☒ Shared Responsibility☒ Strategic Planning

“The best time to plant a tree is twenty years ago. The second best time is today.”

– Chinese Proverb

IV. Customer Service, Safety and Maintenance

Rationale:

Research indicates that customers will stop using a service or product not because of price or product quality issues, but because they did not like the human side of doing business with the provider of the product or service. Customer service is a highly important component of every service providing organization. Organizations that are unable or unwilling to properly service their customers (and employees) stand to lose the customers' business. An organization that best demonstrates excellent customer service characteristics will have a distinct advantage over its competition. Customer service – external and internal – is critical and essential to increasing revenue and retaining employees.

In order to provide successful customer service, Montgomery County must properly manage their fleet of buses and vehicles. Although, fleet maintenance falls outside of DOT responsibilities, it is imperative that maintaining the operation and mechanical condition of the equipment is critical to ensure safe, efficient vehicle performance and lengthened life span. Having an effective vehicle maintenance program in place reduces maintenance cost, decreases downtime, lowers accident incidences and improves employee's morale. Providing well maintained vehicles and equipment enhances the organization's image as a safety minded and caring entity.

Recommendations:

1. Increase collaboration and obtain results with Fleet Management to:
 - a. Provide safe, operational, and modernized equipment and tools for employees to properly perform their duties and responsibilities;
 - b. Improve the quality control of bus inspections, service and maintenance;
 - c. Increase the capacity to repair or replace equipment in a more timely manner; and
 - d. Improve the cleanliness of buses and county vehicles
2. Promote "safety first" attitude and actions for employees and passengers
3. Increase new bus operators knowledge of routes, customer service, bus operation and protocol procedures
4. Provide employees with proper personal safety gear, equipment and communication devices
5. Establish protocol procedures for emergency situations (i.e. hurricanes, terrorists, etc.)
6. Properly adjust and revise bus route time schedules, stops and breaks to safely transport passengers and improve employees' personal needs
7. Advertise and provide public awareness on proper passenger behavior, fare requirements and safety issues

Ride On – Climate Survey and Assessment Report

8. Improve internal customer service practices and attitudes to inform, collaborate, and support each other with integrity and respect
9. Improve and revise employees dress code and provide the appropriate quality and quantity attire to match their job position and weather conditions

Keyword Findings – Customer Service, Safety and Maintenance	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attitude and Behaviors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professionalism
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decision-making Procedures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quality Control
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Diversity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Allocations
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Equipment Replacement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Return on Investment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reliability
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service

“The more you engage with customers the clearer things become and the easier it is to determine what you should be doing.”

–John Russell, President, Harley Davidson

66

V. Recognition, Accomplishments, Advancement and Evidence of Success

Rationale:

Measuring the success of an organization requires defining success and requires collecting evidence to measure success. Performance measurements consist of collecting, analyzing and/or reporting information regarding the performance of an individual, group, organization, system or component. It can involve studying processes and strategies within an organization. Without measuring performance, an organization can flounder, drift, implode or dissolve.

Measuring success is of utmost importance; however, doing something about or with the success is even more crucial if an organization is to benefit from the success as well as assure its continuation. High-performance organizations understand the necessity of offering awards and incentives that recognize, validate and value outstanding work. These awards and incentives keep employees motivated and are an effective means of reinforcing the organization's expectations and goals, especially in times when merit budgets are low (or even frozen), or in times when promotions are rare, health care premiums are on the rise, and overall job satisfaction is low.

For a program to be effective, however, it must create value. This means that the program must have a performance component, or it will be meaningless. Many supervisors and managers dismiss recognition and reward programs as feel-good activities. Evidence suggests that there is a strong link between noncash awards and incentives and improved job performance.

Successful organizations cite a number of reasons for adopting recognition programs, which include: reducing costs; attracting and retaining key employees; increasing employee productivity, competitiveness, revenues and profitability; improving quality, safety and customer service; and lowering stress, absenteeism and turnover.

Recommendations:

1. Recognize and accept the diversity of work styles and methods
2. Recognize the talents, skills, and knowledge that each employee offers
3. Celebrate and recognize individuals and depot accomplishments
4. Establish events, programs and incentives to recognize individuals and Ride On accomplishments
5. Create a structure for identifying, posting and publishing Ride On accomplishments
6. Determine how each person likes to be recognized for his/her accomplishments – then recognize them appropriately

Ride On – Climate Survey and Assessment Report

7. Deliberately and intentionally advocate for recognition of the contributions and work that Ride On performs
8. Recognize the skills, abilities, and knowledge of current employees and promote from within
9. Identify available funding resources for professional development opportunities
10. Work with the Office of Human Resources to allow for job experience to become a qualification criteria factor for advancement and promotion
11. Utilize the professional development opportunities offered by the county to elevate employees abilities
12. Provide more opportunities for employees to expand, utilize, and advance their skills and knowledge
13. Establish data guidelines to measure transit service effectiveness
14. Establish quarterly transit service performance measures and goals
15. Recognize and capitalize on the wealth of experience, knowledge, commitment and dedication of Ride On employees
16. Develop quarterly or semi-annual Ride On progress reports and monitoring plans
17. Utilize stakeholders' feedback to document success and to improve results and effectiveness
18. Creatively build on past successes and future opportunities
19. Promote "healthy employees" programs, incentives and practices

Keyword Findings – Recognition, Accomplishments, Advancement and Evidence of Success	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appreciation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Career Opportunities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuous Improvement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expertise <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group Dynamics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Incentives <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Measures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Promotions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Respect <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Team Effectiveness <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Values

"A pat on the back is only a few vertebrae removed from a kick in the pants, but is miles ahead in results.

-Ella Wheeler Wilcox

68