

MEMORANDUM

November 25, 2015

TO: Government Operations & Fiscal Policy Committee

FROM: Jacob Sesker, Senior Legislative Analyst *JS*
Linda Price, Legislative Analyst *LP*

SUBJECT: Discussion: Implementation of the FY16 Operating and Capital Budgets

Key Points

Councilmembers requested this briefing in response to concerns that arose related to the implementation of Council budget priorities, such as those priorities added to the budget through the reconciliation process.

Key points/recommendations:

- Continue to require reporting on new positions and projects, as was done in FY16;
- Monitor all reporting and notification requirements in the budget resolution;
- Ask Executive to transmit an amendment to the Savings Plan related to bus service;
- Require status updates related to implementation of all Reconciliation List items;
- Hold February worksessions to review quarterly analyses and year-end transfers; and
- Require third quarterly analysis to include recommendations for how to avoid transferring non-tax supported appropriations to tax supported budgets.

Purpose

The purpose of this briefing is to discuss implementation and oversight issues associated with appropriations. This briefing will include discussion of the following:

- (1) Background regarding appropriations
- (2) Reporting and notification requirements in the operating budget
- (3) FY16 Savings Plan and Reconciliation List items
- (4) Quarterly analyses and the year-end transfers

Appropriations

A Charter is “the organic, the fundamental law, establishing basic principles governing relationships between the government and the people, and among the various governmental branches and bodies.” *Cheeks v. Cedlair*, 287 Md. 595, 607 (1980). In essence, Montgomery County’s Charter is its constitution.

Section 101 of the Charter vests all legislative powers in the County Council. Section 201 vests executive power in the County Executive. Article 3 of the Charter (Sections 301 to 316) establishes the processes of appropriation and expenditure, including the roles of both the Executive and the Council in that process. Under Section 303, it is the Executive who proposes capital and operating budgets (including recommended expenditures and the sources of funds). **Under Section 305, the Council may “add to, delete from, increase or decrease any appropriation item in the operating or capital budget.”** Section 306 establishes the process for Council transmittal of the approved budget to the Executive, and the subsequent process for any item veto or reduction by the Executive and Council re-approval of vetoed or reduced budget items. See © 1-7 for Article 3.

A budget is a complete and itemized plan of proposed expenditures—in essence, a fiscal plan for the upcoming year.¹ Both the Executive and the Council have roles to play in the process that leads up to adoption of a budget. The Council must levy taxes to pay for all tax supported activities of government and must appropriate funds to give the Executive branch authority to spend. Appropriations occur both as part of the annual budget process and from time to time throughout the year through the supplemental and special appropriation processes.

An appropriation is a legislative act to set aside a sum of money for a public purpose—without the appropriation, the Executive has no authority to spend public funds. Generally speaking, once the appropriation is made, the Executive must implement the legislative policy that justified the appropriation.

In the operating budget, the Council appropriates at the department level² in large categories—personnel costs and operating expense.³ The Council budget resolution includes dozens of “budget provisions” that specify purposes, amounts, limitations, and in some cases tie the appropriation or expenditure to reporting or notification requirements. These budget provisions are useful in situations in which a broader or more general appropriation would not express the Council’s intent with sufficient clarity. In the capital budget, project description forms include a significant

¹ In addition to the annual operating and capital budgets, the Charter also establishes processes related to 6-year programs for public services, capital improvements, and fiscal policy.

² Prior to FY95, the Council appropriated several larger departments by division. For example, the Department of Finance was appropriated by the Office of the Director, the Division of Accounting, and the Division of Revenue. The Police Department was appropriated by Headquarters, Field Services Bureau, Investigative Bureau, Management Services Bureau, and Grants and Revenues. The 10% limitation for transfer of appropriation applied.

³ Prior to FY11, the Council appropriated in three categories: personnel costs, operating expense, and capital outlay, with capital outlay applying to only a few appropriations. Currently, the Council includes a Budget Provision that identifies appropriations that previously would have been capital outlay and requires OMB to report if less than 90% of the funds will be spent on capital outlay. This is Budget Provision 60 in the FY16 Operating Budget Resolution. See http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/COUNCIL/Resources/Files/res/2015/20150521_18-150.pdf for the full FY16 Operating Budget resolution.

amount of detail regarding the Council's intent. The implementation issues discussed in this memorandum therefore focus on the operating budget.

As referenced above, supplemental and special appropriations are necessary from time to time to increase appropriations outside of the regular budget cycle. In addition, Section 309 establishes the parameters of the Executive's authority to transfer funds.

§309. Transfer of Funds. The County Executive may at any time transfer an unencumbered appropriation balance within a division or between divisions of the same department. Transfers between departments, boards or commissions, or to any new account, shall be made only by the County Council upon the recommendation of the County Executive. The total cumulative transfers from any one appropriation shall not exceed ten percent of the original appropriation. No transfer shall be made between the operating and capital budget appropriation.

Transfers become necessary because **the County's Charter (§311) prohibits expenditures in excess of unencumbered appropriations.**⁴ The Executive may transfer unencumbered appropriations within a division or between divisions of the same department. Such transfers do not require Council approval. However, **transfers between departments, boards, commissions, or accounts can only be made by the Council** upon recommendation of the Executive. Each year, the Executive sends to the Council a resolution to transfer spending authority from departments that spent less than their budgets into departments that spent more than their budgets in the preceding fiscal year. The Council transfers spending authority between departments or accounts by resolution.

The year-end transfer must be completed before the County can complete its independent audit and report the audit results to the State. Under State law, Montgomery County and other counties with populations of more than 400,000 must submit independent audits to the State by January 1. By the time the Council receives a year-end transfer request from the Executive, the fiscal year is over and the appropriation has been spent—the transfer simply closes the books on the previous fiscal year.

The Council's budget process contains several milestone events, beginning with the Executive's transmittal of the budget and ending with the year-end transfer. The Council's oversight role continues throughout the year as the Council and its committees receive reports and request information to monitor revenues and expenditures. This memorandum includes recommendations that are intended to build additional oversight into the Council's processes.

Reporting and Notification Requirements

Attached at © 8 is a list of the reporting and notification requirements in the FY16 budget resolution. The list includes requirements that are date-specific, as well as those that are triggered by specific events. Examples include notifications related to grant applications and appropriations, reports related to Emergency Medical Services (EMS) transport and reimbursement fees, capital outlay reports, and quarterly analyses of operating expenditures. Similar reporting and notification

⁴ §311. Limitations on Expenditures: No expenditures of County funds shall be made or authorized in excess of the available unencumbered appropriations therefor.

requirements are part of the budget resolution each year. Each reporting and notification requirement's history is unique, but all are tied to the Council's oversight functions.

In most cases, the Council receives reports and notices in accordance with the budget resolution. There are, of course, instances in which reports and notifications are not sent on time—as a result of oversight, technical difficulty or impossibility, or some other reason.

- The notification requirement that has been problematic for the last couple of years (related to the transition to the ERP system) is the Future Federal State and Other Grants Non-Departmental Account (NDA). These notifications are required under multiple provisions in the budget resolution each year.
- In FY16, the Council has received some reports on time (e.g., the October EMS Transport Fee Reimbursement Report). A reporting requirement that relates to new positions added in the operating budget⁵ was added to the budget resolution for the first time in FY16. Council staff and OMB resolved some early issues related to this report. The second report (due November 25) was received by the Council prior to the deadline established in the resolution.

OMB is working with Council staff to resolve any issues related to these reports.

The reporting and notification requirements that are not tied to specific dates are all conditional, i.e., the requirement is triggered by the occurrence of an event outside the Council's control. For example, budget provision #51 includes the following notification requirement, which was included for the first time in the FY16 budget resolution: *The Chief Administrative Officer must also notify the Council within 15 days of a decision to "freeze" a proposed procurement that would result in a new program being delayed or eliminated or result in a significant break in the operation of an ongoing program.*

The following improvements to the reporting and notification process have recently been implemented:

- The Council included new reporting requirements in the FY16 budget resolution related to new positions and procurement freezes so that the Council can be better informed about the status of funded positions and projects.
- The analyst assigned to OMB has also been assigned to coordinate with other analysts in order to monitor all reporting and notification requirements and to prepare any correspondence necessary to communicate with the party required to report.

⁵ For FY 2016, the Chief Administrative Officer must transmit two status reports to the Council on identified positions receiving initial funding in FY 2015 or FY 2016. The first report must be provided no later than August 30, 2015 and must identify whether a decision has been made to freeze a position or approve an exemption. The second report must provide the status for these positions as of November 13, 2015 and be transmitted no later than November 25, 2015. If a position is identified in the November report as having received an exemption, the report must also include the date the position was posted for recruitment.

FY16 Savings Plan and Reconciliation List Items

Each year, the Council approves some items that were not in the Executive's recommended budget. These items (so-called Reconciliation List items) are priorities of Councilmembers and may not be priorities of the Executive.

On July 8, the Executive transmitted a Savings Plan that included \$40.7 million in proposed cuts to the FY16 operating budget and \$10.1 million in proposed cuts to the FY16 capital budget (current revenue). On July 28, the Council approved a Savings Plan that cut a combined \$54 million from the operating and capital budgets. The Council achieved its savings by relying more heavily on cuts to the capital budget (\$26 million in savings). In all, there were 72 operating budget items in the proposed savings plan that the Council did not approve either in full or in part, as well as two capital budget items.

With respect to the Savings Plan items about which the Executive and Council were not in full agreement, Council staff reports either that the Executive Branch is implementing the approved plan, or that there is no evidence that the Council's priorities are not being funded (e.g., because it is too early to tell). Staff will continue to monitor these projects in the weeks and months to come.

A separate issue, however, is how to address one item in which the Executive and Council were in agreement: cutting bus service on three specific routes. In adopting its FY16 Savings Plan, the Council approved the Executive's recommendation to eliminate Ride On Routes 42 and 98 entirely and to eliminate weekend service on Route 83, all effective in January 2016. The net savings from these reductions was estimated to be about \$1.7 million in FY16 and \$3.4 million in FY17 and subsequent years. These are among the least cost-effective routes in the system, operating well below Ride On's own standards for service retention.

The Department of Transportation received much public comment in opposition to these reductions. Subsequently, on October 19, DOT announced that the Executive had decided instead to cut back late evening service weekdays on Routes 42 and 98, early morning and late evening service on all three routes on Saturdays, and all service on Sundays. DOT notes that this lesser reduction would save about \$750,000 in FY16 and \$1.5 million in FY17 and subsequent years (© 9). The Savings Plan would have allowed seven Ride On buses to be redeployed on existing or future routes that would be better utilized. However, the Executive's October decision retains all the peak-period service, so none of these buses will be available for redeployment.

Since this one item from the FY16 Savings Plan was included in a resolution approved by the Council, Council staff believes that the appropriate way to consider a change to this item would be for the Executive to transmit an amendment to the Savings Plan resolution for the Council's consideration. The difficult decisions made by the Executive and Council in the Savings Plan and approved by the Council in a resolution should not be reversed via a letter from the Acting Director of Transportation. **Council staff recommends that the Council ask the Executive to transmit a recommended amendment to the Savings Plan resolution.**

Reconciliation List items are a related but separate issue. In future budgets, **Council staff recommends including all Reconciliation List items in a budget provision to ensure their implementation and reconfirm the Council's intent.**

As a condition of spending any funds appropriated in this resolution, the Chief Administrative Officer must transmit to the Council Administrator reports describing the implementation status of all County Government items approved by the Council on the Reconciliation List, item #__ on the Council's agenda of May __. The reports must be provided by December 1 for the period ending November 1, and by February 1 for the period ending January 1.

Quarterly Analyses and Year-End Transfers

Departments and offices in County Government typically spend less in total than the Council approved operating budget for that fiscal year. However, spending for some departments exceeds the approved budget. OMB updates the Council twice each year regarding the spending of departments and offices—the second quarterly analysis is due in mid-February, and the third quarterly analysis is due in mid-May. Departments that are on pace to overspend their budgets often do, requiring a transfer of appropriation at the end of the year.

The quarterly analyses are among the reporting requirements stipulated in the budget resolution that the Council approves each May: *As required by Charter Section 209⁶ and as a condition of spending any funds appropriated in this resolution, the Office of Management and Budget must provide to the Council the second and third quarterly budget analysis of department and office expenditures and revenues no later than 45 days after the end of the second and third fiscal quarters.*

The quarterly analyses can provide an early warning about departments that may overspend their budget appropriations (although there is both signal and noise in the analyses). Seventeen offices and departments have exceeded their budget in at least three out of the last six fiscal years. The second quarterly analysis correctly projected overspending more than half of the time for 8 of the 17 offices or departments.

The offices and departments prepare the quarterly analysis reports using a tracking template prepared by OMB to provide information on expenditures (workforce and operating) and encumbrances and to project any remaining surplus or shortfalls for the remainder of the year. The departments use reports and data available in the ERP-Enterprise Business Intelligence and Reporting System to analyze and project the figures that are reported to OMB. This information is used to complete the quarterly analyses that are transmitted to the Council.

“Budget controls” prevent departments and offices from expending operating expense dollars if they have insufficient budget appropriation. If a department is nearing its budget appropriation and appears likely to run out of appropriation, a series of alternatives are considered. These options were provided in a June 4, 2010 OMB memo (see © 10) and include the following:

1. Submit an Executive Transfer budget change request to OMB to move up to 10% of personnel costs to fund operating expenses⁷.

⁶ County Charter, §209. The County Executive shall provide the Council with any information concerning the Executive Branch that the Council may require for the exercise of its powers.

⁷ See County Charter, §309.

2. Liquidate current year encumbrances to generate additional current year operating expense appropriation. (OMB has been more proactive in liquidating encumbrances annually and mid-year, so this may be less feasible than in prior fiscal years.)
3. Discuss with OMB a request for a Supplemental Appropriation. The memo notes this should be done early in the fiscal year as it can take up to two months to administer a Supplemental Appropriation. The third quarterly analysis report is made available in Mid-May, 1.5 months prior to the end of the fiscal year.
4. "If all of the above have been exhausted or is temporarily impractical, and the department can adequately document the need to over-spend your budget, then a request to remove the control for your department should be submitted to the Director of OMB."

If the budget control is removed and the department or office overspends its budget, a transfer of appropriation is necessary. To cover any overages from the preceding fiscal year, the Executive transmits a year-end transfer request. The Council then approves a resolution authorizing the transfer of appropriations from offices and departments that spent less to those that overspent. This "closeout" process is required before the County can conduct its independent audit and then report those results to the State as required by law.⁸

The Executive transmitted the FY15 Year-End Transfer on November 23, 2015 (see © 11-29 for the full transmittal and resolution).

There is some variation from year to year regarding which departments or offices donate and which receive the transfers at the end of the year. For more detail, see © 30-36: The summary table below shows the departments and offices that most commonly fall into both categories.

Department	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
Circuit Court	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	No Transfer	No Transfer
Sheriff's Office	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient
State's Attorney	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient
Consumer Protection	Recipient	Recipient	No Transfer	Recipient	No Transfer
Corrections	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	No Transfer
County Attorney	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient
Economic Development	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient
Ethics Commission	Recipient	No Transfer	Recipient	No Transfer	Recipient
General Services	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient
Health and Human Services	Donor	Donor	Donor	No Transfer	No Transfer
Human Resources	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient
Human Rights	No Transfer	No Transfer	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient
Police	Donor	Donor	Donor	Donor	Donor
Public Information	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient
Fire and Rescue	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient
Mass Transit	Recipient	Recipient	No Transfer	Recipient	No Transfer
Cable TV	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient	No Transfer	No Transfer
Leaf Vacuuming	Donor	Donor	Recipient	Recipient	Recipient
Permitting Services	Recipient	No Transfer	Recipient	Recipient	No Transfer
Solid Waste Disposal	Donor	Donor	Donor	Donor	Donor

⁸ See County Charter, §315 and Annotated Code of Maryland, Article 19, §37 and §40.

Currently, the quarterly analyses are circulated, but there is no systematic response to them. A more structured system, in which the Council's Committees all make time to follow up on the second quarterly analysis in February⁹ (remember, the third quarterly analysis is received in May), would enable **each Committee to review the second quarterly analyses in much the same way that Committees reviewed the Savings Plan this past summer—in an intensive 1-2 week set of worksessions in which many issues/departments within a Committee's jurisdiction were handled in each worksession.**

The quarterly analyses, along with the most recent (November/December) year-end transfer, provide Committees with two data points: the quarterly analysis indicates which departments are on pace to overspend their budgets in the current year, while the year-end transfer identifies departments that overspent their budgets in the previous year. These two data points will help Committees to identify departments that are likely to overspend in the future and to request additional information to determine the causes.

For FY17, Council staff will reference historical information on quarterly analyses and year-end transfers in the body of the budget memos to committees. With more historical information, Committees will be better able to judge whether the recommended budgets (transmitted in March) accurately reflect anticipated expenditures.

Finally, if the third quarterly analysis (transmitted in May) indicates that departments and offices, in the aggregate, are likely to overspend the tax supported appropriation, then the Executive should indicate in the transmittal how that issue will be addressed. Doing so will help **avoid unnecessarily transferring appropriations from non-tax supported budgets to cover overspending in tax supported budgets.** Council staff recommends the following change to the current budget provision (added language is underlined).

As required by Charter Section 209 and as a condition of spending any funds appropriated in this resolution, the Office of Management and Budget must provide to the Council the second and third quarterly budget analysis of department and office expenditures and revenues no later than 45 days after the end of the second and third fiscal quarters. If the third quarterly analysis indicates that the tax-supported expenditures and encumbrances, in the aggregate, will exceed the latest tax-supported appropriations, then the transmittal must include the Executive's recommendations for avoiding a transfer of non-tax supported appropriations to tax supported budgets.

Attachments:

- © 1 Charter, Article 3 (Finance)
- © 8 FY16 Reporting and Notification Requirements
- © 9 Ride On Service Changes
- © 10 FY11 Budget Controls Implemented in ERP
- © 11 FY15 Year-End Transfer
- © 30 Appendix: Recurring Recipients and Donors of Year-End Transfers

⁹ Because the third quarterly analysis occurs in May when the Council is finalizing the budget, it would be a practical impossibility to add worksessions during that time frame to review the third quarterly analysis.

[Print](#)

Montgomery County Code

Article 3. Finance.

Sec. 301. Fiscal Year.

The fiscal year of the County shall commence on July 1 of each year and end on June 30 in the following year, unless otherwise prescribed by state law.

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 4/7/99 clarifying that the Council may place conditions on appropriations prior to June 1, with certain limitations.

Sec. 302. Six-Year Programs for Public Services, Capital Improvements, and Fiscal Policy.

The County Executive shall submit to the Council, not later than January 15 of each even-numbered year, a comprehensive six-year program for capital improvements. The County Executive shall submit to the Council, not later than March 15 of each year, comprehensive six-year programs for public services and fiscal policy. The six-year programs shall require a vote of at least five Councilmembers for approval or modification. Final Council approval of the six-year programs shall occur at or about the date of budget approval.

The public services program shall include a statement of program objectives and recommend levels of public service by the County government, and shall provide an estimate of costs, a statement of revenue sources, and an estimate of the impact of the program on County revenues and the capital budget.

The capital improvements program shall include a statement of the objectives of capital programs and the relationship of capital programs to the County's long-range development plans; shall recommend capital projects and a construction schedule; and shall provide an estimate of costs, a statement of anticipated revenue sources, and an estimate of the impact of the program on County revenues and the operating budget. The capital improvements program shall, to the extent authorized by law, include all capital projects and programs of all agencies for which the County sets tax rates or approves budgets or programs. The Council may amend an approved capital improvements program at any time by an affirmative vote of six Councilmembers.

The fiscal program shall show projections of revenues and expenditures for all functions, recommend revenue and expenditure policies for the program period and analyze the impact of tax and expenditure patterns on public programs and the economy of the County.

The County Executive shall provide such other information relating to these programs as may be prescribed by law.

All capital improvement projects which are estimated to cost in excess of an amount to be established by law or which the County Council determines to possess unusual characteristics or to be of sufficient public importance shall be individually authorized by law; provided however, that any project declared by the County Council to be of an emergency nature necessary for the

protection of the public health or safety shall not be subject to this requirement if the project is approved by the affirmative vote of six Councilmembers. Any project mandated by law, statutory or otherwise, interstate compact, or any project required by law to serve two or more jurisdictions shall, likewise, not be subject to this requirement. The County Council shall prescribe by law the methods and procedures for implementation of this provision. (Election of 11-7-78; election of 11-4-86; election of 11-3-92; election of 11-5-96.)

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 4/7/99 clarifying that the Council may place conditions on appropriations prior to June 1, with certain limitations. See County Attorney Opinion dated 2/5/96 explaining that the budget must include recommended expenditures and revenue services for the Board of Education and including the legislative history of the section. See County Attorney Opinion No. 90.008 dated 11/20/90 discussing the use of consent calendars to consolidate capital improvement bills and proposed amendments to the County Code to permit more than one item on the consent calendar at a time. [attachment]

Sec. 303. Capital and Operating Budgets.

The County Executive shall submit to the Council, not later than January 15 and March 15, respectively of each year, proposed capital and operating budgets including recommended expenditures and revenue sources for the ensuing fiscal year and any other information in such form and detail as the County Executive shall determine and as may be prescribed by law. These budgets shall be consistent with the six-year programs. A summary shall be submitted with the budgets containing an analysis of the fiscal implications for the County of all available budgets of any agencies for which the Council sets tax rates, makes levies, approves programs or budgets. (Election of 11-6-84; election of 11-3-92.)

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 5/5/09 regarding the County Executive's ability to impound appropriated funds. See County Attorney Opinion dated 10/1/08 explaining Council's ability to impose limitations on the Executive's ability to seek and obtain grants. See County Attorney Opinion dated 4/7/99 clarifying that the Council may place conditions on appropriations prior to June 1, with certain limitations. See County Attorney Opinion dated 6/9/98 addressing the creation of Department of Liquor Control by State law and the department's funding and expenditures. See County Attorney Opinion dated 5/8/98 explaining that State law created the Department of Liquor Control and gives the Council oversight over the department, but does not give the Council budget or appropriation authority. See County Attorney Opinion dated 2/5/96 explaining that the budget must include recommended expenditures and revenue services for the Board of Education and including the legislative history of the section.

Sec. 304. Budget Hearing.

The Council shall hold public hearings on the proposed budget and the six-year programs required by this Charter, commencing not earlier than twenty-one days following their receipt.

Sec. 305. Approval of the Budget; Tax Levies.

The Council may add to, delete from, increase or decrease any appropriation item in the operating or capital budget. The Council shall approve each budget, as amended, and appropriate the funds therefor not later than June 1 of the year in which it is submitted.

An aggregate operating budget which exceeds the aggregate operating budget for the preceding fiscal year by a percentage increase greater than the annual average increase of the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers for the Washington-Baltimore metropolitan area, or any successor index, for the twelve months preceding December first of each year requires the affirmative vote of six Councilmembers. For the purposes of this section, the aggregate operating budget does not include: (1) the operating budget for any enterprise fund; (2) the operating budget for the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission; (3) expenditures equal to tuition and tuition-related charges estimated to be received by Montgomery College; and (4) any grant which can only be spent for a specific purpose and which cannot be spent until receipt of the entire amount of revenue is assured from a source other than County government.

The Council shall annually adopt spending affordability guidelines for the capital and operating budgets, including guidelines for the aggregate capital and aggregate operating budgets. The Council shall by law establish the process and criteria for adopting spending affordability guidelines. Any aggregate capital budget or aggregate operating budget that exceeds the guidelines then in effect requires the affirmative vote of seven Councilmembers for approval.

By June 30 each year, the Council shall make tax levies deemed necessary to finance the budgets. Unless approved by an affirmative vote of nine, not seven, Councilmembers, the Council shall not levy an ad valorem tax on real property to finance the budgets that will produce total revenue that exceeds the total revenue produced by the tax on real property in the preceding fiscal year plus a percentage of the previous year's real property tax revenues that equals any increase in the Consumer Price Index as computed under this section. This limit does not apply to revenue from: (1) newly constructed property, (2) newly rezoned property, (3) property that, because of a change in state law, is assessed differently than it was assessed in the previous tax year, (4) property that has undergone a change in use, and (5) any development district tax used to fund capital improvement projects. (Election of 11-7-78; election of 11-6-84; election of 11-6-90; election of 11-3-92; election of 11-8-94; election of 11-3-98; election of 11-4-08.)

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 5/5/09 regarding the County executive's ability to impound appropriated funds. See County Attorney Opinion dated 10/1/08 explaining Council's ability to impose limitations on the Executive's ability to seek and obtain grants. See County Attorney Opinion dated 6/20/06, concerning the Charter revenue limit, which interpreted Charter Section 305. See County Attorney Opinion dated 5/10/99 recognizing that authorized reimbursement for college tuition, training and/or education costs made to County employees do not violate the Charter. See County Attorney Opinion dated 4/7/99 clarifying that the Council may place conditions on appropriations prior to June 1, with certain limitations. See County Attorney Opinion dated 6/9/98 addressing the creation of Department of Liquor Control by State law and the department's funding and expenditures. See County Attorney Opinion dated 5/8/98 explaining that State law created the Department of Liquor Control and gives the Council oversight over the department, but does not give the Council budget or appropriation authority. See County Attorney Opinion dated 1/26/98 analyzing a petition to amend charter to require any increase in taxes to be approved by referendum. See County Attorney Opinion dated 7/14/94 explaining that the Education Article allows Council to place restrictions on tuition and fees by the Board of Trustees of Montgomery College, and that a proposed amendment to Charter § 305 re approval of budget, appropriation of funds, and levying taxes does not appear to conflict with State law. See County Attorney Opinion dated 9/3/92 explaining flaws in § 305 based on a misleading petition and an amendment that conflicts with State law. See County Attorney Opinion dated 7/14/94 explaining flaws in § 305 based on a misleading petition and an amendment that conflicts with State law. See County Attorney Opinion dated 10/30/91-A describing the additions to Charter § 305 by Question F as not conflicting with the TRIM amendment.

Sec. 306. Item Veto or Reduction.

Upon approval of the budget, it shall be delivered within three days to the County Executive who within ten days thereafter may disapprove or reduce any item contained in it. If the County Executive disapproves or reduces any item in the budget, it shall be returned to the Council with the reasons for the disapproval or reduction in writing. The Council may, not later than June 30 of that year, reapprove any item over the disapproval or reduction of the County Executive by the affirmative vote of six members, except that the affirmative vote of five members shall be required in the case of the budgets of the Council, the Fire and Rescue Commission, the Fire Departments and Rescue Squads, the Housing Opportunities Commission and Montgomery College. (Election of 11-4-80; election of 11-2-82; election of 11-4-86; election of 11-8-88; election of 11-3-92.)

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 5/5/09 regarding the County Executive's ability to impound appropriated funds. See County Attorney Opinion dated 4/7/99 clarifying that the Council may place conditions on appropriations prior to June 1, with certain limitations.

Sec. 307. Supplemental Appropriations.

Any supplemental appropriation shall be recommended by the County Executive, who shall specify the source of funds to finance it. The Council shall hold a public hearing on each proposed supplemental appropriation after at least one week's notice. A supplemental appropriation that would comply with, avail the County of, or put into effect a grant or a federal, state, or county law or regulation, or one that is approved after January 1 of any fiscal year, requires an affirmative vote of five Councilmembers. A supplemental appropriation for any other purpose that is approved before January 1 of any fiscal year requires an affirmative vote of six Councilmembers. The Council may, in a single action, approve more than one supplemental appropriation. The Executive may disapprove or reduce a supplemental appropriation, and the Council may reapprove the appropriation, as if it were an item in the annual budget. (Election of 11-7-2000.)

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 5/5/09 regarding the County Executive's ability to impound appropriated funds. See County Attorney Opinion dated 10/1/08 explaining Council's ability to impose limitations on the Executive's ability to seek and obtain grants. See County Attorney Opinion dated 4/7/99-A clarifying that the Council may place conditions on appropriations prior to June 1, with certain limitations.

Sec. 308. Special Appropriations.

A special appropriation is an appropriation which states that it is necessary to meet an unforeseen disaster or other emergency, or to act without delay in the public interest. Each special appropriation shall be approved by not less than six Councilmembers. The Council may approve a special appropriation at any time after public notice by news release. Each special appropriation shall specify the source of funds to finance it. (Election of 11-4-86; election of 11-7-2000.)

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 5/5/09 regarding the County Executive's ability to impound appropriated funds. See County Attorney Opinion dated 4/7/99 clarifying that the Council may place conditions on appropriations prior to June 1, with certain limitations.

Sec. 309. Transfer of Funds.

The County Executive may at any time transfer an unencumbered appropriation balance within a division or between divisions of the same department. Transfers between departments, boards or commissions, or to any new account, shall be made only by the County Council upon the recommendation of the County Executive. The total cumulative transfers from any one appropriation shall not exceed ten percent of the original appropriation. No transfer shall be made between the operating and capital budget appropriation.

Sec. 310. Surplus.

The County may accumulate earned surplus in any enterprise fund or unappropriated surplus in any other fund. With respect to the General Fund, any unappropriated surplus shall not exceed five percent of the General Fund revenue for the preceding fiscal year. An unappropriated surplus may be used to fund any supplemental or special appropriations. (Election of 11-7-2000.)

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 4/7/99 clarifying that the Council may place conditions on appropriations prior to June 1, with certain limitations.

Sec. 311. Limitations on Expenditures.

No expenditures of County funds shall be made or authorized in excess of the available unencumbered appropriations therefor.

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 10/28/10 comparing the limits on Council authority to make changes to retirement benefits with its ability to modify health benefits. See County Attorney Opinion dated 10/1/08 explaining Council's ability to impose limitations on the Executive's ability to seek and obtain grants. See County attorney Opinion dated 4/28/08 regarding collective bargaining negotiations of benefits for current employees and future retirees. See County Attorney Opinion dated 9/7/07 discussing methods of acquiring the construction of infrastructure for development districts. See County Attorney Opinion dated 5/3/00 clarifying that the County cannot enter into agreements until funds have been appropriated.

Editor's note—Former Sec. 311A, Limitations on Expenditures for Landfills in Residential Zones, adopted by the election of 11-7-08, was repealed by the election of 11-4-08. See East v. Gilchrist, 296 Md. 368, A.2d 285 (1983); holding section 311A cannot be given effect under circumstances involving an order of the secretary of health and mental hygiene and requirement of local funding under public general law.

Editor's note—Former Sec. 311B, Limitations on Expenditures, Contract, and Permits for Burying or Trenching Sewage Sludge in Residential Zones, adopted by the election of 11-4-80, was repealed by the election of 11-4-08.

Sec. 312. Indebtedness.

The County may incur debt. No indebtedness for a term of more than one year shall be incurred by the County to meet current operating expenses. All County indebtedness for a term in excess of one year shall become due not later than thirty years after the date of issuance. If at any time the Council shall have failed to appropriate and to make available sufficient funds to provide for the timely payment of the interest and principal then due upon all County indebtedness, it shall be the duty of

the Director of Finance to pay, or to make available for payment, to the holders of such indebtedness from the first revenues thereafter received applicable to the general funds of the County, a sum equal to such interest and principal. (Election of 11-6-90.)

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 10/23/91 explaining that a loan guarantee to a non-profit corporation is comparable to that of the County making a loan under Ch. 23B. A loan guarantee would not constitute either an operating expense or a capital expense, and could not exceed 1 year.

Sec. 313. Purchasing.

The Council shall prescribe by law a centralized system of purchasing and contracting for all goods and services used by the County. The centralized purchasing system shall be administered under the professional supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer subject to the direction of the County Executive.

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 4/13/99 (4/15/99 on cover memo) analyzing the Chief Administrative Officer's authority to make a sole-source contract in excess of \$25,000 without obtaining consent of the director of procurement or the contract review committee. See County Attorney Opinion dated 9/23/91 explaining that State law does not prohibit the Department of Liquor Control from entering into contracts with private entities to operate the liquor stores.

Editor's note—Former Sec. 313A, Purchasing, Contracting for Goods, Services with C&P Telephone Company, adopted by the election of 11-2-82, was repealed by the election of 11-4-08. In Rowe, et al. v. The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Maryland, et al., 65 Md. App. 527, 501 A.2d (1985), it was held that Charter section 313A could not be given effect because it conflicted with a state Public Service Commission Order.

Sec. 314. Competitive Procurement.

The Council shall prescribe by law for competitive procurement for purchases by or contracts with the County in excess of an amount or amounts established by law. (Election of 11-4-80; election of 11-6-90.)

Editor's note—See County Attorney Opinion dated 11/12/97 indicating that the Charter permits the use of merit system employees for pilot programs and enterprise programs, but prohibits the use of contract employees for these programs. See County Attorney Opinion dated 9/23/91 explaining that State law does not prohibit the Department of Liquor Control from entering into contracts with private entities to operate the liquor stores.

Sec. 315. Audit.

The Council shall contract with, or otherwise employ, a certified public accountant to make annually an independent post audit of all financial records and actions of the County, its officials and employees. The complete report of the audit shall be presented to the Council and copies of it shall be made available to the public.

Editor's note—Res. No. 10-457, introduced and adopted on Nov. 1, 1983, adopted procedures for the selection of the independent auditor.

Sec. 316. Public Access to Fiscal Documents.

All fiscal documents required by this Charter shall be public records, and copies shall be made available to the public. Any estimates, reports, or justifications on which they are based shall be open to public inspection subject to reasonable regulations.

**Recurring and Date Specific Notification and Reporting Requirements
FY16 Operating Budget**

Reporting Date	Budget Provision #	Keyword	Department
8/30/2015	#51	Initially funded positions	Chief Administrative Officer
10/15/2015	#41	EMS Transport Reimbursement Fee	Fire and Rescue Service
11/25/2015	#51	Initially funded positions	Chief Administrative Officer
12/15/2015	#4	Drug Enforcement Forfeiture Fund	Chief of Police
1/1/2016	#40	EMS Transports	Fire and Rescue Service
2/12/2016	#53	Community Grants	Management and Budget
2/15/2016	#50 and #60	2nd Quarterly Analysis and Capital Outlay	Management and Budget
3/15/2016	#4	Drug Enforcement Forfeiture Fund	Chief of Police
3/15/2016	#41	EMS Transport Reimbursement Fee	Management and Budget
4/15/2016	#41	EMS Transport Reimbursement Fee	Fire and Rescue Service
5/16/2016	#50 and #60	3rd Quarterly Analysis and Capital Outlay	Management and Budget
6/30/2016	#40	EMS Transports	Fire and Rescue Service
8/31/2016	#53	Community Grants	Management and Budget
Recurring	#10	Future, federal, state or other grants	County Executive
Recurring	#13	Future, federal, state or other grants	County Executive
Recurring	#14	Future, federal, state or other grants	Fire and Rescue Service
Recurring	#15	Future, federal, state or other grants	County Executive
Recurring	#16	Future, federal, state or other grants	County Executive
Recurring	#51	Savings Plan	County Executive
Recurring	#51	Procurement Freeze	Chief Administrative Officer
Recurring	#52	Fund balances	County Executive
Recurring	#58	Applying for grants	Chief Administrative Officer
Recurring	#59	Leases	Chief Administrative Officer
Recurring	#67	Transfers-Utilities NDA to Debt Service	County Executive

Trans



GO
CC
SBF
LL

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MEMORANDUM

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

Al R. Roshdieh
Acting Director

October 19, 2015

TO: George Leventhal, President
Montgomery County Council

FROM: Al Roshdieh, Acting Director
Department of Transportation

SUBJECT: Ride On Services Changes

The purpose of this memo is to provide you the modifications the County Executive has approved to the Ride On service reductions included in the FY16 Savings Plan. On July 28, 2015, the County Council passed a savings plan that included eliminations to eight (8) Ride On services on three bus routes (routes 42, 83 & 98) with an expected yield of \$1.7 million in savings during FY16 and \$3.4 million in savings for FY17. In accordance with our federal Title VI Public Participation requirement, we conducted a public participation process beginning in August 2015 and ending in early October 2015 which included on board notifications to our customers, announcements on our web site, outreach meetings to impacted groups, and two public forums.

We received over 225 written comments opposing full service eliminations and over 90 residents attended the public forums. Impacted groups include seniors, students, low-income riders and passengers with disabilities. Most customers told us that there would be significant hardships with full service eliminations including job loss, lack of mobility from their home for medical appointments and students who would not be able to get to school. Many alternatives to full eliminations were suggested from our riders. We have carefully considered all of the comments received and we are modifying our FY16 Savings Plan.

The County Executive is restoring the weekday service on the routes 42 and 98 with reduced span of service in the evening period. He is also restoring the Saturday service on the routes 42, 83 & 98 with reduced span of service in the both the morning and evening periods. He is proceeding with the Sunday service eliminations on all three routes as planned. Some Ride On riders will continue to be impacted but most will still be able to use the bus service for their much needed purposes.

The result of these modifications yields \$750,670 in savings during FY16 and \$1.5 million in savings for FY17. We appreciate your concurrence on this matter as we strive to provide Montgomery County residents the services they need. If you have any questions, please contact me 240-777-7175.

ARR:val

cc: Carolyn Biggins

Office of the Director

101 Monroe Street, 10th Floor • Rockville, Maryland 20850 • 240-777-7170 • 240-777-7178 FAX
www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dot

RECEIVED
MONTGOMERY COUNTY
2015 OCT 20 PM 1:37

9



OFFICES OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

Timothy L. Firestine
Chief Administrative Officer

MEMORANDUM

June 4, 2010

To: Executive Branch Department and Office Directors
From: Timothy L. Firestine, Chief Administrative Officer
Subject: FY11 Budget Controls Implemented in ERP

As you know, Phase I of the ERP system (Financials and Purchasing) go live on July 6, 2010. Therefore, beginning in FY11, you will be unable to expend operating dollars if you have insufficient operating appropriation. Hard stops on expenditures are going into effect on total Department/NDA appropriated Operating Expenses (OE) by fund. This budget control provides a tool to assist in managing the budget. If your department staff submit a direct payment or create a requisition in the ERP system that will exceed the budgeted OE, the ERP system will give an error message stating that they have exceeded the department's fund balance and the transaction will not post.

We are aware of specific department situations that might cause difficulty in staying within the OE limit (e.g., purchase of supplies for snow removal by Department of Transportation (DOT) and Department of General Services (DGS) during winter months). Any other overspending OE during the fiscal year, will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

Below is a series of alternatives that departments must take into account/enact before consideration will be granted to remove budget controls from your department.

1. Submit an Executive Transfer budget change request to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to move Personnel Costs (PC) to Operating Expenses (OE) within the County Charter's 10% transferability limit. Please note that your department will need to show that savings are available in PC before OMB will approve this transaction.
2. Liquidate current year encumbrances to generate additional current year OE appropriation.
3. Discuss with OMB a request for a Council Supplemental Appropriation. This needs to be done early in the fiscal year because it can take up to two months to administer a Council Supplemental Appropriation.
4. If all the above have been exhausted or is temporarily impractical, and the department can adequately document the need to over-spend your budget, then a request to remove the control for your department should be submitted to the Director of OMB.

TLF:jb

c: Department Administrative Service Coordinators
Karen Hawkins, Department of Finance
Lenny Moore, Department of Finance
Pam Jones, Department of General Services
Office of Management and Budget Staff



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

November 23, 2015

TO: George Leventhal, Council President

FROM: Isiah Leggett, County Executive 

SUBJECT: Year-End Transfers for the FY15 Operating Budget

The Department of Finance and the Office of Management and Budget have completed an analysis of expenditures by County Departments for FY15. The purpose of this memorandum is to transmit to Council the year-end transfers for the FY15 Operating Budget. Transfers of appropriation totaling \$12,615,300 are required for several departments to cover actual FY15 expenditures.

Some departments ended FY15 with higher spending than appropriated, consistent with our year-end projections at the end of last fiscal year. Other departments are included in this year-end transfer to reconcile over-spending in a category (i.e., personnel costs or operating expenditures) even though total department appropriations were not over-spent. This is because the County Council appropriates by category rather than at the total department level.

These transfers represent the following percentages of the FY15 appropriations for their respective funds and functions:

	<u>FY15</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Transfers</u>	<u>% of Total Fund</u> <u>Appropriation</u>
General Fund: Legislative	\$ 13,886,857	\$ 332,470	2.39%
General Fund: Judicial (incl. Sheriff)	49,444,525	568,000	1.15%
General Fund: Executive	770,760,903	3,216,960	0.42%
General Fund: Non-Departmental	295,579,702	808,850	0.27%
Special Funds: Tax Supported	386,371,569	3,050,050	0.79%
Special Funds: Non-Tax Supported	421,798,387	660,570	0.16%
Special Funds: Internal Service Funds	263,122,536	3,978,400	1.51%

Attached is a recommended resolution for transfers of appropriation to implement these changes. Justifications for the recommended budgetary actions are attached to the resolution.

George Leventhal, President, County Council
November 23, 2015
Page 2

Staff from the Office of Management and Budget and the appropriate departments will be present to provide additional information that may be requested when the Council considers these transfers. The Department of Finance is still in the process of completing its work on the year-end financial statements. Staff will provide additional information if changes to this transfer resolution are necessary prior to Council action. If you have any questions, please contact Alex Espinosa at (240) 777-2800.

IL:aae

Attachment: Transfers of Appropriation for the Year-End Close Out of the FY15 Operating Budget
Justifications for Recommended Transfers of Appropriation

Resolution No: _____
Introduced: _____
Adopted: _____

COUNTY COUNCIL
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: County Council

Subject: Transfers of Appropriation for the Year-End Close Out of the FY15 Operating Budget

Background

1. Section 309 of the Charter of Montgomery County, Maryland provides that transfers of appropriations between departments, boards, and commissions, or to any new account shall be made only by the County Council upon recommendation of the County Executive.
2. The County Executive recommends the attached transfers of appropriation for the year-end close out of the FY15 Operating Budget as necessary and desirable. The justifications for the recommended transfers, entitled "Justifications for Recommended Transfers of Appropriation", are also attached.

ACTION

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland approves the following resolution:

The County Council approves the Transfers of Appropriation for the Year-End Close Out of the FY15 Operating Budget as recommended by the County Executive.

This is a correct copy of Council Action.

Linda Lauer, Clerk of the Council

FY 15 YEAR-END TRANSFERS OF APPROPRIATION

FUND, FUNCTION, DEPARTMENT	TRANSFERS TO \$	TRANSFERS FROM \$
TRANSFERS TO:		
GENERAL FUND:		
Legislative and Judicial Branch Departments		
County Council		
Personnel Costs	236,690	
Board of Appeals		
Personnel Costs	20,930	
Legislative Oversight		
Personnel Costs	15,280	
Merit System Protection Board		
Operating Expenses	59,570	
State's Attorney		
Personnel Costs	33,880	
Operating Expenses	<u>100,330</u>	
	134,210	
Sheriff		
Personnel Costs	432,590	
Operating Expenses	<u>1,200</u>	
	433,790	
Subtotal Legislative and Judicial Branch Departments	900,470	
Executive Branch Departments		
County Executive		
Personnel Costs	134,420	
Community Engagement Cluster		
Personnel Costs	6,270	
Ethics Commission		
Personnel Costs	1,260	
Intergovernmental Relations		
Personnel Costs	3,330	

FY 15 YEAR-END TRANSFERS OF APPROPRIATION

FUND, FUNCTION, DEPARTMENT	TRANSFERS TO \$	TRANSFERS FROM \$
County Attorney		
Personnel Costs	632,470	
Operating Expenses	<u>10,860</u>	
	643,330	
Human Resources		
Personnel Costs	509,950	
Operating Expenses	<u>2,920</u>	
	512,870	
Public Information		
Personnel Costs	99,490	
General Services		
Personnel Costs	1,094,190	
Human Rights		
Personnel Costs	25,470	
Economic Development		
Operating Expenses	696,330	
Subtotal Executive Branch Departments	3,216,960	

FY 15 YEAR-END TRANSFERS OF APPROPRIATION

FUND, FUNCTION, DEPARTMENT	TRANSFERS TO \$	TRANSFERS FROM \$
TRANSFERS TO:		
GENERAL FUND:		
Non- Departmental Accounts		
Municipal Tax Duplication		
Operating Expenses	58,070	
Takoma Park Library Payments		
Operating Expenses	12,990	
Conference and Visitors Bureau		
Operating Expenses	119,360	
Working Families Income Supplement		
Operating Expenses	618,430	
Subtotal Non- Departmental Accounts	808,850	
Total General Funds	4,926,280	
TRANSFERS TO:		
SPECIAL FUNDS: Tax Supported		
Fire and Rescue Service		
Personnel Costs	3,039,800	
Operating Expenses	<u>10,250</u>	
	3,050,050	

FY 15 YEAR-END TRANSFERS OF APPROPRIATION

FUND, FUNCTION, DEPARTMENT	TRANSFERS TO \$	TRANSFERS FROM \$
TOTAL SPECIAL FUNDS: Tax Supported	3,050,050	
Total Tax Supported	7,976,330	
TRANSFERS TO:		
SPECIAL FUNDS: Non-Tax Supported		
Leaf Vacuuming		
Operating Expenses	660,570	
TOTAL SPECIAL FUNDS: Non-Tax Supported	660,570	
TRANSFERS TO:		
INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS		
Employee Health Benefit Self Insurance		
Personnel Costs	111,340	
Operating Expenses	<u>3,867,060</u>	
	3,978,400	
TOTAL INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS: Non-Tax Supported	3,978,400	
TOTAL TRANSFERS TO	12,615,300	

FY 15 YEAR-END TRANSFERS OF APPROPRIATION

FUND, FUNCTION, DEPARTMENT	TRANSFERS TO \$	TRANSFERS FROM \$
TRANSFERS FROM:		
GENERAL FUND:		
Police		
Personnel Costs		2,337,800
Operating Expenses		<u>477,900</u>
		2,815,700
TOTAL GENERAL FUND		2,815,700
Total Tax Supported		2,815,700
TRANSFERS FROM:		
SPECIAL FUNDS: Non-Tax Supported		
Montgomery Housing Initiative		
Operating Expenses		2,588,700
Solid Waste Disposal		
Operating Expenses		2,067,400
Risk Management Self Insurance		
Operating Expenses		5,143,500
TOTAL SPECIAL FUNDS: Non-Tax Supported		9,799,600
TOTAL TRANSFERS FROM		12,615,300

FY15
JUSTIFICATIONS FOR RECOMMENDED TRANSFERS OF APPROPRIATION

1. **County Council**
Personnel costs exceeded the budget due to staff changes and staff promotions.
2. **Board of Appeals**
Personnel costs exceeded the budget due to increased chargeback costs from the County Attorney and actual retirement costs being more than the budget.
3. **Legislative Oversight**
Personnel costs exceeded the appropriation due to a mid-year position reclassification.
4. **Merit System Protection Board**
Operating expenses exceeded the budget due to using a contractor to temporarily fill the vacant Executive Director's position.
5. **State's Attorney**
Operating expenses exceeded the budget due to mandated translation services, unfunded contract attorneys related to the Richmond decision, and higher than expected office expenses.
6. **County Executive**
The total spending in the department was less than budget, but a year-end transfer is needed because of insufficient transferability. Personnel costs exceeded the budget due to actual retirement costs being greater than the budget and a lump-sum leave payout to a retired employee.

7. Community Engagement Cluster

Personnel costs exceeded the appropriation due to a mid-year position change, employee leave payout, and increased personnel costs at the Gilchrist Center.

8. Ethics Commission

Personnel costs exceeded the budget due to higher than budgeted staff salary costs and actual retirement costs being more than the budget.

9. Intergovernmental Relations

Personal costs exceeded the appropriation due to a mid-year position change.

10. Public Information

Personnel costs exceeded the budget due to overtime related to emergency response activations and group insurance costs being greater than the budget.

11. County Attorney

Personnel costs exceeded the budget because the budgeted lapse assumption was not achieved.

Operating expenses exceeded the budget because of child welfare contract attorneys.

12. Human Resources

Personnel costs exceeded the budget because lapsed positions were filled to handle an increased workload.

Operating expenses exceeded the budget due to computer software expenses.

13. General Services

Personnel costs exceeded the budget due to lapse not being met, unbudgeted overtime costs, and mid-year position changes due to the creation of the Office of Procurement.

14. Human Rights

Personnel costs exceeded the budget due to unbudgeted overtime costs and actual retirement costs that were more than the budget.

15. Sheriff

Personnel costs exceeded the appropriation due to overtime costs being greater than the budget.

Operating expenses exceeded the budget due to security service expenses.

16. Economic Development

Operating expenses exceeded the budget due to marketing initiatives, consultant studies of the Purple Line, conversion of the William Hanna Innovations Center to the National Cyber Security Center for Excellence, and Federal lobbying contracts.

17. NDA Municipal Tax Duplication

Operating expenses exceeded the appropriation due to higher than expected speed camera revenue payments to municipalities.

18. NDA Takoma Park Library Payment

Operating expenses exceeded the budget due to the difference between projected and actual real property assessments.

19. NDA Conference and Visitors Center Bureau

Operating expenses exceeded the appropriation because of higher than budgeted Hotel/Motel revenue.

20. NDA Working Families Income Supplement

Operating expenses exceeded the appropriation due to an increased number of recipients receiving the supplement.

21. Fire and Rescue Services

Personnel costs exceeded the budget due to actual retirement costs and overtime costs being greater than the budget and unbudgeted emergency pay.

Operating Expenses exceeded the budget due to payments to volunteer corporations in accordance with the EMST legislation.

22. Leaf Vacuuming

Operating expenses exceeded the appropriation due to higher than expected contractor costs and motor pool expenses being greater than the budget.

23. Employee Health Self Insurance Fund

Personnel costs exceeded the appropriation due to unbudgeted overtime.

Operating expenses exceeded the appropriation due to insurance claims, primarily with the County's prescription drug program, being greater than the budget.

Causes for the projected appropriation surpluses, which are to be transferred, are listed below:

1. **Police**

The surplus in personnel costs is due to lapse and turnover savings.

The surplus in operating expenses is due to actual motor pool expenditures being less than the budget.

2. **Solid Waste Disposal Fund**

The operating expense surplus is due to the following: lower than expected expenditures in the Transfer Station, Household Hazardous Waste, Gude Landfill, Oaks Landfill, and Recycling programs; and reduced Out-of-County Haul program costs.

3. **Montgomery Housing Initiative**

The operating expenses surplus is due to timing of re-appropriated program expenditures.

4. **Risk Management Self Insurance Fund**

The operating expenses surplus is due to lower than expected workers compensation claims.

FY2015 DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE (Thru Period 12)

A01 Tax Supported Funds

		Latest Budget (A)	YTD Actual (B)	YTD Encumb (C)	YTD Total Exp (B+C)	Variance (A-(B+C))
General Fund Total						
Board of Appeals Total						
02D	Personnel Costs	521,021.00	541,946.73	0.00	541,946.73	-20,925.73
	Operating Expenses	51,407.00	39,025.75	0.00	39,025.75	12,381.25
		572,428.00	580,972.48	0.00	580,972.48	-8,544.48
Board of Elections Total						
24D	Personnel Costs	3,493,204.00	3,477,873.73	0.00	3,477,873.73	15,330.27
	Operating Expenses	3,961,888.68	2,904,322.06	985,185.79	3,889,507.85	72,380.83
		7,455,092.68	6,382,195.79	985,185.79	7,367,381.58	87,711.10
Circuit Court Total						
10D	Personnel Costs	8,851,234.00	8,649,047.27	0.00	8,649,047.27	202,186.73
	Operating Expenses	3,013,049.00	2,410,810.82	583,909.55	2,994,720.37	18,328.63
		11,864,283.00	11,059,858.09	583,909.55	11,643,767.64	220,515.36
Community Engagement Cluster Total						
16D	Personnel Costs	2,715,799.00	2,722,067.54	0.00	2,722,067.54	-6,268.54
	Operating Expenses	817,571.56	799,982.73	17,584.15	817,566.88	4.68
		3,533,370.56	3,522,050.27	17,584.15	3,539,634.42	-6,263.86
Consumer Protection Total						
38D	Personnel Costs	2,117,128.00	2,064,750.01	0.00	2,064,750.01	52,377.99
	Operating Expenses	142,191.88	71,090.89	0.00	71,090.89	71,101.19
		2,259,319.88	2,135,840.70	0.00	2,135,840.70	123,479.18
Correction and Rehabilitation Total						
42D	Personnel Costs	63,456,170.00	63,437,009.18	0.00	63,437,009.18	19,160.82
	Operating Expenses	7,797,850.27	7,590,844.73	36,222.06	7,627,066.79	170,783.48
		71,254,020.27	71,027,853.91	36,222.06	71,064,075.97	189,944.30
County Attorney Total						
30D	Personnel Costs	4,671,416.00	5,303,883.60	0.00	5,303,883.60	-632,467.60
	Operating Expenses	971,754.95	950,412.48	32,197.61	982,610.09	-10,855.14
		5,643,170.95	6,254,296.08	32,197.61	6,286,493.69	-643,322.74
County Council Total						
01D	Personnel Costs	9,663,405.00	9,900,094.00	0.00	9,900,094.00	-236,689.00
	Operating Expenses	872,780.44	818,415.64	56,358.61	872,774.25	6.19
		10,536,185.44	10,716,509.64	56,358.61	10,772,868.25	-236,682.81
County Executive Total						
15D	Personnel Costs	4,402,577.00	4,536,987.08	0.00	4,536,987.08	-134,410.08
	Operating Expenses	842,217.21	589,122.04	21,524.39	610,646.43	231,570.78
		5,244,794.21	5,126,109.12	21,524.39	5,147,633.51	97,160.70
Economic Development Total						
76D	Personnel Costs	4,152,994.00	4,152,993.51	0.00	4,152,993.51	0.49
	Operating Expenses	7,339,597.09	7,588,008.89	447,917.16	8,035,926.05	-696,328.96
		11,492,591.09	11,741,002.40	447,917.16	12,168,919.56	-696,328.47
Emergency Management and Homeland Security Total						
49D	Personnel Costs	1,122,561.00	796,272.09	0.00	796,272.09	326,288.91
	Operating Expenses	386,138.00	391,510.50	-43,085.83	348,424.67	37,713.33
		1,508,699.00	1,187,782.59	-43,085.83	1,144,696.76	364,002.24
Environmental Protection Total						
80D	Personnel Costs	1,491,460.00	1,464,217.44	0.00	1,464,217.44	27,242.56
	Operating Expenses	480,753.82	314,550.64	83,038.77	397,589.41	83,164.41
		1,972,213.82	1,778,768.08	83,038.77	1,861,806.85	110,406.97
Ethics Commission Total						
19D	Personnel Costs	336,565.00	337,821.71	0.00	337,821.71	-1,256.71
	Operating Expenses	84,057.00	3,484.59	60,040.00	63,524.59	532.41
		400,622.00	341,306.30	60,040.00	401,346.30	-724.30
Finance Total						
32D	Personnel Costs	10,506,125.00	10,433,161.96	0.00	10,433,161.96	72,963.04
	Operating Expenses	3,735,469.39	2,592,805.55	939,464.94	3,532,270.49	203,198.90
		14,241,594.39	13,025,967.51	939,464.94	13,965,432.45	276,161.94
General Services Total						
36D	Personnel Costs	15,838,744.00	16,932,930.47	0.00	16,932,930.47	-1,094,186.47
	Operating Expenses	25,486,737.46	23,000,752.14	2,495,979.72	25,486,731.86	5.60
		41,325,481.46	39,933,682.61	2,495,979.72	42,429,662.33	-1,094,180.87
Health and Human Services Total						
60D	Personnel Costs	112,786,091.00	109,414,753.60	0.00	109,414,753.60	3,371,337.40
	Operating Expenses	101,531,346.44	96,905,593.26	4,620,735.97	101,526,329.23	5,017.21
		214,317,437.44	206,320,346.86	4,620,735.97	210,941,082.83	3,376,354.61
Housing and Community Affairs Total						

		Latest Budget (A)	YTD Actual (B)	YTD Encumb (C)	YTD Total Exp (B+C)	Variance (A-(B+C))
78D	Personnel Costs	4,301,563.00	4,301,553.36	0.00	4,301,553.36	9.64
	Operating Expenses	961,122.36	702,848.45	91,632.27	794,478.72	166,643.64
		5,262,685.36	5,004,399.81	91,632.27	5,096,032.08	166,653.28
Human Resources Total						
33D	Personnel Costs	5,059,413.00	5,569,354.09	0.00	5,569,354.09	-509,941.09
	Operating Expenses	3,097,136.17	2,625,841.07	474,206.61	3,100,047.68	-2,911.51
		8,156,549.17	8,195,195.16	474,206.61	8,669,401.77	-512,852.60
Human Rights Total						
46D	Personnel Costs	926,998.00	952,465.58	0.00	952,465.58	-25,467.58
	Operating Expenses	102,412.00	93,512.78	536.03	94,048.81	8,363.19
		1,029,410.00	1,045,978.36	536.03	1,046,514.39	-17,104.39
Inspector General Total						
08D	Personnel Costs	696,569.00	695,236.07	0.00	695,236.07	1,332.93
	Operating Expenses	108,425.50	20,067.36	38,507.50	58,574.86	49,850.64
		804,994.50	715,303.43	38,507.50	753,810.93	51,183.57
Intergovernmental Relations Total						
20D	Personnel Costs	788,284.00	791,606.63	0.00	791,606.63	-3,322.63
	Operating Expenses	86,379.00	86,377.46	0.00	86,377.46	1.54
		874,663.00	877,984.09	0.00	877,984.09	-3,321.09
Legislative Oversight Total						
03D	Personnel Costs	1,441,292.00	1,456,569.00	0.00	1,456,569.00	-15,277.00
	Operating Expenses	28,876.12	23,829.51	0.00	23,829.51	5,046.61
		1,470,168.12	1,480,398.51	0.00	1,480,398.51	-10,230.39
Management and Budget Total						
31D	Personnel Costs	3,813,578.00	3,719,432.67	0.00	3,719,432.67	94,145.33
	Operating Expenses	134,630.64	95,166.48	18,708.09	113,874.57	20,756.07
		3,948,208.64	3,814,599.15	18,708.09	3,833,307.24	114,901.40
Merit System Protection Board Total						
04D	Personnel Costs	128,610.10	124,753.83	0.00	124,753.83	3,756.27
	Operating Expenses	29,786.90	34,429.02	54,925.00	89,354.02	-59,567.12
		158,297.00	159,182.85	54,925.00	214,107.85	-55,810.85
NDA - Arts and Humanities Council Total						
99V17	Operating Expenses	4,442,699.96	4,442,699.92	0.00	4,442,699.92	0.04
		4,442,699.96	4,442,699.92	0.00	4,442,699.92	0.04
NDA - Boards, Committees and Commissions Total						
99V26	Operating Expenses	22,950.00	19,896.89	0.00	19,896.89	3,053.11
		22,950.00	19,896.89	0.00	19,896.89	3,053.11
NDA - Charter Review Commission Total						
99V27	Operating Expenses	150.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	150.00
		150.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	150.00
NDA - Community Grants Total						
99V18	Operating Expenses	9,222,332.92	8,050,397.86	1,133,251.85	9,183,649.71	38,683.21
		9,222,332.92	8,050,397.86	1,133,251.85	9,183,649.71	38,683.21
NDA - Compensation and Employee Benefit Adjustments Total						
99V05	Personnel Costs	292,980.00	123,929.18	0.00	123,929.18	169,050.82
	Operating Expenses	715,730.00	715,726.33	0.00	715,726.33	3.67
		1,008,710.00	839,655.51	0.00	839,655.51	169,054.49
NDA - Conference Center Total						
99V19	Personnel Costs	113,337.00	113,336.84	0.00	113,336.84	0.16
	Operating Expenses	499,550.00	50,290.44	0.00	50,290.44	449,259.56
		612,887.00	163,627.28	0.00	163,627.28	449,259.72
NDA - Conference and Visitors Bureau Total						
99V16	Operating Expenses	1,225,848.00	1,345,203.66	0.00	1,345,203.66	-119,355.66
		1,225,848.00	1,345,203.66	0.00	1,345,203.66	-119,355.66
NDA - Consolidated Retiree Health Benefit Trust - College Total						
99V42	Operating Expenses	1,974,000.00	1,974,000.00	0.00	1,974,000.00	0.00
		1,974,000.00	1,974,000.00	0.00	1,974,000.00	0.00
NDA - Consolidated Retiree Health Benefit Trust - MCPS Total						
99V41	Operating Expenses	85,507,000.00	85,507,000.00	0.00	85,507,000.00	0.00
		85,507,000.00	85,507,000.00	0.00	85,507,000.00	0.00
NDA - County Associations Total						
99V21	Operating Expenses	74,728.00	74,728.00	0.00	74,728.00	0.00
		74,728.00	74,728.00	0.00	74,728.00	0.00
NDA - Desktop Computer Modernization Total						
99V35	Operating Expenses	7,225,771.37	6,362,437.91	672,043.42	7,034,481.33	191,290.04
		7,225,771.37	6,362,437.91	672,043.42	7,034,481.33	191,290.04
NDA - Grants To Municipalities In Lieu Of						

		Latest Budget (A)	YTD Actual (B)	YTD Encumb (C)	YTD Total Exp (B+C)	Variance (A-(B+C))
Shares Tax Total						
99V08	Operating Expenses	28,020.00	28,011.89	0.00	28,011.89	8.11
		28,020.00	28,011.89	0.00	28,011.89	8.11
NDA - Group Insurance Retirees Total						
99V02	Operating Expenses	32,462,450.00	32,462,450.00	0.00	32,462,450.00	0.00
		32,462,450.00	32,462,450.00	0.00	32,462,450.00	0.00
NDA - Historical Activities Total						
99V15	Operating Expenses	102,589.60	124,801.16	-22,211.56	102,589.60	0.00
		102,589.60	124,801.16	-22,211.56	102,589.60	0.00
NDA - Homeowners' Association Road Maintenance Reimb. Total						
99V11	Operating Expenses	53,110.00	53,110.00	0.00	53,110.00	0.00
		53,110.00	53,110.00	0.00	53,110.00	0.00
NDA - Housing Opportunities Commission Total						
99V14	Operating Expenses	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NDA - Inauguration and Transition Total						
99V34	Operating Expenses	5,000.00	3,883.57	0.00	3,883.57	1,116.43
		5,000.00	3,883.57	0.00	3,883.57	1,116.43
NDA - Independent Audit Total						
99V24	Operating Expenses	428,589.00	258,571.00	24,198.00	282,769.00	145,820.00
		428,589.00	258,571.00	24,198.00	282,769.00	145,820.00
NDA - Interagency Technology, Policy, and Coordination Commission Total						
99V29	Operating Expenses	5,850.00	1,666.49	0.00	1,666.49	4,183.51
		5,850.00	1,666.49	0.00	1,666.49	4,183.51
NDA - Leases Total						
99V30	Personnel Costs	100,440.00	100,435.27	0.00	100,435.27	4.73
	Operating Expenses	20,910,564.37	20,064,344.66	32,188.42	20,096,533.08	814,031.29
		21,011,004.37	20,164,779.93	32,188.42	20,196,968.35	814,036.02
NDA - Legislative Branch Communications Outreach Total						
99V44	Personnel Costs	179,213.00	179,210.53	0.00	179,210.53	2.47
	Operating Expenses	419,619.55	217,895.31	182,448.16	400,343.47	19,276.08
		598,832.55	397,105.84	182,448.16	579,554.00	19,278.55
NDA - Metro Washington Council of Governments Total						
99V22	Operating Expenses	816,409.00	815,579.00	0.00	815,579.00	830.00
		816,409.00	815,579.00	0.00	815,579.00	830.00
NDA - Montgomery Coalition for Adult English Literacy Total						
99V20	Operating Expenses	1,257,058.00	1,257,058.00	0.00	1,257,058.00	0.00
		1,257,058.00	1,257,058.00	0.00	1,257,058.00	0.00
NDA - Motor Pool Fund Contribution Total						
99V13	Operating Expenses	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NDA - Municipal Tax Duplication Total						
99V07	Operating Expenses	8,048,578.00	8,106,641.00	0.00	8,106,641.00	-58,063.00
		8,048,578.00	8,106,641.00	0.00	8,106,641.00	-58,063.00
NDA - Prisoner Medical Services Total						
99V25	Operating Expenses	50,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50,000.00
		50,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50,000.00
NDA - Public Technology, Inc. Total						
99V23	Operating Expenses	20,000.00	20,000.00	0.00	20,000.00	0.00
		20,000.00	20,000.00	0.00	20,000.00	0.00
NDA - Retiree Health Benefits Trust Total						
99V38	Operating Expenses	38,577,480.00	38,577,480.00	0.00	38,577,480.00	0.00
		38,577,480.00	38,577,480.00	0.00	38,577,480.00	0.00
NDA - Risk Management (General Fund) Total						
99V12	Operating Expenses	19,547,940.00	18,996,436.91	0.00	18,996,436.91	551,503.09
		19,547,940.00	18,996,436.91	0.00	18,996,436.91	551,503.09
NDA - Rockville Parking District Total						
99V31	Operating Expenses	376,600.00	366,136.82	0.00	366,136.82	10,463.18
		376,600.00	366,136.82	0.00	366,136.82	10,463.18
NDA - Snow Removal and Storm Cleanup Total						
99V43	Operating Expenses	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NDA - State Positions Supplement Total						
99V03	Personnel Costs	60,756.00	26,656.61	0.00	26,656.61	34,097.39
		60,756.00	26,656.61	0.00	26,656.61	34,097.39
NDA - State Property Tax Services Total						

		Latest Budget (A)	YTD Actual (B)	YTD Encumb (C)	YTD Total Exp (B+C)	Variance (A-(B+C))
99V37	Operating Expenses	3,464,610.00	3,128,207.84	0.00	3,128,207.84	336,402.16
		3,464,610.00	3,128,207.84	0.00	3,128,207.84	336,402.16
NDA - State Retirement Contribution Total						
99V01	Operating Expenses	1,251,603.00	1,251,603.00	0.00	1,251,603.00	0.00
		1,251,603.00	1,251,603.00	0.00	1,251,603.00	0.00
NDA - Takoma Park Library Annual Payments Total						
99V10	Operating Expenses	132,819.00	145,800.59	0.00	145,800.59	-12,981.59
		132,819.00	145,800.59	0.00	145,800.59	-12,981.59
NDA - Takoma Park Police Rebate Total						
99V09	Operating Expenses	951,540.00	920,996.00	0.00	920,996.00	30,544.00
		951,540.00	920,996.00	0.00	920,996.00	30,544.00
NDA - Utilities Total						
99V99	Operating Expenses	25,319,257.25	24,528,168.10	91,270.50	24,619,438.60	699,818.65
		25,319,257.25	24,528,168.10	91,270.50	24,619,438.60	699,818.65
NDA - Working Families Income Supplement Total						
99V28	Operating Expenses	18,342,200.00	18,960,625.99	0.00	18,960,625.99	-618,425.99
		18,342,200.00	18,960,625.99	0.00	18,960,625.99	-618,425.99
Police Total						
47D	Personnel Costs	229,690,439.00	227,352,584.25	0.00	227,352,584.25	2,337,854.75
	Operating Expenses	52,443,736.97	43,324,365.18	8,391,444.50	51,715,809.68	727,927.29
		282,134,175.97	270,676,949.43	8,391,444.50	279,068,393.93	3,065,782.04
Public Information Total						
23D	Personnel Costs	3,845,910.00	3,945,394.03	0.00	3,945,394.03	-99,484.03
	Operating Expenses	1,219,707.54	890,990.57	228,716.20	1,219,706.77	0.77
		5,065,617.54	4,936,384.60	228,716.20	5,165,100.90	-99,483.26
Public Libraries Total						
71D	Personnel Costs	31,397,293.00	29,912,076.21	0.00	29,912,076.21	1,485,216.79
	Operating Expenses	8,132,982.90	6,366,638.84	1,529,234.99	7,895,873.83	237,109.07
		39,530,275.90	36,278,715.05	1,529,234.99	37,807,950.04	1,722,325.86
Sheriff Total						
48D	Personnel Costs	20,484,182.00	20,916,748.95	0.00	20,916,748.95	-432,566.95
	Operating Expenses	2,525,725.40	2,467,898.96	59,023.72	2,526,922.68	-1,197.28
		23,009,907.40	23,384,647.91	59,023.72	23,443,671.63	-433,764.23
State's Attorney Total						
11D	Personnel Costs	13,878,379.00	13,912,257.14	0.00	13,912,257.14	-33,878.14
	Operating Expenses	1,020,264.00	1,110,548.98	10,038.82	1,120,587.80	-100,323.80
		14,898,643.00	15,022,806.12	10,038.82	15,032,844.94	-134,201.94
Technology Services Total						
34D	Personnel Costs	15,389,919.00	15,364,231.55	0.00	15,364,231.55	25,687.45
	Operating Expenses	18,545,812.97	15,715,799.21	2,377,530.49	18,093,329.70	452,483.27
		33,935,731.97	31,080,030.76	2,377,530.49	33,457,561.25	478,170.72
Transportation Total						
50D	Personnel Costs	24,966,734.00	24,707,848.64	0.00	24,707,848.64	258,885.36
	Operating Expenses	43,811,975.95	42,807,014.47	1,004,952.64	43,811,967.11	8.84
		68,778,709.95	67,514,863.11	1,004,952.64	68,519,815.75	258,894.20
Zoning and Administrative Hearings Total						
05D	Personnel Costs	516,081.00	516,073.26	0.00	516,073.26	7.74
	Operating Expenses	82,251.57	61,618.98	6,308.57	67,927.55	14,324.02
		598,332.57	577,692.24	6,308.57	584,000.81	14,331.76
General Fund Total		1,177,517,027.30	1,141,275,081.98	24,735,027.14	1,166,011,109.08	9,505,906.24
Fire Total						
Fire and Rescue Service Total						
45D	Personnel Costs	183,399,813.00	186,439,610.65	0.00	186,439,610.65	-3,039,797.65
	Operating Expenses	51,510,093.16	43,166,819.71	8,353,514.99	51,520,334.70	-10,241.54
		234,909,906.16	229,606,430.36	8,353,514.99	237,959,945.35	-3,050,039.19
Fire Total		234,909,906.16	229,606,430.36	8,353,514.99	237,959,945.35	-3,050,039.19
Recreation Total						
Recreation Total						
72D	Personnel Costs	19,361,418.00	19,248,878.19	0.00	19,248,878.19	112,539.81
	Operating Expenses	11,018,413.75	10,277,274.93	318,381.43	10,595,656.36	422,757.39
		30,379,831.75	29,526,153.12	318,381.43	29,844,534.55	535,297.20
Recreation Total		30,379,831.75	29,526,153.12	318,381.43	29,844,534.55	535,297.20
Bethesda Urban District Total						
Community Engagement Cluster Total						

		Latest Budget (A)	YTD Actual (B)	YTD Encumb (C)	YTD Total Exp (B+C)	Variance (A-(B+C))
16D	Personnel Costs	131,760.00	125,971.87	0.00	125,971.87	5,788.13
	Operating Expenses	3,588,735.40	3,549,248.88	2,114.40	3,551,363.28	37,372.12
	Bethesda Urban District Total	3,720,495.40	3,675,220.75	2,114.40	3,677,335.15	43,160.25
Silver Spring Urban District Total						
Community Engagement Cluster Total						
16D	Personnel Costs	2,217,059.00	2,151,315.63	0.00	2,151,315.63	65,743.37
	Operating Expenses	1,269,400.05	947,273.10	235,554.25	1,182,827.35	86,572.70
	Silver Spring Urban District Total	3,486,459.05	3,098,588.73	235,554.25	3,334,142.98	152,316.07
Wheaton Urban District Total						
Community Engagement Cluster Total						
16D	Personnel Costs	1,220,191.00	1,066,213.42	0.00	1,066,213.42	153,977.58
	Operating Expenses	624,115.04	574,477.89	49,634.21	624,112.10	2.94
	Wheaton Urban District Total	1,844,306.04	1,640,691.31	49,634.21	1,690,325.52	153,980.52
Mass Transit Total						
Transportation Total						
50D	Personnel Costs	66,992,189.00	66,303,404.24	0.00	66,303,404.24	688,784.76
	Operating Expenses	55,544,021.23	52,931,016.33	1,737,932.57	54,668,948.90	875,072.33
	Mass Transit Total	122,536,210.23	119,234,420.57	1,737,932.57	120,972,353.14	1,563,857.09
Economic Development Fund Total						
Finance Total						
32D	Personnel Costs	126,316.00	126,307.74	0.00	126,307.74	8.26
	Operating Expenses	4,638,388.00	1,955,012.65	3,250.00	1,958,262.65	2,680,125.35
	Economic Development Fund Total	4,764,704.00	2,081,320.39	3,250.00	2,062,570.39	2,680,133.61
Tax Supported Funds Total		1,579,158,939.93	1,530,137,917.21	37,436,408.96	1,567,574,326.17	11,584,613.76

A02 Non-Tax Supported Funds

		Latest Budget (A)	YTD Actual (B)	YTD Encumb (C)	YTD Total Exp (B+C)	Variance (A-(B+C))
Montgomery Housing Initiative Total						
Housing and Community Affairs Total						
76D	Personnel Costs	1,770,182.00	1,747,166.21	0.00	1,747,166.21	23,015.79
	Operating Expenses	34,624,034.00	27,189,314.16	528,067.76	27,717,381.92	6,906,652.08
	Montgomery Housing Initiative Total	36,394,216.00	28,936,480.37	528,067.76	29,465,548.13	6,928,667.87
Cable TV Total						
Technology Services Total						
34D	Personnel Costs	3,561,766.00	3,428,005.88	0.00	3,428,005.88	133,760.12
	Operating Expenses	12,160,159.47	10,375,129.45	1,755,465.43	12,130,594.88	29,564.59
	Cable TV Total	15,721,925.47	13,803,135.33	1,755,465.43	15,586,600.76	163,324.71
Water Quality Protection Total						
Environmental Protection Total						
80D	Personnel Costs	7,550,923.00	7,417,056.92	0.00	7,417,056.92	133,866.08
	Operating Expenses	15,265,818.56	12,600,093.52	2,309,291.93	14,909,385.45	356,433.11
	Water Quality Protection Total	22,816,741.56	20,017,150.44	2,309,291.93	22,326,442.37	490,299.19
Liquor Total						
Liquor Control Total						
85D	Personnel Costs	30,171,953.00	30,161,948.56	0.00	30,161,948.56	10,004.44
	Operating Expenses	21,397,238.67	19,232,173.21	382,899.86	19,615,073.07	1,782,165.60
	Liquor Total	51,569,191.67	49,394,121.77	382,899.86	49,777,021.63	1,792,170.04

		Latest Budget (A)	YTD Actual (B)	YTD Encumb (C)	YTD Total Exp (B+C)	Variance (A-(B+C))
Solid Waste Disposal Total						
Environmental Protection Total						
800	Personnel Costs	9,607,123.00	9,607,113.72	0.00	9,607,113.72	9.28
	Operating Expenses	95,921,175.56	87,037,282.03	6,816,420.45	93,853,702.48	2,067,473.08
	Solid Waste Disposal Total	105,528,298.56	96,644,395.75	6,816,420.45	103,460,816.20	2,067,482.36
Solid Waste Collection Total						
Environmental Protection Total						
800	Personnel Costs	1,256,627.00	1,253,835.37	0.00	1,253,835.37	2,791.63
	Operating Expenses	5,162,238.00	4,717,871.30	163,900.84	4,881,772.14	280,465.86
	Solid Waste Collection Total	6,418,865.00	5,971,706.67	163,900.84	6,135,607.51	283,257.49
Leaf Vacuuming Total						
Transportation Total						
500	Personnel Costs	2,684,053.00	2,658,244.70	0.00	2,658,244.70	25,808.30
	Operating Expenses	2,570,945.23	2,980,775.04	250,737.82	3,231,512.86	-660,567.63
	Leaf Vacuuming Total	5,254,998.23	5,639,019.74	250,737.82	5,889,757.56	-634,759.33
Community Use of Public Facilities Total						
Community Use of Public Facilities Total						
700	Personnel Costs	2,670,949.00	2,627,826.18	0.00	2,627,826.18	43,122.82
	Operating Expenses	7,490,499.39	6,952,377.11	33,661.83	6,986,038.94	504,460.45
	Community Use of Public Facilities Total	10,161,448.39	9,580,203.29	33,661.83	9,613,865.12	547,583.27
Bethesda Parking Total						
Transportation Total						
500	Personnel Costs	2,147,075.00	2,118,112.61	0.00	2,118,112.61	28,962.39
	Operating Expenses	12,885,634.74	11,972,778.75	324,988.44	12,297,767.19	587,867.55
	Bethesda Parking Total	15,032,709.74	14,090,891.36	324,988.44	14,415,879.80	616,829.94
Silver Spring Parking Total						
Transportation Total						
500	Personnel Costs	2,303,536.00	2,149,465.16	0.00	2,149,465.16	154,070.84
	Operating Expenses	9,847,095.28	8,278,012.11	397,602.57	8,675,614.68	1,171,480.60
	Silver Spring Parking Total	12,150,631.28	10,427,477.27	397,602.57	10,825,079.84	1,325,551.44
Montgomery Hills Parking Total						
Transportation Total						
500	Personnel Costs	49,103.00	47,177.86	0.00	47,177.86	1,925.14
	Operating Expenses	95,537.89	62,369.98	12,660.28	75,030.26	20,507.63
	Montgomery Hills Parking Total	144,640.89	109,547.84	12,660.28	122,208.12	22,432.77
Wheaton Parking Total						
Transportation Total						
500	Personnel Costs	362,750.00	362,613.78	0.00	362,613.78	136.22
	Operating Expenses	1,002,612.30	727,341.65	55,839.12	783,180.77	219,431.53
	Wheaton Parking Total	1,365,362.30	1,089,955.43	55,839.12	1,145,794.55	219,567.75
Permitting Total						
Permitting Services Total						
750	Personnel Costs	23,778,816.00	23,778,808.63	0.00	23,778,808.63	7.37
	Operating Expenses	9,116,682.29	7,376,636.78	818,747.82	8,195,384.58	921,307.71
	Permitting Total	32,895,508.29	31,155,445.39	818,747.82	31,974,193.21	921,315.08
Non-Tax Supported Funds Total		315,454,537.38	286,959,530.65	13,850,284.15	300,709,814.80	14,744,722.58

SUMMAR 2015
Y

	Latest Budget (A)	YTD Actual (B)	YTD Encumb (C)	YTD Total Exp (B+C)	Variance (A-(B+C))
A01 Tax Supported Funds Total					
Personnel Costs	877,647,090.10	874,409,267.35	0.00	874,409,267.35	3,237,822.75
Operating Expenses	701,511,849.83	655,728,649.86	37,436,408.96	693,165,058.82	8,346,791.01
A01 Total	1,579,158,939.93	1,530,137,917.21	37,436,408.96	1,567,574,326.17	11,584,613.76
A02 Non-Tax Supported Funds Total					
Personnel Costs	87,914,856.00	87,357,375.58	0.00	87,357,375.58	557,480.42
Operating Expenses	227,539,881.38	199,502,155.07	13,850,284.15	213,352,439.22	14,187,242.16
A02 Total	315,454,737.38	286,859,530.65	13,850,284.15	300,709,814.80	14,744,722.58
Grand Total	1,894,613,477.31	1,816,997,447.86	51,286,693.11	1,868,284,140.97	26,329,336.34

Time run: 11/12/2015 9:14:27 AM

APPENDIX: Recurring Recipients & Donors of Year-End Transfers

Recurring Recipients of Year-End Transfers

I. Judicial Branch Departments

1. Circuit Court

The Circuit Court overspent its budget from FY11 through FY13. The second and third FY11 quarterly analyses projected the Court staying within budget, but the budget was overspent. In FY12, the second quarterly report showed the Court within budget while the third quarterly report more accurately projected the Court exceeding its budget. The FY13 report showed the department spending the full appropriation and not exceeding the budgeted amount in both quarterly reports.

Circuit Court									
<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$9,813,050	\$10,108,064	\$10,371,053	-\$262,988	\$263,000	2.6%	Surplus	Surplus
FY12	Yes	\$9,319,730	\$9,654,402	\$9,970,169	-\$315,768	\$315,780	3.3%	Surplus	Shortfall
FY13	Yes	\$10,330,453	\$10,519,366	\$10,605,937	-\$86,570	\$95,240	0.9%	On Budget	On Budget

2. Sheriff's Office

The Sheriff's Office has exceeded its budget from FY11-15. The FY11-15 quarterly analysis reports accurately projected that the budget would be overspent.

Sheriff's Office									
<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$19,484,030	\$19,503,590	\$20,172,056	-\$668,465	\$668,470	3.4%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY12	Yes	\$19,747,550	\$20,086,464	\$20,835,658	-\$749,194	\$749,210	3.7%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY13	Yes	\$20,972,895	\$20,970,103	\$21,714,243	-\$744,140	\$818,570	3.9%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY14	Yes	\$21,933,890	\$21,987,199	\$22,768,800	-\$781,601	\$781,620	3.6%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY15	Yes	\$22,970,689	\$23,009,887	\$23,443,672	-\$433,784	\$433,790	1.9%	Shortfall	Shortfall

3. State's Attorney

The State's Attorney has exceeded its budget every year between FY11-FY15. The FY11 second and third quarterly analysis reports showed the office would underspend at the end of the fiscal year, but the Office exceeded its budget. The FY12-14 quarterly analysis reports more accurately projected that the Office would exceed its budget, even as early as the second quarterly report. The Office overspent its FY15 appropriation, but both quarterly analysis reports projected the Office ending the fiscal year with a surplus.

State's Attorney's Office									
<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$12,342,270	\$12,344,157	\$12,387,817	-\$43,660	\$43,670	0.4%	Surplus	Surplus
FY12	Yes	\$11,911,280	\$12,069,909	\$12,495,854	-\$425,946	\$425,960	3.5%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY13	Yes	\$12,729,550	\$12,736,028	\$13,553,237	-\$817,209	\$898,940	7.1%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY14	Yes	\$13,790,836	\$13,797,438	\$14,083,611	-\$286,173	\$286,190	2.1%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY15	Yes	\$14,890,779	\$14,898,643	\$15,032,845	-\$134,202	\$134,210	0.9%	Surplus	Surplus

II. Executive Branch Departments

4. Office of Consumer Protection

The Office of Consumer Protection overspent its budget in FY11, FY12, and in FY14. In both FY12 and FY14 the quarterly analysis reports accurately projected that the Office would exceed its budget.

Office of Consumer Protection									
<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$2,079,200	\$2,079,200	\$2,019,975	\$59,225	\$51,620	2.5%	Surplus	Surplus
FY12	Yes	\$1,948,320	\$1,976,781	\$2,007,581	-\$30,800	\$119,620	6.1%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY14	Yes	\$2,148,716	\$2,150,048	\$2,136,954	\$13,094	\$32,310	1.5%	Shortfall	Shortfall

5. Department of Correction and Rehabilitation

The Department of Correction and Rehabilitation (DOCR) has exceeded its appropriation in FY11 through FY14. In the second and third quarterly analysis reports for FY11 through FY14, the DOCR did project that they would exceed its budget.

Department of Correction and Rehabilitation									
<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$61,806,240	\$61,806,240	\$63,033,008	-\$1,226,768	\$1,574,830	2.5%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY12	Yes	\$61,264,450	\$62,283,888	\$63,277,300	-\$993,412	\$993,420	1.6%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY13	Yes	\$65,181,902	\$65,394,548	\$67,452,211	-\$2,057,663	\$2,263,440	3.5%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY14	Yes	\$66,598,101	\$66,848,709	\$69,283,232	-\$2,434,523	\$2,434,540	3.6%	Shortfall	Shortfall

6. Office of the County Attorney

The Office of the County Attorney has exceeded its budget each fiscal year from FY11 through FY15. Both of the FY11, FY13 and FY15 quarterly analysis reports projected that the Office would overspend its budget. The FY12 and FY14 quarterly analysis reports did not project that the Office would exceed its appropriation until the third quarterly report.

Office of the County Attorney

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$4,552,550	\$4,563,836	\$4,966,891	-\$403,055	\$403,070	8.8%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY12	Yes	\$4,039,500	\$4,085,972	\$5,054,066	-\$968,094	\$968,100	23.7%	Surplus	Shortfall
FY13	Yes	\$5,736,881	\$5,745,056	\$5,832,080	-\$87,024	\$95,730	1.7%	Surplus	Surplus
FY14	Yes	\$5,351,793	\$5,756,603	\$6,426,314	-\$669,711	\$669,720	11.6%	Surplus	Shortfall
FY15	Yes	\$5,381,236	\$5,643,171	\$6,286,494	-\$643,323	\$643,330	11.4%	Shortfall	Shortfall

7. Department of Economic Development

The Department of Economic Development (DED) has exceeded its budget each year from FY11 through FY15. The FY11 year-end transfer was for a relatively small amount and no budget deficit was reported in either quarterly report. In FY12, the second quarterly analysis reported the Department within budget while the third quarterly analysis showed the Department being overspent. In FY13, FY14, and FY15 the second and third quarterly analysis reports showed the Department's budget going over the appropriated amount.

Department of Economic Development

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$6,285,150	\$6,285,150	\$6,226,747	\$58,403	\$14,510	0.2%	Surplus	Surplus
FY12	Yes	\$5,990,310	\$6,298,850	\$6,776,080	-\$477,229	\$477,240	7.6%	Surplus	Shortfall
FY13	Yes	\$9,197,933	\$9,547,814	\$9,683,299	-\$135,485	\$149,040	1.6%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY14	Yes	\$8,769,515	\$9,043,506	\$9,857,374	-\$813,868	\$813,880	9.0%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY15	Yes	\$10,663,357	\$11,492,591	\$12,188,920	-\$696,328	\$696,330	6.1%	Shortfall	Shortfall

8. Ethics Commission

The Ethics Commission exceeded its budget in FY11, FY13 and again in FY15. The FY11 and FY13 quarterly reports projected the Commission having a surplus, but the budget was overspent. Both of the FY15 quarterly analysis reports projected the Commission being exactly on budget; however, the Commission overspent its FY15 appropriation. These variances are related to personnel changes that have a large impact on a small budget.

Ethics Commission

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$218,250	\$218,250	\$250,748	-\$32,498	\$37,010	17.0%	Surplus	Surplus
FY13	Yes	\$307,776	\$307,776	\$326,795	-\$19,019	\$22,260	7.2%	Surplus	Surplus
FY15	Yes	\$355,641	\$400,622	\$401,346	-\$724	\$1,260	0.3%	On Budget	On Budget

9. Department of General Services

The Department of General Services (DGS) has exceed its budget each year from FY11 through FY15. In FY11, the second and third quarterly analysis reported DGS underspending its appropriation. The FY12 second quarterly analysis projected DGS spending the appropriated amount; however, the third quarterly analysis projected that the budget for DGS would be overspent.

The FY13 second quarterly analysis report projected that the budget for DGS would be underspent while the third quarterly analysis projected that the Department would stay on budget. For FY14 and FY15, the second and third quarterly analysis reports projected DGS exceeding its appropriated budget.

Department of General Services									
<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$24,011,240	\$27,572,810	\$27,933,078	-\$360,268	\$886,150	3.2%	Surplus	Surplus
FY12	Yes	\$21,354,150	\$23,212,471	\$27,685,417	-\$4,472,946	\$4,472,950	19.3%	Surplus	Shortfall
FY13	Yes	\$24,726,123	\$29,608,536	\$32,240,646	-\$2,632,110	\$2,895,330	9.8%	Shortfall	On Budget
FY14	Yes	\$26,647,551	\$36,067,022	\$39,676,293	-\$3,609,272	\$3,609,280	10.0%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY15	Yes	\$29,468,025	\$41,335,481	\$42,429,662	-\$1,094,181	\$1,094,190	2.6%	Shortfall	Shortfall

10. Office of Human Resources

The Office of Human Resources (OHR) overspent its budget each year from FY11 through FY15. The FY11 and FY12 quarterly analysis reports projected the Office not overspending its budget, but OHR did exceed its budget. In FY13, FY14 and FY15, the Office did project in both quarterly analysis reports that the original budget would be exceeded.

Office of Human Resources									
<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$6,082,800	\$6,247,004	\$5,986,222	\$260,782	\$154,680	2.5%	Surplus	Surplus
FY12	Yes	\$5,996,540	\$6,215,549	\$6,204,545	\$11,005	\$186,850	3.0%	Surplus	On Budget
FY13	Yes	\$7,136,988	\$7,244,102	\$7,336,825	-\$92,724	\$239,890	3.3%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY14	Yes	\$7,656,440	\$7,784,603	\$8,032,503	-\$247,899	\$312,080	4.0%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY15	Yes	\$7,778,639	\$8,156,549	\$8,669,402	-\$512,853	\$512,870	6.3%	Shortfall	Shortfall

11. Office of Human Rights

The Office of Human Rights overspent its budget in past three fiscal years (FY13-FY15). By the third quarterly analysis report, the projections in FY13 and FY15 were accurate, reporting a shortfall. In FY14, the second quarter report projected a surplus, but projections were revised down to the Office's budget being right on budget by the third quarterly analysis report.

Office of Human Rights									
<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY13	Yes	\$896,948	\$921,085	\$960,105	-\$39,021	\$57,840	6.3%	On Budget	Shortfall
FY14	Yes	\$942,673	\$950,642	\$967,325	-\$16,683	\$17,170	1.8%	Surplus	On Budget
FY15	Yes	\$1,023,278	\$1,029,410	\$1,046,514	-\$17,104	\$25,470	2.5%	Shortfall	Shortfall

12. Public Information

In FY11 through FY15, the Office of Public Information (PIO) overspent its budget. In each fiscal year the second and third quarterly analysis reports have projected that PIO would not overspend its budget, but PIO has exceeded the budget each year. The year-end transfer memos do not always specify whether the source of overspending is in the Public Relations portion of the PIO budget or in MC311. Overspending has occurred in personnel costs each year but is largely due to exceeding operating expense.

Office of Public Information									
<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$4,960,350	\$4,960,350	\$5,072,835	-\$112,485	\$112,490	2.3%	Surplus	Surplus
FY12	Yes	\$4,719,510	\$5,016,937	\$5,155,563	-\$138,626	\$138,630	2.8%	On Budget	Surplus
FY13	Yes	\$5,016,769	\$5,279,976	\$5,429,662	-\$149,685	\$164,660	3.1%	Surplus	Surplus
FY14	Yes	\$4,660,061	\$4,899,434	\$5,004,036	-\$104,602	\$104,620	2.1%	Surplus	Surplus
FY15	Yes	\$4,816,129	\$5,065,618	\$5,165,101	-\$99,483	\$99,490	2.0%	Surplus	Surplus

III. **Tax Supported Special Funds**

13. Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service

Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services (MCFRS) overspent its budget in FY11 through FY15. In each fiscal year the second and third quarterly analysis reports have projected that the Fire and Rescue Services budget would be overspent.

Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service									
<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Transfer Yes/No</i>	<i>Original Budget</i>	<i>Latest Budget</i>	<i>Expen. + Encum.</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Year-End Transfer</i>	<i>Transfer As % of Latest</i>	<i>Second Quarter Projection</i>	<i>Third Quarter Projection</i>
FY11	Yes	\$182,148,330	\$180,682,358	\$186,371,242	-\$5,688,884	\$7,048,940	3.9%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY12	Yes	\$179,769,870	\$183,732,598	\$190,189,534	-\$6,456,936	\$6,456,950	3.5%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY13	Yes	\$204,946,888	\$205,681,839	\$206,181,667	-\$499,828	\$549,820	0.3%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY14	Yes	\$217,018,693	\$220,000,820	\$225,440,145	-\$5,439,325	\$5,439,330	2.5%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY15	Yes	\$224,302,381	\$234,909,906	\$237,959,945	-\$3,050,039	\$3,050,050	1.3%	Shortfall	Shortfall

14. Mass Transit

Transit's original appropriation was exceeded in FY11 and FY12, then again in FY14. The second and third quarterly analysis reports accurately projected that Transit would exceed its budget in FY11 and FY12. In FY14, the third quarterly analysis accurately projected that Transit would overspend its budget.

Mass Transit									
Fiscal Year	Transfer Yes/No	Original Budget	Latest Budget	Expen. + Encum.	Variance	Year-End Transfer	Transfer As % of Latest	Second Quarter Projection	Third Quarter Projection
FY11	Yes	\$104,309,460	\$102,981,901	\$106,100,197	-\$3,118,296	\$3,118,300	3.0%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY12	Yes	\$102,750,000	\$103,994,277	\$109,378,236	-\$5,383,959	\$5,383,960	5.2%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY14	Yes	\$116,665,732	\$117,031,393	\$117,253,437	-\$222,044	\$222,060	0.2%	Surplus	Shortfall

IV. Non-Tax Supported Special Funds

15. Cable TV

Cable overspent its budget from FY11 through FY13. The second and third quarterly analysis reports accurately projected that Cable would exceed its budget in FY11 through FY13. The second and third quarterly analysis reports in FY15 projected that Cable would overspend its appropriation. However, they are projected to underspend the FY15 budget.

Cable TV									
Fiscal Year	Transfer Yes/No	Original Budget	Latest Budget	Expen. + Encum.	Variance	Year-End Transfer	Transfer As % of Latest	Second Quarter Projection	Third Quarter Projection
FY11	Yes	\$10,492,160	\$10,973,300	\$11,016,682	-\$43,382	\$475,740	4.3%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY12	Yes	\$11,813,340	\$12,448,735	\$12,606,464	-\$157,729	\$157,730	1.3%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY13	Yes	\$13,146,951	\$13,818,630	\$14,120,808	-\$302,178	\$332,410	2.4%	Shortfall	Shortfall

16. Permitting Services

Permitting Services overspent its budgets in FY11, FY13 and FY14. In FY11 the second and third quarterly analysis reports accurately projected that the budget would be overspent. The FY13 second quarterly report projected that the Department would be overspent, but the third quarterly analysis inaccurately projected the Department would be within budget. In FY14, the both quarterly analysis reports projected that the Departments budget would be underspent.

Permitting Services									
Fiscal Year	Transfer Yes/No	Original Budget	Latest Budget	Expen. + Encum.	Variance	Year-End Transfer	Transfer As % of Latest	Second Quarter Projection	Third Quarter Projection
FY11	Yes	\$24,151,420	\$24,151,420	\$25,171,575	-\$1,020,155	\$1,020,160	4.2%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY13	Yes	\$27,619,194	\$27,743,353	\$27,818,184	-\$74,831	\$82,320	0.3%	Shortfall	Surplus
FY14	Yes	\$29,642,071	\$30,117,584	\$30,314,745	-\$197,161	\$215,300	0.7%	Surplus	Surplus

17. Vacuum Leaf Collection

The Vacuum Leaf Collection Fund has been overspent in FY13, FY14 and FY15. In FY13 and FY15, the second and third quarterly analyses projected the Fund having a surplus or staying on budget, but the Fund was overspent both years. The FY14 second and third quarterly analysis reports accurately projected that the fund would be overspent.

Vacuum Leaf Collection									
Fiscal Year	Transfer Yes/No	Original Budget	Latest Budget	Expen. + Encum.	Variance	Year-End Transfer	Transfer As % of Latest	Second Quarter Projection	Third Quarter Projection
FY11	Yes*	\$5,303,340	\$5,303,340	\$4,565,176	\$738,164	-\$350,860	-6.6%	Surplus	Surplus
FY12	Yes*	\$5,272,920	\$5,323,685	\$4,945,191	\$378,494	-\$312,092	-5.9%	Surplus	Surplus
FY13	Yes	\$5,444,337	\$5,044,337	\$5,333,885	-\$289,548	\$318,510	6.3%	Surplus	Surplus
FY14	Yes	\$5,155,303	\$5,155,303	\$5,447,247	-\$291,944	\$296,170	5.7%	Shortfall	Shortfall
FY15	Yes	\$5,224,643	\$5,254,998	\$5,889,758	-\$634,759	\$660,570	12.6%	On Budget	On Budget

**The Fund was a donor, not a recipient, of a year-end transfer.*

Recurring Donors of Year-End Transfers

In addition to the offices and departments that routinely receive year-end transfers, there are a few departments that routinely underspend their budget and fund the transfers. Health and Human Services has funded a total of \$13,789,070 over three fiscal years (FY11, 12, and FY13). In total, these transfers equal 2.6 percent of the HHS approved budget. The Police funded a total of \$18,313,290 in year-end transfers over five fiscal years (FY11 through FY15). In total, these transfers equal 1.47 percent of the Department's approved budget. Additionally, Solid Waste Disposal, which is an Enterprise Fund, has funded a total of \$13,511,990 in year-end transfers from FY11 through FY15. In total, these transfers equal 2.69 percent of Solid Waste Disposal's approved budget.

F:\Sesker\project files\Budget implementation\budget implementation 113015.doc