

T&E COMMITTEE #1
April 21, 2016

MEMORANDUM

April 19, 2016

TO: Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy & Environment Committee
FROM: ^{GO} Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Administrator
SUBJECT: Resolution on FY17 transportation fees, charges, and fares;
FY17 Operating Budget: Mass Transit Fund, Parking Lot District Funds, and associated
FY17-22 Capital Improvements Program projects; and
FY17 Operating Budget: Snow Removal and Storm Cleanup NDA

Those anticipated to attend this worksession include:

Al Roshdieh, Director, Department of Transportation (DOT)
Emil Wolanin, Deputy Director, DOT
Carolyn Biggins, Chief, Division of Transit Services, DOT
Jose Thommana, Chief, Division of Parking Management, DOT
Alicia Thomas, Budget Analyst, DOT
Phil McLaughlin, Manager of Operations Planning, Division of Transit Services, DOT
Sandra Brecher, Chief, Commuter Services Section, Division of Transit Services, DOT
Brady Goldsmith, Budget Analyst, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

I. FY17 Transportation Fees, Charges, and Fares

According to Section 2-57A of the Montgomery County Code, all fees, charges, and fares for any transportation or transportation-related service or product provided by the Department of Transportation must be set by Council resolution adopted after a public hearing and approved by the Executive, unless any law expressly requires a different process. If the Executive disapproves a resolution within 10 days after it is adopted and the Council readopts it by a vote of six Councilmembers, or if the Executive does not act within 10 days after the Council adopts it, the resolution takes effect. The fees, charges, and fares currently in effect are those in Council Resolution 18-128 adopted on May 13, 2015 and approved by the Executive on May 20, 2015.

In order to manage demand among parking facilities, last year the Council granted DOT the authority to set the fees for garage and lot spaces in Bethesda, Silver Spring, and Wheaton at lower than the hourly and monthly charges in the resolution. To date DOT has not used this authority widely, but it is developing a plan that will be implemented in Bethesda PLD later this year.

The Executive is recommending no changes to fees, charges, and fares for FY17. No recommendations have been suggested for comment by Councilmembers or Council staff. The public hearing is scheduled for April 26. The draft adoption resolution is on ©1-8.

II. FY17 Operating Budget: Mass Transit Fund

Overview. The Executive's recommendations for the Mass Transit Fund are attached on ©9-16. The Executive recommends total expenditures of \$127,602,501 for the Mass Transit Fund, a \$1,413,049 (1.1%) increase from the FY16 approved budget. Operating Budget workyears would increase by 6.28 FTEs, to 842.47 FTEs, a 0.8% increase.

Ride On service. With the exception of a proposed express service from Clarksburg to Shady Grove Metro and a new service to Tobytown (see below), there are no new routes or other significant additions to service recommended. The table on ©17-19 displays—in descending order—the effectiveness of existing Ride On routes on weekdays, Saturdays and Sundays.¹ Overall, the average is 21.7 riders per platform hour, down from 22.4 riders per hour a year ago. Most routes meet Ride On's minimum performance standards: 15 riders per platform hour for peak-period-only routes that are served by full-size Ride On buses; 12 riders per platform hour for peak-period-only routes served by small buses; and 10 riders per platform hour for all-day routes. Those routes that fall consistently or significantly below these minimum standards (those near the bottom of ©19) should be evaluated over the next year for curtailment or elimination, with the freed-up buses re-deployed to provide more frequent service on oversubscribed routes.

Clarksburg-to-Shady Grove Metro shuttle service. Recognizing that the northern portion of the Corridor Cities Transitway would not be built to Clarksburg for many years, last fall Councilmembers Floreen and Rice wrote to the Executive requesting an express bus service between Clarksburg and the Shady Grove Metro Station, running every 15-20 minutes during peak periods and every 30 minutes during the off-peak on weekdays (©20-21).

The Executive has included a peak-period-only service in his Recommended Budget. It would run every 20 minutes for 3½ hours in the morning peak and 3½ hours in the evening peak on weekdays, starting in May 2017. By that time the five added buses needed will be delivered and ready to put into service. At first, it is estimated conservatively to carry 350 passengers per day. The two-month cost in FY17 would be \$117,438; starting in FY18 the cost would be about \$705,000 annually. The fare would be \$1.75 per trip, and would cover about 10.3% of the cost, well below the system average of 22%.

Tobytown service. The Executive proposes to pilot a route between the Rockville Metro Station and Tobytown, a historic minority community of 60 residents on Pennyfield Lock Road near River Road. One bus, operated under contract to the Jewish Council on Aging, would run every 60-75 minutes during the morning and evening weekday peak periods: three or four round-trips in each peak.

¹ Ridership data is for the 12-month period through December 2015. Services hours are those in January 2016.

It would stop at the schools serving Tobytown—Travilah ES, Frost MS, and Wootton HS—as well as Shady Grove Hospital, the Universities at Shady Grove, and Rockville Metro. The fare would be \$1.75 per trip, the same as the regular Ride On fare.

The Executive proposes initiating the service in October 2017, and DOT estimates it would draw about 30 patrons daily. In the nine months this route would operate during FY17 the cost is estimated to be \$160,000.² Starting in FY18 it would cost about \$213,000 annually. The fare is projected to raise about \$6,000 in revenue in FY17 and about \$8,000 in FY18 and beyond. This would cover 3.8% of the service's cost, considerably below the system average of 22%.

Councilmembers Berliner and Katz advocate providing the same service that was proposed last year: running every 60-75 minutes from 6am to 7pm weekdays (©22-23). DOT estimates that this would add only 18 more passengers daily and would cost an additional \$144,000 more in FY17 and \$192,000 more in FY18 and beyond. Councilmember Navarro also supports adding service to Tobytown (©24). The Council received testimony supporting this service from James Martin and Dan and Mimi Segal (©25-27).

Public transit is effective only where there is sufficient density to support it. The bar is set particularly low for bus service; nevertheless, there are many remote areas of the County where transit is not supportable. Tobytown is not alone; there are many other places in the county not served by Ride On: Laytonsville (population, 353), Brookeville (134), and Barnesville (172) are examples. Other historic minority communities in or near the Agricultural Reserve do not have Ride On service, including Jerusalem, Sugarland, and Good Hope. Two earlier pilots for Tobytown were tried and failed in the last decade. It has not grown since, so there is no reason to believe this pilot will fare any better. Also, Montgomery County Public Schools already serves Tobytown from Wootton HS and Frost MS with an after-school activity bus Tuesdays through Thursdays.

Call-'n'-Ride. The Call-'n'-Ride Program provides subsidized taxi service for low-income seniors (age 67 or older) and low-income persons with disabilities (age 18 or older). The subsidy levels were adjusted two years ago. The subsidy levels for one-person households is as follows:

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

A table showing both the income ranges for households up to six persons is on ©28.

For many years the age for low-income seniors to be eligible was 70. In the 1990s, when the Executive was on the Council and Chair of the T&E Committee, he proposed reducing the eligibility age to 65, but the exigencies of the budget allowed the Council to reduce it only to 68. The following year he led an effort to reduce it to 67, where it has remained for nearly two decades. Now he proposes

² The Recommended Budget shows the cost as a reduction of \$60,000 from FY16, because the format is to show change from the Approved FY16 Budget. The Approved Budget assumed a cost of \$220,000, but service was deleted in July 2015 as part of the FY16 Savings Plan.

bringing it down to 65, which would add an estimated 445 participants to the program and increase its cost by \$138,000. This would be slightly offset by additional revenue.

Fare Share Program. Until the Great Recession, transportation management districts (TMDs) were budgeted to fund monetary incentives to employers to subsidize their employees' non-auto commuting. The Fare Share Program had the County buy down the cost of an employee's monthly transit fare for a year or more if there was an equal matching buy-down from the employer. The Super Fare Share Program required a five-year contractual commitment: in the first year, the County would buy down \$64 of an employee's monthly fare if it were matched by only \$1/month per employee from the employer; in the successive four years the cost of the buy-down was equally shared between the County and the employer.

These programs were successful means for improving the non-auto-driver mode share (NADMS) in the TMDs, and they were two of the few "carrots" TMD marketing staff could encourage transit commuting. The last year when Fare Share and Super Fare Share Programs were budgeted was FY10 when \$981,000 was set aside for that purpose. Meanwhile the recent experience meeting NADMS goals in the TMDs has been mixed. The chart on ©29-30 shows the NADMS in FYs12-14 for each of the five existing TMDs; the current NADMS goal in the Subdivision Staging Policy (SSP) is annotated. The chart shows that Bethesda and Silver Spring fell short of the goal in FY14, and that North Bethesda has remained well below it throughout. The Council should consider adding funds to the Reconciliation List to re-initiate the Fare Share Program.

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

Following the directives from the consultant, DOT calculated the recommended partially allocated cost of Ride On for FY17 to be \$91.90/hour, compared to \$90.08/hour in FY16. This is the rate that should be used in deciding whether it would be more cost effective to add Ride On or Metrobus service. The corresponding partially-allocated rate for Metrobus is \$115.73/hour for FY17, which is down from \$123.76 from FY16. Therefore, at the margin, it is still generally more cost-effective for the County to add Ride On service rather than Metrobus service. DOT has provided a more detailed breakdown of Ride On's \$91.90/hour partially allocated and \$111.30/hour fully allocated costs (©31).

III. FY17 Operating Budget: Parking Lot District Funds

Overview. The Executive's recommendations for the Parking Lot District (PLD) Funds are attached on ©32-43. For FY17, the Executive recommends total expenditures of \$27,318,751 for the Parking Lot District Funds, a \$707,226 (2.5%) decrease from the FY16 approved budget. Operating Budget Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) would decrease by a net of 0.80 FTEs (-1.6%), to 48.53 FTEs.

Security. No changes are recommended for parking garage and lot security in FY17. All the security again will be provided by contract security guards, with the exception of 6,000 of 44,400 hours in the Silver Spring PLD, which will continue to be provided by the Clean & Safe Team.

Fiscal health of the PLDs. The County’s policy is that each PLD strive for a year-end fund balance equal to 30% of available resources. Each of the PLDs is measured against this standard in the analyses and recommendations that follow.

Montgomery Hills. The year-end fund balance as a percent of resources will drop below 30% starting in FY18. This despite the fact that the Executive’s fiscal plan would, starting in FY18, cease transferring \$5,000 annually to the Silver Spring Regional Services Center to conduct minimal streetscape maintenance in Montgomery Hills.³ The year-end balances as a percent of resources are shown below:

Montgomery Hills PLD: Reserves as % of Resources	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22
Executive Recommendation	56%	33%	21%	14%	12%	16%	24%

Periodically there have been suggestions to merge this tiny PLD with the Silver Spring PLD, for administrative simplicity as much as anything else. There were two potential problems with this: (1) the Montgomery Hills property tax rate has historically been much lower than Silver Spring’s, so the taxes on Montgomery Hills businesses would had to have been increased substantially; and (2) the parking fees in Montgomery Hills have been historically lower than Silver Spring’s, and so the rates for its lots would had to have been increased higher than what the market there would bear.

However, neither of problems exist anymore. Last year the Council set the property tax in all four PLDs at \$0/\$100. It also allows DOT to set parking fees at rates lower than the maximum within any PLD. Therefore, the two districts could be merged without having an effect on taxes or fees in Montgomery Hills. Given that the Silver Spring CBD is in very robust fiscal shape (see below), there may never be a better opportunity to merge the Montgomery Hills PLD into the Silver Spring CBD. To do so will require legislation; it should be enacted in FY17 so it could go into effect at the beginning of FY18.

Wheaton. This PLD is in the worst fiscal shape of the four, its year-end reserves dropping to 10% of revenue in FY18 and 3% in FY19. It would get a bump when the new government office building opens, but would drop below 10% again by FY22. It would be much worse except that the Executive is anticipating loans of \$200,000 in FY19 and again in FY20 from the Silver Spring PLD to keep the Wheaton PLD afloat. No payback time is specified, but it would be no earlier than FY23.

A further sign of Wheaton PLD’s bad fiscal straits is that its transfer to support the Wheaton Urban District is dropping from \$607,000 in FY16 to only \$24,358 in FY17. The County Code requires that of the sum of an urban district’s tax revenue and its transfer from the PLD, one cannot be more than 90% of the total. Historically the PLD transfer is close to 90% of this total, as a way to keep the urban district tax down. However, in FY17, the PLD transfer itself would only be 10% of this total. Since Wheaton’s urban district tax rate is being kept the same, its General Fund subsidy would be increased by \$557,231 in FY17—to a total of \$1,917,740—and larger amounts in subsequent years.

³ More than a decade ago the Council approved a bill sponsored by Councilmember Tom Perez that allowed this transfer.

Wheaton PLD:	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY
Reserves as % of Resources	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Executive Recommendation	56%	38%	10%	3%	14%	11%	8%

Silver Spring and Bethesda. These two PLDs have had reversals of fortune. A decade ago the Silver Spring PLD was just recovering from long-term financial straits that required millions of dollars of loans from the General Fund for the maintenance of its facilities. With the revitalization of Silver Spring very far along, the health of its PLD is the best it has been in decades.

Silver Spring’s PLD revenues will be bolstered in FY18 when the Executive plans for the charging hours for all parking spaces to be extended to 10:00 pm Monday through Friday, bringing in a further \$1,900,000 annually. The result of these and other smaller adjustments in the Fiscal Plan is that the Silver Spring PLD’s ending reserve in FY16 will equal 100% of its available resources, far above the 30% target.

Silver Spring PLD:	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY
Reserves as % of Resources	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Executive Recommendation	166%	104%	100%	79%	57%	36%	14%

Councilmember Leventhal, responding to concerns raised by Bonifant Street businesses, has asked the T&E Committee to consider adding \$36,000 for wayfinding signs for Lot 38 and Garage 5, and \$50,000 for temporary lighting nearby (©44-45). Should the Council concur, the wayfinding signs would be a legitimate PLD expense and, as noted above, the PLD is in sufficiently good shape to absorb the cost. It could be a straight “add” to its budget. However, since the temporary lighting would not be on the site of either Lot 38 or Garage 5, it would be funded by the General Fund. Therefore, if the Council agrees with the need for the lighting, these funds should go on the Reconciliation List.

The Bethesda PLD, historically very strong, has taken a step back over the past few years. However, Bethesda’s revenues will also improve in several ways. In FY18 the PLD will receive a one-time payment of \$1,700,000 from the General Fund for the back portion of Garage #35 (Rugby and Woodmont Avenues) for parking for the new Bethesda Station. In FY18 it will receive \$6,500,000 from the sale of Lot #43 (Woodmont and Cordell Avenues) for a private development (up from last year’s estimate of \$4.5 million).⁴ In FY17 the rates in Garages 40, 49, and 57 will go up from \$0.80/hour to the fee resolution’s maximum—\$1.00/hour—which will raise an additional \$600,000 annually. In FY18 the Executive’s plan calls for the charging hours for lots and garages to be extended to Saturdays, bringing in a further \$1,300,000 annually. The result of these and other smaller adjustments in the Fiscal Plan is that the Bethesda PLD’s ending reserve in the next several years will be fairly healthy.

Bethesda PLD:	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY
Reserves as % of Resources	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Executive Recommendation	37%	21%	47%	36%	26%	39%	19%

⁴ The HIF will receive \$2,167,000 from this sale.

IV. FY17-22 CIP: Parking Lot District projects

Consent projects. The following projects have no or little change in scope, timing, or year-to-year cost:

Consent bridge projects (page)	Funding Change	Timing Change
Facility Planning Parking: Bethesda PLD (20-2)	none	not applicable
Facility Planning Parking: Silver Spring PLD (20-3)	none	not applicable
Facility Planning Parking: Wheaton PLD (20-4)	none	not applicable
Parking Lot District Service Facility (20-5)	none	delayed a few months
Silver Spring Lot 3 Parking Garage (20-11)	none	none
Parking: Silver Spring Facility Renovations (20-9)	none	not applicable
Parking: Wheaton Facility Renovations (20-12)	none	not applicable

Parking: Bethesda Facility Renovations (20-7). The ramp-up of expenditures anticipated starting in FY17 will continue through at least FY22, so the six-year total is proposed to increase by \$3,523,000 (27%) over the Approved CIP. Work will occur in all the garages except the recently opened Garage 31 at Bethesda and Woodmont Avenues. The work includes steel, ceiling and wall painting, concrete repairs, and other infrastructure maintenance. The elevators will be modernized in Garage 40 (between Cordell and St. Elmo Avenues) in FYs17-19 and in Garage 49 (next to the Metro station) in FY21.

V. FY17 Operating Budget: Snow Removal and Storm Cleanup NDA

For the FY16 Budget the Council appropriated \$5,884,990 for this NDA, which supplements the amounts budgeted for this work within the Departments of Transportation and General Services. This was the same amount for this NDA since it was inaugurated in the FY12 budget. The reason for the odd amount is that the Council wanted to set aside a total of \$9 million for snow removal and storm cleanup, and the DOT General Fund budget for FY12 was \$3,115,010.

The Executive's budget calls for the DOT General Fund budget for FY17 to include \$3,342,206 for storm removal and storm cleanup, virtually the same as for FY16. However, he recommends raising the NDA to \$10 million, recognizing that the costs have been consistently higher.⁵ This would bring total funds budgeted for this purpose to \$13,342,206.

The amount set aside in this NDA should be part of the larger deliberation as to how high the General Fund reserve as a whole should be set. To give the Council the most flexibility in determining the size of the reserve, Council staff suggests that the NDA be retained at \$5,884,990 for now, and to put the balance on the Reconciliation List, in four tranches: \$1,115,010 (that would bring the NDA up to \$7 million), and three tranches of \$1 million each.

f:\orlin\fy16\te&e\fy17op\160421te.doc

⁵ The snow removal supplemental appropriation request for FY16 will be transmitted soon.

Resolution: _____
Introduced: April 5, 2016
Adopted: _____

**COUNTY COUNCIL
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**

By: County Council

SUBJECT: Setting Transportation Fees, Charges, and Fares

Background

1. Under Section 2-57A of the Montgomery County Code, as of July 22, 2004 all fees, charges, and fares for any transportation or transportation-related service or product provided by the Department of Transportation must be set by Council resolution adopted after a public hearing and approved by the Executive, unless any law expressly requires a different process. If the Executive disapproves a resolution within 10 days after it is adopted and the Council readopts it by a vote of six Councilmembers, or if the Executive does not act within 10 days after the Council adopts it, the resolution takes effect.
2. The fees, charges, and fares currently in effect are those in Council Resolution 18-128 adopted on May 13, 2015 and approved by the Executive on May 20, 2015.
3. The dates for the Traffic Management District charges have been updated to include the current period this resolution will be in effect.
4. A public hearing on this resolution was advertised and held on April 26, 2016.

Action

The County Council for Montgomery County approves the following resolution:

Transportation fares, fees, and charges in Resolution 18-128 are amended as described in Table 1, attached.

Effective dates for Traffic Management District charges have been updated.

These changes become effective July 1, 2016.

This is a correct copy of Council Action.

Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council

Approved

Date

Isiah Leggett, County Executive

Date

TABLE 1: TRANSPORTATION FARES, FEES, AND CHARGES

I. Transit Fares

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

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

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

A. Bethesda Parking Lot District

1. Meters on-street from 9am to 10 pm, Monday through Saturday, and in lots from 7am to 10 pm, Monday through Friday, and in garages from 7am to 10pm, Monday through Friday.
 - a. Parking in spaces within right of way of public streets \$2.00 Per Hr.
 - b. Parking in spaces on a surface parking lot \$1.25 or Less Per Hr.
 - c. Parking in spaces in a parking garage \$1.00 or Less Per Hr.

2. Garage 49
 - Daily Maximum \$12.00 Per Day
 - Lost Ticket \$12.00 Per Day

3. A Garage Specific
 - Monthly Access Card \$150.00 or Less Per Month

4. Special Permits
 - a. Parking permits
 - Parking Convenience Sticker \$150.00Per Month
 - Daily Parking Permit \$12.00 Per Day
 - “AM/PM” Parking Permit \$20.00 Per Month
 - b. Carpool Permits
 - 2 Persons \$107.00 Per Month
 - 3 and 4 Persons \$58.00 Per Month
 - 5 or More Persons \$15.00 Per Month
 - c. Townhouse Resident Permit \$2.00 Per Month

5. Bethesda Library parking lot \$1.00 Per Hour

B. Silver Spring Parking Lot District

1. Meters on-street from 9 am to 6 pm, Monday through Friday, and in lots and garages from 7 am to 7 pm,
 - a. Parking in spaces within right of way of public streets \$1.00 Per Hr.
 - b. Parking in spaces on a surface parking lot \$0.80 or Less Per Hr.
 - c. Parking in spaces in a parking garage \$0.70 or Less Per Hr.
(Except for Garage 60 and 61)

2. Special Permits
 - a. Parking permits
 - Parking Convenience Sticker \$123.00 Per Month
 - Daily Parking Permit \$7.80 Per Day
 - “AM/PM” Parking Permit \$20.00 Per Month
 - Garage Specific Monthly Access \$123.00 or Less Per Month
(Except for Garage 60 and 61)

b. Carpool Permits	
2 Persons	\$87.00 Per Month
3 and 4 Persons	\$49.00 Per Month
5 or More Persons	\$11.00 Per Month
c. Townhouse Resident Permit	\$2.00 Per Month
d. Permit in Garages 9 and 16 for residents in the area bounded by Blair Mill Road, Eastern Avenue and Georgia Avenue	\$95.00 Per Month
3. Garages 60 and 61	\$1.00 Per Hour
Monthly Permit	\$189.00 Per Month
4. Wheaton Parking Lot District	
1. Meters on-street from 9 am to 6 pm, Monday through Saturday, and in lots from 9 am to 6 pm, Monday through Saturday, and in garages from 9 am to 6 pm, Monday through Friday	
Short-Term (First 4 hours)	\$0.75 Per Hour
Long-Term (More than 4 hours)	\$0.60 or Less Per Hour
2. Special Permits	
Parking Convenience Sticker	\$113.00 Per Month
Townhouse Resident Permit	\$2.00 Per Month
5. Montgomery Hills Parking Lot District	
1. Meters on-street from 9 am to 6 pm, Monday through Friday, and in lots from 9 am to 6 pm, Monday through Friday	
Short-Term (First 4 hours)	\$0.50 Per Hour
Long-Term (More than 4 hours)	\$0.50 Per Hour
2. Special Permits	
Parking Convenience Sticker	\$90.00 Per Month
Townhouse Resident Permit	\$2.00 Per Month
6. Areas Outside Parking Lot Districts	
1. Meters on-street and in lots from 7 am to 7 pm, Monday through Friday	
Short-Term (First 4 hours)	\$1.00 Per Hour
Long-Term (More than 4 hours)	\$0.65 Per Hour
2. Special Permits	
Parking Convenience Sticker	\$123.00 Per Month

III. Parking Fines and Other Charges (with County Code Section Citations)

A. Motor vehicles, traffic control and highways, generally

31-6(b)(2) Snow emergency – Parked in Right-of-Way \$85.00

5

31-7	Unregistered vehicle/parking prohibited	\$60.00
31-8	Impeding traffic, threaten public safety	\$60.00

B. Parking regulations generally -on-street

31-11(b)	Emergency/Temporary no parking sign	\$60.00
31-12	Violation of official sign (except residential permit parking)	\$60.00
31-12	Residential permit parking violation	\$50.00
31-13	Parking of vehicle – snow accumulation	\$60.00
31-14	Parking of heavy commercial vehicles, recreational vehicles, or buses	\$75.00
31-16	Over 24 hours	\$60.00
31-17	Within 35 feet of intersection	\$60.00
31-18	Posted time limit	\$60.00
31-19	Obstructing driveways (within 5 feet)	\$60.00
31-20	No person will:	
	(a) Stop, stand or park a vehicle whether occupied or not:	
	(1) Impeding traffic	\$60.00
	(2) On a sidewalk	\$60.00
	(3) Within an intersection	\$60.00
	(4) On a crosswalk	\$60.00
	(5) Alongside street repair	\$60.00
	(6) On bridge/ in tunnel	\$60.00
	(7) On any highway ramp	\$60.00
	(8) Official school board/Montgomery College sign	\$60.00
	(9) Rush hour restriction	\$60.00
	(10) Behind Official sign in Right-of-Way	\$60.00
	(b) Stand or park a vehicle, whether occupied or not, except momentarily to pick up or discharge a passenger:	
	(1) within 15 feet of fire hydrant	\$60.00
	(2) within 20 feet of painted crosswalk	\$60.00
	(3) within 30 feet of traffic control signal/device	\$60.00
	(4) at a firehouse entrance clearance	\$60.00
	(5) at a No Standing sign	\$60.00
	(6) double parking	\$60.00
	(7) at a posted/marked fire lane	\$250.00
	(8) in front of theaters, posted	\$60.00
	(9) more than 12 inches from curb	\$60.00
	(10) opposite the flow of traffic	\$60.00
	(11) blocking another vehicle	\$60.00
	(12) not within designated parking space	\$60.00
	(13) at a posted bus stop	\$60.00
	(14) at a posted taxi stand	\$60.00
	(15) in a handicapped parking space	\$250.00
	(c) Park a vehicle, whether occupied or not, except temporarily for the purpose of and while actually engaged in loading or unloading merchandise or passenger:	
	(1) within 50 feet of a railroad crossing	\$60.00
	(2) at an official No Parking sign	\$60.00

C. Off-street public parking regulations

31-25	(a) No person shall park a vehicle on a public parking facility:	
	(1) in violation of an official sign	\$60.00
	(2) in a No Parking zone	\$60.00
	(3) not within a designated parking space	\$60.00
	(4) in or on driving aisle/driveway/sidewalks	\$60.00
	(5) at a bagged meter/temporary sign/barricade	\$60.00
	(6) blocking another vehicle	\$60.00
	(7) over 24 hours where not authorized	\$60.00
	(8) vehicle unregistered/inoperative	\$60.00
	(9) in violation front-in-only posted	\$60.00
	(10) straddling marked parking spaces	\$60.00
	(11) unattended/running	\$60.00
	(12) impeding traffic	\$60.00
31-27	(b) Prohibited vehicle/weight/size/type	\$60.00
31-30(c)	(c) Snow/ice emergency	\$60.00

D. Parking meters generally

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

E. Administration, enforcement, penalties, and collection

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

F. Residential Parking Permits

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

IV. Transportation Management District (TMD) annual fees

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

A. Bethesda Transportation Management District

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

B. Friendship Heights Transportation Management District

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

C. North Bethesda Transportation Management District

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

D. Silver Spring Transportation Management District

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

E. Greater Shady Grove Transportation Management District

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

* Between July 1, [2014] 2016 and June 30, [2015] 2017, 2.5 cents/sf GFA will be charged for each full quarter after a use and occupancy permit has been issued.



Transit Services

Mission Statement

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

Budget Overview

The total recommended FY17 Operating Budget for the Division of Transit Services is \$127,602,501, an increase of \$1,413,049 or 1.12 percent from the FY16 Approved Budget of \$126,189,452. Personnel Costs comprise 56.73 percent of the budget for 825 full-time position(s) and no part-time position(s), and a total of 842.47 FTEs. Total FTEs may include seasonal or temporary positions and may also reflect workforce charged to or from other departments or funds. Operating Expenses account for the remaining 43.27 percent of the FY17 budget.

The general obligation bond Debt Service for the Mass Transit Fund is appropriated in the Debt Service Fund and is not displayed in this section. To pay for the Debt Service, a transfer of funds from the Mass Transit Fund to the Debt Service Fund of \$18,863,850 is required.

Significant multi-program adjustments in Administration, Taxi Regulation, and Transit Operations Planning are due to corrections in staffing allocation across programs.

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

Linkage to County Result Areas

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

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

Department Performance Measures

Performance measures for this department are included below (where applicable), with multi-program measures displayed at the front of this section and program-specific measures shown with the relevant program. The FY16 estimates reflect funding based on the FY16 approved budget. The FY17 and FY18 figures are performance targets based on the FY17 recommended budget and funding for comparable service levels in FY18.

Initiatives

- ★ Implement Express Ride On Service between Clarksburg and Shady Grove Metrorail Station.
- ★ Enhance Call-n-Ride program by reducing age eligibility from 67 to 65, adding 445 participants to the program.
- ★ Implement Ride On Plus priority service from the Lakeforest Transit Center to the Medical Center Metrorail Station starting in FY18.
- ★ Program \$5 million in the Capital Budget and call upon the State to match that commitment to move the MD 355 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) study to a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) stage.
- ★ Program \$6.5 million in the Capital Budget for the planning and design of a high-quality BRT on US 29 with the intent of getting this route operational in less than four years.

- ★ Piloting left-turn signal warning technology to improve pedestrian and transit passenger safety.

Accomplishments

- ✓ Implemented Safety Instructors at field depots.
- ✓ Completed Facility Planning studies for transit improvements at the Lakeforest Transit Center, Milestone Transit Center, Germantown Transit Center and Boyds. All four locations include design enhancements for buses and passengers, as well as additional commuter parking capacity.
- ✓ Implemented 18 span-of-service improvements within budget providing additional service for Montgomery County residents and employers. Developed scheduling adjustments for 25 additional Ride On service routes to help improve on-time performance.
- ✓ The Call-n-Ride program increased its income eligibility limits in each of its categories after decades of remaining unchanged. This increased the number of residents who are now eligible for program participation and also reduced co-payments for over 500 current participants.
- ✓ The new Call-n-Ride program swipe card system has continued to reduce the average cost per trip which was \$23 in 2012 to \$16 currently. With these savings, participants can take about three more trips per month.
- ✓ Increased customer outreach events by 25%.
- ✓ The Call-n-Ride program conducted an outdoor advertising campaign placing 30 bus side advertisements on Ride On buses and 50 ads on bus shelters in the County. The program also developed a new brochure to help disseminate information about program changes, and increased outreach to eligible residents by participating in Resource fairs at different community centers, seniors' events and other community fairs.

Program Contacts

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

Program Descriptions

Medicaid and Senior Programs

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

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	7,403,175	10.85
Increase Cost: Medicaid Transportation Program	352,672	1.70
Enhance: Reduce Call-n-Ride Age Eligibility from 67 to 65	138,000	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	28,824	0.05
FY17 Recommended	7,922,671	12.60

Ride On

Fixed-route bus service is provided by the Ride On system throughout the County. Ride On operates primarily in neighborhoods and provides a collector and distributor service to the major transfer points and transit centers in the County. Ride On supplements and coordinates the County's mass transit services with Metrobus and Metrorail service which is provided by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The Ride On transit system operates and manages more than 78 routes; maintains a strategic plan for replacement of the bus

fleet; trains new bus operators and provides continuing safety, remedial and refresher instruction for existing operators; and coordinates activities with a state of the art Central Communications Center; which also operates Ride On's computer-aided dispatch/automatic vehicle location system.

Program Performance Measures	Actual FY14	Actual FY15	Estimated FY16	Target FY17	Target FY18
Hours of service	1,113,892	1,133,548	1,126,185	1,124,417	1,130,039
Number of reported collisions between Ride On buses and a person or object, per 100,000 miles driven	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.7
On time performance for Ride On buses	87.5%	87.5%	88.0%	88.5%	89.0%
Passengers per hour of service	23.6	22.9	23.0	23.1	23.1
Passengers transported (millions)	26.337	25.972	25.928	26.014	26.144
Ride On passengers transported per capita (Ratio of the number of passengers boarding a Ride On bus within a fiscal year and Montgomery County's population) ¹	26.7	26.2	26.0	26.0	26.0
Percent of Ride On customers who report a satisfactory customer service experience	N/A	80%	80%	80%	80%
Ride On complaints per 100,000 bus riders	24.3	23.7	23.7	23.7	23.7

¹ Definition: This measure is calculated annually comparing the number of Ride On passengers to the Montgomery County Population. It indicates whether the Ride On is maintaining a constant share of Montgomery County residents.

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	102,188,606	765.60
Increase Cost: Motor Pool Adjustment	1,174,488	0.00
Add: Express Ride On Service Between Clarksburg and Shady Grove Metro	117,438	5.00
Decrease Cost: Implement Tobytown Service to Peak-Only Schedule	(60,000)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Perform Driver Training in Buses Rather than Leased Training Vans	(116,484)	0.00
Reduce: Annualization of FY16 Savings Plan Reductions - Sunday Ride On Service on Routes 42, 83, and 98	(1,574,667)	(8.00)
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	2,700,404	7.19
FY17 Recommended	104,429,785	769.79

Commuter Services

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

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	3,466,035	18.19
Increase Cost: Council of Governments grant increase	15,405	0.00
Technical Adj: Commuter Assistance Grant	0	(0.10)
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	(5,939)	0.10
FY17 Recommended	3,475,501	18.19

Taxi Regulation

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

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
--------------------------	--------------	------

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	858,951	7.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	(203,794)	(2.00)
FY17 Recommended	655,157	5.00

Customer Service

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

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	1,630,390	6.13
Increase Cost: Kids Ride Free/ Seniors Ride Free	78,500	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	18,855	0.50
FY17 Recommended	1,727,745	6.63

Transit Operations Planning

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

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	3,746,073	17.70
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY16	(159,240)	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	(1,739,925)	(10.70)
FY17 Recommended	1,846,908	7.00

Transit Parking Facility Maintenance

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

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	318,766	1.28
Increase Cost: Germantown Transit Center Operation and Maintenance	42,500	0.00
Increase Cost: Montgomery Mall Transit Center Operation and Maintenance	29,000	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	2,954	0.00
FY17 Recommended	393,220	1.28

Passenger Facilities

The Passenger Facilities program provides for the safe, comfortable, clean, and accessible entry for transit customers into the transit system. The program is responsible for supervising the construction and maintenance of bus shelters and the collection of the County's share of

revenues generated through advertising sales, as provided under a 15-year franchise agreement. It is also responsible for the purchase, installation, maintenance and replacement of all equipment, including but not limited to bus benches, trash receptacles, transit information display units, and other passenger amenities. The program installs and maintains all system signage, including poles and bus stop flags.

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	1,081,305	4.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	13,160	0.00
FY17 Recommended	1,094,465	4.00

Fixed Costs

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

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	3,007,953	0.00
Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment	(206,885)	0.00
FY17 Recommended	2,801,068	0.00

Administration

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

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	2,488,198	5.44
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	767,783	12.54
FY17 Recommended	3,255,981	17.98

Budget Summary

	Actual FY15	Budget FY16	Estimate FY16	REC FY17	% Chg Bud/Rec
MASS TRANSIT					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	49,901,724	51,022,629	51,344,864	51,920,892	1.8 %
Employee Benefits	16,401,680	18,552,688	17,505,887	18,611,084	0.3 %
Mass Transit Personnel Costs	66,303,404	69,575,317	68,850,751	70,531,976	1.4 %
Operating Expenses	53,247,388	51,916,573	51,342,906	52,004,886	0.2 %
Mass Transit Expenditures	119,550,792	121,491,890	120,193,657	122,536,862	0.9 %
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	810	810	810	808	-0.2 %
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	820.69	821.40	821.40	826.08	0.6 %
REVENUES					
Bus Advertising	1,100,940	545,000	935,000	935,000	71.6 %
Insurance Recoveries	243,039	0	0	0	—

	Actual FY15	Budget FY16	Estimate FY16	REC FY17	% Chg Bud/Rec
Investment Income	0	7,710	0	0	-100.0 %
Miscellaneous Revenues	267,491	0	0	0	—
Motor Pool Charges/Fees	487,923	0	0	0	—
Other Charges/Fees	628,624	837,000	982,194	982,194	17.3 %
Other Fines/Forfeitures	11,514	0	0	0	—
Parking Fees	666,639	661,385	661,385	661,385	—
Parking Fines	813,243	405,000	405,000	405,000	—
Property Tax	68,879,640	107,000,412	106,834,291	95,144,257	-11.1 %
Ride On Fare Revenue	22,732,309	23,550,593	22,824,165	22,819,465	-3.1 %
State Aid: Call N' Ride	186,554	379,110	379,110	379,110	—
State Aid: Damascus Fixed Route	225,815	309,950	309,950	309,950	—
State Aid: Ride On	38,204,604	39,089,040	38,264,000	38,264,000	-2.1 %
Taxi Licensing Fees	555,763	531,000	531,000	531,000	—
Mass Transit Revenues	135,004,098	173,316,200	172,126,095	160,431,361	-7.4 %

GRANT FUND - MCG

EXPENDITURES

Salaries and Wages	1,056,755	1,373,507	1,373,507	1,462,021	6.4 %
Employee Benefits	371,590	375,290	375,290	397,913	6.0 %
Grant Fund - MCG Personnel Costs	1,428,345	1,748,797	1,748,797	1,859,934	6.4 %
Operating Expenses	3,760,801	2,948,765	2,948,765	3,205,705	8.7 %
Grant Fund - MCG Expenditures	5,189,146	4,697,562	4,697,562	5,065,639	7.8 %

PERSONNEL

Full-Time	15	15	15	17	13.3 %
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	14.93	14.79	14.79	16.39	10.8 %

REVENUES

Federal Grants	1,898,483	1,763,357	1,763,357	1,939,694	10.0 %
State Grants	3,204,216	2,934,205	2,934,205	3,125,945	6.5 %
Grant Fund - MCG Revenues	5,102,699	4,697,562	4,697,562	5,065,639	7.8 %

DEPARTMENT TOTALS

Total Expenditures	124,739,938	126,189,452	124,891,219	127,602,501	1.1 %
Total Full-Time Positions	825	825	825	825	—
Total Part-Time Positions	0	0	0	0	—
Total FTEs	835.62	836.19	836.19	842.47	0.8 %
Total Revenues	140,106,797	178,013,762	176,823,657	165,497,000	-7.0 %

FY17 Recommended Changes

	Expenditures	FTEs
MASS TRANSIT		
FY16 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	121,491,890	821.40
Changes (with service impacts)		
Enhance: Reduce Call-n-Ride Age Eligibility from 67 to 65 [Medicaid and Senior Programs]	138,000	0.00
Add: Express Ride On Service Between Clarksburg and Shady Grove Metro [Ride On]	117,438	5.00
Reduce: Annualization of FY16 Savings Plan Reductions - Sunday Ride On Service on Routes 42, 83, and 98 [Ride On]	(1,574,667)	(8.00)
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Increase Cost: FY17 Compensation Adjustment	1,195,703	0.00
Increase Cost: Motor Pool Adjustment [Ride On]	1,174,488	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	506,362	0.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of FY16 Personnel Costs	367,477	7.68
Increase Cost: Kids Ride Free/ Seniors Ride Free [Customer Service]	78,500	0.00
Increase Cost: Germantown Transit Center Operation and Maintenance [Transit Parking Facility Maintenance]	42,500	0.00
Increase Cost: Montgomery Mall Transit Center Operation and Maintenance [Transit Parking Facility Maintenance]	29,000	0.00

	Expenditures	FTEs
Increase Cost: Printing and Mail	13,028	0.00
Decrease Cost: Implement Tobytown Service to Peak-Only Schedule [Ride On]	(60,000)	0.00
Shift: Telecommunications to the Telecommunications Non-Departmental Account	(88,870)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Mystery Rider Contract	(100,000)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Perform Driver Training in Buses Rather than Leased Training Vans [Ride On]	(116,484)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY16 [Transit Operations Planning]	(159,240)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment [Fixed Costs]	(206,885)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retirement Adjustment	(311,378)	0.00
FY17 RECOMMENDED	122,536,862	826.08

GRANT FUND - MCG

FY16 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	4,697,562	14.79
<u>Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)</u>		
Increase Cost: Medicaid Transportation Program [Medicaid and Senior Programs]	352,672	1.70
Increase Cost: Council of Governments grant increase [Commuter Services]	15,405	0.00
Technical Adj: Commuter Assistance Grant [Commuter Services]	0	(0.10)
FY17 RECOMMENDED	5,065,639	16.39

Program Summary

Program Name	FY16 APPR		FY17 REC	
	Expenditures	FTEs	Expenditures	FTEs
Medicaid and Senior Programs	7,403,175	10.85	7,922,671	12.60
Ride On	102,188,606	765.60	104,429,785	769.79
Commuter Services	3,466,035	18.19	3,475,501	18.19
Taxi Regulation	858,951	7.00	655,157	5.00
Customer Service	1,630,390	6.13	1,727,745	6.63
Transit Operations Planning	3,746,073	17.70	1,846,908	7.00
Transit Parking Facility Maintenance	318,766	1.28	393,220	1.28
Passenger Facilities	1,081,305	4.00	1,094,465	4.00
Fixed Costs	3,007,953	0.00	2,801,068	0.00
Administration	2,488,198	5.44	3,255,981	17.98
Total	126,189,452	836.19	127,602,501	842.47

Charges to Other Departments

Charged Department	Charged Fund	FY16		FY17	
		Total\$	FTEs	Total\$	FTEs
MASS TRANSIT					
Health and Human Services	General Fund	282,694	0.00	282,694	0.00
GRANT FUND - MCG					
Health and Human Services	Grant Fund	127,000	0.00	0	0.00
Total		409,694	0.00	282,694	0.00

Future Fiscal Impacts

Title	CE RECOMMENDED (\$000s)					
	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22

MASS TRANSIT

Transit Services

(15)

Transportation 48-7

Title	CE RECOMMENDED (\$000s)					
	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22
EXPENDITURES						
FY17 Recommended	122,537	122,537	122,537	122,537	122,537	122,537
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Express Service from Clarksburg to Shady Grove Metro	0	588	588	588	588	588
Annualize for full year cost (10 months).						
MD 355 Priority Service	0	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
Operating costs for new service planned for FY18.						
Labor Contracts	0	1,271	1,271	1,271	1,271	1,271
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and other negotiated items.						
Subtotal Expenditures	122,537	126,997	126,997	126,997	126,997	126,997

16

FY16 Route Profile

Route	Ser	Route Description	Gar	Avg Daily Riders	Annual Riders	Annual Platform Miles	Annual Platform Hours	Riders Per Platform Hour
15	Wkdy	Langley Park-Wayne Ave.-Silver Spring	S	3,294	839,970	200,361	21,471	39.1
55	Wkdy	GTC-Milestone-MC,G-Lakeforest-Shady Grove-MC,R-Rockville	G	7,748	1,975,740	668,465	52,658	37.5
1	Wkdy	Silver Spring-Leland St.-Friendship Heights	S	1,910	487,050	157,771	13,413	36.3
49	Wkdy	Glenmont-Layhill-Rockville	G	2,273	579,615	223,265	16,856	34.4
55	Sun	GTC-Milestone-Lakeforest-Shady Grove	G	2,969	169,233	65,602	4,925	34.4
15	Sat	Langley Park-Wayne Ave.-Silver Spring	S	2,460	130,380	38,822	3,901	33.4
15	Sun	Langley Park-Wayne Ave.-Silver Spring	S	1,713	97,641	29,943	2,993	32.6
59	Wkdy	Montgomery Village-Lakeforest-Shady Grove-Rockville	G	3,682	938,910	371,696	29,478	31.9
11	Wkdy	Silver Spring-East/West Hwy-Friendship Heights	S	823	209,865	84,925	6,834	30.7
20	Sun	Hillandale-Northwest Park-Silver Spring	S	1,931	110,067	35,957	3,637	30.3
61	Sat	GTC-Lakeforest-Shady Grove	G	2,159	114,427	45,089	3,832	29.9
20	Sat	Hillandale-Northwest Park-Silver Spring	S	2,224	117,872	37,791	3,975	29.7
61	Wkdy	GTC-Lakeforest-Shady Grove	G	2,595	661,725	290,358	22,415	29.5
48	Wkdy	Wheaton-Bauer Dr.-Rockville	G	2,046	521,730	230,874	18,182	28.7
20	Wkdy	Hillandale-Northwest Park-Silver Spring	S	2,846	725,730	263,305	25,551	28.4
55	Sat	GTC-Milestone-Lakeforest-Shady Grove-Rockville	G	4,752	251,856	110,547	8,931	28.2
57	Wkdy	Lakeforest-Washington Grove-Shady Grove	G	2,008	512,040	224,380	18,335	27.9
2	Wkdy	Lyttonsville-Silver Spring	S	883	225,165	59,897	8,109	27.8
2	Sun	Lyttonsville-Silver Spring	S	543	30,951	8,145	1,123	27.6
48	Sat	Wheaton-Bauer Dr.-Rockville	G	1,553	82,309	36,084	3,000	27.4
59	Sat	Montgomery Village-Lakeforest-Shady Grove-Rockville	G	2,229	118,137	53,160	4,320	27.3
48	Sun	Wheaton-Bauer Dr.-Rockville	G	1,118	63,726	29,283	2,377	26.8
46	Wkdy	Shady Grove-Montgomery College-Rockville Pike-Medical Center	G	3,381	862,155	337,758	32,615	26.4
66	Wkdy	Shady Grove-Piccard Drive-Shady Grove Hospital-Traville TC	G	191	48,705	23,807	1,862	26.2
61	Sun	GTC-Lakeforest-Shady Grove	G	1,625	92,625	44,331	3,625	25.6
49	Sun	Glenmont-Lay hill-Rockville	G	1,045	59,565	31,870	2,331	25.6
2	Sat	Lyttonsville-Silver Spring	S	524	27,772	7,602	1,092	25.4
16	Wkdy	Takoma-Langley Park-Silver Spring	S	3,222	821,610	325,393	32,309	25.4
1	Sat	Silver Spring-Leland St.-Friendship Heights	S	1,085	57,505	27,585	2,274	25.3
64	Wkdy	Montgomery Village-Quail Valley-Emory Grove-Shady Grove	G	1,365	348,075	208,238	13,770	25.3
100	Wkdy	GTC-Shady Grove	G	2,215	564,825	510,372	22,364	25.3
17	Sun	Langley Park-Maple Ave.-Silver Spring	S	853	48,621	19,177	1,938	25.1
10	Wkdy	Twinbrook-Glenmont-White Oak-Hillandale	S	2,399	611,745	311,312	24,582	24.9
54	Wkdy	Lakeforest-Washingtonian Blvd-Rockville	G	1,886	480,930	232,774	19,533	24.6
54	Sat	Lakeforest-Washingtonian Boulevard-Rockville	G	1,327	70,331	35,921	2,878	24.4
12	Sun	Takoma-Flower Avenue-Wayne Avenue-Silver Spring	S	1,036	59,052	26,216	2,462	24.0
58	Sat	Lakeforest-Montgomery Village-East Village-Shady Grove	G	1,063	56,339	32,663	2,369	23.8
54	Sun	Lakeforest-Washingtonian Boulevard-Rockville	G	1,085	61,845	32,451	2,605	23.7
57	Sun	Lakeforest-Washington Grove-Shady Grove	G	1,028	58,596	31,197	2,468	23.7
34	Wkdy	Aspen Hill-Wheaton-Bethesda-Friendship Heights	S	2,484	633,420	302,749	26,877	23.6
59	Sun	Montgomery Village-Lakeforest-Shady Grove-Rockville	G	1,804	102,828	58,111	4,400	23.4
12	Wkdy	Takoma-Flower Avenue-Wayne Avenue-Silver Spring	S	1,517	386,835	173,984	16,728	23.1
26	Wkdy	Glenmont-Aspen Hill-Twinbrook-Montgomery Mall	S	2,877	733,635	394,212	31,977	22.9
56	Wkdy	Lakeforest-Quince Orchard-Shady Grove Hospital-Rockville	G	2,149	547,995	333,499	24,021	22.8
17	Wkdy	Langley Park-Maple Ave.-Silver Spring	S	1,191	303,705	129,617	13,388	22.7
71	Wkdy	Kingsview-Dawson Farm-Shady Grove	G	371	94,605	84,935	4,182	22.6
5	Wkdy	Twinbrook-Kensington-Silver Spring	S	2,008	512,040	272,692	22,644	22.6
16	Sat	Takoma-Langley Park-Silver Spring	S	2,577	136,581	60,672	6,042	22.6
100	Sat	GTC-Shady Grove	G	772	40,916	33,149	1,813	22.6
58	Wkdy	Lakeforest-Montgomery Village-East Village-Shady Grove, Watkins Mill & MD355	G	1,339	341,445	239,522	15,351	22.2
1	Sun	Silver Spring - Friendship Heights	S	842	47,994	24,279	2,160	22.2
L8	Sat	Grand Pre-Bel Pre, Connecticut, Friendship Hts Station	S	1,170	62,010	41,282	2,814	22.0
9	Wkdy	Wheaton-Four Corners-Silver Spring	S	1,186	302,430	164,778	13,770	22.0

FY16 Route Profile

Route	Ser	Route Description	Gar	Avg Daily Riders	Annual Riders	Annual Platform Miles	Annual Platform Hours	Riders Per Platform Hour
41	Wkdy	Aspen Hill-Weller Rd.-Glenmont	S	772	196,860	81,801	9,002	21.9
57	Sat	Lakeforest-Washington Grove-Shady Grove	G	1,349	71,497	39,743	3,286	21.8
12	Sat	Takoma-Flower Avenue-Wayne Avenue-Silver Spring	S	994	52,682	25,085	2,454	21.5
46	Sat	Shady Grove-Montgomery College-Rockville Pike-Medical Center	G	2,002	106,106	51,052	5,014	21.2
65	Wkdy	Montgomery Village-Shady Grove	G	189	48,195	34,277	2,295	21.0
26	Sat	Glenmont-Aspen Hill-Twinbrook-Montgomery Mall	S	2,040	108,120	64,177	5,168	20.9
13	Wkdy	Takoma-Manchester Rd.-Three Oaks Dr.-Silver Spring	S	298	75,990	35,542	3,647	20.8
97	Wkdy	GTC, Germantown MARC, Waring Station, GTC	N	658	167,790	118,264	8,135	20.6
16	Sun	Takoma-Langley Park-Silver Spring	S	2,032	115,824	56,219	5,843	19.8
46	Sun	Shady Grove-Montgomery College-Rockville Pike-Medical Center	G	1,731	98,667	60,174	5,079	19.4
60	Wkdy	Montgomery Village-Flower Hill-Shady Grove	G	275	70,125	52,795	3,621	19.4
47	Wkdy	Rockville-Montgomery Mall-Bethesda	S	1,436	366,180	256,267	19,049	19.2
10	Sat	Twinbrook-Glenmont-White Oak-Hillandale	S	1,396	73,988	53,361	3,858	19.2
56	Sat	Lakeforest-Quince Orchard-Shady Grove Hospital-Rockville	G	1,317	69,801	50,423	3,652	19.1
49	Sat	Glenmont-Layhill-Rockville	G	987	52,311	33,502	2,745	19.1
100	Sun	GTC-Shady Grove	G	568	32,376	35,441	1,704	19.0
34	Sun	Wheaton-Bethesda-Friendship Heights	S	1,321	75,297	41,558	3,979	18.9
14	Wkdy	Takoma-Piney Branch Road-Franklin Ave.-Silver Spring	S	719	183,345	122,550	9,741	18.8
34	Sat	Wheaton-Bethesda-Friendship Heights	S	1,314	69,642	35,981	3,721	18.7
74	Wkdy	GTC-Great Seneca Hwy.-Shady Grove	G	1,046	266,730	270,017	14,331	18.6
17	Sat	Langley Park-Maple Ave.-Silver Spring	S	735	38,955	17,478	2,099	18.6
10	Sun	Twinbrook-Glenmont-White Oak-Hillandale	S	1,227	69,939	51,592	3,785	18.5
9	Sun	Wheaton-Four Corners-Silver Spring	S	708	40,356	23,788	2,217	18.2
L8	Sun	Grand Pre-Bel Pre, Connecticut, Friendship Hts Station	S	815	46,455	38,195	2,554	18.2
79	Wkdy	Clarksburg-Skiyark-Scenery-Shady Grove	G	376	95,880	125,965	5,330	18.0
24	Wkdy	Hillandale-Northwest Park-Takoma	S	243	61,965	31,380	3,468	17.9
58	Sun	Lakeforest-Montgomery Village-East Village-Shady Grove	G	652	37,164	30,079	2,092	17.8
41	Sat	Aspen Hill-Weller Rd.-Glenmont	S	624	33,072	16,441	1,887	17.5
9	Sat	Wheaton-Four Corners-Silver Spring	S	778	41,234	21,953	2,359	17.5
63	Wkdy	Shady Grove-Gaither Road-Piccard Dr.-Rockville	G	710	181,050	100,725	10,506	17.2
43	Wkdy	Traville TC-Shady Grove-Hospital-Shady Grove	G	757	193,035	135,818	11,297	17.1
64	Sat	Montgomery Village-Quail Valley-Emory Grove-Shady Grove	G	811	42,983	34,117	2,549	16.9
26	Sun	Glenmont-Aspen Hill-Twinbrook-Montgomery Mall	S	1,657	94,449	69,227	5,620	16.8
56	Sun	Lakeforest-Quince Orchard-Shady Grove Hospital-Rockville	G	1,024	58,368	50,295	3,517	16.6
25	Wkdy	Langley Park-Washington Adventist Hosp-Maple Ave-Takoma	S	499	127,245	65,617	7,727	16.5
39	Wkdy	Briggs Chaney-Glenmont	S	331	84,405	80,187	5,126	16.5
97	Sat	GTC, Gunner's Lake, GTC	N	314	16,642	15,342	1,023	16.3
38	Wkdy	Wheaton-White Flint	S	805	205,275	135,438	12,801	16.0
90	Wkdy	Damascus-Woodfield Rd- Airpark Shady Grove	G	886	225,930	296,970	14,484	15.6
45	Wkdy	Fallsgrrove-Rockville Senior Center-Rockville-Twinbrook	N	974	248,370	201,861	15,938	15.6
76	Wkdy	Poolesville-Kentlands-Shady Grove	G	737	187,935	246,603	12,240	15.4
36	Wkdy	Potomac-Bradley Blvd.-Bethesda	S	521	132,855	125,934	8,670	15.3
75	Wkdy	Clarksburg-Correctional Facility-Milestone-GTC	G	479	122,145	155,394	8,007	15.3
23	Wkdy	Sibley Hospital-Brookmont-Sangamore Road-Friendship Heights	S	600	153,000	126,799	10,098	15.2
5	Sat	Twinbrook-Kensington-Silver Spring	S	947	50,191	38,436	3,371	14.9
28	Wkdy	Silver Spring Downtown (VanGo)	N	598	152,490	106,406	10,455	14.6
18	Wkdy	Langley Park-Takoma-Silver Spring	S	713	181,815	106,009	12,495	14.6
78	Wkdy	Kingsview-Richter Farm-Shady Grove	G	237	60,435	82,538	4,182	14.5
51	Wkdy	Norbeck P&R-Hewitt Ave.-Glenmont	S	257	65,535	55,598	4,539	14.4
47	Sat	Rockville-Montgomery Mall-Bethesda	N	905	47,965	42,898	3,323	14.4
29	Wkdy	Bethesda-Glen Echo-Friendship Heights	N	696	177,480	172,959	12,342	14.4
96	Wkdy	Montgomery Mall-Rock Spring-Grosvenor	N	438	111,690	97,762	7,803	14.3
97	Sun	GTC, Gunner's Lake, GTC	N	232	13,224	12,888	946	14.0

FY16 Route Profile

Route	Ser	Route Description	Gar	Avg Daily Riders	Annual Riders	Annual Platform Miles	Annual Platform Hours	Riders Per Platform Hour
30	Wkdy	Medical Center-Pooks Hill-Bethesda	S	636	162,180	126,212	11,654	13.9
38	Sat	Wheaton-White Flint	N	506	26,818	22,565	1,929	13.9
22	Wkdy	Hillandale-White Oak-FDA-Silver Spring	S	397	101,235	86,422	7,293	13.9
43	Sat	Traville TC-Shady Grove-Hospital-Shady Grove	G	423	22,419	18,928	1,622	13.8
41	Sun	Aspen Hill-Weller Rd.-Glenmont	S	288	16,416	10,064	1,203	13.6
5	Sun	Twinbrook-Kensington-Silver Spring	S	824	46,968	40,852	3,460	13.6
64	Sun	Montgomery Village-Quail Valley-Emory Grove-Shady Grove	G	571	32,547	34,276	2,411	13.5
T2	Sat	Friendship Hts, River Rd, Falls Rd, Rockville W.	S	672	35,616	44,964	2,655	13.4
14	Sat	Takoma-Piney Branch Road-Franklin Ave.-Silver Spring	S	370	19,610	17,506	1,479	13.3
32	Wkdy	Naval Ship R&D-Cabin John-Bethesda	N	254	64,770	71,165	4,947	13.1
T2	Sun	Friendship Hts, River Rd, Falls Rd, Rockville W.	S	622	35,454	48,061	2,770	12.8
23	Sat	Sibley Hospital-Brookmont-Sangamore Road-Friendship Heights	S	399	21,147	20,495	1,659	12.7
19	Wkdy	Northwood-Four Corners-Silver Spring	S	137	34,935	34,897	2,805	12.5
8	Wkdy	Wheaton-Forest Glen-Silver Spring	N	607	154,785	163,889	13,005	11.9
70	Wkdy	Milestone-Medical Center-Bethesda Express	G	630	160,650	375,987	13,898	11.6
47	Sun	Rockville-Montgomery Mall-Bethesda	N	697	39,729	44,164	3,443	11.5
29	Sun	Glen Echo-Friendship Heights	N	174	9,918	17,713	861	11.5
83	Sat	GTC-Waters Landing-Milestone	N	329	17,437	27,007	1,553	11.2
33	Wkdy	Glenmont-Kensington-Medical Center	S	340	86,700	79,076	7,803	11.1
67	Wkdy	Traville TC-North Potomac-Shady Grove	G	118	30,090	42,531	2,754	10.9
37	Wkdy	Potomac-Tuckerman La.-Grosvenor-Wheaton	N	240	61,200	84,209	5,712	10.7
38	Sun	Wheaton-White Flint	N	411	23,427	23,501	2,280	10.3
4	Wkdy	Kensington-Silver Spring	S	210	53,550	52,849	5,228	10.2
8	Sat	Wheaton-Forest Glen-Silver Spring	N	476	25,228	27,516	2,465	10.2
44	Wkdy	Twinbrook-Hungerford-Rockville	N	105	26,775	30,954	2,652	10.1
21	Wkdy	Briggs Chaney-Tamarack-Dumont Oaks-Silver Spring	N	247	62,985	114,490	6,350	9.9
6	Wkdy	Grosvenor-Parkside-Montgomery Mall Loop	N	255	65,025	77,237	6,809	9.6
83	Wkdy	Germantown MARC-GTC-Waters Landing-Milestone-Holy Cross	N	516	131,580	250,117	13,923	9.5
7	Wkdy	Forest Glen-Wheaton	N	73	18,615	16,703	1,989	9.4
81	Wkdy	Rockville-Tower Oaks-White Flint	N	157	40,035	53,749	4,335	9.2
98	Wkdy	GTC, Kingsview, GCC, Cinnamon Woods	N	449	114,495	194,336	13,235	8.7
52	Wkdy	MGH-Olney-Rockville	N	169	43,095	80,878	5,126	8.4
53	Wkdy	Shady Grove-MGH-Olney-Glenmont	N	325	82,875	202,151	9,920	8.4
45	Sat	Fallsgrove-Rockville-Twinbrook	N	366	19,398	31,614	2,348	8.3
18	Sat	Langley Park-Takoma-Silver Spring	S	352	18,656	16,759	2,268	8.2
31	Wkdy	Glenmont-Kemp Mill Rd.-Wheaton	N	101	25,755	37,536	3,137	8.2
42	Wkdy	White Flint-Montgomery Mall	N	371	94,605	148,548	11,603	8.2
18	Sun	Langley Park-Takoma	S	232	13,224	10,243	1,693	7.8
93	Wkdy	Twinbrook-HHS-Twinbrook	N	28	7,140	5,577	969	7.4
98	Sat	GTC, Kingsview, Soccerplex	N	257	13,621	32,004	1,929	7.1
42	Sat	White Flint-Montgomery Mall	N	253	13,409	22,257	1,977	6.8
3	Wkdy	Takoma-Dale Dr.-Silver Spring	N	27	6,885	16,565	1,199	5.7
29	Sat	Bethesda-Glen Echo-Friendship Heights	N	126	6,678	23,193	1,505	4.4
28	Sat	Silver Spring Downtown (VanGo)	N	195	10,335	19,983	2,480	4.2
94	Wkdy	Germantown MARC-Clarksburg Meet the MARC January 2014	N	55	14,025	92,993	4,463	3.1
42	Sun	Eliminated Jan 2016						
83	Sun	Eliminated Jan 2016						
98	Sun	Eliminated Jan 2016						

Garage- S Silver Spring, G-Gaithersburg, N-Nicholson Ct

Avg Daily Ridership 1 year thru Dec-15 Service Hours are Jan 2016

25,353,972 15,241,529 1,169,513 21.7

19



MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

NANCY FLOREEN
COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT

MEMORANDUM

October 27, 2015

To: Isiah Leggett, County Executive

From: Nancy Floreen, Council Vice President
Craig Rice, Council member

Subject: Express bus service between Clarksburg and Shady Grove Metro

As the Clarksburg corridor city continues towards its buildout, there is still little in the way of effective transit serving it. There are only three bus routes: Route 75, which runs all day to the Germantown Transit Center; Route 79, an all-day route that winds through Clarksburg and east Germantown before joining I-270 at Middlebrook Road and proceeding to the Shady Grove Station; and Route 94, a free shuttle between Clarksburg and the Germantown MARC Station.

Express service is not planned to be provided between Clarksburg and the Shady Grove Metro Station in the near- or middle-term future. Several years ago the State ceased its planning work on Phase 2 of the Corridor Cities Transitway, which would extend from Metropolitan Grove to Clarksburg. Planning for the MD 355 BRT has only recently begun so it, too, is many years off. We believe the best course for the short-term is to provide express bus service between Clarksburg and Shady Grove via I-270 and I-370. There is already an HOV lane on I-270 from I-370 to MD 121 that buses can use heading northbound during afternoon rush hours; if the State were to respond to our call to re-purpose the inside southbound lane of I-270 from MD 121 to I-370—as planned in the late 1990s when I-270 was last widened—then there would be the opportunity for fast and reliable bus service during morning rush hours as well.

We request that you ask the Division of Transit Services to lay out a specific path for this route and to estimate the operating cost and revenue for an express route running between Clarksburg via I-270 (getting on at the MD 121 interchange) and the Shady Grove Station. In these calculations Transit Services should assume a fairly frequent headway—either every 15 or 20 minutes—during weekday peak periods, and a 30-minute headway during the off-peak on weekdays. The five new Ride On buses included in the budget should be delivered in FY17 and could be put to use on this new route.

October 27, 2015
Page 2 of 2

Once this information is produced we ask that you include such a service in your Recommended FY17 Operating Budget. Should you choose not to do so, please have Transit Services forward to us its information about this route, so we can have the opportunity to have the Council consider including it in the Approved FY17 Budget.

cc: Al Roshdieh, Acting Director, DOT
Carolyn Biggins, Chief, DOT Division of Transit Services
Marilyn Balcombe, President / CEO, Gaithersburg Germantown Chamber of Commerce
David Stein, President, Clarksburg Chamber of Commerce
Councilmembers



MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

ROGER BERLINER
COUNCILMEMBER
DISTRICT 1

CHAIRMAN
TRANSPORTATION, INFRASTRUCTURE
ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

January 8, 2015

The Honorable Isiah Leggett
County Executive
101 Monroe St, 2nd Floor
Rockville, MD 20850

Dear County Executive Leggett,

As you appreciate all too well, many difficult choices were made in the FY16 savings plan, in an effort to save \$50 million in hard budget times. We understand, also, that the upcoming FY17 budget will pose a number of challenges that will require tough decisions, fiscal discipline, and an eye towards prioritizing the most fundamental duties of county government. With that context in mind, we are writing today to ask that you include funding for the Tobytown Shuttle service in the FY17 operating budget.

Tobytown is an isolated, historic African-American community in a low-density part of Potomac. Serving it effectively with transportation will always require a non-traditional approach that will necessitate a certain amount of public subsidy. However, all evidence suggests that improving transportation for low-income community creates greater economic opportunity and the chance to end a cycle of poverty. The Tobytown residents, and adjacent communities in Potomac, believe that this service will offer real mobility to help them better access jobs and school.

When we decided to not fund the shuttle in the FY16 savings plan, the Council did so with the understanding that we would consider lower-cost alternatives to the proposed shuttle. After reviewing the options and hearing from Tobytown residents, we have concluded that the shuttle proposed by DOT and incorporated in your original FY16 budget is the best approach to provide transit at Tobytown, and we ask that you make this recommendation again this year. We stand ready to support it, even in difficult budgetary times.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter. We look forward to working with you this budget season.

22

Sincerely,



Roger Berliner
Councilmember, District 1
Chair, Transportation, Infrastructure,
Energy, and Environment Committee



Sidney Katz
Councilmember, District 3

CC: Al Roshdieh, Acting Director, Montgomery County Department of Transportation
Carolyn Biggins, Chief, Division of Transit Services, MCDOT
Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Administrator




**MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND**

**OFFICE OF COUNCILMEMBER
NANCY NAVARRO**

MEMORANDUM

April 5, 2016

TO: Roger Berliner
Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy & Environment (T&E) Committee Chair

FROM: Nancy Navarro 
Councilmember, District 4

SUBJECT: FY17 Operating Budget: Ride On Service for Tobytown

In advance of the FY17 Operating Budget worksessions, I would like to draw your attention to an issue affecting the residents of Tobytown in Potomac.

As you know, Tobytown is an historical African-American community, but has also been historically disadvantaged in regard to transit services. The Tobytown community is nestled in Potomac just off of River Road. With no crosswalks, sidewalks, stop signs, or street lights, and a posted speed limit of 50 miles per hour, this area of the County is far from pedestrian friendly. Nevertheless, residents of Tobytown have been requesting transit services for years, as many residents do not have access to any other modes of transportation.

During the FY16 Operating Budget worksession on the Mass Transit Fund, the T&E Committee concurred with the County Executive's recommendation to include \$220,000 for a pilot route to serve the Tobytown community; however, this item was unfortunately reduced during the FY16 Savings Plan.

I would like to request that the T&E Committee look at options to provide Ride On service to the residents of Tobytown. Having transit access would improve the quality of life for residents of Tobytown.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

CC: Nancy Floreen, T&E Committee Member
Tom Hucker, T&E Committee Member

FY2017 Montgomery County Budget Hearing Testimony
—April 6, 1:30 PM-3:30 PM
by James Martin

I would like to express our need for public transportation near Tobytown.

First of all—we are at least a forty-five minute walk from any bus stop. This makes it more difficult for us to get to work, medical appointments, after school activities for our children, and for us to be able to enjoy quality leisure activities. In addition, we are in a food desert, which means that we do not have easy access to quality food.

We have been pushing for transportation for a long time. We ask you to grant us the opportunity to access the services our neighbors enjoy.

It's a failure for sure if we don't try Ride On service. Please follow through on the County Executive's recommendation for Ride On service to the Tobytown and River's Edge community.

Thank you.

25

Submitted by Dan and Mimi Segal, April 6, 2016 to Montgomery County Council and Montgomery County Executive as Testimony in support of a Rivers Edge/Tobytown RideOn Bus

Please Approve the Budget for RideOn Bus Service for the Rivers Edge and Tobytown communities on River Road in Potomac, Maryland

Tobytown is a tiny neighborhood just 2.7 miles away from the nearest bus stop located at Travilah Elementary School at 13801 Dufief Mill Rd North Potomac, MD 20878 . Though 2.7 miles doesn't seem very far by car, the distance is oppressive to residents who have to walk it first thing in the morning to the nearest bus which takes them to the Metro at Shady Grove and then on to their jobs. In bad weather or good, it means the last leg of their commute home every night is the one hour walk back in the dark on winding roads without street lights or sidewalks after a long day at the job. It shouldn't be so difficult to get back home at night.

When we think of Montgomery County we think of affluence and opportunities. We think of River Road and its multi-million dollar homes; the mansions of movie stars, politicians and the owner of the Washington Redskins. But nestled right off River Road, among all the glitz and opulence is a very humble and proud community of modest means called Tobytown, built on land that three freed slaves had the audacity to purchase for themselves and their families back in 1875. The families who live there now are mostly descendants of those original freed men. Their families were there long before anyone else and their families have stayed there ever since. You'd think we would at least see them as having some seniority and worthy of our respect when considering providing basic services for this geographically-stranded ethnic community whose history dates back to slavery. Back in the late 1800's and early 1900's they depended on horses to get to work in nearby fields. Once the roadways were paved and the automobile became popular, the township became accessible to the wider community only by car. But you need a car to get a job and a job to buy a reliable car. And thus began the stacked deck. ***Without bus service Tobytown residents were at a disadvantage that history never righted.***

The residents of Tobytown have repeatedly asked for access to RideOn bus service for decades and have been repeatedly ignored and denied. The lack of a bus has meant that they cannot get or keep reliable employment and it has meant they live in a food desert with few options for healthy food choices. It has meant children being unable to stay after school to join other students who share job and intern opportunities or to enjoy a leg up studying for tests together. It has meant not being able to access medical centers in a timely manner when family members need it most. It has meant that ***getting to*** Montgomery College every day to get to classes on time has been more of a struggle and a burden than excelling in college.

The desperate need for bus access for people along River Road has gone unanswered for decades. There were a couple half-hearted transportation options offered by the County to Tobytown residents in the distant past including subsidized taxi vouchers and the loan of a private van that the residents would have to drive themselves. Both programs were doomed to fail from the beginning because they were poorly planned, they weren't discussed in detail with community members beforehand and they were never really meant to be a long term solution to the very real transportation problem. They were band aids that could never succeed, and sadly in the end, residents of Tobytown were made to look as if they had somehow failed. It was suggested that they hadn't used the programs properly.

In reality, Tobytown has never wanted anything but to be included in the RideOn bus service afforded to everyone else in Montgomery County. They've always just wanted inclusion and access to all the opportunities to jobs, medical centers and hospitals, food sources, schools and social possibilities that they desperately need. ***The only way to all those services for them is reliable bus service on a RideOn.***

Bus access is the difference between social and economic opportunity and *isolation*. It's the difference between being able to be a reliable employee or to be present for IEPs and parent-teacher conferences at their children's schools, and getting loved ones to doctor appointments on time.

My own kids have all been able to walk out of Wootton High School after school and hop on a bus anytime, any day of the week **for free**. The kids who ride that bus come from some of the wealthiest families in the country. How is it that we can find the money to subsidize RideOn buses for them but not for the neediest members of our community?

For decades the residents of Tobytown have asked for RideOn bus service. They have been told by the County that a bus would be provided. As recently as October 1st, Tobytown was to have bus service for the first time. The kids and their parents met to talk excitedly about all their dreams of where they would go on the first day of bus operation. They wrote up and shared their dream lists. One wanted to go see a movie and drink a milkshake with friends. Another wanted to go to the zoo with their family and some said they just wanted to finally be free to go *anywhere*. October 1st came and went, and the bus the County offered never came. I cannot begin to describe to you the distraught emotions I witnessed of their dashed hopes, their dreams once again deferred, the effects of broken promises and the loss of trust.

We need to show the residents of Tobytown that we all recognize that they are at a disadvantage and that it doesn't have anything to do with them. It's time that we acknowledge that Tobytown residents are as much a part of Montgomery County as anyone else and that their lives have value and that we want them to be connected to the rest of our community.

We have an opportunity to make good on promises to provide bus service to Tobytown residents as well as numerous homes on River Road who have day workers who would benefit from a bus. In the past the County has referred to the proposed bus service as the "Tobytown Bus" instead of the "Rivers Edge Bus." It's important to Tobytown residents that not all the ridership burden be placed on them since there is a much larger potential ridership when bus service targets includes Rivers Edge and surrounding neighborhoods as well. Tobytown residents want very much to just be included in the RideOn service that currently exists for the rest of the area.

There is already a pull-off at Rivers Edge for a RideOn to conveniently stop and pick up all area riders around Rivers Edge and Tobytown so that no construction or repaving is necessary.

Please approve the proposed budget without cuts for the Rivers Edge/Tobytown RideOn Bus so that residents can finally join the rest of our Montgomery County community with all the benefits and privilege it has to offer. A RideOn bus is the first step in leveling the playing field to freedom and real access. Please support them. It will mean life-changing access and a chance to compete and interact with the rest of us which has been missing in their lives ever since those three brave freedmen bought the land outright with the audacity to hope.

**Income Eligibility Categories for Call-n-Ride
Income Limits by Household Size**

Categories	Cost Per \$60 Value	Cost Per \$120 Value	1-Person	2-Person	3-Person	4-Person	5-Person	6-Person
Level 1	\$5.25	\$10.50	up to \$15,856	up to \$21,403	up to \$26,950	up to \$32,498	up to \$38,047	up to \$43,595
Level 2	\$10.00	\$20.00	\$15,857 - \$21,403	\$21,404 - \$24,404	\$26,951 - \$31,404	\$32,499 - \$37,489	\$38,048 - \$43,747	\$43,596 - \$49,295
Level 3	\$20.00	\$40.00	\$21,404 - \$26,951	\$24,405 - \$29,951	\$31,405 - \$36,725	\$37,490 - \$42,500	\$43,748 - \$49,447	\$49,296 - \$54,995
Level 4	\$30.00	\$60.00	\$26,952 - \$32,499	\$29,952 - \$36,951	\$36,726 - \$42,800	\$42,501 - \$47,102	\$49,448 - \$55,147	\$54,996 - \$60,695

28

TMD Mode Share Summary - Three Year Trend				
Monday-Friday Two Hour Peak Period (7 am-8:59 am)				
Non-Auto Driver Mode Share (%)*				
TMD	FY12	FY13	FY14	NADMS %
Bethesda	35.5	41.7	34.2	37%
North Bethesda	24.9	23.7	27.0	39%
Friendship Heights	39.4	41.2	42.4	39%
Silver Spring	45.5	55.2	39.2	46%
Greater Shady Grove	11.0	15.6	16.1	12.5%
<i>*NADMS includes all bus & train, carpool & vanpool riders, telework, compressed schedule, bicycling/bikeshare, walking</i>				
Weekday Modal Split 2-Hr Peak (%)**				
TMD	FY12	FY13	FY14	
Bethesda				
Drive Alone	60.8	54.5	62.8	
Carpool/Vanpool Driver	3.7	3.8	3.0	
Carpool/Vanpool Passenger	1.8	2.2	1.6	
Ride On	1.1	1.7	2.6	
Metrobus/Commuter Bus	3.3	4.9	3.8	
Metrorail	20.6	21.9	19.1	
MARC/VRE	1.4	2.0	1.2	
Walked/Bicycled	3.8	5.6	3.6	
Other	0.1	0.2	0.0	
Compressed Day Off	0.6	0.2	0.1	
Telework	2.8	3.0	2.3	
North Bethesda				
Drive Alone	71.1	72.1	69.4	
Carpool/Vanpool Driver	3.9	4.2	3.7	
Carpool/Vanpool Passenger	3.7	2.4	1.8	
Ride On	2.8	2.4	3.3	
Metrobus/Commuter Bus	2.5	2.4	2.9	
Metrorail	7.4	6.3	7.6	
MARC/VRE	0.9	1.0	1.4	
Walked/Bicycled	2.2	1.9	2.4	
Other	0.2	0.0	0.1	
Compressed Day Off	1.1	1.1	1.4	
Telework	4.0	6.2	6.1	
**Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding				

Weekday Modal Split 2-Hr Peak (%)**				
TMD	FY12	FY13	FY14	
<i>Friendship Heights</i>				
Drive Alone	57.2	54.3	54.8	
Carpool/Vanpool Driver	3.4	4.5	2.9	
Carpool/Vanpool Passenger	6.0	5.0	4.0	
Ride On	2.9	2.1	2.4	
Metrobus/Commuter Bus	2.5	2.8	2.9	
Metrorail	20.5	22.0	23.7	
MARC/VRE	1.6	3.0	1.8	
Walked/Bicycled	3.0	2.7	4.0	
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Compressed Day Off	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Telework	2.7	3.5	3.3	
<i>Silver Spring</i>				
Drive Alone	50.3	40.5	56.5	
Carpool/Vanpool Driver	4.2	4.2	4.3	
Carpool/Vanpool Passenger	2.3	2.9	3.5	
Ride On	3.0	2.6	4.6	
Metrobus/Commuter Bus	9.6	7.8	5.9	
Metrorail	13.7	14.1	6.5	
MARC/VRE	10.1	15.7	7.4	
Walked/Bicycled	3.4	5.4	7.2	
Other	0.1	0.4	0.3	
Compressed Day Off	0.5	0.8	0.2	
Telework	2.8	5.7	3.6	
<i>Greater Shady Grove</i>				
Drive Alone	85.0	79.8	78.9	
Carpool/Vanpool Driver	4.1	4.6	5.0	
Carpool/Vanpool Passenger	4.4	2.5	2.5	
Ride On	1.7	4.7	1.9	
Metrobus/Commuter Bus	0.7	1.1	1.2	
Metrorail	0.4	2.5	4.2	
MARC/VRE	0.6	0.6	0.5	
Walked/Bicycled	0.6	0.5	1.7	
Other	0.0	0.1	0.0	
Compressed Day Off	0.3	0.5	0.7	
Telework	2.2	3.1	3.5	
**Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding				

FY17 CE Recommended Budget Operating Cost of Ride On Bus Service

<u>Cost Element</u>	<u>Cost/Hour</u> <u>FY17 Dollars</u>		
	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>	
Bus Operators	\$48.24	\$48.24	
Motor Pool	\$33.02	\$81.27	→ Rate for any new service added
Coordinators	\$3.11	\$84.37	
Other Operating Labor	\$2.96	\$87.33	
(31) Schedule/Communications	\$4.57	\$91.90	→ WMATA Non-Regional Rate \$115.73 (FY17)
Customer Service/Safety	\$2.78	\$94.68	
Other Non-labor Oper/Mgmt Svcs/ General Administration/Other	\$6.31	\$100.99	
Indirect	\$10.32	\$111.30	
Fully Allocated Cost	<u>\$111.30</u>		



Parking District Services

Mission Statement

The mission of Parking District Services is to:

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

Linkage to County Result Areas

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

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

Department Performance Measures

Performance measures for this department are included below (where applicable), with multi-program measures displayed at the front of this section and program-specific measures shown with the relevant program. The FY16 estimates reflect funding based on the FY16 approved budget. The FY17 and FY18 figures are performance targets based on the FY17 recommended budget and funding for comparable service levels in FY18.

Initiatives

- ★ Establish a parking guidance system directing visitors to the Capital Crescent and Bethesda/Elm Garages. New "dynamic signage" will be installed at key locations in the Bethesda downtown area. Signage will display real-time space availability and hourly rates to assist motorists in locating parking facilities with available spaces and evaluate pricing options.
- ★ Develop and test the viability of using License Plate Reader (LPR) technologies for parking access control at the Woodmont Corner Garage in Bethesda.
- ★ Find a no-cost or low-cost method to place LED lighting in the interior of Bethesda garages that have not yet been converted.
- ★ Review local specifications and contracts to find the most cost-efficient method to add rooftop and surface lot LED lighting at all PLD facilities.
- ★ Explore new methods of solar panel installation on garage rooftops as technical expertise expands in this field.
- ★ Single space parking meters at the NOAA and Kennett Street Garages and the Bonifant & Easley surface lot in Silver Spring will be converted to multi-space pay machines. These new machines will provide payment options for customers to include: coins, credit

cards, and pay-by-cell phone. In addition, real-time communication, web-based management, secure wireless alarming, and receipt for payment are included.

Accomplishments

- ✓ Transitioned from a duration based pricing model to a demand/location based pricing model in the Silver Spring PLD. The goal is to optimize the use of existing parking resources by redistributing parking demand. This pricing model was successfully adopted in Bethesda in FY14.
- ✓ 1,200 on-street meters in Silver Spring were replaced with new "smart" parking meters expanding payment options. The "smart" meters accept credit cards in addition to coins or pay-by-cell phone. In FY15, Bethesda's on-street meters were converted to "smart" meters.
- ✓ New electric vehicle (EV) charging stations were installed in garages in Bethesda and Silver Spring. The new stations are located at the Woodmont Corner and Waverly Garage in Bethesda; the Cameron/Second Street and Kennett Street Garages in Silver Spring; and the Amherst Garage in Wheaton. These new stations bring the total number of EV charging stations in County owned parking facilities to eight stations (16 spaces).
- ✓ With the County Attorney's Office, drafted a Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) to develop a Garage Advertising Policy. Advertising snap frames are currently located at the Woodmont Corner and Bethesda/Elm Garages in Bethesda and the Cameron St. and Town Square Garages in Silver Spring. Expansion of the program to all Parking Lot District garages and select surface lots is ongoing.

Productivity Improvements

- ✱ New automated pay stations and entrance/exit parking gates in the Wayne Avenue and Town Square garages in Silver Spring replaced the 10-year old system. This new system includes bill-to-bill pay stations and credit card only stations. The bill-to-bill automatic money handling device will recycle up to 3 denominations of currency by using bills paid into the machine to replenish the internal "cash bank". This will reduce overall cash on hand, the number of cash fills/removals, and operating costs. The credit card only machines will speed up processing for customers and improve traffic flow on exit.
- ✱ LED lighting was installed in Bethesda's Woodmont Corner Garage as the first County garage in this new program. PEPCO rebates provided the fixtures at no cost to the County. This new generation of lighting provides a much brighter appearance while saving over 40% in electric costs.
- ✱ Performed tests on deck cleaning/sweeping equipment which will allow more efficient and quieter maintenance of heavily traveled pedestrian areas of the PLD garages. The department is researching specifications and existing contracts with local jurisdictions.

Program Contacts

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

Program Descriptions

Management Services and Property Development

This program supports the overall Parking Services program objectives through the management of Information Technology, Human Resources and Planning teams to optimize organizational effectiveness and the delivery of services to the public. It also administers the County's Parking Lot District Ad Valorem tax program and the Division's innovation initiatives. Additionally, the program strategically plans for all components of the re-development of Parking Lot District (PLD) real property to promote the economic growth and stability of associated urban districts. The program's responsibilities are for drafting and releasing Requests for Development Proposals; generating property appraisals; negotiations and overseeing the execution of General Development Agreements; and Purchase Sales Agreements, including related development documents. The program also leads project management efforts including design and construction of PLD real property as part of mixed-use re-development projects.

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	2,871,188	11.60
Shift: Telecommunications to the Telecommunications Non-Departmental Account - Montgomery Hills	(725)	0.00
Shift: Telecommunications to the Telecommunications Non-Departmental Account - Wheaton	(5,480)	0.00
Shift: Telecommunications to the Telecommunications Non-Departmental Account - Bethesda	(25,745)	0.00
Shift: Telecommunications to the Telecommunications Non-Departmental Account - Silver Spring	(27,750)	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	(153,268)	(0.90)
FY17 Recommended	2,658,220	10.70

Financial Management Services

The Financial Management Program has overall responsibility for the recordation and reconciliation of all parking district revenue. In addition, this program has primary responsibility for the development and execution of the Division Budget in coordination with other programs and the associated 6 Year Fiscal Cash Flows for the Parking Lot District Enterprise Funds. Also included are Accounts Payable activities and all procurement actions. It is also responsible for revenue bond debt, fixed assets and utilities programs. This program serves as the primary point of contact for the Department of Finance in the preparation of the annual financial statements of the four Parking Lot District enterprise funds and in responding to any inquiries from the auditors of those statements.

Program Performance Measures	Actual FY14	Actual FY15	Estimated FY16	Target FY17	Target FY18
Customer satisfaction rate for Parking Lot Districts (PLDs) ¹	3.28	NA	TBD	NA	TBD
Parking Management cost efficiency (ratio of expenses to revenues)	59	57	74	83	83
Parking Management revenue generated (\$ millions)	41.2	42.9	37.6	33	33
Parking Management operating expenditures (\$ millions)	23.6	24.6	28	27.3	27.3

¹ Rating on a scale of 1 to 4 with 4=best

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	8,144,407	4.20
Decrease Cost: Debt Service - Bethesda	(386,569)	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	170,184	0.90
FY17 Recommended	7,928,022	5.10

Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering

This program provides the maintenance of all parking lots, garages, and surrounding grounds. Facilities maintenance is programmed at a level which is designed to ensure the operational integrity of the facilities and the safety of parking patrons. Maintenance of parking facilities includes: snow and ice removal; housekeeping services; equipment maintenance for elevators, electrical systems, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems (HVAC); facility repairs for maintenance of damaged glass, asphalt, concrete, plumbing, painting, space stripes, graffiti, doorframes, brick and block, meter posts, and woodwork due to vandalism, use and age; and grounds-keeping services. Additionally, the program supports a balanced system of public parking which promotes the economic stability and growth of the County's central business districts. This is implemented through the design and construction of new parking facilities, including mixed-use projects. The program also includes renovating and improving existing parking facilities to ensure the preservation and integrity of the parking system and its continued service to the public. This program also evaluates energy usage and recommends and implements improvements that reduce the amount of energy used by off-street facilities.

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	5,516,152	17.50
Increase Cost: Silver Spring Lot 3 Parking Garage Operation and Maintenance	62,000	0.00
Increase Cost: Emergency Backup Batteries in Garages - Silver Spring	57,200	0.00
Increase Cost: Emergency Battery Backup in Garages - Bethesda	38,500	0.00

Parking District Services

(34)

Transportation **47.3**

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
Increase Cost: Emergency Backup Batteries in Garages - Wheaton	22,000	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	79,906	0.00
FY17 Recommended	5,775,758	17.50

Parking Operations

This unit has overall responsibility for the collection and processing of all parking revenue, including revenue from individual meters, automated pay stations, cashiered facilities, parking permits, and parking fines. Additionally it provides support to the Mass Transit Fund in the processing of bus revenue for deposit. The program is also responsible for the management of the parking citation database and provides management of the appeal process for all parking tickets written within the County. Parking Operations maintains regularly scheduled parking enforcement patrols in all Parking Lot Districts (PLD), residential permit areas outside the PLDs, and other designated County facilities. In addition, this program provides a comprehensive meter maintenance program to ensure all meter devices function properly. Augmenting the public safety mission of the County Police, this unit also provides contract security guard services for parking facilities to detect and report theft, vandalism, and threats to personal security. Security support is also provided by the Silver Spring Clean and Safe Team. Parking Operations also manages and executes the Parking Outside the Parking Districts Program funded by the County's General Fund.

FY17 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY16 Approved	11,494,230	16.03
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services - Silver Spring	21,290	0.00
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services - Bethesda	11,220	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increase for Pay-on-Foot and Pay-by-Space Maintenance- Silver Spring	3,730	0.00
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services - Wheaton	2,110	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increases for Pay-on-Foot and Pay-By-Space Maintenance - Bethesda	1,500	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increases for Pay-on-Foot and Pay-by-Space Maintenance - Wheaton	240	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY16	(524,247)	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	(53,322)	(0.80)
FY17 Recommended	10,956,751	15.23

Budget Summary

	Actual FY15	Budget FY16	Estimate FY16	REC FY17	%Chg Bud/Rec
PARKING DISTRICT - BETHESDA					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	1,556,419	1,610,885	1,567,816	1,640,378	1.8 %
Employee Benefits	561,694	610,367	580,742	593,867	-2.7 %
Parking District - Bethesda Personnel Costs	2,118,113	2,221,252	2,148,558	2,234,245	0.6 %
Operating Expenses	7,327,772	7,964,429	8,184,878	7,992,313	0.4 %
Debt Service Other	4,959,789	4,960,917	4,820,467	4,574,348	-7.8 %
Parking District - Bethesda Expenditures	14,405,674	15,146,598	15,153,903	14,800,906	-2.3 %
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	29	29	29	29	—
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	21.12	20.84	20.84	20.39	-2.2 %
REVENUES					
Electrical Permits and Licenses	1,106	0	0	0	—
Investment Income	15,243	107,190	27,990	39,990	-62.7 %
Miscellaneous Revenues	(1,053,755)	284,120	284,120	284,120	—
Other Charges and Fees	(350)	0	0	0	—

	Actual FY15	Budget FY16	Estimate FY16	REC FY17	%Chg Bud/Rec
Parking Fees	13,193,457	14,383,000	13,505,081	14,105,081	-1.9 %
Parking Fines	4,261,637	4,600,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	-29.3 %
Property Rentals	667,361	40,000	40,000	40,000	—
Property Tax	2,746,026	0	0	0	—
Smart Meters	0	316,000	0	0	-100.0 %
Parking District - Bethesda Revenues	19,830,725	19,730,310	17,107,191	17,719,191	-10.2 %

PARKING DISTRICT - SILVER SPRING

EXPENDITURES

Salaries and Wages	1,574,896	1,764,616	1,738,826	1,805,105	2.3 %
Employee Benefits	574,569	676,881	640,165	658,483	-2.7 %
Parking District - Silver Spring Personnel Costs	2,149,465	2,441,497	2,378,991	2,463,588	0.9 %
Operating Expenses	8,561,955	9,008,472	9,076,472	8,601,324	-4.5 %
Parking District - Silver Spring Expenditures	10,711,420	11,449,969	11,455,463	11,064,912	-3.4 %

PERSONNEL

Full-Time	20	20	20	20	—
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	24.78	24.58	24.58	24.30	-1.1 %

REVENUES

Investment Income	29,670	63,540	67,090	95,840	50.8 %
Miscellaneous Revenues	(901,872)	6,825,000	7,600,000	0	-100.0 %
Other Charges/Fees	(2,623)	0	0	0	—
Parking Fees	10,254,175	11,805,800	10,661,253	10,661,253	-9.7 %
Parking Fines	2,713,531	2,256,250	1,869,689	1,869,689	-17.1 %
Property Rentals	8,804	0	0	0	—
Property Tax	7,641,713	0	0	0	—
Parking District - Silver Spring Revenues	19,743,398	20,950,590	20,198,032	12,626,782	-39.7 %

PARKING DISTRICT - MONTGOMERY HILLS

EXPENDITURES

Salaries and Wages	36,733	36,875	36,766	39,417	6.9 %
Employee Benefits	10,445	12,957	10,997	11,514	-11.1 %
Parking District - Montgomery Hills Personnel Costs	47,178	49,832	47,763	50,931	2.2 %
Operating Expenses	71,831	34,399	35,699	33,398	-2.9 %
Parking District - Montgomery Hills Expenditures	119,009	84,231	83,462	84,329	0.1 %

PERSONNEL

Full-Time	0	0	0	0	—
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.42	-10.6 %

REVENUES

Investment Income	1,322	13,100	2,990	4,270	-67.4 %
Miscellaneous Revenues	(12,685)	0	0	0	—
Parking Fees	35,481	45,000	45,000	45,000	—
Parking Fines	41,857	28,000	28,000	28,000	—
Property Tax	89,654	0	0	0	—
Parking District - Montgomery Hills Revenues	155,629	86,100	75,990	77,270	-10.3 %

PARKING DISTRICT - WHEATON

EXPENDITURES

Salaries and Wages	263,962	268,160	266,547	275,755	2.8 %
Employee Benefits	98,652	106,730	101,347	103,519	-3.0 %
Parking District - Wheaton Personnel Costs	362,614	374,890	367,894	379,274	1.2 %
Operating Expenses	767,928	970,289	977,289	989,330	2.0 %
Parking District - Wheaton Expenditures	1,130,542	1,345,179	1,345,183	1,368,604	1.7 %

PERSONNEL

Full-Time	3	3	3	3	—
-----------	---	---	---	---	---

	Actual FY15	Budget FY16	Estimate FY16	REC FY17	% Chg Bud/Rec
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	3.52	3.44	3.44	3.42	-0.6 %
REVENUES					
Investment Income	2,210	7,930	5,000	7,140	-10.0 %
Miscellaneous Revenues	(189,020)	0	0	0	—
Parking Fees	869,850	960,000	905,000	815,000	-15.1 %
Parking Fines	572,066	600,000	546,000	511,000	-14.8 %
Property Tax	426,306	0	0	0	—
Parking District - Wheaton Revenues	1,681,412	1,567,930	1,456,000	1,333,140	-15.0 %
DEPARTMENT TOTALS					
Total Expenditures	26,366,645	28,025,977	28,038,011	27,318,751	-2.5 %
Total Full-Time Positions	52	52	52	52	—
Total Part-Time Positions	0	0	0	0	—
Total FTEs	49.89	49.33	49.33	48.53	-1.6 %
Total Revenues	41,411,164	42,334,930	38,837,213	31,756,383	-25.0 %

FY17 Recommended Changes

	Expenditures	FTEs
PARKING DISTRICT - BETHESDA		
FY16 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	15,146,598	20.84
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Increase Cost: Emergency Battery Backup in Garages - Bethesda [Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering]	38,500	0.00
Increase Cost: FY17 Compensation Adjustment	34,616	0.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of FY16 Personnel Costs	16,198	(0.07)
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	12,594	0.00
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services - Bethesda [Parking Operations]	11,220	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increases for Pay-on-Foot and Pay-By-Space Maintenance - Bethesda [Parking Operations]	1,500	0.00
Increase Cost: Printing and Mail	836	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retiree Health Insurance Pre-funding - Bethesda	(20)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment	(350)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retirement Adjustment	(17,824)	0.00
Shift: Telecommunications to the Telecommunications Non-Departmental Account - Bethesda [Management Services and Property Development]	(25,745)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Charges from Finance	(30,648)	(0.38)
Decrease Cost: Debt Service - Bethesda [Financial Management Services]	(386,569)	0.00
FY17 RECOMMENDED	14,800,906	20.39

PARKING DISTRICT - SILVER SPRING

FY16 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	11,449,969	24.58
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Increase Cost: Silver Spring Lot 3 Parking Garage Operation and Maintenance [Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering]	62,000	0.00
Increase Cost: Emergency Backup Batteries in Garages - Silver Spring [Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering]	57,200	0.00
Increase Cost: FY17 Compensation Adjustment	35,465	0.00
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services - Silver Spring [Parking Operations]	21,290	0.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of FY16 Personnel Costs	17,024	0.01
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	13,144	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increase for Pay-on-Foot and Pay-by-Space Maintenance- Silver Spring [Parking Operations]	3,730	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retiree Health Insurance Pre-funding - Silver Spring	(20)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment	(1,070)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retirement Adjustment	(19,227)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Charges from Finance	(22,596)	(0.29)

	Expenditures	FTEs
Shift: Telecommunications to the Telecommunications Non-Departmental Account - Silver Spring [Management Services and Property Development]	(27,750)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY16 [Parking Operations]	(524,247)	0.00
FY17 RECOMMENDED	11,064,912	24.30

PARKING DISTRICT - MONTGOMERY HILLS

FY16 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	84,231	0.47
<u>Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)</u>		
Increase Cost: FY17 Compensation Adjustment	736	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	262	0.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of FY16 Personnel Costs	220	(0.05)
Increase Cost: Charges from Finance	168	0.00
Decrease Cost: Retirement Adjustment	(233)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment	(330)	0.00
Shift: Telecommunications to the Telecommunications Non-Departmental Account - Montgomery Hills [Management Services and Property Development]	(725)	0.00
FY17 RECOMMENDED	84,329	0.42

PARKING DISTRICT - WHEATON

FY16 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	1,345,179	3.44
<u>Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)</u>		
Increase Cost: Emergency Backup Batteries in Garages - Wheaton [Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering]	22,000	0.00
Increase Cost: FY17 Compensation Adjustment	5,404	0.00
Increase Cost: Annualization of FY16 Personnel Costs	3,382	0.01
Increase Cost: Solid Waste Services - Wheaton [Parking Operations]	2,110	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	2,081	0.00
Increase Cost: Contractual Increases for Pay-on-Foot and Pay-by-Space Maintenance - Wheaton [Parking Operations]	240	0.00
Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment	(170)	0.00
Decrease Cost: Charges from Finance	(2,199)	(0.03)
Decrease Cost: Retirement Adjustment	(3,943)	0.00
Shift: Telecommunications to the Telecommunications Non-Departmental Account - Wheaton [Management Services and Property Development]	(5,480)	0.00
FY17 RECOMMENDED	1,368,604	3.42

Program Summary

Program Name	FY16 APPR		FY17 REC	
	Expenditures	FTEs	Expenditures	FTEs
Management Services and Property Development	2,871,188	11.60	2,658,220	10.70
Financial Management Services	8,144,407	4.20	7,928,022	5.10
Parking Facility Maintenance and Engineering	5,516,152	17.50	5,775,758	17.50
Parking Operations	11,494,230	16.03	10,956,751	15.23
Total	28,025,977	49.33	27,318,751	48.53

Future Fiscal Impacts

Title	CE RECOMMENDED (\$000s)					
	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22
PARKING DISTRICT - BETHESDA						

Title	CE RECOMMENDED (\$000s)					
	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22
EXPENDITURES						
FY17 Recommended	14,801	14,801	14,801	14,801	14,801	14,801
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Emergency Battery Backup in Garages	0	(39)	0	(39)	0	(39)
Replacement every two years.						
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-funding	0	(5)	(11)	(14)	(17)	(17)
These figures represent the estimated cost of pre-funding retiree health insurance costs for the County's workforce.						
Labor Contracts	0	27	27	27	27	27
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and other negotiated items.						
Subtotal Expenditures	14,801	14,783	14,816	14,774	14,810	14,771

PARKING DISTRICT - SILVER SPRING

EXPENDITURES

FY17 Recommended	11,065	11,065	11,065	11,065	11,065	11,065
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Emergency Backup Batteries in Garages	0	(57)	0	(57)	0	(57)
Replacement every two years.						
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-funding	0	(4)	(8)	(10)	(12)	(12)
These figures represent the estimated cost of pre-funding retiree health insurance costs for the County's workforce.						
Silver Spring Lot 3 Parking Garage	0	62	62	62	62	62
Operating and Maintenance costs						
Labor Contracts	0	28	28	28	28	28
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and other negotiated items.						
Subtotal Expenditures	11,065	11,094	11,147	11,088	11,143	11,086

PARKING DISTRICT - MONTGOMERY HILLS

EXPENDITURES

FY17 Recommended	84	84	84	84	84	84
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Labor Contracts	0	1	1	1	1	1
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and other negotiated items.						
Subtotal Expenditures	84	84	84	84	84	84

PARKING DISTRICT - WHEATON

EXPENDITURES

FY17 Recommended	1,369	1,369	1,369	1,369	1,369	1,369
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Emergency Backup Batteries in Garages	0	(22)	0	(22)	0	(22)
Replacement every two years.						
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-funding	0	(1)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(2)
These figures represent the estimated cost of pre-funding retiree health insurance costs for the County's workforce.						
Labor Contracts	0	4	4	4	4	4
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and other negotiated items.						
Subtotal Expenditures	1,369	1,351	1,373	1,351	1,372	1,350

FY17-22 Public Services Program: Fiscal Plan Bethesda Parking Lot District							
	Estimated	Recommended	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Assumptions							
Indirect Cost Rate	15.87%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%
CPI (Fiscal Year)	1.80	2.20	2.50	2.90	3.30	3.70	4.10
Investment Income Yield	0.30%	0.55%	1.25%	1.75%	2.25%	2.75%	3.25%
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 13,059,293	\$ 13,366,666	\$ 11,687,619	\$ 15,581,507	\$ 14,049,836	\$ 12,574,368	\$ 11,456,977
Revenues							
Charges for Services	\$ 13,505,081	\$ 14,105,081	\$ 15,405,081	\$ 15,405,081	\$ 15,405,081	\$ 15,405,081	\$ 15,405,081
Fines & Forfeits	\$ 3,250,000	\$ 3,250,000	\$ 3,250,000	\$ 3,250,000	\$ 3,250,000	\$ 3,250,000	\$ 3,250,000
Miscellaneous	\$ 352,110	\$ 364,110	\$ 8,604,100	\$ 444,090	\$ 484,080	\$ 524,070	\$ 564,060
Subtotal Revenues	\$ 17,107,191	\$ 17,719,191	\$ 27,259,181	\$ 19,099,171	\$ 19,139,161	\$ 19,179,151	\$ 19,219,141
Transfers							
Transfers to General Fund	\$ (1,855,915)	\$ (1,882,332)	\$ (5,331,232)	\$ (2,376,612)	\$ (2,445,611)	\$ (2,515,786)	\$ (2,586,352)
Telecommunications NDA	\$ (354,960)	\$ (380,332)	\$ (380,332)	\$ (367,533)	\$ (367,533)	\$ (367,533)	\$ (367,533)
Indirect Costs	\$ -	\$ (12,799)	\$ (12,799)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Indirect Costs	\$ (354,960)	\$ (367,533)	\$ (367,533)	\$ (367,533)	\$ (367,533)	\$ (367,533)	\$ (367,533)
Transfers to Special Funds : Tax Supported							
Bethesda Urban District	\$ (2,200,955)	\$ (1,502,000)	\$ (1,950,900)	\$ (2,009,079)	\$ (2,078,078)	\$ (2,148,253)	\$ (2,218,819)
Parking District Service Facility	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (144,900)	\$ (144,900)	\$ (144,900)	\$ (144,900)	\$ (144,900)
Transfer From Silver Spring PLD	\$ 1,500,000	\$ -	\$ (3,000,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Resources	\$ 29,110,569	\$ 29,203,524	\$ 33,615,567	\$ 32,304,066	\$ 30,743,385	\$ 29,237,733	\$ 28,089,766
CIP Current Revenue Appropriation Expenditure							
Other CIP Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ (590,000)	\$ (2,715,000)	\$ (3,092,000)	\$ (3,155,000)	\$ (2,990,000)	\$ (2,435,000)	\$ (2,690,000)
Other CIP Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriations/Expenditures							
Operating Budget	\$ (10,333,436)	\$ (10,226,558)	\$ (10,384,007)	\$ (10,507,455)	\$ (10,634,686)	\$ (10,765,262)	\$ (10,899,273)
Existing Debt Service	\$ (4,820,467)	\$ (4,574,348)	\$ (4,575,040)	\$ (4,576,062)	\$ (4,570,138)	\$ (4,571,030)	\$ (3,050,203)
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,150	\$ 10,950	\$ 13,970	\$ 17,200	\$ 17,200
Battery Backup	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38,500	\$ -	\$ 38,500	\$ -	\$ 38,500
Labor Agreement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (26,663)	\$ (26,663)	\$ (26,663)	\$ (26,663)	\$ (26,663)
Subtotal PSP Operating Budget Appropriation	\$ (15,153,903)	\$ (14,800,906)	\$ (14,942,060)	\$ (15,099,230)	\$ (15,179,017)	\$ (15,345,756)	\$ (13,920,439)
Total Use of Resources	\$ (15,743,903)	\$ (17,515,906)	\$ (18,034,060)	\$ (18,254,230)	\$ (18,169,017)	\$ (17,780,756)	\$ (16,610,439)
Year End Fund Balance	\$ 13,366,666	\$ 11,687,619	\$ 15,581,507	\$ 14,049,836	\$ 12,574,368	\$ 11,456,977	\$ 11,479,326
Bond Restricted Reserve	\$ (7,956,369)	\$ (8,516,804)	\$ (8,551,496)	\$ (8,583,882)	\$ (8,608,307)	\$ (8,845,365)	\$ (8,877,573)
Year End Available Fund Balance	\$ 5,410,297	\$ 3,170,815	\$ 7,030,011	\$ 5,465,953	\$ 3,966,062	\$ 2,611,613	\$ 2,601,754
Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Next Year's PSP Expenses	37%	21%	47%	36%	26%	19%	19%
Target Balance	\$ 3,700,216	\$ 3,735,515	\$ 3,774,808	\$ 3,794,754	\$ 3,836,439	\$ 3,480,110	\$ 3,480,110

Assumptions:

- The cash balance includes funds required to be held by the District to cover Bond Covenants. Bond coverage (annual net revenues over debt service requirements) is maintained at about 254 percent in FY17. The minimum requirement is 125 percent.
- Revenue for the air rights lease for Garage 49 is assumed in FY16 through FY22.
- These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY18-22 expenditures are based on the "major, known commitments" of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, estimates of compensation and inflation cost increases, the operating costs of capital facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. They do not include unapproved service improvements. The projected future expenditures, revenues, and fund balance may vary based on changes to fee or tax rates, usage, inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here.
- The Parking Lot Districts have a fund balance policy target equal to 25 percent of the following year's projected operating budget expenses. The target was lowered from 50 percent based on an independent analysis of the parking lot district funds.

FY17-22 Public Services Program: Fiscal Plan Montgomery Hills Parking Lot District		Estimated	Recommended	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Assumptions								
Indirect Cost Rate		15.87%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%
CPI (Fiscal Year)		2.25	2.32	2.40	2.73	3.15	3.45	3.73
Investment Income Yield		0.16%	0.19%	0.36%	0.75%	1.35%	1.80%	2.15%
Beginning Fund Balance		\$ 67,549	\$ 47,117	\$ 26,680	\$ 16,807	\$ 11,204	\$ 9,872	\$ 12,809
Revenues								
Charges for Services		\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000
Fines & Forfeits		\$ 28,000	\$ 28,000	\$ 28,000	\$ 28,000	\$ 28,000	\$ 28,000	\$ 28,000
Miscellaneous		\$ 2,990	\$ 4,270	\$ 8,540	\$ 12,810	\$ 17,080	\$ 21,350	\$ 25,620
Subtotal Revenues		\$ 75,990	\$ 77,270	\$ 81,540	\$ 85,810	\$ 90,080	\$ 94,350	\$ 98,620
Transfers								
Transfers to General Fund		\$ (12,960)	\$ (13,378)	\$ (7,885)	\$ (7,885)	\$ (7,885)	\$ (7,885)	\$ (7,885)
Indirect Costs		\$ (7,960)	\$ (8,378)	\$ (7,885)	\$ (7,885)	\$ (7,885)	\$ (7,885)	\$ (7,885)
Regional Services Center		\$ (5,000)	\$ (5,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Transfers to Special Funds : Tax Supported		\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,610)	\$ (1,610)	\$ (1,610)	\$ (1,610)	\$ (1,610)
Parking District Service Facility		\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,610)	\$ (1,610)	\$ (1,610)	\$ (1,610)	\$ (1,610)
Total Resources		\$ 130,579	\$ 111,009	\$ 98,725	\$ 93,122	\$ 91,790	\$ 94,727	\$ 101,934
Appropriations/Expenditures								
Operating Budget		\$ (83,462)	\$ (84,329)	\$ (81,329)	\$ (81,329)	\$ (81,329)	\$ (81,329)	\$ (81,329)
Labor Agreement		\$ -	\$ -	\$ (589)	\$ (589)	\$ (589)	\$ (589)	\$ (589)
Subtotal PSP Operating Budget Appropriation		\$ (83,462)	\$ (84,329)	\$ (81,918)	\$ (81,918)	\$ (81,918)	\$ (81,918)	\$ (81,918)
Total Use of Resources		\$ (83,462)	\$ (84,329)	\$ (81,918)	\$ (81,918)	\$ (81,918)	\$ (81,918)	\$ (81,918)
Year End Available Fund Balance		\$ 47,117	\$ 26,680	\$ 16,807	\$ 11,204	\$ 9,872	\$ 12,809	\$ 20,016
Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Next Year's PSP Expenses		56%	33%	21%	14%	12%	16%	24%
Target Balance		\$ 21,082	\$ 20,480	\$ 20,480	\$ 20,480	\$ 20,480	\$ 20,480	\$ 20,480

Assumptions:

1. These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY18-22 expenditures are based on the "major, known commitments" of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, estimates of compensation and inflation cost increases, the operating costs of capital facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. They do not include unapproved service improvements. The projected future expenditures, revenues, and fund balance may vary based on changes to fee or tax rates, usage, inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here.
2. The Parking Lot Districts have a fund balance policy target equal to 25 percent of the following year's projected operating budget expenses. The target was lowered from 50 percent based on an independent analysis of the parking lot district funds.

41

FY17-22 Public Services Program: Fiscal Plan Silver Spring Parking Lot District							
	Estimated	Recommended	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Assumptions							
Indirect Cost Rate	15.87%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%
CPI (Fiscal Year)	2.25	2.32	2.40	2.73	3.15	3.45	3.73
Investment Income Yield	0.16%	0.19%	0.36%	0.75%	1.35%	1.80%	2.15%
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 18,808,969	\$ 18,313,183	\$ 11,772,319	\$ 11,492,307	\$ 9,131,343	\$ 6,676,993	\$ 4,208,727
Revenues							
Charges for Services	\$ 10,661,253	\$ 10,661,253	\$ 12,561,253	\$ 12,561,253	\$ 12,561,253	\$ 12,561,253	\$ 12,561,253
Fines & Forfeits	\$ 1,869,689	\$ 1,869,689	\$ 1,869,689	\$ 1,869,689	\$ 1,869,689	\$ 1,869,689	\$ 1,869,689
Miscellaneous	\$ 7,667,090	\$ 95,840	\$ 357,510	\$ 453,350	\$ 549,190	\$ 645,030	\$ 740,870
Subtotal Revenues	\$ 20,198,032	\$ 12,626,782	\$ 14,788,452	\$ 14,884,292	\$ 14,980,132	\$ 15,075,972	\$ 15,171,812
Transfers							
Transfers to General Fund	\$ (6,338,355)	\$ (2,492,734)	\$ 121,516	\$ (3,097,594)	\$ (3,221,162)	\$ (3,145,805)	\$ (3,273,902)
Transfers to Special Funds : Tax Supported	\$ (2,390,150)	\$ (487,452)	\$ (487,452)	\$ (405,260)	\$ (405,260)	\$ (405,260)	\$ (405,260)
Transfer to Wheaton PLD	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (200,000)	\$ (200,000)	\$ -	\$ -
Silver Spring Urban District	\$ (2,448,205)	\$ (2,005,282)	\$ (2,391,032)	\$ (2,492,334)	\$ (2,615,902)	\$ (2,740,545)	\$ (2,868,642)
Transfer to Bethesda PLD	\$ (1,500,000)	\$ -	\$ 3,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Indirect Costs	\$ (390,150)	\$ (405,260)	\$ (405,260)	\$ (405,260)	\$ (405,260)	\$ (405,260)	\$ (405,260)
Total Resources	\$ 32,668,646	\$ 28,447,231	\$ 26,682,287	\$ 23,279,005	\$ 20,890,313	\$ 18,607,159	\$ 16,106,637
CIP Current Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ (2,900,000)	\$ (5,610,000)	\$ (3,913,000)	\$ (2,700,000)	\$ (2,700,000)	\$ (2,700,000)	\$ (2,700,000)
Appropriations/Expenditures							
Operating Budget	\$ (10,355,463)	\$ (9,964,912)	\$ (10,148,016)	\$ (10,265,497)	\$ (10,390,436)	\$ (10,520,578)	\$ (10,656,758)
Operating Leases	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)	\$ (1,100,000)
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,560	\$ 7,560	\$ 9,640	\$ 11,870	\$ 11,870
Battery Backup	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 57,200	\$ -	\$ 57,200	\$ -	\$ 57,200
Labor Agreement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (27,724)	\$ (27,724)	\$ (27,724)	\$ (27,724)	\$ (27,724)
Lot 3 Parking Garage	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (62,000)	\$ (62,000)	\$ (62,000)	\$ (62,000)	\$ (62,000)
Subtotal PSP Operating Budget Appropriation	\$ (11,455,463)	\$ (11,064,912)	\$ (11,276,980)	\$ (11,447,661)	\$ (11,513,320)	\$ (11,698,432)	\$ (11,777,412)
Total Use of Resources	\$ (14,355,463)	\$ (16,674,912)	\$ (15,189,980)	\$ (14,147,661)	\$ (14,213,320)	\$ (14,398,432)	\$ (14,477,412)
Year End Available Fund Balance	\$ 18,313,183	\$ 11,772,319	\$ 11,492,307	\$ 9,131,343	\$ 6,676,993	\$ 4,208,727	\$ 1,629,225
Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Next Year's PSP Expenses	166%	104%	100%	79%	57%	36%	14%
Target Balance	\$ 2,766,228	\$ 2,819,245	\$ 2,861,915	\$ 2,878,330	\$ 2,924,608	\$ 2,944,353	\$ 2,944,353

Assumptions:

1. These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY18-22 expenditures are based on the "major, known commitments" of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, estimates of compensation and inflation cost increases, the operating costs of capital facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. They do not include unapproved service improvements. The projected future expenditures, revenues, and fund balance may vary based on changes to fee or tax rates, usage, inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here.
2. The Parking Lot Districts have a fund balance policy target equal to 25 percent of the following year's projected operating budget expenses. The target was lowered from 50 percent based on an independent analysis of the parking lot district funds.

FY17-22 Public Services Program: Fiscal Plan Wheaton Parking Lot District							
	Estimated	Recommended	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Assumptions							
Indirect Cost Rate	15.87%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%	16.45%
CPI (Fiscal Year)	2.25	2.32	2.40	2.73	3.15	3.45	3.73
Investment Income Yield	0.16%	0.19%	0.36%	0.75%	1.35%	1.80%	2.15%
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 1,486,093	\$ 773,000	\$ 490,452	\$ 143,827	\$ 41,300	\$ 227,695	\$ 178,495
Revenues							
Charges for Services	\$ 905,000	\$ 815,000	\$ 725,000	\$ 815,000	\$ 1,205,000	\$ 1,205,000	\$ 1,205,000
Fines & Forfeits	\$ 546,000	\$ 511,000	\$ 476,000	\$ 511,000	\$ 636,000	\$ 636,000	\$ 636,000
Miscellaneous	\$ 5,000	\$ 7,140	\$ 14,280	\$ 21,420	\$ 28,560	\$ 35,700	\$ 42,840
Subtotal Revenues	\$ 1,456,000	\$ 1,333,140	\$ 1,215,280	\$ 1,347,420	\$ 1,869,560	\$ 1,876,700	\$ 1,883,840
Transfers							
Transfers to General Fund	\$ (666,910)	\$ (90,084)	\$ (110,133)	\$ 93,161	\$ 93,161	\$ (106,839)	\$ (107,777)
Telecommunications NDA	\$ (59,910)	\$ (66,455)	\$ (66,455)	\$ (62,391)	\$ (62,391)	\$ (62,391)	\$ (62,391)
Indirect Costs	\$ -	\$ (4,064)	\$ (4,064)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Transfers to Special Funds : Tax Supported	\$ (59,910)	\$ (62,391)	\$ (62,391)	\$ (62,391)	\$ (62,391)	\$ (62,391)	\$ (62,391)
Wheaton Urban District	\$ (607,000)	\$ (23,629)	\$ (43,678)	\$ 155,552	\$ 155,552	\$ (44,448)	\$ (45,386)
Parking District Service Facility	\$ (607,000)	\$ (23,629)	\$ (24,358)	\$ (25,128)	\$ (25,128)	\$ (25,128)	\$ (26,066)
Transfers from Silver Spring PLD	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (19,320)	\$ (19,320)	\$ (19,320)	\$ (19,320)	\$ (19,320)
Transfers from Silver Spring PLD	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ -
Total Resources	\$ 2,275,183	\$ 2,016,056	\$ 1,595,600	\$ 1,584,408	\$ 2,004,021	\$ 1,997,557	\$ 1,954,558
CIP Current Revenue Appropriation Expenditure	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)	\$ (157,000)
Appropriations/Expenditures							
Operating Budget	\$ (1,345,183)	\$ (1,368,604)	\$ (1,317,313)	\$ (1,387,249)	\$ (1,642,776)	\$ (1,663,842)	\$ (1,685,463)
Retiree Health Insurance Pre-Funding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 540	\$ 1,140	\$ 1,450	\$ 1,780	\$ 1,780
Battery Backup	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,000	\$ -	\$ 22,000	\$ -	\$ 22,000
Labor Agreement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (4,219)	\$ (4,219)	\$ (4,219)	\$ (4,219)	\$ (4,219)
Subtotal PSP Operating Budget Appropriation	\$ (1,345,183)	\$ (1,368,604)	\$ (1,294,773)	\$ (1,386,109)	\$ (1,619,326)	\$ (1,662,062)	\$ (1,661,683)
Total Use of Resources	\$ (1,502,183)	\$ (1,525,604)	\$ (1,451,773)	\$ (1,543,109)	\$ (1,776,326)	\$ (1,819,062)	\$ (1,818,683)
Year End Available Fund Balance	\$ 773,000	\$ 490,452	\$ 143,827	\$ 41,300	\$ 227,695	\$ 178,495	\$ 135,875
Available Fund Balance As A Percent of Next Year's PSP Expenses	56%	38%	10%	3%	14%	11%	8%
Target Balance	\$ 342,151	\$ 323,693	\$ 346,527	\$ 404,831	\$ 415,516	\$ 415,421	\$ 415,421

Assumptions:

1. These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY18-22 expenditures are based on the "major, known commitments" of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, estimates of compensation and inflation cost increases, the operating costs of capital facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. They do not include unapproved service improvements. The projected future expenditures, revenues, and fund balance may vary based on changes to fee or tax rates, usage, inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here.
2. The Parking Lot Districts have a fund balance policy target equal to 25 percent of the following year's projected operating budget expenses. The target was lowered from 50 percent based on an independent analysis of the parking lot district funds.

43



MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

GEORGE LEVENTHAL
COUNCILMEMBER
AT-LARGE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Roger Berliner, Chair Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy and Environment Committee

FROM: George Leventhal, Councilmember *George Leventhal*

DATE: March 22, 2016

SUBJECT: Enhancement Projects for Bonifant Street

It was recently brought to my attention that the business owners who operate in the 900 block of Bonifant Street in Silver Spring are experiencing difficulties in directing visitors to adequate nearby parking facilities and ensuring a sense of safety for their customers. I am writing to propose directional way-finding signs to assist visitors to find parking on this important commercial street.

Currently, Lot 38 and the parking structure at Bonifant and Dixon serve as the most convenient lots for visitors; however, neither is particularly easy to find if you are unfamiliar with downtown Silver Spring. Signage for Lot 38 does not face oncoming traffic in either direction and can easily be missed by drivers, especially at night, due to the lighting conditions in that area. In addition, sidewalk lighting on the side of the street opposite Lot 38 is abysmal. Some of the only illumination for individuals walking on that side of the street at night comes from the storefront windows of the businesses that are operating. Not only is it an issue of the County doing its part to promote our local businesses, but it is a public safety issue as well.

Now that the long awaited transit center is operational, and given that the Purple Line will be built in the near future, I believe it is imperative that residents, commuters and individuals looking to partake in the rich and diverse offerings on Bonifant Street be given the appropriate tools to do so. To that end, I am asking that the Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy and Environment Committee (T&E) examine adding directional way-finding signs to this area of downtown Silver Spring in the FY17 budget.

Department of Transportation (DOT) representatives have advised me that appropriate way-finding signage would cost approximately \$36,000 for both parking lots. In addition, I am in continuing dialogue with DOT about how we can improve the lighting in the surrounding area on a temporary basis (until the more permanent solution arrives with the installation of lights that will accompany the Purple Line).

I request that the T&E Committee add \$36,000 for way-finding signs and a placeholder amount of \$50,000 for temporary lighting (with final cost to be determined before the end of the budget) for Bonifant Street to the FY17 reconciliation list.

I look forward to working closely with you on these issues, and I am always available for any follow up questions you may have.

CC: Nancy Floreen, President – Montgomery County Council
Tom Hucker, Councilmember
Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Administrator