

AGENDA ITEM #24
May 5, 2009

Worksession

MEMORANDUM

May 1, 2009

TO: County Council

FROM: Minna K. Davidson, Legislative Analyst *MKD*

SUBJECT: **Worksession: FY10 Operating Budget
Urban Districts**

PHED Committee Recommendation

The PHED Committee reviewed the Executive's FY10 operating budget for the Urban Districts on April 29, and recommends approval.

The packet for the Committee's April 29 worksession is attached on © 1-26, and an addendum is on © 27-29.

Summary of PHED Committee Discussion

At the Committee's request, Urban District representatives clarified that a total of eight positions are vacant in the Silver Spring Urban District, two positions are vacant in Wheaton, and the one position assigned to the Bethesda Urban District is filled. The vacant positions in Silver Spring and Wheaton have been lapsed to meet FY09 savings targets. The Executive expects to fill them in FY10 with individuals who were subject to Reductions in Force in other parts of County Government.

As the Wheaton Urban District is the only one recommended to receive a transfer from the General Fund, Councilmember Knapp recommended reducing the General Fund transfer, possibly by about \$200,000, and reallocating the funds to the Emerging Communities Initiative to enable the Regional Services Centers to provide urban district type services in other areas that need them. Executive staff said that a funding reduction of that magnitude would require

significant service reductions in the Wheaton Urban District, and that the reductions would be very noticeable because they would have to come from the District's Clean and Safe activities.

The Committee considered whether there were other options for reductions that would not disproportionately affect Wheaton. Because the other Urban Districts are funded from non-General Fund sources, reducing them would not necessarily increase fiscal capacity in the General Fund.

The Committee ultimately decided to recommend placing \$250,000 on the Reconciliation List for the Regional Services Centers budget in two increments of \$125,000 each to fund the Emerging Communities Initiative, with the understanding the funds allocated to the Silver Spring Regional Services Center are to be used for neighborhood maintenance services in Long Branch that were funded in FY09 through the Department of Housing and Community Affairs. (For more on this recommendation, see the packet for the Regional Services Centers FY10 operating budget, Council Agenda Item #23, May 5, 2009.) The Committee decided that they would not recommend offsetting reductions in the Urban District budgets, but would try to identify offsetting reductions in other portions of the budget during the Council's budget review.

The Committee requested a briefing after budget season on the Urban Districts' activities, their accomplishments to date, and their goals for the future.

PHED COMMITTEE #2
April 29, 2009

Worksession

MEMORANDUM

April 28, 2009

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee
FROM: Minna K. Davidson, Legislative Analyst *MKD*
SUBJECT: **Worksession: FY10 Operating Budget
Urban Districts**

Those expected for this worksession:

Natalie Cantor, Director, Mid-County Regional Services Center
Kenneth Hartman, Director, Bethesda-Chevy Chase Regional Services Center
Roylene Roberts, Acting Director, Silver Spring Regional Services Center
Brady Goldsmith, Office of Management and Budget

The Executive's recommendation for the Urban Districts is attached at ©1-6.

OVERVIEW

For FY10, the Executive recommends total expenditures of \$7,932,220 for the Urban Districts, a decrease of -\$20,630 or -0.3% from the FY09 approved budget of \$7,952,850. Not included in this amount are Silver Spring Urban District expenditures of \$387,860 and 8.0 wy that are charged to the CIP and \$104,870 and 3.0 wy that are charged to the Silver Spring Parking Lot District.

| | FY08 Actual | FY09 Approved | FY10 CE Recommended | % Change FY09-FY10 |
|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Expenditures: | | | | |
| Urban District Funds | 6,712,857 | 7,952,350 | 7,932,220 | -0.3% |
| TOTAL Expenditures | 6,712,857 | 7,952,350 | 7,932,220 | -0.3% |
| Positions: | | | | |
| Full-time | 32 | 32 | 32 | 0.0% |
| Part-time | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.0% |
| TOTAL Positions | 33 | 33 | 33 | 0.0% |
| WORKYEARS | 57.6 | 58.1 | 58.1 | 0.0% |

The Executive recommends no change in the number of full time or part time positions.

The Executive's recommended changes in Personnel Costs and Operating Expenses for the three Urban Districts are summarized in the table below.

| Summary of Urban District Expenditures by Category | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Urban District | FY08 Actual | FY09 Approved | FY10 CE Rec. | % change FY09-10 |
| Bethesda | | | | |
| Personnel Costs | 9,982 | 62,690 | 63,560 | 1.4% |
| Operating Expenses | 2,552,410 | 3,338,910 | 3,316,650 | -0.7% |
| Total Expenses | 2,562,392 | 3,401,600 | 3,380,210 | -0.6% |
| Silver Spring | | | | |
| Personnel Costs | 1,559,119 | 1,815,730 | 1,838,040 | 1.2% |
| Operating Expenses | 1,111,082 | 1,075,040 | 1,053,890 | -2.0% |
| Total Expenses | 2,670,201 | 2,890,770 | 2,891,930 | 0.0% |
| Wheaton | | | | |
| Personnel Costs | 966,760 | 1,157,060 | 1,187,350 | 2.6% |
| Operating Expenses | 512,504 | 503,420 | 472,730 | -6.1% |
| Total Expenses | 1,479,264 | 1,660,480 | 1,660,080 | 0.0% |

Personnel costs are recommended to increase slightly to accommodate annualizations of FY09 costs, service increments, and adjustments to group insurance and retirement costs. Operating expenses for each urban district include several increases and decreases that result in a net decrease in total expenses.

Key changes in operating expenses are summarized in the table on the next page.

| Key Operating Expense Changes | |
|---|------------------|
| Urban District/Item | \$ Change |
| Bethesda Urban District | |
| Insurance, Rent, and Parking Adjustments | 8,850 |
| Risk Management Adjustment | 6,150 |
| Eliminate Play in a Day | -13,500 |
| Publication of Events Calendar | -25,000 |
| Silver Spring Urban District | |
| Risk Management Adjustment | -9,440 |
| Hardware and Storage Costs | -10,310 |
| Wheaton Urban District | |
| Risk Management Adjustment | -5,240 |
| Professional purchase of service | -6,000 |
| Tool rental, education, computer software, uniforms | -8,030 |
| Other supplies, equipment, materials | -11,240 |

URBAN DISTRICTS AND PROGRAMS

Urban Districts were created to promote public interest activities that benefit residential and commercial interests in particular communities. Urban Districts enhance the safety and security of individuals and property and provide assistance with capital projects that promote the economic stability and growth of the district. In addition, Urban Districts ensure that communities are maintained in a clean and attractive manner, promote a sense of community identity, ensure adequate infrastructure and foster a dynamic social and business climate.

The County's three Urban Districts are Bethesda, Silver Spring, and Wheaton. The Bethesda Urban District is run by an Urban District corporation, the Bethesda Urban Partnership. The Silver Spring and Wheaton Urban Districts are managed by the respective Regional Services Centers.

Urban District services include promotions, sidewalk repair and maintenance, streetscaping activities and tree maintenance. The table below compares FY09 approved and FY10 recommended funding and workyears by program.

| Comparison of Urban District Costs and Workyears by Program | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Program | FY09 Approved | | FY10 CE Rec. | |
| | \$ | wy | \$ | wy |
| Promotion of Community and Business Activities | 1,263,120 | 0.9 | 1,221,660 | 0.9 |
| Sidewalk Repair | 143,970 | 0 | 143,970 | 0 |
| Streetscape Maintenance | 3,446,660 | 26.7 | 3,481,710 | 26.2 |
| Tree Maintenance | 121,360 | 0 | 121,360 | 0 |
| Enhanced Security | 1,139,840 | 26 | 1,263,700 | 25.5 |
| Administration | 1,837,900 | 4.5 | 1,699,820 | 5.5 |
| Total | 7,952,850 | 58.1 | 7,932,220 | 58.1 |

In October 2008, the PHED Committee reviewed the services provided in Urban Districts and emerging communities. Summaries of the maintenance and landscaping services in the Silver Spring and Wheaton Urban Districts that were provided for the October review are attached on © 15-16. A summary of similar services from the Office of Legislative Oversight's 2008 evaluation of the Bethesda Urban Partnership is attached on © 17-18.

FY10 EXPENDITURE ISSUES

The Executive's budget would fund the same services as in FY09, with small adjustments in ongoing costs from year to year, and a few small reductions that generally are not expected to impact service to the community.

Two proposed reductions with potential service impacts are discussed below.

Issue #1: Bethesda UD - Eliminate "Play in a Day", -\$13,500

Play in a Day is a theatrical production in which six directors have 12 hours to write a ten-minute one act play and six acting companies then have 12 hours to rehearse and perform each play. The event culminates in an evening production of a "play produced in a day". Three hundred people attended the 2009 Play in a Day. The admission charge was \$10 per person.

According to Bethesda Urban District representatives, Play in a Day is a significant initiative of the Bethesda Arts and Entertainment District which promotes downtown Bethesda as an arts destination. Eliminating the program would eliminate the opportunity for people to attend a professional theatrical production at a reasonable cost. It also would eliminate the free press coverage generated by the event. More detailed information from the Bethesda Urban District is attached on © 10-11.

Council staff recommendation: Approve as recommended by the Executive.

Issue #2: Bethesda UD – Reduce publication of events calendar, -\$25,000

The Events Calendar is a bi-monthly publication that promotes independent events in downtown Bethesda and festivals produced by the Bethesda Urban Partnership. The Calendar is mailed to 55,000 households in the Greater Bethesda Chevy Chase area, and distributed to six hotels, commercial and apartment buildings, kiosks and special events. The proposed reduction would mean that the Calendar would be mailed to 4,500 fewer households, and the distribution to hotels, commercial and apartment buildings would be discontinued, diminishing the reach of marketing efforts. Additional information about this reduction is on © 11.

Council staff recommendation: Approve as recommended by the Executive.

Possible area for further reduction: The current budget for the Calendar is \$100,750. If the Committee feels it is necessary to take an additional reduction in the Urban District budgets, the Committee could consider reducing the funding by another -\$25,000. The

Calendar could either be sent to its current distribution less frequently, or could be sent to a smaller distribution on its current schedule.

REVENUE ISSUES

The Urban Districts are funded through a combination of revenues from the Urban District Tax, Parking Lot District fees, maintenance charges on optional method development, transfers from the General Fund, and miscellaneous revenues. The proceeds from either the Urban District tax or parking fees transferred into an Urban District Fund must not exceed 90 percent of their combined total. In addition, the transfer from the Parking Lot District must not exceed the number of parking spaces in the Urban District times the number of enforcement hours per year times 20 cents. Urban District fund calculations from the FY10-15 Fiscal Plan are attached on © 7-9.

Urban District Tax Rate: The Executive is proposing no tax rate changes for the Urban Districts from FY09 to FY10. The recommended tax rates are shown in the table below.

| Urban District | Real Property | Personal Property |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Bethesda | .012 | .030 |
| Silver Spring | .024 | .060 |
| Wheaton | .030 | .075 |

Transfers from the General Fund: Several years ago, the Council defined “baseline services” for Urban Districts: those services that would routinely be funded by the County’s General Fund if there were no Urban Districts. The idea was that the special revenues in each Urban District Fund (Urban District taxes, Parking Lot District transfers, and investment income) were to provide for certain services *above and beyond* what would normally be covered by the General Fund. The baseline services included street sweeping three times each week, twice weekly trash pickup, litter collection between two and five times each week, semi-annual cleaning of brick pavers, monthly mowing, tree pruning on an optimal cycle, and regular streetlight maintenance.

Using a formula based on costs at that time, the “baseline service” target level in Bethesda was \$230,420, in Silver Spring was \$241,630, and in Wheaton was \$76,090. The goal was to use the each Urban District’s General Fund baseline transfer as the starting point for building the rest of its budget. This objective often has not been met due to fiscal exigencies. For example, for the past few years, the Bethesda Urban District usually has had sufficient resources from its Urban District tax and Parking Lot District transfer, and the Council has used the \$230,420 “due” to Bethesda to fund other needs in the General Fund portion of the budget.

For FY09, the Executive recommended baseline and non-baseline transfers from the General Fund for Wheaton, and a baseline transfer for Silver Spring. To increase fiscal capacity in the General Fund, the Council shifted the source of funds for the Silver Spring baseline transfer and part of the Wheaton non-baseline transfer from the General Fund to the Parking Lot

Districts. For the Bethesda Urban District, the Council increased the Parking Lot District transfer and lowered the Urban District tax rates from 1.6¢ to 1.2¢ for real property and 4.0¢ to 3.0¢ for personal property.

For FY10, Wheaton is the only Urban District that will receive transfers from the General Fund. The other Urban Districts will fund all services through a combination of other sources. The table below shows the estimated baseline service costs, the total FY10 resources, and the amounts of the Wheaton General Fund transfers.

| Urban District | Baseline Transfer | Baseline Service Cost | Non-baseline Transfer | Total General Fund Transfer | Total FY10 Resources |
|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Bethesda | \$0 | \$230,420 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,467,340 |
| Silver Spring | \$0 | \$241,630 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,965,960 |
| Wheaton | \$76,090 | \$76,090 | \$1,168,000 | \$1,244,090 | \$1,703,480 |

Issue #3: Increase in General Fund Transfer to the Wheaton Urban District

The Wheaton Urban District needs a large transfer from the General Fund because the Wheaton Parking Lot District (PLD) is struggling. Even though there was a parking rate increase last year, it brought in much less revenue than anticipated. The current estimate is that only \$835,000 will be collected this year instead of \$1 million as was originally projected. In addition, the PLD’s property tax revenue is down by more than a quarter, leaving it with a very small fund balance. Because of this situation, the Executive recommended decreasing the Wheaton PLD’s transfer to the Urban District by 58% (from \$688,490 in FY09 to \$292,320 in FY10), and increasing the non-baseline General Fund transfer by 73% (from \$675,510 to \$1,168,000).

Council staff comments: It is of some concern that a large increase in the non-baseline General Fund transfer is required. Because of the condition of the Parking Lot District fund, however, the only way to reduce the General Fund transfer would be to reduce the services provided by the Wheaton Urban District.

ADDITIONAL ISSUE

Issue #4: Request for a Wheaton Sobering Center

The Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee had asked the Executive to establish a Wheaton Sobering Center to provide a safe place for habitual inebriates to sober up and receive counseling. The Executive did not provide funds for this initiative in his budget. In public hearing testimony, the Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee requested that the Council consider adding the necessary funds (© 19-20).

On April 23, the Health and Human Services Committee reviewed the Executive’s recommendations for the Department of Health and Human Services’ Behavioral Health and Crisis Services which houses the current Public Inebriation Intervention Team (PIIT Team). The

Committee recommended placing \$162,420 on the Reconciliation List to implement a PIIT Team in Wheaton in the second half of FY10.

At the worksession, Councilmember Berliner asked whether Urban District funding might be used to fund the Wheaton PIIT Team services, as the services have been requested by the business community.

Council staff comments: In view of the Executive's proposed General Fund transfer to the Wheaton Urban District, Council staff does not believe that Urban District funding for the PIIT Team would be feasible at this time. However, if a Wheaton PIIT Team is implemented in the second half of FY10, it might be possible to ask whether the Urban District or the business community could make a contribution to support the annualization of the PIIT Team in FY11 and the continuation of the Team in future years.

Council staff would also note that the Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee's testimony mentions that the Montgomery County Business Alliance has been very active in an effort to reduce public drunkenness in downtown Wheaton. The Committee may want to ask Wheaton Urban District staff to describe the Alliance's efforts in more detail.

This packet contains:

circle #

| | |
|---|----|
| CE's FY10 budget for the Urban Districts | 1 |
| FY10-15 Fiscal Plan, Bethesda Urban District | 7 |
| FY10-15 Fiscal Plan, Silver Spring Urban District | 8 |
| FY10-15 Fiscal Plan, Wheaton Urban District | 9 |
| Responses to Council staff questions on the budget | 10 |
| Summary of Silver Spring & Wheaton maint. services | 15 |
| OLO summary of BUP maintenance services | 17 |
| Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee testimony | 19 |

rsc\op bud\10 phedpac ud.doc

Urban Districts

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Urban Districts (Bethesda, Silver Spring, and Wheaton) is to: ensure that each district is maintained in a clean, safe, and attractive manner; promote a strong sense of identity in each district; ensure that each district has adequate infrastructure and the enhanced services required by their higher levels of activity in order to foster a vibrant social and business climate; and ensure long-term economic viability and vitality.

BUDGET OVERVIEW

The total recommended FY10 Operating Budget for the Urban Districts is \$7,932,220, a decrease of \$20,630 or 0.3 percent from the FY09 Approved Budget of \$7,952,850. Personnel Costs comprise 38.9 percent of the budget for 32 full-time positions and one part-time position for 58.1 workyears. Operating Expenses account for the remaining 61.1 percent of the FY10 budget.

LINKAGE TO COUNTY RESULT AREAS

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

- ❖ *A Responsive, Accountable County Government*
- ❖ *Healthy and Sustainable Neighborhoods*
- ❖ *Safe Streets and Secure Neighborhoods*
- ❖ *Strong and Vibrant Economy*
- ❖ *Vital Living for All of Our Residents*

DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

This table presents the department's headline measures or submeasures that relate to multiple programs including projections from FY09 through FY11. These estimates reflect funding based on the FY09 savings plan, the FY10 budget, and funding for comparable service levels in FY11.

| Measure | Actual FY07 | Actual FY08 | Estimated FY09 | Projected FY10 | Projected FY11 |
|--|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Headline Measures | | | | | |
| Urban District blocks that require frequent litter removal (%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Landscaped areas that require frequent maintenance (%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Publicly owned land without landscape treatment (%) | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Street furniture items that require frequent maintenance (%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Presence of uniformed Clean and Safe Team staff per city block (avg hrs/day) | n/a | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 |
| Customers served directly by Clean and Safe Teams (annually) | n/a | 24,429 | 54,829 | 54,829 | 54,829 |
| Attendance at Urban District special events (annually) | 196,400 | 178,650 | 189,500 | 202,500 | 202,500 |
| Average number of unique website hits per month | 11,380 | 79,290 | 77,850 | 80,000 | 80,000 |

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND INITIATIVES

- ❖ *Launched downtown Bethesda Wireless Fidelity to provide wireless Internet access at four hot spot points.*
- ❖ *In Silver Spring, increased the number of commercial sidewalk sweeping equipment, which allows staff to cover assigned areas more quickly.*
- ❖ *In Wheaton, purchased steam cleaning machine to clean grease, gum, etc. from sidewalks. The new method replaces power washing of sidewalks which had negative environmental impacts. The new steam system can operate all day on a couple gallons of water.*
- ❖ *Productivity Improvements*

8 1

- Transferred funds for Bethesda Circulator from Transit Services to Bethesda Urban District saving staff time and electronic payment fees.
- Computerized field equipment and software in Silver Spring to assist Public Service Aides in collecting data and providing information for the citizens.
- Distributed information to Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee and Wheaton Redevelopment Advisory Committee by electronic means only. Member orientation handbook was distributed on CD ROM.

PROGRAM CONTACTS

Contact Natalie Cantor of the Urban Districts at 240.777.8100 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

Promotion of Community and Business Activities

This program enhances the quality of life in the Urban Districts and surrounding communities; fosters a strong, vibrant business climate within each Urban District; and creates a positive image and a sense of identity for the Districts. These goals are accomplished through enhanced maintenance activities; sponsorship of community events, including festivals, concerts, and parades; the installation of seasonal banners, unique signs, holiday decorations, and other amenities to give each District a sense of place; and the development and distribution of newsletters, brochures, and other promotional material highlighting the Districts. Each Urban District develops its programs with the active participation of its advisory committee or Urban District Corporation.

| Program Performance Measures | Actual FY07 | Actual FY08 | Estimated FY09 | Projected FY10 | Projected FY11 |
|--|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Attendance at Urban District special events (annually) | 196,400 | 178,650 | 189,500 | 202,500 | 202,500 |
| Average number of unique website hits per month | 11,380 | 79,290 | 77,850 | 80,000 | 80,000 |

| FY10 Recommended Changes | Expenditures | WYs |
|--|------------------|------------|
| FY09 Approved | 1,263,120 | 0.9 |
| Decrease Cost: Professional Purchase of Service | -6,000 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Other Supplies, Equipment, and Materials | -11,240 | 0.0 |
| Eliminate: Play in a Day | -13,500 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Publication of Events Calendar | -25,000 | 0.0 |
| Miscellaneous adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting more than one program | 14,280 | 0.0 |
| FY10 CE Recommended | 1,221,660 | 0.9 |

Sidewalk Repair

This program provides for the removal and replacement of deteriorated concrete and brick walks and curbs in the Urban Districts.

| FY10 Recommended Changes | Expenditures | WYs |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------|
| FY09 Approved | 143,970 | 0.0 |
| FY10 CE Recommended | 143,970 | 0.0 |

Streetscape Maintenance

This program provides maintenance of, and improvement to, the streetscape amenities within each Urban District. Various service levels include litter collection, semi-annual sidewalk pressure washing, trash receptacle service at least three times a week, mowing and snow removal as needed, lighting maintenance, maintenance of planted/landscaped areas, and street sweeping.

| Program Performance Measures | Actual FY07 | Actual FY08 | Estimated FY09 | Projected FY10 | Projected FY11 |
|--|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Urban District blocks that require frequent litter removal (%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Landscaped areas that require frequent maintenance (%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Publicly owned land without landscape treatment (%) | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Street furniture items that require frequent maintenance (%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| FY10 Recommended Changes | Expenditures | WYs |
|--------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| FY09 Approved | 3,446,660 | 26.7 |

| | Expenditures | WYs |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| Increase Cost: Streetscape Maintenance (non BUP) | 1,260 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Tool Rental | -1,000 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Hardware and Storage Costs | -10,310 | 0.0 |
| Miscellaneous adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting more than one program | 45,100 | -0.5 |
| FY10 CE Recommended | 3,481,710 | 26.2 |

Tree Maintenance

This program provides pruning, planting, fertilization, necessary spraying, replacement, watering, mulching, and tree base cleaning in the Urban Districts.

| FY10 Recommended Changes | Expenditures | WYs |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------|
| FY09 Approved | 121,360 | 0.0 |
| FY10 CE Recommended | 121,360 | 0.0 |

Enhanced Security

This program provides safeguards against property theft, vandalism, and personal security in the Silver Spring and Wheaton Urban Districts. The goal of the program is to provide an enhanced level of protection and reduce the perception of crime through the use of County and Park Police support, as well as the Safe Teams.

| Program Performance Measures | Actual FY07 | Actual FY08 | Estimated FY09 | Projected FY10 | Projected FY11 |
|--|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Presence of uniformed Clean and Safe Team staff per city block (avg hrs/day) | n/a | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 |
| Customers served directly by Clean and Safe Teams (annually) | n/a | 24,429 | 54,829 | 54,829 | 54,829 |

| FY10 Recommended Changes | Expenditures | WYs |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| FY09 Approved | 1,139,840 | 26.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Education and Training | -1,550 | 0.0 |
| Miscellaneous adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting more than one program | 125,410 | -0.5 |
| FY10 CE Recommended | 1,263,700 | 25.5 |

Administration

This program provides staff support for contract administration and clerical services to the Urban District Advisory Committees and for the administration of the Bethesda Urban Partnership (BUP), Inc., a non-profit Corporation created to manage the day-to-day operation of the Bethesda Urban District. This program also provides for budget preparation and monitoring, payment authorization, and records maintenance.

| FY10 Recommended Changes | Expenditures | WYs |
|--|------------------|------------|
| FY09 Approved | 1,837,900 | 4.5 |
| Increase Cost: Annualization of FY09 Personnel Costs | 29,330 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Insurance, Rent, and Parking Adjustments | 8,850 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment - Bethesda | 6,150 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Computer Software | -2,480 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment - Wheaton | -5,240 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment - Silver Spring | -9,440 | 0.0 |
| Miscellaneous adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting more than one program | -165,250 | 1.0 |
| FY10 CE Recommended | 1,699,820 | 5.5 |

10

BUDGET SUMMARY

| | Actual FY08 | Budget FY09 | Estimated FY09 | Recommended FY10 | % Chg Bud/Rep |
|---|------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| BETHESDA URBAN DISTRICT | | | | | |
| EXPENDITURES | | | | | |
| Salaries and Wages | 8,112 | 45,850 | 48,190 | 51,310 | 11.9% |
| Employee Benefits | 1,870 | 16,840 | 11,170 | 12,250 | -27.3% |
| Bethesda Urban District Personnel Costs | 9,982 | 62,690 | 59,360 | 63,560 | 1.4% |
| Operating Expenses | 2,552,410 | 3,338,910 | 3,338,910 | 3,316,650 | -0.7% |
| Capital Outlay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | --- |
| Bethesda Urban District Expenditures | 2,562,392 | 3,401,600 | 3,398,270 | 3,380,210 | -0.6% |
| PERSONNEL | | | | | |
| Full-Time | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | --- |
| Part-Time | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | --- |
| Workyears | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | --- |
| REVENUES | | | | | |
| Investment Income: Pooled | 9,843 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | --- |
| Property Tax | 546,612 | 459,050 | 457,770 | 485,780 | 5.8% |
| Optional Method Development | 130,376 | 147,350 | 130,000 | 130,000 | -11.8% |
| Bethesda Urban District Revenues | 686,831 | 616,400 | 587,770 | 615,780 | -0.1% |
| SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT | | | | | |
| EXPENDITURES | | | | | |
| Salaries and Wages | 1,233,783 | 1,411,730 | 1,338,730 | 1,430,910 | 1.4% |
| Employee Benefits | 325,336 | 404,000 | 347,210 | 407,130 | 0.8% |
| Silver Spring Urban District Personnel Costs | 1,559,119 | 1,815,730 | 1,685,940 | 1,838,040 | 1.2% |
| Operating Expenses | 1,111,082 | 1,075,040 | 1,075,040 | 1,053,890 | -2.0% |
| Capital Outlay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | --- |
| Silver Spring Urban District Expenditures | 2,670,201 | 2,890,770 | 2,760,980 | 2,891,930 | 0.0% |
| PERSONNEL | | | | | |
| Full-Time | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | --- |
| Part-Time | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | --- |
| Workyears | 35.2 | 35.2 | 35.2 | 35.2 | --- |
| REVENUES | | | | | |
| Property Tax | 608,206 | 629,220 | 641,920 | 681,730 | 8.3% |
| Optional Method Development | 134,425 | 144,500 | 134,000 | 134,000 | -7.3% |
| Investment Income | 9,736 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | --- |
| Silver Spring Urban District Revenues | 752,367 | 783,720 | 775,920 | 815,730 | 4.1% |
| WHEATON URBAN DISTRICT | | | | | |
| EXPENDITURES | | | | | |
| Salaries and Wages | 747,336 | 889,750 | 855,730 | 920,870 | 3.5% |
| Employee Benefits | 219,424 | 267,310 | 242,690 | 266,480 | -0.3% |
| Wheaton Urban District Personnel Costs | 966,760 | 1,157,060 | 1,098,420 | 1,187,350 | 2.6% |
| Operating Expenses | 512,504 | 503,420 | 503,420 | 472,730 | -6.1% |
| Capital Outlay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | --- |
| Wheaton Urban District Expenditures | 1,479,264 | 1,660,480 | 1,601,840 | 1,660,080 | 0.0% |
| PERSONNEL | | | | | |
| Full-Time | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | --- |
| Part-Time | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | --- |
| Workyears | 21.9 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 21.9 | --- |
| REVENUES | | | | | |
| Property Tax | 149,097 | 178,020 | 163,810 | 174,030 | -2.2% |
| Investment Income | 24,499 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | --- |
| Wheaton Urban District Revenues | 173,596 | 188,020 | 173,810 | 184,030 | -2.1% |
| DEPARTMENT TOTALS | | | | | |
| Total Expenditures | 6,711,857 | 7,952,850 | 7,761,090 | 7,932,220 | -0.3% |
| Total Full-Time Positions | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | --- |
| Total Part-Time Positions | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | --- |
| Total Workyears | 57.6 | 58.1 | 58.1 | 58.1 | --- |
| Total Revenues | 1,612,794 | 1,588,140 | 1,537,500 | 1,615,540 | 1.7% |

11 44

FY10 RECOMMENDED CHANGES

| | Expenditures | WYs |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| BETHESDA URBAN DISTRICT | | |
| FY09 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION | 3,401,600 | 1.0 |
| Changes (with service impacts) | | |
| Eliminate: Play in a Day [Promotion of Community and Business Activities] | -13,500 | 0.0 |
| Other Adjustments (with no service impacts) | | |
| Increase Cost: Insurance, Rent, and Parking Adjustments [Administration] | 8,850 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment - Bethesda [Administration] | 6,150 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Streetscape Maintenance (non BUP) [Streetscape Maintenance] | 1,260 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment | 520 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Service Increment | 350 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Printing and Mail Adjustment - Bethesda | 10 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Occupational Medical Services Adjustment - Bethesda | -30 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Publication of Events Calendar [Promotion of Community and Business Activities] | -25,000 | 0.0 |
| FY10 RECOMMENDED: | 3,380,210 | 1.0 |
| SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT | | |
| FY09 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION | 2,890,770 | 35.2 |
| Other Adjustments (with no service impacts) | | |
| Increase Cost: Service Increment | 10,350 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment | 6,420 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Annualization of FY09 Personnel Costs | 3,310 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment | 2,230 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Motor Pool Rate Adjustment - Silver Spring | 30 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Printing and Mail Adjustment - Silver Spring | -420 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Occupational Medical Services Adjustment | -1,010 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment - Silver Spring [Administration] | -9,440 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Hardware and Storage Costs [Streetscape Maintenance] | -10,310 | 0.0 |
| FY10 RECOMMENDED: | 2,891,930 | 35.2 |
| WHEATON URBAN DISTRICT | | |
| FY09 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION | 1,660,480 | 21.9 |
| Other Adjustments (with no service impacts) | | |
| Increase Cost: Annualization of FY09 Personnel Costs [Administration] | 29,330 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Service Increment | 10,280 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment | 3,840 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment | 1,170 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Motor Pool Rate Adjustment - Wheaton | 370 | 0.0 |
| Increase Cost: Printing and Mail Adjustments | 70 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Occupational Medical Services Adjustment - Wheaton | -620 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Tool Rental [Streetscape Maintenance] | -1,000 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Education and Training [Enhanced Security] | -1,550 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Computer Software [Administration] | -2,480 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Uniform Replacement | -3,000 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Risk Management Adjustment - Wheaton [Administration] | -5,240 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Professional Purchase of Service [Promotion of Community and Business Activities] | -6,000 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Other Supplies, Equipment, and Materials [Promotion of Community and Business Activities] | -11,240 | 0.0 |
| Decrease Cost: Abolish Administrative Specialist III position and create Program Specialist II position | -14,330 | 0.0 |
| FY10 RECOMMENDED: | 1,660,080 | 21.9 |

12

5

PROGRAM SUMMARY

| Program Name | FY09 Approved | | FY10 Recommended | |
|--|------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|
| | Expenditures | WYs | Expenditures | WYs |
| Promotion of Community and Business Activities | 1,263,120 | 0.9 | 1,221,660 | 0.9 |
| Sidewalk Repair | 143,970 | 0.0 | 143,970 | 0.0 |
| Streetscape Maintenance | 3,446,660 | 26.7 | 3,481,710 | 26.2 |
| Tree Maintenance | 121,360 | 0.0 | 121,360 | 0.0 |
| Enhanced Security | 1,139,840 | 26.0 | 1,263,700 | 25.5 |
| Administration | 1,837,900 | 4.5 | 1,699,820 | 5.5 |
| Total | 7,952,850 | 58.1 | 7,932,220 | 58.1 |

CHARGES TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS

| Charged Department | Charged Fund | FY09 | | FY10 | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | Total\$ | WYs | Total\$ | WYs |
| SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT | | | | | |
| CIP | CIP | 387,860 | 8.0 | 387,860 | 8.0 |
| Parking District Services | Silver Spring Parking District | 104,870 | 3.0 | 104,870 | 3.0 |
| Total | | 492,730 | 11.0 | 492,730 | 11.0 |

FUTURE FISCAL IMPACTS

| Title | CE REC. | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | FY10 | FY11 | FY12 | FY13 | FY14 | FY15 |
| This table is intended to present significant future fiscal impacts of the department's programs. | | | | | | |
| BETHESDA URBAN DISTRICT | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| FY10 Recommended | 3,380 | 3,380 | 3,380 | 3,380 | 3,380 | 3,380 |
| No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections. | | | | | | |
| Subtotal Expenditures | 3,380 | 3,380 | 3,380 | 3,380 | 3,380 | 3,380 |
| SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| FY10 Recommended | 2,892 | 2,892 | 2,892 | 2,892 | 2,892 | 2,892 |
| No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections. | | | | | | |
| Labor Contracts | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| These figures represent the estimated cost of service increments and associated benefits. | | | | | | |
| Subtotal Expenditures | 2,892 | 2,897 | 2,897 | 2,897 | 2,897 | 2,897 |
| WHEATON URBAN DISTRICT | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| FY10 Recommended | 1,660 | 1,660 | 1,660 | 1,660 | 1,660 | 1,660 |
| No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections. | | | | | | |
| Labor Contracts | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| These figures represent the estimated cost of service increments and associated benefits. | | | | | | |
| Subtotal Expenditures | 1,660 | 1,665 | 1,665 | 1,665 | 1,665 | 1,665 |

13

FY10-15 PUBLIC SERVICES PROGRAM: FISCAL PLAN

Bethesda Urban District

| FISCAL PROJECTIONS | FY09 ESTIMATE | FY10 REC | FY11 PROJECTION | FY12 PROJECTION | FY13 PROJECTION | FY14 PROJECTION | FY15 PROJECTION |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| ASSUMPTIONS | | | | | | | |
| Property Tax Rate: Real Property | 0.012 | 0.120 | 0.120 | 0.120 | 0.120 | 0.120 | 0.120 |
| Assessable Base: Real Property (000) | 3,294,500 | 3,525,800 | 3,783,100 | 3,906,400 | 3,983,300 | 4,088,000 | 4,254,400 |
| Property Tax Collection Factor: Real Property | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% |
| Property Tax Rate: Personal Property | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 |
| Assessable Base: Personal Property (000) | 225,600 | 227,300 | 229,900 | 232,500 | 235,100 | 237,800 | 240,500 |
| Property Tax Collection Factor: Personal Property | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% |
| Indirect Cost Rate | 12.88% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% |
| CPI (Fiscal Year) | 4.1% | 3.3% | 2.8% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% |
| Investment Income Yield | 1.30% | 1.10% | 1.65% | 2.55% | 2.80% | 3.10% | 3.35% |
| BEGINNING FUND BALANCE | 69,010 | 25,290 | 87,130 | 89,860 | 92,110 | 94,180 | 95,180 |
| REVENUES | | | | | | | |
| Taxes | 457,770 | 485,780 | 517,140 | 532,560 | 542,460 | 555,700 | 576,280 |
| Charges For Services | 130,000 | 130,000 | 133,640 | 136,980 | 140,400 | 143,910 | 147,510 |
| Subtotal Revenues | 587,770 | 615,780 | 650,780 | 669,540 | 682,860 | 699,610 | 723,790 |
| INTERFUND TRANSFERS (Net Non-CIP) | | | | | | | |
| Transfers To The General Fund | (8,070) | (8,730) | (8,750) | (8,750) | (8,750) | (8,750) | (8,750) |
| Indirect Costs | (8,070) | (8,730) | (8,750) | (8,750) | (8,750) | (8,750) | (8,750) |
| Transfers From Special Fds: Non-Tax + ISF | 2,774,850 | 2,835,000 | 2,837,000 | 2,906,000 | 2,983,000 | 3,058,000 | 3,130,000 |
| From Bethesda Parking District | 2,774,850 | 2,835,000 | 2,837,000 | 2,906,000 | 2,983,000 | 3,058,000 | 3,130,000 |
| TOTAL RESOURCES | 3,423,560 | 3,467,340 | 3,566,160 | 3,656,650 | 3,749,220 | 3,843,040 | 3,940,220 |
| PSP OPER. BUDGET APPROP/ EXP'S. | | | | | | | |
| Operating Budget | (3,398,270) | (3,380,210) | (3,476,130) | (3,564,370) | (3,654,870) | (3,747,690) | (3,842,900) |
| Labor Agreement | n/a | 0 | (170) | (170) | (170) | (170) | (170) |
| Subtotal PSP Oper Budget Approp / Exp's | (3,398,270) | (3,380,210) | (3,476,300) | (3,564,540) | (3,655,040) | (3,747,860) | (3,843,070) |
| TOTAL USE OF RESOURCES | (3,398,270) | (3,380,210) | (3,476,300) | (3,564,540) | (3,655,040) | (3,747,860) | (3,843,070) |
| YEAR END FUND BALANCE | 25,290 | 87,130 | 89,860 | 92,110 | 94,180 | 95,180 | 97,150 |
| END-OF-YEAR RESERVES AS A | | | | | | | |
| PERCENT OF RESOURCES | 0.7% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% |

Assumptions:

- Transfers from the Bethesda Parking District are adjusted annually to fund the approved service program and to maintain an ending fund balance of approximately 2.5 percent of resources.
- Property tax revenue is assumed to increase over the six years based on an improved assessable base.
- Large assessable base increases are due to economic growth and new projects coming online.
- The labor contract with the Municipal and County Government Employees Organization, Local 1994, expires at the end of FY10.
- These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY11-15 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.
- Section 68A-4 of the County Code requires: a) that the proceeds from either the Urban District tax or parking fee transfer must not be greater than 90 percent of their combined total; and b) that the transfer from the Parking District not exceed the number of parking spaces in the Urban District times the number of enforcement hours per year times 20 cents.

(14)

FY10-15 PUBLIC SERVICES PROGRAM: FISCAL PLAN

Silver Spring Urban District

| FISCAL PROJECTIONS | FY09 ESTIMATE | FY10 REC | FY11 PROJECTION | FY12 PROJECTION | FY13 PROJECTION | FY14 PROJECTION | FY15 PROJECTION |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| ASSUMPTIONS | | | | | | | |
| Property Tax Rate: Real Property | 0.024 | 0.024 | 0.024 | 0.024 | 0.024 | 0.024 | 0.024 |
| Assessable Base: Real Property (000) | 2,349,700 | 2,514,600 | 2,698,100 | 2,786,000 | 2,840,900 | 2,915,600 | 3,034,300 |
| Property Tax Collection Factor: Real Property | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% |
| Property Tax Rate: Personal Property | 0.060 | 0.060 | 0.060 | 0.060 | 0.060 | 0.060 | 0.060 |
| Assessable Base: Personal Property (000) | 142,000 | 143,000 | 144,600 | 146,200 | 147,900 | 149,600 | 151,300 |
| Property Tax Collection Factor: Personal Property | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% |
| Indirect Cost Rate | 12.88% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% |
| CPI (Fiscal Year) | 4.1% | 3.3% | 2.8% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% |
| Investment Income Yield | 1.30% | 1.10% | 1.65% | 2.55% | 2.80% | 3.10% | 3.35% |
| BEGINNING FUND BALANCE | 126,890 | 289,590 | 74,030 | 78,260 | 81,000 | 83,980 | 85,230 |
| REVENUES | | | | | | | |
| Taxes | 641,920 | 681,730 | 726,310 | 748,150 | 762,200 | 780,970 | 810,190 |
| Charges For Services | 134,000 | 134,000 | 137,750 | 141,190 | 144,720 | 148,340 | 152,050 |
| Miscellaneous | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal Revenues | 775,920 | 815,730 | 864,060 | 889,340 | 906,920 | 929,310 | 962,240 |
| INTERFUND TRANSFERS (Net Non-CIP) | | | | | | | |
| Transfers To The General Fund | 2,147,760 | 1,860,640 | 2,154,940 | 2,241,940 | 2,342,940 | 2,441,940 | 2,538,940 |
| Indirect Costs | (233,870) | (252,360) | (253,060) | (253,060) | (253,060) | (253,060) | (253,060) |
| Transfers From Special Fds: Non-Tax + ISF | (233,870) | (252,360) | (253,060) | (253,060) | (253,060) | (253,060) | (253,060) |
| From Silver Spring Parking District | 2,381,630 | 2,113,000 | 2,408,000 | 2,495,000 | 2,596,000 | 2,695,000 | 2,792,000 |
| TOTAL RESOURCES | 3,050,570 | 2,965,960 | 3,093,030 | 3,209,540 | 3,330,860 | 3,455,230 | 3,586,410 |
| PSP OPER. BUDGET APPROP/ EXP'S. | | | | | | | |
| Operating Budget | (2,760,980) | (2,891,930) | (3,009,670) | (3,123,440) | (3,241,780) | (3,364,900) | (3,492,990) |
| Labor Agreement | n/a | 0 | (5,100) | (5,100) | (5,100) | (5,100) | (5,100) |
| Subtotal PSP Oper Budget Approp / Exp's | (2,760,980) | (2,891,930) | (3,014,770) | (3,128,540) | (3,246,880) | (3,370,000) | (3,498,090) |
| TOTAL USE OF RESOURCES | (2,760,980) | (2,891,930) | (3,014,770) | (3,128,540) | (3,246,880) | (3,370,000) | (3,498,090) |
| YEAR END FUND BALANCE | 289,590 | 74,030 | 78,260 | 81,000 | 83,980 | 85,230 | 88,320 |
| END-OF-YEAR RESERVES AS A PERCENT OF RESOURCES | 9.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% |

Assumptions:

1. Transfers from the Silver Spring Parking District are adjusted annually to fund the approved service program and to maintain an ending fund balance of approximately 2.5 percent of resources.
2. Property tax revenue is assumed to increase over the six years based on an improved assessable base.
3. Large assessable base increases are due to economic growth and new projects coming online.
4. The labor contract with the Municipal and County Government Employees Organization, Local 1994, expires at the end of FY10.
5. These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY11-15 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.
6. Section 68A-4 of the County Code requires: a) that the proceeds from either the Urban District tax or parking fee transfer must not be greater than 90 percent of their combined total; and b) that the transfer from the Parking District not exceed the number of parking spaces in the Urban District times the number of enforcement hours per year times 20 cents.

FY10-15 PUBLIC SERVICES PROGRAM: FISCAL PLAN

Wheaton Urban District

| FISCAL PROJECTIONS | FY09 ESTIMATE | FY10 REC | FY11 PROJECTION | FY12 PROJECTION | FY13 PROJECTION | FY14 PROJECTION | FY15 PROJECTION |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| ASSUMPTIONS | | | | | | | |
| Property Tax Rate: Real Property | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 | 0.030 |
| Assessable Base: Real Property (000) | 483,600 | 517,500 | 555,300 | 573,400 | 584,700 | 600,100 | 624,500 |
| Property Tax Collection Factor: Real Property | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% | 99.1% |
| Property Tax Rate: Personal Property | 0.075 | 0.075 | 0.075 | 0.075 | 0.075 | 0.075 | 0.075 |
| Assessable Base: Personal Property (000) | 27,400 | 27,600 | 27,900 | 28,200 | 28,500 | 28,800 | 29,100 |
| Property Tax Collection Factor: Personal Property | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% | 97.5% |
| Indirect Cost Rate | 12.88% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% | 13.73% |
| CPI (Fiscal Year) | 4.1% | 3.3% | 2.8% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% |
| Investment Income Yield | 1.30% | 1.10% | 1.65% | 2.55% | 2.80% | 3.10% | 3.35% |
| BEGINNING FUND BALANCE | 283,030 | 146,060 | 43,400 | 44,890 | 45,830 | 48,380 | 50,820 |
| REVENUES | | | | | | | |
| Taxes | 163,810 | 174,030 | 185,490 | 191,090 | 194,670 | 199,470 | 206,940 |
| Miscellaneous | 10,000 | 10,000 | 20,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Subtotal Revenues | 173,810 | 184,030 | 205,490 | 221,090 | 224,670 | 229,470 | 236,940 |
| INTERFUND TRANSFERS (Net Non-CIP) | | | | | | | |
| Transfers To The General Fund | (149,030) | (163,020) | (163,720) | (163,720) | (163,720) | (163,720) | (163,720) |
| Indirect Costs | (149,030) | (163,020) | (163,720) | (163,720) | (163,720) | (163,720) | (163,720) |
| Transfers From The General Fund | 751,600 | 1,244,090 | 1,500,090 | 1,552,090 | 1,646,090 | 1,750,090 | 1,679,090 |
| To Baseline Services | 76,090 | 76,090 | 76,090 | 76,090 | 76,090 | 76,090 | 76,090 |
| To Non-Baseline Services | 675,510 | 1,168,000 | 1,424,000 | 1,476,000 | 1,570,000 | 1,674,000 | 1,603,000 |
| Transfers From Special Fds: Non-Tax + ISF | 688,490 | 292,320 | 195,000 | 195,000 | 170,000 | 135,000 | 275,000 |
| From Wheaton Parking District | 688,490 | 292,320 | 195,000 | 195,000 | 170,000 | 135,000 | 275,000 |
| TOTAL RESOURCES | 1,747,900 | 1,703,480 | 1,780,260 | 1,849,350 | 1,922,870 | 1,999,220 | 2,078,130 |
| PSP OPER. BUDGET APPROP/ EXP'S. | | | | | | | |
| Operating Budget | (1,601,840) | (1,660,080) | (1,730,310) | (1,798,460) | (1,869,430) | (1,943,340) | (2,020,320) |
| Labor Agreement | n/a | 0 | (5,060) | (5,060) | (5,060) | (5,060) | (5,060) |
| Subtotal PSP Oper Budget Approp / Exp's | (1,601,840) | (1,660,080) | (1,735,370) | (1,803,520) | (1,874,490) | (1,948,400) | (2,025,380) |
| TOTAL USE OF RESOURCES | (1,601,840) | (1,660,080) | (1,735,370) | (1,803,520) | (1,874,490) | (1,948,400) | (2,025,380) |
| YEAR END FUND BALANCE | 146,060 | 43,400 | 44,890 | 45,830 | 48,380 | 50,820 | 52,750 |
| END-OF-YEAR RESERVES AS A | | | | | | | |
| PERCENT OF RESOURCES | 8.4% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% |

Assumptions:

1. Transfers from the Wheaton Parking District are adjusted annually to fund the approved service program and to maintain an ending fund balance of approximately 2.5 percent of resources.
2. Property tax revenue is assumed to increase over the six years based on an improved assessable base.
3. Large assessable base increases are due to economic growth and new projects coming online.
4. The Baseline Services transfer provides basic right-of-way maintenance comparable to services provided countywide.
5. The Non-Baseline Services transfer is necessary to maintain fund balance policy.
6. The labor contract with the Municipal and County Government Employees Organization, Local 1994, expires at the end of FY10.
7. These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY11-15 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.
8. Section 68A-4 of the County Code requires: a) that the proceeds from either the Urban District tax or parking fee transfer must not be greater than 90 percent of their combined total; and b) that the transfer from the Parking District not exceed the number of parking spaces in the Urban District times the number of enforcement hours per year times 20 cents.

16

9

**Urban Districts
FY10 Operating Budget**

Questions

Please provide responses by noon on Friday, April 24, 2009

Bethesda – BUD/BUP respond to each question

1. Please provide a breakout of the \$8,850 increase in insurance, rent, and parking.
 - The \$8,850 is made up solely by rent and increases in landlord operating expenses as part of the lease agreement. There is a set 3% increase in base rent each year and any annual increases in building operating expenses and taxes are passed through to tenants on a prorated basis.

2. How is the insurance portion of the above increase different from the \$6,150 increase for Risk Management?
 - The Bethesda Urban District began contributing to the Risk Management Fund with the addition of a new full time position in FY09. Due to a budget load error in FY09, the Bethesda Urban District fund contribution was understated. (see #17 Risk Management)

3. What is Play in a Day? What will be the impact of eliminating it?
 - Play in a Day is a theatrical production that includes six participating theatre companies. In 2009, Imagination Stage (Bethesda, MD), Adventure Theatre (Bethesda, MD), Olney Theatre, MD (Olney, MD), Playground Playwrights' Group, Ganymeade Arts and The Keegen Theatre participated. Each playwright has 12 hours to write a ten-minute, one act play and turn it over to the director and actors who then have 12 hours to rehearse and then perform a play – culminating in an evening production of a “play produced in a day.” Three hundred people attended the 2009 Play in a Day and paid \$10 per ticket for admission.

Play in a Day is a significant initiative of the Bethesda Arts & Entertainment District which promotes downtown Bethesda as an destination for the arts. Eliminating it would eliminate the opportunity for people to attend a professional theatrical production for the reasonable price of \$10 per ticket. Most individual theatre tickets sell for \$35 – \$85 per seat at professional theatres in Montgomery County. Additionally, Bethesda was significantly spotlighted in the free press coverage that was

(17)

(16)

received in *The Washington Post (Weekend's Best, Montgomery Extra, Style on the Go)* *Bethesda Gazette*, Entertainment section of *The Gazette* and *Bethesda Magazine*.

4. Please describe the events calendar that is recommended for a -\$25,000 reduction by the Executive.

- The Events Calendar is a bi-monthly publication mailed to 55,000 households in the Greater Bethesda Chevy Chase area that promotes independent events happening in downtown Bethesda as well as festivals produced by the Bethesda Urban Partnership. The calendar is also distributed at the six Bethesda hotels, commercial buildings and apartment buildings, Bethesda's kiosks and special events.

This calendar promotes local businesses and non-profit organizations that do not have a marketing budget to reach the many residents of Bethesda and Chevy Chase to promote upcoming special events, promotional sales and more.

5. How much is currently budgeted for the events calendar? What will be the impact of the proposed reduction?

- The current budget is \$100,750. The proposed reduction will require the calendar to not be distributed to the 4,500 households of North Bethesda and to hotels, apartments, and commercial buildings in downtown Bethesda. This will greatly impact the reach of marketing efforts which benefit local businesses and non-profit organizations in downtown Bethesda.

Silver Spring – SSUD please respond to each question

6. How much is currently budgeted for hardware and storage costs?

- (\$10,000.00)

7. What will be the impact of the Executive's proposed reduction of -\$10,310 for this purpose?

- **We will have to move all materials from the current storage location and put them in a temporary location. This temporary location is only good for a year and then we will need to find a new location that maybe free to us.**

Wheaton – WUD please respond to each question

8. How much is budgeted for professional purchase of service? **\$0 in FY10; \$6,000 in FY09**
9. What is this funding used for? **In the past, the funding has been used for website design – redevelopment and updating, a marketing funding study, Wheaton logo design, brochure development, etc.**
10. What will be the impact of the Executive’s proposed reduction of -\$6,000? **We will no longer be able to fund such items.**
11. The Executive is proposing several small reductions in tool rental, education, computer software, and uniforms which total -8,030. Will any of these reductions negatively impact the Urban District’s ability to deliver services to the public? **These reductions will not negatively impact services to the public.**
12. The Executive recommends a reduction of -\$11,240 for other supplies, equipment, and materials. If this reduction comes from more than one account, how does it break out?

Office Supplies and Equipment - \$4,000
Supplies and Materials - \$3,400
Miscellaneous Operating Expenses - \$3,460

13. How much is budgeted for FY09 in the affected accounts?

| | FY09 | FY10 |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| Other Education, Tuition and Training | \$3,200 | \$ 1,650 |
| Computer Software | \$2,480 | \$ 0 |
| Office Supplies and Equipment (3849) | \$4,000 | \$ 0 |
| Uniforms | \$11,300 | \$ 8,300 |
| Other Supplies & Materials | \$3,400 | \$ 0 |
| Tool Rentals | \$2,100 | \$ 1,100 |
| Misc. Operating Expenses | \$18,141 | \$14,681 |

14. What would be the impact of the Executive’s recommended reduction for FY10?

We will not be able to provide training to our Safe Team on bicycle patrol; we will be unable to update our GIS software; we will be unable to repair or replace broken or old equipment; we will not be able to replace worn uniforms; we will need to cutback on tool rentals, etc.

15. Why is the General Fund transfer to the Wheaton Urban District increased?

Response from Brady Goldsmith for Questions 15 & 16: The Wheaton Parking Lot District received a one-time boost in parking fee revenue in FY09 due to a rate increase. No rate increase is recommended in FY10. Therefore, the transfer to the Wheaton Urban District must decrease due to fiscal capacity in the PLD fund. The General Fund transfer to the Wheaton Urban District increases to maintain a 2.5 percent fund balance.

16. Why is the transfer from the Wheaton Parking Lot District to the Wheaton Urban District decreased? **See above.**

Risk Management

17. Why are Risk Management costs increasing in Bethesda?

- **In FY10 OMB made a decision to change the formula for dispersing the Risk Management costs to the three Urban Districts. Up until the creation of a new position in BUD in FY09, there were no personnel costs associated with BUD. In years prior Silver Spring and Wheaton UD's prorated the Risk Management costs by WY percentages and the cost was split between the two – Bethesda was not included. It was determined by OMB in FY10 that a better method would be to prorate the costs for Risk Management by total budget rather than WY's. This is why Bethesda's costs bumped up dramatically and the costs for both Silver Spring and Wheaton decreased.**

18. Why are Risk Management costs decreasing in Silver Spring and Wheaton? **SEE ABOVE**

Silver Spring & Wheaton Urban District Maintenance & Landscaping Activities

| Task | Service Provider | Frequency of Services | Description |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|---|--|
| Litter Collection | UD staff | Daily | Collect and dispose of litter and debris from the public right of way (sidewalks, curb line, roadway, & medians), pedestrian bridges, planters, tree pits and areas outside of district if it primarily benefits the district. |
| | Contractor (SS) | One day each weekend | |
| Trash Receptacle Service | Contractor | 4 times per week (WUD) | Empty trash cans, replace bags, and pick up litter around receptacle. |
| | UD staff | Daily (SSUD) As needed | |
| Sidewalk Cleaning (concrete & brick) | UD staff | Sweeping – Weekly Gum / Stain | Clean all sidewalks to remove gum, paint, grease, and other debris. |
| | | Removal – On as needed basis | Clean pedestrian tunnel (SSUD) |
| Landscape Maintenance | Contractor | 2 times per year (WUD) | Mulch & fertilize all planting areas and prune shrubs |
| | | Once a year minimum (SS) | |
| | UD staff | As needed | |
| | UD staff | Daily (WUD) As needed (SSUD) | Control weeds, replace and install new plant material and trim shrubs as needed. |
| | | Contractor | |
| | UD staff | As needed in spring, summer, & fall | Water plants |
| Contractor | As needed | Use integrated pest management techniques | |

| Task | Service Provider | Frequency of Services | Description |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Tree Maintenance | UD staff | Weekly, as needed | Clean up debris in tree pits, mulch, reset bricks, pruning of small trees, control weeds and pests, water |
| | Contractor | Annually | Prune deadwood, thin crowns, remove dead and dying trees. Fertilize new trees. |
| Tree Planting | Contractor | As needed | Plant new and replacement trees |
| | UD staff | | |
| Mowing | Contractor | 7-10 day schedule during the growing season | Mow, remove litter, and edge mowed areas in public right of way. Fertilize as needed. |
| | UD staff | As needed | |
| Snow Removal | UD staff | As needed | Clear snow and ice from crosswalks, curb cuts, bus stops, and fire hydrants. Salt and sand where needed. |
| Street Sweeping | Contractor | 3 times per week | Remove debris from curb lines and curbed medians |
| Sidewalk and Curb Repair | UD staff | Brick Sidewalks – as needed | Repair cracked, spalled, broken, or potentially dangerous sidewalks, curbs, and medians |
| | Contractor | Concrete Sidewalks – Annually | |
| Pest Management (Rodent) | Contractor | Visit downtown / monitoring stations bi-weekly | Monitor downtown rodent activity levels and eliminate problems in public right of way |
| Light Pole Painting | Contractor & UD staff | As needed | Repaint Urban District light poles |
| Other | UD staff Contractor (banners and flags) | As needed; seasonally | Maintain all streetscape amenities (benches, tables, bollards, planters, & trash receptacles), graffiti removal, crosswalk and pothole inspections, banners and flags. |

i. Maintenance and Landscaping in the Bethesda Urban District

The Bethesda Urban Partnership has an annual agreement with the County to manage the Bethesda Urban District. The Bethesda-Chevy Chase Regional Services Center administers this contract. The FY08 agreement, which is similar to the FY05-FY07 agreements, states that BUP will conduct maintenance activities on public rights-of-way in the urban district.⁷

BUP performs the following services within the Bethesda Urban District: litter collection, emptying trash cans, brick sidewalk cleaning, landscape maintenance, tree maintenance, tree planting, mowing, snow removal, street sweeping, sidewalk repair, and opening and closing the Bethesda trail tunnel gates.

BUP's FY08 annual agreement with the County requires the organization to meet minimum standards for these activities. Table 4-1, below and on the next page, describes each activity and how often each should be completed. In some areas, BUP's practices exceed the contract requirements: trash cans are emptied six days per week rather than five days per week, trash cans in heavy-traffic areas are emptied more than once a day, and streets are swept three days per week although the contract does not specify frequency.

Additionally, BUP has worked with the community to address ongoing maintenance concerns. For example, the Bethesda Tunnel of the Capital Crescent Trail was poorly lit and had recurring problems with graffiti. BUP worked with community groups to raise money to improve the lighting and install additional fencing in the tunnel, which eliminated the graffiti.

Table 4-1: Bethesda Urban District Maintenance and Landscaping Activities

| Task | Required Frequency | Description |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Litter Collection | Daily | Collect and dispose of litter from sidewalks, pedestrian bridges, planters, tree pits, and areas outside district if it primarily benefits the district |
| Trash Receptacle Service | 5 times/week | Empty trash cans, replace bags, and pick up litter |
| Brick Sidewalk Cleaning | At least annually | Clean all brick sidewalks to remove gum, paint, and other debris |
| Landscape Maintenance | 2 times/year | Mulch and fertilize all planting areas and prune shrubs |
| | Continually | Control weeds |
| | As needed | Water plants and use integrated pest management techniques |
| Tree Maintenance | As needed | Clean up debris in tree pits, mulch, reset bricks, control weeds and pests, water, prune |
| | Annually | Fertilize |
| Tree Planting | As needed | Plant new and replacement trees |

⁷ Article I, paragraph 3

23
16

Table 4-1: Bethesda Urban District Maintenance and Landscaping Activities, continued

| Task | Required Frequency | Description |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Mowing | 12 times/year | Mow, remove litter, and edge mowed areas in public right-of-way. Fertilize as needed. |
| Snow Removal | As needed | Clear snow and ice from crosswalks |
| Street Sweeping | Not specified | Remove debris from curb lines and curbed medians |
| Sidewalk repair | As needed | Maintain all sidewalks |
| Bethesda Trail Tunnel Gates | Daily | Open gates at 6:00 a.m. and close at 10:00 p.m. |

Source: Annual Agreement by and between Montgomery County, Maryland and Bethesda Urban Partnership, Inc., FY08

ii. Maintenance of Optional Method Development Properties

BUP’s annual agreement with the County to manage the Bethesda Urban District states that BUP “may enter into agreements with optional method developers enabling the Corporation to maintain streetscape amenities on private or public properties in the urban district.” In practice, the Planning Board requires optional method developers to receive services from BUP to maintain streetscape amenities such as landscaping and sidewalks in the public right-of-way as a condition in the site plan approval process.

BUP currently provides maintenance services in the public right-of-way for 21 optional method development (OMD) properties. When a new OMD is completed, the director of field operations visits the property and inventories the services that BUP will perform there. BUP sends this information to the Regional Services Center. Additionally, BUP reports quarterly to the RSC on actual services performed.

The County bills OMD property owners for services on a quarterly basis and notifies them of any changes in services or fees; the County then reimburses BUP for services.

Although BUP’s contract with the County allows BUP to provide maintenance services for amenities on private OMD property, BUP has chosen not to do this primarily because all OMD property owners require maintenance and landscape contractors to provide snow removal services. BUP considers the liability insurance, equipment, and additional staffing that would be required to provide snow removal services to be operationally and cost prohibitive.

24
17

-1
Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee
Testimony
FY10 County Executive Recommended Operating Budget
Montgomery County Council
April 13, 2009 – 7:00 p.m.

Good evening Council President Andrews and Councilmembers. My name is Brett Schneider and I am Chair of the Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee. My address is 2424 Reddie Drive in Wheaton, Maryland.

Wheaton faces serious threats to the continued stability and well-being of the downtown area. It should come as no surprise that we are experiencing an unprecedented increase in retail vacancies. In the last 3 months Wheaton has lost three major businesses – Office Depot, Circuit City and the Cinema and Drafthouse. Our small businesses and restaurants are struggling to stay open and unfortunately, we have been forced to witness many closures.

The number one priority of the Wheaton Urban District is to keep the Wheaton Clean and Safe Team intact. The maintenance efforts, “public safety ambassador” services, and uniformed presence of the Clean and Safe Team sends a clear message to our community and business owners that the doors in downtown Wheaton are open for business.

Keeping our dedicated CBD police unit at their current level is another major priority for us. Without them, there is no question that crime in the downtown area will indeed increase. The CBD Police Unit has proven time and time again how valuable they are to downtown Wheaton. Over the past holiday season, at a serious incident at Westfield Wheaton, our CBD officers were able to arrive on the scene within moments of the first call. Their immediate response enabled them to pursue the suspects and lead to one arrest that evening. The remaining suspects were apprehended and charged within a few days of the incident.

We were quite disappointed to learn that County Executive Isiah Leggett did not fund the establishment of a Wheaton Sobering Center in his recommended budget. Habitual inebriants in downtown Wheaton are costing the County thousands of dollars in EMS and Police response time. Expansion of the Sobering Center to include downtown Wheaton would allow Police and EMS to free up valuable resources and enable them to respond to more calls for service. With the creation of a Sobering Center, habitual inebriants will be provided with a safe location to sober up and offered counseling and available services. In the past year, in an effort to cut down on public drunkenness, the Montgomery County Business Alliance has been very active in downtown Wheaton. The Business Alliance is a public collaboration developed with an understanding that community business participation in solving alcohol related issues is not just an advantage but an essential element to achieving sustainability. The Business Alliance meets regularly to arrange *Cops in Shops*® programs and *Alcohol Trainings*. While our

25
~~18~~

efforts are definitely a step in the right direction, we urge the Council to consider adding the funds required to expand the Sobering Center to include downtown Wheaton.

I wish to thank you for your continuing support of downtown Wheaton and for the opportunity to share the priorities of the Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee with you today.

26

18

MEMORANDUM

April 29, 2009

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee
FROM: *MKD* Minna K. Davidson, Legislative Analyst
SUBJECT: Worksession: FY10 Operating Budget
Urban Districts

Attached are two summary tables which are provided for ease in comparing the overall funding and expenditures in the three Urban Districts. The table on © 1 shows the breakout of FY10 funding sources recommended to support FY10 expenditures for each district. The table on © 2 provides breakouts for each Urban District showing FY09 approved and FY10 recommended funding sources to support expenditures for each year.

The budget numbers presented in these tables are taken from the calculations for the Urban District Funds in the FY10-15 Fiscal Plan. For information about the underlying assumptions for each of the funds, please refer to the FY10-15 fund calculations on © 7-9 of the Urban District packet (PHED Committee #2 for April 29).

| FY10 Urban District Funding Sources | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Funding Source | Bethesda | Silver Spring | Wheaton |
| Beginning Fund Balance | 25,290 | 289,590 | 146,060 |
| Revenues | | | |
| Urban District Tax | 485,780 | 681,730 | 174,030 |
| Charges for services to optional method development | 130,000 | 134,000 | 0 |
| Investment Income | 0 | 0 | 10,000 |
| Interfund Transfers | | | |
| Transfer to the General Fund for indirect costs* | -8,730 | -252,360 | -163,020 |
| Transfer from the General Fund for baseline services | 0 | 0 | 76,090 |
| Transfer from the General Fund for non-baseline services | 0 | 0 | 1,168,000 |
| Transfer from Parking Lot District | 2,835,000 | 2,113,000 | 292,320 |
| Total Resources | 3,467,340 | 2,965,960 | 1,703,480 |
| CE Recommended operating budget | -3,380,210 | -2,891,930 | -1,660,080 |
| Projected FY10 year end fund balance | 87,130 | 74,030 | 43,400 |
| End of year reserves as a % of resources | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% |
| *Indirect costs are calculated by formula to cover the costs for services provided to the Urban Districts by centralized County functions such as Human Resources, Management and Budget, County Attorney, etc. As with other special funds, indirect costs are transferred from the Urban District funds to the General Fund. | | | |

28
A

| Comparison of Urban District Funding, FY09 - FY10 | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| Urban District | FY09 Approved | FY10 CE Rec. |
| Bethesda Urban District | | |
| Beginning Fund Balance | 69,010 | 25,290 |
| Revenues | | |
| Urban District Tax | 457,770 | 485,780 |
| Charges for services to optional method development | 130,000 | 130,000 |
| Interfund Transfers | | |
| Transfer to the General Fund for indirect costs* | -8,070 | -8,730 |
| Transfer from Bethesda Parking Lot District | 2,774,850 | 2,835,000 |
| Total Resources | 3,423,560 | 3,467,340 |
| Operating budget expenditures | -3,398,270 | -3,380,210 |
| Projected year end fund balance | 25,290 | 87,130 |
| End of year reserves as a % of resources | 0.7% | 2.5% |
| Silver Spring Urban District | | |
| Beginning Fund Balance | 126,890 | 289,590 |
| Revenues | | |
| Urban District Tax | 641,920 | 681,730 |
| Charges for services to optional method development | 134,000 | 134,000 |
| Interfund Transfers | | |
| Transfer to the General Fund for indirect costs* | -233,870 | -252,360 |
| Transfer from Silver Spring Parking Lot District | 2,381,630 | 2,113,000 |
| Total Resources | 3,050,570 | 2,965,960 |
| Operating budget expenditures | -2,760,980 | -2,891,930 |
| Projected year end fund balance | 289,590 | 74,030 |
| End of year reserves as a % of resources | 9.5% | 2.5% |
| Wheaton Urban District | | |
| Beginning Fund Balance | 283,030 | 146,060 |
| Revenues | | |
| Urban District Tax | 163,810 | 174,030 |
| Investment Income | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Interfund Transfers | | |
| Transfer to the General Fund for indirect costs* | -149,030 | -163,020 |
| Transfer from the General Fund for baseline services | 76,090 | 76,090 |
| Transfer from the General Fund for non-baseline services | 675,510 | 1,168,000 |
| Transfer from Wheaton Parking Lot District | 688,490 | 292,320 |
| Total Resources | 1,747,900 | 1,703,480 |
| Operating budget expenditures | -1,601,840 | -1,660,080 |
| Projected year end fund balance | 146,060 | 43,400 |
| End of year reserves as a % of resources | 8.4% | 2.5% |
| *Indirect costs are calculated by formula to cover the costs for services provided to the Urban Districts by centralized County functions such as Human Resources, Management and Budget, County Attorney, Etc. As with other special funds, indirect costs are transferred from the Urban District funds to the General Fund. | | |

29

2