


PHED Committee #1
April 22, 2014

MEMORANDUM

April 18, 2014

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee

FROM: Jacob Sesker, Senior Legislative Analyst 

SUBJECT: FY15 Operating Budget for Urban Districts

Those expected for this worksession include: Ken Hartman, Director, Bethesda Regional Services Center; Reemberto Rodriguez, Director, Silver Spring Regional Services Director; Ana Lopez Van Balen, Director, Midcounty Regional Services Center; Helen Vallone, OMB.

The Executive's recommendations for the Urban Districts are attached at © 2-8. FY15-FY20 Fiscal Plans for the Urban Districts are on © 9-11. Responses to Council staff questions are attached on © 12-14. Correspondence from the Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee is attached at © 15-17. Correspondence from the Greater Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce is attached at © 18-21.

Urban Districts were created to promote public interest activities that benefit residential and commercial interests in particular communities. Urban Districts are intended to enhance safety and security, promote economic stability and growth and a sense of community identity, ensure adequate infrastructure, foster a dynamic social and business climate, and ensure that communities are maintained in a clean and attractive manner ("clean and safe programs"). The County's three Urban Districts are in Bethesda, Silver Spring, and Wheaton. The Bethesda Urban District is run by an Urban District corporation, the Bethesda Urban Partnership (BUP). The Silver Spring and Wheaton Urban Districts are managed by the respective Regional Centers.

1. BUDGET OVERVIEW

For FY15, the Executive recommends total expenditures of \$8,471,302 for the three Urban Districts, an increase of \$547,461 or 6.7% **above** the FY14 approved budget. Not included in this amount are Silver Spring Urban District expenditures of \$104,865 and 3.0 FTEs (same as FY14) that are charged to the Silver Spring Parking Lot District for enhanced security by Clean and Safe Team's members in parking lots and garages.

URBAN DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND WORKFORCE					% Change FY14- FY15
	FY12 Actual	FY13 Budget	FY14 Budget	FY15 CE Rec	
Urban District Expenditures	7,186,391	7,644,852	8,193,841	8,741,302	6.7%
Positions:					
Full time	31	31	31	60	93.5%
Part time	1	1	1	1	0.0%
FTEs	52.00	55.32	55.02	58.30	6.0%

Districts

Changes by district are modest, with the largest increase being an additional \$328,936 for Silver Spring (up 11.42% versus FY14); changes in Bethesda (up 5.83% versus FY14) and Wheaton (up 0.75%) are even lower. Staffing in both Bethesda and Silver Spring remained virtually unchanged, while the Executive proposes an increase of 15.46% versus FY14.

Urban Districts - Expenditure and FTE Changes			
	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton
FY14 Budget	3,513,396	2,880,043	1,800,402
FY15 CE Rec.	3,718,381	3,208,979	1,813,942
\$ Change	204,985	328,936	13,540
% Change	5.83%	11.42%	0.75%
FY14 FTE	1.00	34.62	19.40
FY 15 CE Rec. FTE	1.00	34.90	22.40
FTE change	0.00	0.28	3.00
% change	0%	0.81%	15.46%

Programs

The Urban Districts operate 6 programs. The following chart displays the expenditure and FTE changes by program for FY14 and FY15 Recommended. Much of the Urban Districts budget was shifted from Streetscape Maintenance to Administration or to Promotion of Community and Business Activities as a result of a shift of personnel from temporary to full time merit. *See Q & A, © 13.*

Expenditure/FTE Changes in Urban District Programs				
Program	Expenditures		FTE	
	FY14	FY15	FY14	FY15
Promotion of Community and Business Activities	1,437,727	2,764,583	0.90	25.45
Sidewalk Repair	143,969	143,969	0.00	0.00
Streetscape Maintenance	3,412,903	1,827,803	27.25	0.00
Tree Maintenance	115,810	115,810	0.00	0.00
Enhanced Security	1,230,390	1,105,829	23.57	20.57
Administration	1,853,042	2,783,308	3.30	12.28
Total	8,193,841	8,741,302	55.02	58.30

2. EXPENDITURE ISSUES

The Executive proposes only minimal changes in all three service districts. Conversion of temporary employees to merit meant that there are large numbers moving around in this budget.

Key Operating Expense Changes	
Item	\$
Bethesda	
Bethesda Circulator Contract Increase	20,600
Living wage adjustment for contract workers	25,000
Contract increase for compensation and benefits	51,101
Contract increase for insurance, rent and parking	30,810
Contract omcrease for maintenance	30,500
Silver Spring	
Conversion of 19 temporary employees to permanent merit	296,460
Elimination of one-time items	-61,000
Wheaton	
Conversion of 7 temporary employees to permanent merit	107,238
Annualization of FY14 personnel costs	-140,466

Each of the Urban District budgets includes funding for trash collection. *For details about trash collection, garbage, recycling, and pet waste in each of the Urban Districts, see Q & A, © 13.* In FY14, money was added to the budget in Silver Spring for pet waste collection. Those pet waste stations have been ordered and will be installed this spring. *See © 13.*

In addition, the Council received requests for increases in funding for the Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee and from the Greater Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce (GSSCC) (*see © 15-21*). The GSSCC letter cites demand for urban services generated by a significant new supply of development.

Staff agrees that there may be additional demand for urban services in Silver Spring in the near term, and that by FY19 it will be reasonable to consider whether a higher level of service in Wheaton is appropriate. In both Wheaton and Silver Spring there is an inherent tension—on the one hand, the combination of density and growth may result in a need to fund a higher level of service, while on the other hand the economic development incentive programs (impact tax exemptions, Enterprise Zone status, economic development fund projects, etc.) that have catalyzed that growth also have eroded the potential increases in revenue generated by the new development.

If the Committee would like to place any of the items proposed by GSSCC on the reconciliation list, then Staff recommends asking the Executive to estimate the cost of such items. Staff can circulate those costs to Committee members prior to Council straw votes on the department budgets.

In FY14, the Executive Branch indicated that it would be reexamining the issue of dark sky compliance for all urban districts as part of the FY15 budget. No such initiative was funded. Staff notes that in FY14 the PHED Committee did not support \$195,000 for a dark sky compliance program in the Wheaton Urban District. However, the Urban District did pursue that in partnership with DOT, and implemented a short term solution for \$11,940.

REVENUE ISSUES

On the revenue side, Urban Districts are funded from a combination of sources, including Urban District taxes, transfers from the Parking Lot District (PLD), General Fund transfers, and maintenance charges for enhanced services. 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.

The Executive is proposing no tax rate changes for the Urban Districts from FY14 to FY15. 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

A table showing FY15 recommended funding sources for Urban Districts appears below. The Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy and Environment (T&E) Committee will review the Parking Lot District rates on April 28. After that review, Staff will determine whether there is any opportunity to increase the Parking Lot District contributions to any of the Urban Districts. *Urban District fund calculations from the FY15-20 Fiscal Plan are attached on © 9-11.*

FY15 URBAN DISTRICT FUNDING SOURCES				
Funding Source	Bethesda	Silver Spring	Wheaton	
Beginning Fund Balance	380,273	338,838	315,560	
Revenues				
Urban District Tax	480,406	729,771	164,449	
Charges for services for enhanced services	150,000	134,000	0	
Investment Income	0	0	0	
Interfund Transfers				
Transfer to the General Fund for indirect costs*	-20,910	-351,850	-196,450	
Transfer from the General Fund for baseline services	0	0	76,090	
Transfer from the General Fund for non-baseline services	0	0	1,208,340	
Transfer from Parking Lot District	2,823,989	2,440,546	292,320	
Total Resources	3,813,758	3,291,305	1,860,309	
CE Recommended Operating Budget	3,718,381	3,208,979	1,813,942	
Projected FY15 year end fund balance	95,377	82,326	46,367	
End of year reserves as a % of resources	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	

Potential issues include why \$292,320 from the Wheaton PLD to the Wheaton Urban District in FY16-FY20 is not shown in the fiscal plan for the Wheaton PLD. Also, revenues to the Wheaton Urban District do not increase in FY19 when the new garage on Lot 13 is complete. While modifications or clarifications to these issues will help the Committee understand plans for the later years in the 6-year PSP, neither will affect the FY15 operating budget.

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 was established for the three districts. The goal was to use 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 several 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 funding “due” to Bethesda to fund other needs in the General Fund portion of the budget. The baseline service cost to Wheaton is set at \$76,090. In addition, the Wheaton Urban District receives “non-baseline” transfers from the General Fund to provide funding for services not covered by Urban District taxes or the Parking Lot District.

For FY14—as in FY13—Wheaton was the only Urban District to receive transfers from the General Fund. The other Urban Districts funded all services through a combination of other sources. For FY15, the situation will remain the same. Most of the revenue funding the Wheaton Urban District is transferred from the General Fund.

Staff concurs with the Executive’s recommended budget for the Urban Districts.

Attachments: © 1 Comparison of Urban District Funding Sources FY14-FY15
© 2 Recommended FY15 Operating Budget: Urban Districts
© 9 Fiscal Plan
© 12 Council Staff Q & A
© 15 SSUDAC Correspondence
© 18 GSSCC Letter

f:\sesker\project files\fy15 ob\fy 15 ob urb dis\042214 fy15 urb dis phed.doc

**COMPARISON OF URBAN DISTRICT FUNDING SOURCES
FY14-FY15**

	FY14 Estimate	FY15 CE Rec.
BETHESDA URBAN DISTRICT		
Beginning Fund Balance	364,649	380,273
Revenues		
Urban District Tax	466,960	480,406
Charges for services to optional method development	150,000	150,000
Interfund Transfers		
Transfer to the General Fund for indirect costs*	-19,940	-20,910
Transfer from Bethesda Parking Lot District	2,932,000	2,823,989
Total Resources	3,893,669	3,813,758
Operating budget expenditures	-3,513,396	-3,718,381
Projected year end fund balance	380,273	95,377
End of year reserves as a % of resources	9.8%	2.5%
SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT		
Beginning Fund Balance	228,149	338,838
Revenues		
Urban District Tax	708,460	729,771
Charges for services to optional method development	134,000	134,000
Interfund Transfers		
Transfer to the General Fund for indirect costs*	-286,320	-351,850
Transfer from Silver Spring Parking Lot District	2,405,000	2,440,546
Total Resources	3,189,289	3,291,305
Operating budget expenditures	-2,850,451	-3,208,979
Projected year end fund balance	338,838	82,326
End of year reserves as a % of resources	10.6%	2.5%
WHEATON URBAN DISTRICT		
Beginning Fund Balance	73,159	315,560
Revenues		
Urban District Tax	159,771	164,449
Interfund Transfers		
Transfer to the General Fund for indirect costs*	-171,110	-196,450
Transfer from the General Fund for baseline services	76,090	76,090
Transfer from the General Fund for non-baseline services	1,385,000	1,208,340
Transfer from Wheaton Parking Lot District	292,320	292,320
Total Resources	1,815,230	1,860,309
Operating budget expenditures	-1,499,670	-1,813,942
Projected year end fund balance	315,560	46,367
End of year reserves as a % of resources	17.4%	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.

Urban Districts

MISSION STATEMENT

Urban Districts maintain and enhance the County's downtowns (Bethesda, Silver Spring, and Wheaton) as prosperous, livable urban centers, increasing maintenance of the streetscape and its amenities; providing additional public amenities such as plantings, seating, shelters, and works of art; promoting the commercial and residential interests of these areas; and programming cultural and community activities.

BUDGET OVERVIEW

The total recommended FY15 Operating Budget for the Urban Districts is \$8,741,302, an increase of \$547,461 or 6.7 percent from the FY14 Approved Budget of \$8,193,841. Personnel Costs comprise 41.0 percent of the budget for 60 full-time positions and one part-time position, and a total of 58.30 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 59.0 percent of the FY15 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

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

Measure	Actual FY12	Actual FY13	Estimated FY14	Target FY15	Target FY16
Multi-Program Measures					
BETHESDA URBAN DISTRICT					
Marketing and Promotion:					
- Effectiveness of social media -					
Average number of website sessions per month	NA	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Number of social media followers	NA	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with urban districts' promotional events (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4
Hospitality:					
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with the "value added" of the UD Hospitality team (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4
Streetscape Maintenance:					
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with cleanliness levels of Urban District maintained (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with urban district's landscape maintenance (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4
SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT					
Marketing and Promotion:					
- Effectiveness of social media -					
Average number of website sessions per month	NA	63,500	63,500	63,500	63,500
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with urban districts' promotional events (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4

	Actual FY12	Actual FY13	Estimated FY14	Target FY15	Target FY16
Hospitality:					
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with the "value added" of the UD Hospitality team (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4
Streetscape Maintenance:					
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with cleanliness levels of Urban District maintained (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with urban district's landscape maintenance (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4
WHEATON URBAN DISTRICT					
Marketing and Promotion:					
- Effectiveness of social media -					
Average number of website sessions per month	NA	13,200	13,200	13,200	13,200
Number of social media followers	NA	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with urban districts' promotional events (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4
Hospitality:					
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with the "value added" of the UD Hospitality team (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4
Streetscape Maintenance:					
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with cleanliness levels of Urban District maintained (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4
- Overall satisfaction of Urban Districts Advisory Board with urban district's landscape maintenance (scale 1-5)	NA	4	4	4	4

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND INITIATIVES

- ❖ *Bethesda Circulator annual ridership has increased by more than 40,000 since the Bethesda Urban Partnership (BUP) took over management of the service in 2006. Annual ridership in FY13 was 307,822.*
- ❖ *BUP has launched "Studio B" - a collection of artist work studios in the Bethesda Crescent building. The artist studios were provided by the property owner to fulfill public arts requirements as a condition of a recent site plan amendment. BUP will license the artists who will produce, display, teach, and sell art from the space.*
- ❖ *BUP employs contractors to help maintain more than 500,000 square feet of brick and concrete sidewalks, landscaping, and care of more than 1,200 street trees.*
- ❖ *The Silver Spring Urban District, in partnership with the Department of General Services and the private sector, helped purchase, install, and maintain new recycling receptacles and new, solar powered 'Big-Belly' compactors in Veterans Plaza and vicinity.*
- ❖ *The Silver Spring Urban District provided support to over 40 community outdoor celebrations on Veterans Plaza in downtown Silver Spring. These events brought over 100,000 people to the area.*
- ❖ *The Silver Spring Urban District collaborated with the Department of General Services to introduce several "Big Belly" Solar Trash Compactors to downtown Silver Spring.*
- ❖ *The Silver Spring Urban District partnered with Silver Spring Green to initiate a trash recycling program.*
- ❖ *The Silver Spring Urban District experimented with earth friendly equipment to maintain a clean downtown.*
- ❖ *Wheaton Urban District began re-branding the area through the development of a new Wheaton logo, Wheaton Urban District website, new seasonal light pole banners, and basic promotional materials.*
- ❖ *Wheaton Urban District in partnership with Department of Transportation made all of its streetlights dark-sky compliant.*
- ❖ *Wheaton Urban District carried out its signature events while supporting new ones, including the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia Food Truck Festival.*

PROGRAM CONTACTS

Contact Ken Hartman of the Urban Districts at 240.777.8206 or Helen P. Vallone of the Office of Management and Budget at 240.777.2755 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 sponsorship of community events, that may include 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.

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>FTEs</i>
FY14 Approved	1,437,727	0.90
Increase Cost: Bethesda Circulator Contract Increase	20,600	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.	1,306,256	24.55
FY15 CE Recommended	2,764,583	25.45

Sidewalk Repair

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

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>FTEs</i>
FY14 Approved	143,969	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	143,969	0.00

Streetscape Maintenance

This program provides maintenance of, and improvement to, the streetscape amenities within each Urban District. Various service levels include litter collection, sidewalk maintenance, 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.

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>FTEs</i>
FY14 Approved	3,412,903	27.25
Increase Cost: Conversion of 19 Temporary Employees to Permanent Merit positions	296,460	0.28
Increase Cost: Conversion of 7 Temporary Employees to Permanent Merit positions	107,238	0.00
Increase Cost: Contract Increase for Maintenance	30,500	0.00
Enhance: Streetscape maintenance due to pedestrian safety/traffic calming project	1,900	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.	-2,021,198	-27.53
FY15 CE Recommended	1,827,803	0.00

Tree Maintenance

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

<i>FY15 Recommended Changes</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>FTEs</i>
FY14 Approved	115,810	0.00
FY15 CE Recommended	115,810	0.00

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 the Safe Team as the eyes and ears of County Police and as a uniformed visual presence to create a safe and secure environment. Safe Team members also act as "ambassadors" providing information, directions, first aid and CPR, and roadside assistance to residents, visitors, and the business community.

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	1,230,390	23.57
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	-124,561	-3.00
FY15 CE Recommended	1,105,829	20.57

Administration

This program provides staff support for contract administration, Urban District Advisory Committees and for the administration of Urban District corporations. This program also provides for budget preparation and monitoring, payment authorization, records maintenance, and the Bethesda Circulator contract.

FY15 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY14 Approved	1,853,042	3.30
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs.	930,266	8.98
FY15 CE Recommended	2,783,308	12.28

BUDGET SUMMARY

	Actual FY13	Budget FY14	Estimated FY14	Recommended FY15	% Chg Bud/Rec
BETHESDA URBAN DISTRICT					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	81,494	82,023	82,023	84,615	3.2%
Employee Benefits	40,681	45,085	45,086	47,145	4.6%
Bethesda Urban District Personnel Costs	122,175	127,108	127,109	131,760	3.7%
Operating Expenses	3,292,438	3,386,288	3,386,287	3,586,621	5.9%
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	—
Bethesda Urban District Expenditures	3,414,613	3,513,396	3,513,396	3,718,381	5.8%
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	1	1	1	1	—
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	—
REVENUES					
Optional Method Development	107,780	150,000	150,000	150,000	—
Property Tax	465,163	450,080	466,960	480,406	6.7%
Bethesda Urban District Revenues	572,943	600,080	616,960	630,406	5.1%
SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	1,194,998	1,390,963	1,396,210	1,765,828	27.0%
Employee Benefits	353,767	433,913	395,115	451,231	4.0%
Silver Spring Urban District Personnel Costs	1,548,765	1,824,876	1,791,325	2,217,059	21.5%
Operating Expenses	908,309	1,055,167	1,059,126	991,920	-6.0%
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	—
Silver Spring Urban District Expenditures	2,457,074	2,880,043	2,850,451	3,208,979	11.4%
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	18	18	18	37	105.6%
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	34.92	34.62	34.62	34.90	0.8%
REVENUES					
Optional Method Development	93,805	134,000	134,000	134,000	—
Property Tax	640,833	631,314	708,460	729,771	15.6%
Silver Spring Urban District Revenues	734,638	765,314	842,460	863,771	12.9%
WHEATON URBAN DISTRICT					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	724,441	950,708	677,714	969,471	2.0%
Employee Benefits	228,928	266,292	234,391	268,370	0.8%
Wheaton Urban District Personnel Costs	953,369	1,217,000	912,105	1,237,841	1.7%
Operating Expenses	504,819	583,402	587,565	576,101	-1.3%
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	—
Wheaton Urban District Expenditures	1,458,188	1,800,402	1,499,670	1,813,942	0.8%
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	12	12	12	22	83.3%
Part-Time	1	1	1	1	—
FTEs	19.40	19.40	19.40	22.40	15.5%
REVENUES					
Property Tax	150,687	148,519	159,771	164,449	10.7%
Wheaton Urban District Revenues	150,687	148,519	159,771	164,449	10.7%
DEPARTMENT TOTALS					
Total Expenditures	7,329,875	8,193,841	7,863,517	8,741,302	6.7%
Total Full-Time Positions	31	31	31	60	93.5%
Total Part-Time Positions	1	1	1	1	—
Total FTEs	55.32	55.02	55.02	58.30	6.0%
Total Revenues	1,458,268	1,513,913	1,619,191	1,658,626	9.6%

FY15 RECOMMENDED CHANGES

	Expenditures	FTEs
BETHESDA URBAN DISTRICT		
FY14 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	3,513,396	1.00
<u>Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)</u>		
Increase Cost: Contract Increase for Compensation and Benefits	51,101	0.00
Increase Cost: Contract Increase for Insurance, Rent, and Parking	30,810	0.00
Increase Cost: Contract Increase for Maintenance [Streetscape Maintenance]	30,500	0.00
Increase Cost: Motor Pool Rate Adjustment	26,768	0.00
Increase Cost: Living Wage adjustment for contract workers	25,000	0.00
Increase Cost: Bethesda Circulator Contract Increase [Promotion of Community and Business Activities]	20,600	0.00
Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment	14,268	0.00
Increase Cost: FY15 Compensation Adjustment	3,708	0.00
Increase Cost: Printing and Mail	1,286	0.00
Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment	754	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	190	0.00
FY15 RECOMMENDED:	3,718,381	1.00
SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT		
FY14 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	2,880,043	34.62
<u>Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)</u>		
Increase Cost: Conversion of 19 Temporary Employees to Permanent Merit positions [Streetscape Maintenance]	296,460	0.28
Increase Cost: FY15 Compensation Adjustment	88,873	0.00
Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment	12,271	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	3,591	0.00
Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment	3,259	0.00
Decrease Cost: Motor Pool Rate Adjustment	-14,518	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14	-61,000	0.00
FY15 RECOMMENDED:	3,208,979	34.90
WHEATON URBAN DISTRICT		
FY14 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	1,800,402	19.40
<u>Changes (with service impacts)</u>		
Enhance: Streetscape maintenance due to pedestrian safety/traffic calming project [Streetscape Maintenance]	1,900	0.00
<u>Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)</u>		
Increase Cost: Conversion of 7 Temporary Employees to Permanent Merit positions [Streetscape Maintenance]	107,238	0.00
Increase Cost: Motor Pool Rate Adjustment	52,171	0.00
Increase Cost: FY15 Compensation Adjustment	50,771	0.00
Increase Cost: Risk Management Adjustment	8,628	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	2,413	0.00
Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment	885	0.00
Technical Adj: Clean Team	0	3.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY14	-70,000	0.00
Decrease Cost: Annualization of FY14 Personnel Costs	-140,466	0.00
FY15 RECOMMENDED:	1,813,942	22.40

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Program Name	FY14 Approved		FY15 Recommended	
	Expenditures	FTEs	Expenditures	FTEs
Promotion of Community and Business Activities	1,437,727	0.90	2,764,583	25.45
Sidewalk Repair	143,969	0.00	143,969	0.00
Streetscape Maintenance	3,412,903	27.25	1,827,803	0.00
Tree Maintenance	115,810	0.00	115,810	0.00
Enhanced Security	1,230,390	23.57	1,105,829	20.57
Administration	1,853,042	3.30	2,783,308	12.28
Total	8,193,841	55.02	8,741,302	58.30

CHARGES TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Charged Department	Charged Fund	FY14		FY15	
		Total\$	FTEs	Total\$	FTEs
SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT					
Parking District Services	Silver Spring Parking District	104,865	3.00	104,865	3.00

FUTURE FISCAL IMPACTS

Title	CE REC.			(5000's)		
	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
This table is intended to present significant future fiscal impacts of the department's programs.						
BETHESDA URBAN DISTRICT						
Expenditures						
FY15 Recommended	3,718	3,718	3,718	3,718	3,718	3,718
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 associated benefits.						
Subtotal Expenditures	3,718	3,719	3,719	3,719	3,719	3,719
SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT						
Expenditures						
FY15 Recommended	3,209	3,209	3,209	3,209	3,209	3,209
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Labor Contracts	0	26	26	26	26	26
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and associated benefits.						
Labor Contracts - Other	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
These figures represent other negotiated items included in the labor agreements.						
Subtotal Expenditures	3,209	3,233	3,233	3,233	3,233	3,233
WHEATON URBAN DISTRICT						
Expenditures						
FY15 Recommended	1,814	1,814	1,814	1,814	1,814	1,814
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Labor Contracts	0	15	15	15	15	15
These figures represent the estimated annualized cost of general wage adjustments, service increments, and associated benefits.						
Labor Contracts - Other	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
These figures represent other negotiated items included in the labor agreements.						
Subtotal Expenditures	1,814	1,828	1,828	1,828	1,828	1,828

FY15-20 PUBLIC SERVICES PROGRAM: FISCAL PLAN			Bethesda Urban District				
FISCAL PROJECTIONS	FY14 ESTIMATE	FY15 REC	FY16 PROJECTION	FY17 PROJECTION	FY18 PROJECTION	FY19 PROJECTION	FY20 PROJECTION
ASSUMPTIONS							
Property Tax Rate: Real Property	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
Assessable Base: Real Property (000)	3,444,900	3,567,800	3,698,200	3,885,000	4,112,600	4,348,800	4,603,300
Property Tax Collection Factor: Real Property	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%
Property Tax Rate: Personal Property	0.030	0.030	0.030	0.030	0.030	0.030	0.030
Assessable Base: Personal Property (000)	198,700	194,800	188,200	183,000	178,200	173,700	169,100
Property Tax Collection Factor: Personal Property	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%
Indirect Cost Rate	15.69%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%
CPI (Fiscal Year)	1.6%	2.0%	2.2%	2.5%	2.6%	2.4%	2.3%
Investment Income Yield	0.19%	0.35%	0.95%	1.55%	2.15%	2.85%	3.45%
BEGINNING FUND BALANCE	364,649	380,273	95,377	97,598	100,131	102,838	104,626
REVENUES							
Taxes	466,960	480,406	493,951	514,599	540,207	566,923	595,781
Charges For Services	150,000	150,000	153,330	157,194	161,328	165,248	169,016
Subtotal Revenues	616,960	630,406	647,281	671,793	701,535	732,171	764,797
INTERFUND TRANSFERS (Net Non-CIP)							
Transfers To The General Fund	(19,940)	(20,910)	(20,990)	(20,990)	(20,990)	(20,990)	(20,990)
Indirect Costs	(19,940)	(20,910)	(20,990)	(20,990)	(20,990)	(20,990)	(20,990)
Transfers From Special Fds: Non-Tax + ISF	2,932,000	2,823,989	3,180,017	3,254,417	3,330,349	3,399,184	3,464,902
From Bethesda Parking District	2,932,000	2,823,989	3,180,017	3,254,417	3,330,349	3,399,184	3,464,902
TOTAL RESOURCES	3,893,669	3,813,758	3,901,685	4,002,818	4,111,025	4,213,203	4,313,336
PSP OPER. BUDGET APPROP/ EXP'S.							
Operating Budget	(3,513,396)	(3,718,381)	(3,803,561)	(3,902,161)	(4,007,661)	(4,108,051)	(4,204,851)
Labor Agreement	n/a	0	(526)	(526)	(526)	(526)	(526)
Subtotal PSP Oper Budget Approp / Exp's	(3,513,396)	(3,718,381)	(3,804,087)	(3,902,687)	(4,008,187)	(4,108,577)	(4,205,377)
TOTAL USE OF RESOURCES	(3,513,396)	(3,718,381)	(3,804,087)	(3,902,687)	(4,008,187)	(4,108,577)	(4,205,377)
YEAR END FUND BALANCE	380,273	95,377	97,598	100,131	102,838	104,626	107,959
END-OF-YEAR RESERVES AS A							
PERCENT OF RESOURCES	9.8%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Assumptions: 1. 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. 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. These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY16-20 expenditures are based on the "major, known commitments" of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, estimates of compensation and inflation cost increases, the operating costs of capital facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. They do not include unapproved service improvements. The projected future expenditures, revenues, and fund balance may vary based on changes to fee or tax rates, usage inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here. 5. 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.							

FY15-20 PUBLIC SERVICES PROGRAM: FISCAL PLAN

Silver Spring Urban District

FISCAL PROJECTIONS	FY14 ESTIMATE	FY15 REC	FY16 PROJECTION	FY17 PROJECTION	FY18 PROJECTION	FY19 PROJECTION	FY20 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)	2,681,600	2,777,300	2,878,800	3,024,200	3,201,400	3,385,200	3,583,300
Property Tax Collection Factor: Real Property	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%
Property Tax Rate: Personal Property	0.060	0.060	0.060	0.060	0.060	0.060	0.060
Assessable Base: Personal Property (000)	123,000	120,600	116,500	113,300	110,300	107,500	104,700
Property Tax Collection Factor: Personal Property	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%
Indirect Cost Rate	15.69%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%
CPI (Fiscal Year)	1.6%	2.0%	2.2%	2.5%	2.6%	2.4%	2.3%
Investment Income Yield	0.19%	0.35%	0.95%	1.55%	2.15%	2.85%	3.45%
BEGINNING FUND BALANCE	228,149	338,838	82,326	85,914	89,205	92,772	96,361
REVENUES							
Taxes	708,460	729,771	751,464	784,108	824,410	866,399	911,782
Charges For Services	134,000	134,000	136,975	140,427	144,120	147,622	150,988
Subtotal Revenues	842,460	863,771	888,439	924,532	968,530	1,014,021	1,062,770
INTERFUND TRANSFERS (Net Non-CIP)							
Transfers To The General Fund	(286,320)	(351,850)	(355,700)	(355,700)	(355,700)	(355,700)	(355,700)
Indirect Costs	(286,320)	(351,850)	(355,700)	(355,700)	(355,700)	(355,700)	(355,700)
Transfers From Special Fds: Non-Tax + ISF	2,405,000	2,440,546	2,819,662	2,913,261	3,008,699	3,101,091	3,190,481
From Silver Spring Parking District	2,405,000	2,440,546	2,819,662	2,913,261	3,008,699	3,101,091	3,190,481
TOTAL RESOURCES	3,189,289	3,291,305	3,434,726	3,568,007	3,710,734	3,852,183	3,993,882
PSP OPER. BUDGET APPROP/ EXP'S.							
Operating Budget	(2,850,481)	(3,208,979)	(3,324,559)	(3,454,549)	(3,593,709)	(3,731,569)	(3,869,419)
Labor Agreement	n/a	0	(24,253)	(24,253)	(24,253)	(24,253)	(24,253)
Subtotal PSP Oper Budget Approp / Exp's	(2,850,481)	(3,208,979)	(3,348,812)	(3,478,802)	(3,617,962)	(3,755,822)	(3,893,672)
TOTAL USE OF RESOURCES	(2,850,481)	(3,208,979)	(3,348,812)	(3,478,802)	(3,617,962)	(3,755,822)	(3,893,672)
YEAR END FUND BALANCE	338,838	82,326	85,914	89,205	92,772	96,361	100,210
END-OF-YEAR RESERVES AS A PERCENT OF RESOURCES							
	10.6%	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. These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY16-20 expenditures are based on the "major, known commitments" of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, estimates of compensation and inflation cost increases, the operating costs of capital facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. They do not include unapproved service improvements. The projected future expenditures, revenues, and fund balance may vary based on changes to fee or tax rates, usage inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here.
5. 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.

FY15-20 PUBLIC SERVICES PROGRAM: FISCAL PLAN

Wheaton Urban District

FISCAL PROJECTIONS	FY14 ESTIMATE	FY15 REC	FY16 PROJECTION	FY17 PROJECTION	FY18 PROJECTION	FY19 PROJECTION	FY20 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)	475,400	492,400	510,400	536,200	567,600	600,200	635,300
Property Tax Collection Factor: Real Property	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%	98.9%
Property Tax Rate: Personal Property	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.075	0.075
Assessable Base: Personal Property (000)	25,600	25,100	24,300	23,600	23,000	22,400	21,800
Property Tax Collection Factor: Personal Property	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%	97.5%
Indirect Cost Rate	15.69%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%	15.87%
CPI (Fiscal Year)	1.6%	2.0%	2.2%	2.5%	2.6%	2.4%	2.3%
Investment Income Yield	0.19%	0.35%	0.95%	1.55%	2.16%	2.85%	3.45%
BEGINNING FUND BALANCE	73,159	315,560	46,367	48,656	49,872	52,211	54,183
REVENUES							
Taxes	159,771	164,449	169,205	176,348	185,226	194,459	204,435
Subtotal Revenues	159,771	164,449	169,205	176,348	185,226	194,459	204,435
INTERFUND TRANSFERS (Net Non-CIP)							
Transfers To The General Fund	(171,110)	(196,450)	(198,640)	(198,640)	(198,640)	(198,640)	(198,640)
Indirect Costs	(171,110)	(196,450)	(198,640)	(198,640)	(198,640)	(198,640)	(198,640)
Transfers From The General Fund	1,461,090	1,284,430	1,632,223	1,697,159	1,767,713	1,835,673	1,903,050
Baseline Services	76,090	76,090	76,090	76,090	76,090	76,090	76,090
Non-Baseline Services	1,385,000	1,208,340	1,556,133	1,621,069	1,691,623	1,759,583	1,826,960
Transfers From Special Fds: Non-Tax + ISF	292,320	292,320	292,320	292,320	292,320	292,320	292,320
From Wheaton Parking District	292,320	292,320	292,320	292,320	292,320	292,320	292,320
TOTAL RESOURCES	1,815,230	1,860,209	1,941,476	2,015,842	2,096,491	2,176,023	2,253,348
PSP OPER. BUDGET APPROP/ EXPL.							
Operating Budget	(1,499,670)	(1,813,942)	(1,878,972)	(1,952,122)	(2,030,432)	(2,107,992)	(2,185,522)
Labor Agreement	n/a	0	(13,848)	(13,848)	(13,848)	(13,848)	(13,848)
Subtotal PSP Oper Budget Approp / Exp's	(1,499,670)	(1,813,942)	(1,892,820)	(1,965,970)	(2,044,280)	(2,121,840)	(2,199,370)
TOTAL USE OF RESOURCES	(1,499,670)	(1,813,942)	(1,892,820)	(1,965,970)	(2,044,280)	(2,121,840)	(2,199,370)
YEAR END FUND BALANCE	315,560	46,367	48,656	49,872	52,211	54,183	55,978
END-OF-YEAR RESERVES AS A							
PERCENT OF RESOURCES	17.4%	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. These projections are based on the Executive's Recommended Budget and include the revenue and resource assumptions of that budget. FY16-20 expenditures are based on the "major, known commitments" of elected officials and include negotiated labor agreements, estimates of compensation and inflation cost increases, the operating costs of capital facilities, the fiscal impact of approved legislation or regulations, and other programmatic commitments. They do not include unapproved service improvements. The projected future expenditures, revenues, and fund balance may vary based on changes to fee or tax rates, usage inflation, future labor agreements, and other factors not assumed here.
7. 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.

11

FY15 OPERATING BUDGET QUESTIONS FOR URBAN DISTRICTS

1. General: Please provide summary table of personnel costs and operating expenses by Urban District for FY13, FY14 budget and estimate, and FY15 recommended.

Response no longer needed per Jacob Sesker.

2. Silver Spring: Have complaints regarding pet waste decreased since implementation of the disposal stations for pet waste?

The pet waste disposal stations have been ordered and will be installed this spring. We will monitor response and provide a report before the next winter arrives.

3. Wheaton: The Urban District, in partnership with DOT, made all of its streetlights dark sky compliant. Last year the WUDAC requested \$195,000 for this purpose, and the Council did not fund this request, specifically rejecting the Wheaton-specific approach to dark sky compliance. Is that correct? Where did the funds come from to pay for this \$195,000 improvement?

Council recommended the Urban Districts work with DOT and address the issue of dark sky compliance when it is being addressed county wide. As a temporary measure to make our pedestrian lights compliant, DOT and the Urban District decided to paint the tops of the globes to restrict light from going upward. This short-term solution was funded by the Wheaton Urban District maintenance budget at a cost of \$11,940.

4. Wheaton: - No question to respond to.
5. Please explain the increase from 31 to 60 full time employees and from 55.02 to 58.30 FTEs. What precipitated this change, why some districts affected and not others, what were is the future fiscal impact (see line "labor agreement" on pages 8-10 of Fiscal Plan), etc.

There were temporary employees that were converted to full time merit employees based on an agreement with MCGEO. The County and MCGEO agreed to convert temporary employees who had been employed longer than 18 months in the Silver Spring and Wheaton Urban Districts to merit status. This settlement did not include the Bethesda Urban District because, due to the Urban Partnership structure of that District (the work is contracted out), and those employees are not County employees. Any future budgetary impact will be from compensation increases generally available to County employees.

6. Please describe the trash, recycling and pet waste disposal programs in each of the districts (minimum # of collections, who performs, which days, sources of funding, unique trends/issues or problems).

Silver Spring

As part of a contractual agreement with the Silver Spring Urban District (SSUD), the Bethesda Urban Partnership empties approximately 183 regular SSUD trash receptacles on Mon, Wed., Thurs, Fri., and Sat. SSUD staff empties receptacles on Sun. and Tues. and as demand dictates.

SSUD staff empties the few Victor Stanley recycling receptacles that have been placed and delivers recycling to BUP who in turn takes the items to the Shady Grove Transfer Station. Larger Victor Stanley recycling receptacles are currently on order.

At Veteran's Plaza, SSUD services the Big Belly Solar compactor receptacles and other receptacles (regular and recycling). As weather warms demand increases - at peak, receptacles are emptied several times per day/eve.

Recycling and trash collection is funded by the Silver Spring Urban District maintenance budget. Pet waste receptacles will be installed this Spring.

A continuing challenge is that businesses and residents use our receptacles versus a trash service of their own. In the evening cleaning companies will often set out trash bags (alongside our trash receptacles) from the office or business where they have cleaned. We do periodic reminders to these businesses with a focus on the enterprises that are creating the greatest problems.

With recycling cross-contamination remains a challenge. There remain opportunities for higher use of the recycling receptacles. Continuing community education will hopefully cause proper use to increase over time.

Bethesda

The Bethesda Urban Partnership (BUP), the Urban District Corporation for the Bethesda Urban District, has 230 trash cans in the public right of way throughout Downtown Bethesda. BUP also collects from 28 recycling cans in the public ROW and public gathering spots. Trash/Recycling cans are emptied at least once a week with more frequent collection as needed and in the summer.

Trash cans are evenly distributed throughout the Bethesda Urban District. Recycling receptacles are placed in the ROW and near public gathering spaces and other locations with a high volume of lunchtime and weekend pedestrian traffic.

Litter and recycling collection are primary responsibilities of the Bethesda Urban District and funded through the Bethesda Urban District maintenance budget. The 28

recycling cans in Bethesda were purchased through private contributions received from Bethesda Green and by Federal Realty Investment Trust.

Wheaton

The Wheaton Urban District currently owns and maintains 77 litter receptacles throughout the

Downtown in public Right of Way, with a goal of at least one receptacle per block.

More

receptacles are located in areas where there is a demand such as high concentration of carry

out/convenience stores as well as areas where people gather to eat outdoors. The receptacles are emptied by Wheaton Urban District staff Monday through Friday and by Bethesda Urban Partnership on Saturday.

In partnership with the Brownstones Civic association, pet waste signs have been placed on our trash receptacles to manage pet waste around their residential property.

Wheaton Urban District, with grant funds from the State, plans to add approximately 17 solar powered Big Belly litter and recycling units in the downtown by this summer 2014. Big Belly units compact trash at the point of collection, reducing overflows and allowing for less frequent collection. The units can hold over 150 gallons of trash and are fully enclosed.

The Wheaton Urban District also has a pilot project for cigarette butt receptacles in one block in the downtown where there is a concentration of restaurants/bars.

All the above programs are funded through the Urban District Streetscape maintenance program.

BUD, FIN &
ECON DEV

JS
CC

Guthrie, Lynn

From: Melvin Tull [mel@leedg.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2014 3:08 PM
To: Montgomery County Council; Ike Leggett; Rice's Office, Councilmember
Cc: Rodriguez, Reemberto; Freeman, Yvette; Miller, Seana; 'cfcamacho@comcast.net'; 'Donald Hague'; 'Dan Figueroa'; dee.michaud@gmail.com; 'Ernest Bland'; suzyzusy@longandfoster.com; LourieArchitects@aol.com
Subject: County Executive's Proposed FY 15 Budget for the Silver Spring Urban District
Attachments: SSUDAC Advice-FY15 Propo_001.pdf

County Executive Leggett and Council President Rice:

The attached letter from the Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee is the Committee's effort to fulfill the obligation to advise the County Executive and County Council on matters of importance.

The Committee appreciates the opportunity to consider issues such as the proposed budget. Throughout the FY 15 budget process we attempted to work diligently with the Silver Spring Regional Center Director to provide documentation and support for additional resources.

The proposed budget in fact would reduce the Operating Expenses resources of the Urban District budget.

The attached letter is the advice of the Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee that increased activities and residential growth in the Silver Spring central business district should not be ignored, but should be met with appropriate increases in resources to maintain the public realm.

Mel

Melvin Tull
Chairman
Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee

SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 31, 2014

**Hon. Isiah Leggett, County Executive
Montgomery County, Maryland
101 Monroe Street, Second Floor
Rockville, MD 20850**

**Mr. Craig Rice, President
Montgomery County Council
100 Maryland Avenue
Rockville, MD 20850**

Re: Silver Spring Urban District FY 15 Budget

Dear Messrs.' Leggett and Rice:

After reviewing the County Executive's Proposed FY 2015 Budget the Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee advises the County Executive and County Council that the proposed budget is not responsive to the growth of Silver Spring.

Silver Spring grew rapidly in recent years with momentum that continued through the recession. In fact the budget document notes (page 38-5) urban district property tax revenue growing at a 15.6% rate. Years of growth accompanied by annual budget restrictions have left the Silver Spring Urban District far behind in capability to handle deferred problems and in readiness to deal with additional residents and events.

At the beginning of the FY 15 budget this committee identified nearly \$1 million of accumulated needs of which \$570,000 was classified as urgent.

Although the County Executive's Proposed Budget provides no new resources the identified needs remain and continue to grow. In fact, the need for Urban District action expands as new residents occupy new apartment buildings, new restaurants and entertainment venues attract more visitors, and more organizations select Silver Spring for their events. Silver Spring is a vigorous, dynamic center where people want to be. Montgomery County provides for an extra level of maintenance in central business districts in recognition that the County's standard level of maintenance is not adequate for the demands of a busy urban area, and that areas like Silver Spring must be kept attractive and comfortable despite the extraordinary level of use. The Silver Spring Urban District has proven to be an effective mechanism to accomplish the goal of making our central business district a desirable place to be, live, work, shop and visit. Guidance from our Regional Center Director, leadership from Urban District management, and

exemplary effort by the Urban District staff, the "red shirts", has kept up with the recession reality of 'do more with less'. The Committee advises that the time to provide adequate funding has been deferred long enough and FY15 is a critical year.

The Committee acknowledges that available sources of revenue are a factor in the determination of whether to provide for an adequate level of Urban District services. Three revenue sources support the Urban District. In addition to Optional Method Development charges and Urban District Property Tax revenue, the largest source of funds is a transfer from the Silver Spring Parking Lot District. Transfers from the Silver Spring Parking Lot District Fund are intended, of course, for uses that benefit the Silver Spring Parking Lot District where the funds are raised. Until this year the Committee understood that the SSPLD could not afford to transfer more out of its fund. The County Executive's Proposed FY 15 budget changed that understanding by proposing to transfer far, far more to other purposes than ever before. The transfer out of the SSPLD Fund to the County's General Fund is proposed to increase in FY15 by \$3,347,861, to \$3,3696,097 (FY13 = \$282,700, FY14 = \$348,236). This proposed rate of transfer out of the SSPLD Fund is proposed to continue for at least five more years through FY 2020. As a result Silver Spring Parking Lot District Fund reserves will be reduced 43.6%, from \$13.9 million to \$8.3 million. No indication of off-setting revenue from the scheduled sales of Public Parking Lot 3 or Public Parking Garage 21 was discovered in the proposed budget.

Although the proposed budget does not identify an intended General Fund use for the funds transferred out of the Silver Spring Parking Lot District, it is the advice of this Committee that \$570,000 should be directed to the Silver Spring Urban District in FY15 for use in the SSPLD area. Since the annual \$3.3 million transfer from the SSPLD Fund is proposed to continue, this Committee advises that the additional funding for maintenance of the growing Silver Spring urban district should likewise continue.

Sincerely,



Melvin Tull

Chairman



April 16, 2014

Councilmember Nancy Floreen, Chair
and Members of the Planning, Housing and Economic Development Committee
Montgomery County Council
100 Maryland Avenue
Rockville, Maryland 20854

Re: Silver Spring Urban District Needs

Dear Councilmember Floreen and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the leadership of the Greater Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce, and our member businesses that pay additional property taxes because their businesses are located within either the Silver Spring Urban District or the Silver Spring Parking Lot District, I am writing to ask your assistance in addressing the current and future needs of the Silver Spring Urban District.

Silver Spring is still growing. During the next few years, more than 5,000 new residential rental apartments will open, bringing almost 9,000 new residents to the downtown area. Adding to these new feet-on-the-street are countless visitors taking advantage of Silver Spring's new restaurants, existing and new attractions like the AFI and the Fillmore, and the Silver Spring Civic Building which has become a venue for events small and large. Unfortunately, the County Executive's Proposed FY 2015 Budget for the Silver Spring Urban District is not at all responsive to the continuing growth of Silver Spring and needs associated with the growth and expectations.

Some years back, Montgomery County established Urban Districts and Parking Lot Districts because these urban areas were deemed to require a more intensive level of maintenance, upkeep, and other services than the mostly suburban areas of the County. The model required property owners in these districts to pay a higher level of taxes – ad valorem taxes – in order to fund this extra level of service. Over the years, the Silver Spring Urban District has proven to be an effective mechanism to accomplish the goal of making our central business district a desirable place to be, live, work, shop, and visit.

Unfortunately though, despite continued growth in Silver Spring, even during the recent recession, our community has fallen victim to the County's annual budget cutbacks. The Urban District budget has not kept up with the increasing demand, and the Parking Lot District budget, which is the largest source of funding for the Urban District has consistently been viewed by the Executive and Council staff as a source for shifting into the General Fund, monies from higher taxes that were supposed to be used in the Parking Lot District where they were collected. The transfer of these funds have required the deferral of needed repairs and maintenance as well as not enabling the Districts to maintain the level of service required to meet the growing needs of our residents, business partners, and visitors.

Yes, the Urban District Staff innovatively absorbed additional work with introduction of measures such as "Weekend Crews" in collaboration with the Department of Correction and Rehabilitation. And, our "red shirts" have worked hard to "do more with less" and keep our community "clean and safe." But the reality is: the Silver Spring Urban District has been left far behind in its capability to address current and deferred problems, and in its readiness to deal with the growing number of residents and patrons.

As mentioned previously, the Silver Spring Parking Lot District Budget is the largest source of funding for the Urban District budget and currently the Silver Spring PLD has sufficient reserves to begin investing back into

Silver Spring to address some of our accumulated and future needs. At the beginning of the FY 15 budget process, the Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee conservatively identified nearly \$1 million of accumulated needs, more than half of which were classified as "urgent." Attached, you will find a list of projects that have come to the Chamber's attention and are considered important to the future of Silver Spring. (The list includes most of the items on the Urban District Advisory Committee list.) We respectfully ask you to make the necessary additions to the Urban District budget to help us begin to address these unmet needs. We understand that the formula for transferring dollars from the PLD to the Urban District would allow for a larger transfer than is currently being made, and we ask you to make the necessary adjustments to begin using those Silver Spring dollars to address Silver Spring's needs.

We recognize that some of the items on this list will be matters that might be funded directly in the PLD budget and we will be writing to the Council's Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy & Environment Committee, as well, to address this issue.

We thank you for your consideration of our concerns and would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jane Redicker".

Jane Redicker
President

Silver Spring Urban District Unmet Needs

1. Walkway / curb repairs: Due to postponed attention a need has accumulated to the level that the UD must increase its ability to immediately address hazardous conditions, and to begin systematic repair of old and/or deteriorated sidewalks. Recent State Highway Administration projects in Silver Spring did not reconstruct and restore brick sidewalks to Planning Board standards and MC DOT design requirements. Repair or replacement costs are anticipated for sidewalk failure resulting in trip and fall hazard for pedestrians and liability for the county. Further, despite the fact that SHA's work was to install ADA compliant crosswalk ramps, in some cases their work left more problems than existed before. It has been left to the Urban District to solve these matters. (URBAN DISTRICT PROJECT)
2. Trash Can Replacement: While the Urban District crew does an excellent job of keeping the area clean and promptly emptying trash cans (unlike the recent problems in the District of Columbia over the past weekend), many of the trash receptacles are more than ten years old, with broken or missing lids or other damage. New recycling cans were purchased last year, but it is time to look at replacing the worn out regular cans.
3. Veterans Plaza Maintenance: Due to extraordinary increase in popularity of this venue and size of the resident population enjoying this resource, it is time to provide the staff level for regular maintenance, trash removal, and clean-up for use between events. An MOU with the Department of General Services and funding from the PLD budget into the Urban District budget would assure that this area remains safe and attractive. (URBAN DISTRICT PROJECT)
4. Transit Center Area Maintenance: Includes maintenance of the new Transit Center Plaza area opening for FY15, the Metropolitan Branch Bicycle Trail segment, and the new 'Ripifont' street. During construction of the Silver Spring Transit Center bus operations were conducted 'on street' in a busy Interim Operations Site. The Silver Spring Transit Center project supports eight Urban District positions for that location. That commitment must not be reduced following the opening of the new Transit Center this summer. Those eight positions will be needed as bus riders adapt to new travel patterns, especially during the construction phase of restoration of the IOS sidewalk environment. (URBAN DISTRICT PROJECT)
5. Transit Center "Green Space": Control and responsibility for the 'green open space' between the Transit Center and Wayne Avenue was not determined in time for FY15 budget applications. Nevertheless, budgets will need to be adjusted to provide capacity to make this a comfortable and safe gathering place. While the area may fall under the control of WMATA once the fence comes down, past experience indicates that responsibility for anything beyond having an officer available to respond to calls when problems occur. An MOU with WMATA for the Urban District to take care of cleaning and maintenance, perhaps install some lighting for the area, would assure that this is an attractive and safe place. (URBAN DISTRICT PROJECT)
6. Expansion and Extension of VanGo Circulator Service: As Silver Spring's residential population grows and efforts to keep those residents out of individual vehicles continue, the VanGo circulator bus service should play a key role, especially in supporting our burgeoning nighttime economy. However, the current schedule, which has the busses operating Monday to Friday from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., may be satisfactory for taking employees from Metro to offices and back, but it fails to address the needs of a residential population for a bus service that will not only take them to dinner but will be there to take them home, and for grocery shopping on weekends. It has also been suggested that some of the busses have become drab and worn and in need of replacement now or in the future. (PARKING LOT DISTRICT PROJECT)
7. Repair and Replacement of Lighting and Railings Under CSX Bridge: The old florescent lighting in and around the CSX bridge in South Silver Spring is hanging and dangling over Georgia Avenue. The railings are rusting and falling apart. Further, the red paint that was applied in the 70s has faded to an unattractive pink. CSX will not fix this. State Highway will not address it. Yet, this is a major gateway into Silver

Silver Spring Urban District Unmet Needs – 2

Spring. Modern, energy efficient lighting along the passageways, new safe railings would assure that this connector for walkers and bikers remains safe and attractive. And, a new coat of paint wouldn't hurt. (URBAN DISTRICT PROJECT)

8. Beautification/Seasonal Affirmation: Some years back, during budget cuts, the landscaping budget for the Urban District had to reduce replacement of many of the "green things" and other projects that make the downtown more welcoming. With additional funding, the Urban District could increase planting spring flowers; re-establish 'Welcome' and occasion banners on street light poles, flags on light poles for patriotic days, and holiday lights to accent the seasonal change and enliven the night. (URBAN DISTRICT PROJECT)
9. Adjustment for expected 10% annual growth in residential units (some 5,000 more apartments and 9,000 more residents), visitors, and events: increased staff and operating expense. (URBAN DISTRICT PROJECT)
10. Maintenance in Garages: While the Department of Transportation has done a good job of making sure the garages in Silver Spring are "safe," many business have called for an increased level of maintenance and regular clean-up in the County-owned garages. (PARKING LOT DISTRICT PROJECT)
11. Increased Urban District Staffing: In order to undertake many of these projects, it is likely that the Urban District will require additional "red shirt" staffing. In addition, there is a need for another administrative person to work with other agencies (CSX, WMATA, other County agencies) on projects that cross jurisdictional lines but are essential to the success of the Urban District. While we are pleased with the efforts of the current director and staff, recent challenges in dealing with SHA regarding the less-than-acceptable sidewalk repairs its crews made after replacing the ADA ramps at crosswalks was an incredible drain on an already busy staff. We believe that having an individual dedicated to working through these challenges would free the director to focus on Urban District specific responsibilities. (URBAN DISTRICT PROJECT)