



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

6611 Kenilworth Avenue • Riverdale, Maryland 20737

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

FROM: John Kroll, Corporate Budget Director

DATE: July 7, 2020

SUBJECT: Montgomery County FY21 Savings Plan

As you are aware from the presentation at the July 2 Planning Board meeting, Montgomery County has requested a FY21 savings plan for our operating budget. Following the summary presentation last week, the departments have provided greater detail for the proposed budget.

As a reminder, the Planning Department has assisted the Commissioners' Office, and DHRM and Finance have assisted the Inspector General in meeting their reduction targets, so the table below reflects each department's reductions.

| Fund / Department | Adjusted Reduction |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Administration Fund | |
| Commissioners' Office | 4,112 |
| Planning | 1,299,926 |
| DHRM | 147,436 |
| Finance | 141,598 |
| Legal | 94,719 |
| Merit Board | 5,232 |
| Inspector General | 3,582 |
| Corporate IT | 101,082 |
| CAS Support Services | 47,222 |
| Non-Dept | 6,041 |
| | |
| Park Fund | |
| Parks | 5,925,988 |
| | |
| Total | 7,776,938 |

Summaries of departmental reductions are attached. Please keep in mind that these represent current thinking as how best to reduce our budgets by these amounts. As the year progresses and circumstances change, the departments reserve the right to make adjustments to accomplish the same level of savings.

In addition, the County requested \$628,000 of reductions to the FY21 Capital Budget; these reductions could come from either current revenue (County pay-go) or in County GO bonds.

The Parks Department focused on reductions to GO bond-funded projects rather than current revenue-funded projects for several reasons. Sizable reductions had already been made to the smaller pool of current revenue projects leading up to the Council’s approval of the budget in May and would have continued to impact renovation and maintenance projects disproportionately. While the group of projects funded by GO bonds also included some renovation and maintenance projects, the group was larger and could absorb several small reductions here and there while still maintaining an emphasis on priority capital projects.

The table below lists GO bond-funded capital projects with their Council-approved funding levels in May. It also lists the proposed reduction amount by project to meet the requested reduction of \$628,000.

FY21 Revised Spending Plan Proposal - Capital Budget

GO Bonds (\$000)

| PDF# | Project | Council Approved FY21 May 2020 | Proposed Reduction amount July 2020 | Revised funding level |
|--------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| P998711 | Energy Conservation - Non-Local Parks | 100 | 10 | 90 |
| P998763 | Minor New Construction - Non-Local Parks | 700 | 80 | 620 |
| P871745 | Ovid Hazen Wells Recreational Park* | 300 | 100 | 200 |
| P871903 | PLAR: NL - Park Building Renovations | 400 | 81 | 319 |
| P998709 | PLAR: NL - Play Equipment | 500 | 55 | 445 |
| P871554 | PLAR: NL - Resurfacing Lots and Paths | 750 | 166 | 584 |
| P998715 | PLAR: NL - Court Renovations | 400 | 81 | 319 |
| P888754 | Trails: Hard Surface Renovation | 700 | 55 | 645 |
| TOTAL | | 8828 | 628 | 8200 |

*The \$100k shown here is a delay of expenditure from FY21 into later years of this project rather than a budget reduction

With your agreement, both the operating and capital proposed reductions will be forwarded to the Council.

Attachments: Departmental operating budget reductions