



**THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Planning Department, Montgomery County, Maryland  
2425 Reedie Drive Wheaton, Maryland 20902

MCPB Date: 11/12/20  
Agenda Item # 3

**MEMORANDUM**

DATE: November 5, 2020  
TO: Montgomery County Planning Board  
VIA: Gwen Wright, Director, Planning Department *GLMW*  
Tanya Stern, Deputy Planning Director  
FROM: Karen Warnick, Chief, Management Services Division *Kaw*  
Anjali Sood, Budget Manager, Management Services Division  
SUBJECT: Approval of Planning Department's FY22 Proposed Budget

---

**Action Requested:** Approval of the FY22 Proposed Budget funding and staffing levels.

**Background**

At its September 17 meeting, the Planning Board received a presentation from the Commission's Department of Human Resources and Management (DHRM) on the FY22 budget process including key trends and the budget outlook, strategy, and timeline.

Following this meeting, the Planning Department had an FY22 operating budget work session with the Planning Board on October 15 at which the Board approved the Department's request to prepare the budget as proposed at the base budget plus new initiative level.

**FY22 Proposed Budget Overview**

Since the October 15 meeting with the Planning Board, the Planning Department received updated information regarding the FY22 retirement costs which were originally projected to decrease in FY22 but are now projected to increase. The difference from the original projection included in the October 15 memo to the current projection is \$484,373 which equates to a 2.3% increase in Planning's overall budget request. This additional projection is reflected in all the proposals in this memo, which supersede our previous FY22 proposal.

The Planning Department's **FY22 proposed budget is \$22,341,798** which reflects the base budget plus new initiatives. This proposed budget is an **increase of \$1,693,027 or 8.2%** from the FY21 adopted budget.

There are several attachments included with this memo for your reference.

- Attachment A - Updated FY22 Budget Summary Chart with New Initiatives List (page 5)
- Attachment B - FY22 Proposed Expenditure Budget by Division (pages 6-8)
- Attachment C - FY22 Proposed Positions/Workyears by Division (pages 9-10)
- Attachment D - FY22 Work Program Crosswalk of the Workyear Allocation by Division (page 11)
- Attachment E - FY22 Work Program Crosswalk of the Budget Allocation by Program Element (page 12)
- Attachment F - FY22 Special Revenue Fund - Synopsis Description (page 13)
- Attachment G - FY22 Master Plan and Major Projects Schedule (page 14)
- Attachment H - Letter of Support from MCDOT for the Bikeway Branding Plan (page 15)

## Known Operating Commitments

The Planning Department's FY22 known operating commitments, mandated, contractual, and inflationary increases, and chargeback adjustments for the operations of the department are:

Salaries and Benefits *	347,491
CPI increase for Contracts and Supplies (1.0%)	\$41,961
Adjustment - Risk Management, Long-Term Disability and Legal Chargeback	\$6,105
Major Known Commitments	\$44,000
Capital Equipment Internal Service Fund	(\$144,400)
Chargeback to Development Review – Special Revenue Account	\$240,233
Adjustments in Departmental Chargebacks to CIO and Commission Wide IT (CWIT)	<u>\$44,283</u>
<b>Total of Major Known Operating Commitments</b>	<b>\$579,673</b>

*\* Salary and Benefits total does not include compensation marker, OPEB PayGo and OPEB prefunding. They are budgeted in the Administration Fund's non-departmental account.*

## Lapse and Staffing

For FY22, the Department plans to maintain an approximate 4.5% lapse rate and its current budgeted staffing level of 151 positions and 149.60 work years (142.98 funded work years and 6.62 lapsed work years). The funding work years level includes: 0.5 work years for the new ongoing request to convert a part-time career position to a full-time career position in Historic Preservation, 1.0 work years for the funding of one unfunded position for Forest Conservation in Intake and Regulatory Coordination, 1.0 work years for the funding of one unfunded position for Research in the Research and Strategic Projects Division. The department is retaining one (1) unfunded position.

## Fees and Revenue Estimates

The majority of the Department's budget is tax supported, funded through the Administration Fund. There are also revenues received through charges for services, fees for materials and established Special Revenue Funds. The Department anticipates **\$203,500 in fees from service charges and other program fees** in FY22.

The Department also receives an appropriation in revenue from the Water Quality Protection Fund (WQPF) to offset costs that will be incurred in FY22 to provide specific activities consistent with the intent of the Fund such as compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. Each year, the department requests an increase in the appropriation to cover the prior year compensation increases. Since no compensation increase was included in the FY21 budget, no increase is requested for the FY22 budget. **For FY22, the Department is requesting an overall appropriation of \$415,600 (same as FY21).**

## Special Revenue Fund

Special Revenue Funds account for the proceeds from specific revenue sources restricted for a designated purpose. The Special Revenue Fund summary is comprised of several different funds within the Parks and Planning Departments. The largest or most notable special revenue fund is the Development Review Special Revenue Account (DR-SRA).

Each special revenue fund budget includes proposed revenues, expenditures, and fund balances. Special Revenue fund balances are shown separately from the tax supported funds to avoid confusing the resources of one fund type with another.

The Special Revenue Fund summary has an estimated beginning balance of **\$3,030,741. The proposed FY22 budget reflects revenues of \$3,245,000, expenditures of \$3,953,583, and an ending balance of \$2,322,158. (This includes a \$500K transfer from the Administration Fund to the DR-SRA for FY22).**

The chart below shows the FY22 proposed revenues and expenditures for the Special Revenue Fund. A synopsis of the special revenue funds included in the FY22 proposed budget are included in **Attachment F** (page 13).

Planning Department FY22 Special Revenue Fund Summary	*FY22 Estimated beginning balance	FY22 Proposed Revenue	FY22 Proposed Expenditures	FY22 Projected Ending Balance
Traffic Mitigation Program	-\$5,937	\$20,000	\$14,000	\$63
Historic Preservation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Map Sales	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Environmental / Forest Conservation Penalties	\$96,036	\$25,800	\$44,000	\$77,836
Development Review SRA	\$2,145,914	\$2,535,800	\$3,425,583	\$1,256,131
Forest Conservation fund	\$794,728	\$163,400	\$470,000	\$488,128
<b>Total Before Transfer In</b>	<b>\$3,030,741</b>	<b>\$2,745,000</b>	<b>\$3,953,583</b>	<b>\$1,822,158</b>
DR-SRA Transfer In		\$500,000		\$500,000
<b>Total after Transfer In</b>	<b>\$3,030,741</b>	<b>\$3,245,000</b>	<b>\$3,953,583</b>	<b>\$2,322,158</b>

Development Review Special Revenue Account (DR-SRA) – Chargebacks

The DR-SRA was created to collect fees generated from the submission of development applications. Staff time spent reviewing development applications is charged back from the Administration Fund to the DR-SRA. For FY22, the Planning Department is requesting to reduce the chargeback to the Administration Fund to 22.0 wy based on the FY20 actuals. This would **reduce the chargeback amount by \$240,233**.

Other changes to the DR-SRA **chargebacks include increases** of \$4,865 (3% increase from FY21) from the Legal Department and \$5,950 (8% increase from FY21) from the Finance Department for their services.

The Department has traditionally requested a transfer from the Administration Fund into the DR-SRA in recognition of the fact that revenues may not cover the costs of our review efforts. The fund performed well in five of the last eight fiscal year primarily due to the fees collected for various large projects in commercial-residential zones. This performance built a significant fund balance. While the Council did not approve a transfer in FY14 to FY16, transfers of \$500,000 and \$300,000 were approved in FY17 and FY18 respectively. In FY19, and FY20 the Council did not approve a transfer due to tight fiscal constraints. The fund performed well in FY19; Planning Department did not request a transfer from the Administration fund to DR-SRA in FY21.

The revenues collected in FY20 totaled \$2,230,613. For FY22, the Planning Department proposed budget is \$2.5 million in revenues. This may be optimistic based on the pandemic and the County's economy in general. This revenue level will draw down the fund balance by \$879,243, bringing the fund balance very close to the \$1.2 million minimum fund balance reserve. To stabilize the DR-SRA fund for the next few years and to ease in the transfer amount as it builds up to the \$1 million range by FY25, the Planning Department is **requesting a \$500K transfer from the Administration Fund to the DR-SRA** for FY22.

**Work Program Overview**

The Planning Department's FY22 Work Program is organized into four major components: (1) Master Planning Program; (2) Regulatory Planning Program; (3) Information Resources; and (4) Management and Administration. See work program details broken out by work years in **Attachment D** (page 11) and by funding amounts in **Attachment E** (page 12).

**New Initiatives**

There are several new initiatives that are being proposed which focus on ways to both reimagine and reinvigorate our master planning activities, as well as ways to address significant planning issues and concerns that face Montgomery County. **For FY22, the new one-time and on-going requests totals \$798,854**. The new one-time initiatives request is \$560,000. The new on-going initiatives request is \$238,854 and includes funding to convert a part time position to full time and to fund two currently unfunded positions.

The Planning Department understands these are difficult budget times and makes these requests after a great deal of thought. We reviewed our current staffing complement before requesting the new positions and found that these are new duties that cannot be accomplished with our current level. The two positions have been unfunded since FY11 when 31 career positions were abolished, and 7 additional positions were unfunded. With the restoration of the funding for these positions, the Planning Department's complement is still 31 positions below the FY10 level.

In response to Commissioner Patterson's suggestions during the October 15<sup>th</sup> work session about pursuing other funding sources, it is worth noting that the Planning Department seeks creative ways to collaborate with other agencies and the private sector to fulfill the requirements of our work program such as our partnership with the Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) on the Bikeways Branding Plan. See **Attachment H** (page 15) for a letter of support from MCDOT confirming their desire to partner with Montgomery Planning on these efforts.

In addition, we have been successful in pursuing and getting grant funding to support our work program. This fiscal year, our Historic Preservation Program has received a grant of \$25,000 from the Maryland Historical Trust to support our research and assessment of historic properties. We believe that several of the transportation projects proposed for FY22 could be eligible for grants administered by the Transportation Policy Board of the Council of Governments and we will be applying for these grants. As we have more information about whether we are successful in getting grants, there may be opportunities – as we go through the budget process – to reduce some FY22 requests.

The chart in **Attachment A** (page 5) provides the FY22 funding request for the items discussed at the budget work session on October 15.

**Master Plan and Major Projects Schedule**

The Planning Department's FY22 Proposed Master Plan and Major Projects schedule presented to the Planning Board at the October 15 work session is included in **Attachment G** (page 14).

**Summary**

The Planning Department has put great thought into preparing the FY22 Proposed Budget. Staff is mindful of the cost pressures facing the County as well as the concerns of residents in terms of the importance of excellent planning, communication and outreach. The FY22 budget request shows our commitment to continue to provide the best services possible to County residents with **an 8.2% increase for our base budget and new initiatives**. This includes a \$500,000 or 2.4% increase for the transfer to the Development Review Special Revenue Fund.

Staff is requesting approval from the Planning Board to proceed to finalize the FY22 Planning Department's operating budget and special revenue fund budget as proposed.

**NEXT STEPS:**

The next steps in the FY22 budget process are:

Full Commission approves the FY22 Proposed Budget Resolution	December 16, 2020
M-NCPPC submits Proposed Budget in Brief according to statutory mandate to County Executive and County Council	January 15, 2021
County Executive makes recommendations	March 15, 2021
County Council hold Public Hearings on budget	April 2021
County Council Reviews M-NCPPC Budget	April & May 2021
Montgomery and Prince George's County Councils Meet	May 2021
County Councils Adopt Budget	May 2021

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
PRELIMINARY FY22 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST**

	FY21 Adopted Budget	\$20,648,771	% Change
<b><i>FY22 BASE BUDGET CHANGES</i></b>			
Salaries and Benefits *		\$347,491	
CPI Increase for Contracts and Supplies (1%)		\$41,961	
Adjustment - Risk Management, Long - Term Disability, and Legal Chargeback		\$6,105	
Major Known Commitments		\$44,000	
Capital Equipment Internam Service Fund		<b>(\$144,400)</b>	
Chargebacks to Development Review - Special Revenue Account		\$240,233	
Adjustments in Departmental Chargebacks to CIO and Commission Wide IT		\$44,283	
<b>Subtotal - Base Budget Changes</b>		<b><u>\$579,673</u></b>	<b><u>2.8%</u></b>
<b><i>Less: FY21 One Time Expenses</i></b>		<b><u>(\$245,000)</u></b>	<b><u>(1.2%)</u></b>
<b><i>Enhancements / New Funding Request for FY22 (One Time)</i></b>			
Continuation of Modeling for Takoma Park Master Plan		\$50,000	
Fairland-Briggs Chaney Master Plan Support		\$75,000	
Bikeways Branding Plan		\$25,000	
Commercial Space Adaptability Study		\$60,000	
E-Commerce and Logistics Industry Trends and Needs Assessment		\$75,000	
Wheaton Downtown Study		\$75,000	
Access Management Study		\$50,000	
Innovative Housing Tool Kit		\$50,000	
Redlining/Segregation Mapping Tool		\$100,000	
<b>Subtotal - Proposed One Time Changes</b>		<b><u>\$560,000</u></b>	<b><u>2.7%</u></b>
<b><i>Enhancements / New Funding Request for FY22 (On Going)</i></b>			
Master Plan Support for Historic Preservation Designations		\$20,000	
Convert Part Time Position to Full Time Position		\$23,654	
Workyear and Funding for Full Time Position – Forest Conservation		\$97,600	
Workyear and Funding for Full Time Position – Research		\$97,600	
<b>Subtotal - Proposed - On Going Changes</b>		<b><u>\$238,854</u></b>	<b><u>1.2%</u></b>
<b>Transfer to Development Review Special Revenue Fund</b>		<b><u>\$500,000</u></b>	<b><u>2.4%</u></b>
<b>Planning Department's share of CIO/CWIT New Initiatives</b>		<b><u>\$59,500</u></b>	<b><u>0.3%</u></b>
<b>Net Change from FY21 Adopted to FY22 Proposed Budget</b>		<b><u>\$1,693,027</u></b>	<b><u>8.2%</u></b>
<b>*FY22 Proposed Budget</b>		<b><u>\$22,341,798</u></b>	<b><u>8.2%</u></b>

**Notes:**

\* Total does not include compensation marker, OPEB PayGo and OPEB prefunding. They are budgeted in the Administration Fund's non-departmental account.

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
PROPOSED BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2022 - Expenditures by Division by Type**

	<b>FY 20 Actual</b>	<b>FY 21 Adopted</b>	<b>FY22 Proposed</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<b><u>Office of the Planning Director</u></b>				
Personnel Services	1,408,455	1,333,192	1,369,561	2.7%
Supplies and Materials	2,808	7,500	7,500	0.0%
Other Services and Charges	405,649	123,100	73,200	-40.5%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	(32,600)	(21,800)	-	-100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,784,312</b>	<b>1,441,992</b>	<b>1,450,261</b>	<b>0.6%</b>
<b><u>Management Services</u></b>				
Personnel Services	2,151,646	1,199,139	1,114,932	-7.0%
Supplies and Materials	22,278	3,250	2,500	-23.1%
Other Services and Charges	296,937	68,037	14,550	-78.6%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,470,862</b>	<b>1,270,426</b>	<b>1,131,982</b>	<b>-10.9%</b>
<b><u>Communications Division</u></b>				
Personnel Services	-	1,201,754	1,196,340	-0.5%
Supplies and Materials	-	18,500	16,500	-10.8%
Other Services and Charges	-	354,782	356,782	0.6%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,575,036</b>	<b>1,569,622</b>	<b>-0.3%</b>
<b><u>Countywide Planning &amp; Policy</u></b>				
Personnel Services	2,601,327	2,608,708	2,782,468	6.7%
Supplies and Materials	2,492	7,400	4,600	-37.8%
Other Services and Charges	550,737	134,750	388,850	188.6%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	(14,100)	(21,800)	-	-100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,140,456</b>	<b>2,729,058</b>	<b>3,175,918</b>	<b>16.4%</b>
<b><u>Downcounty Planning</u></b>				
Personnel Services	1,774,903	2,007,259	1,983,624	-1.2%
Supplies and Materials	8,080	5,000	5,000	0.0%
Other Services and Charges	189,543	242,400	167,700	-30.8%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	(492,900)	(587,600)	(680,010)	15.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,479,626</b>	<b>1,667,059</b>	<b>1,476,314</b>	<b>-11.4%</b>

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT**  
**PROPOSED BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2022 - Expenditures by Division by Type**

	<b>FY 20 Actual</b>	<b>FY 21 Adopted</b>	<b>FY22 Proposed</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<b><u>Mid-County Planning</u></b>				
Personnel Services	2,464,891	2,679,363	2,771,178	3.4%
Supplies and Materials	1,340	1,500	1,150	-23.3%
Other Services and Charges	465,508	15,300	91,400	497.4%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	(676,000)	(645,600)	(649,691)	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,255,739</b>	<b>2,050,563</b>	<b>2,214,037</b>	<b>8.0%</b>
<b><u>Upcounty Planning</u></b>				
Personnel Services	2,448,562	2,460,353	2,504,876	1.8%
Supplies and Materials	844	2,500	2,500	0.0%
Other Services and Charges	35,936	61,600	86,600	40.6%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	(795,700)	(855,900)	(837,379)	-2.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,689,641</b>	<b>1,668,553</b>	<b>1,756,597</b>	<b>5.3%</b>
<b><u>Intake &amp; Regulatory Coordination</u></b>				
Personnel Services	1,954,671	2,051,006	2,207,548	7.6%
Supplies and Materials	3,725	9,750	8,950	-8.2%
Other Services and Charges	9,046	18,950	19,950	5.3%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	(1,305,700)	(1,160,500)	(1,009,187)	-13.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>661,742</b>	<b>919,206</b>	<b>1,227,261</b>	<b>33.5%</b>
<b><u>Information Technology &amp; Innovation</u></b>				
Personnel Services	2,209,821	2,367,574	2,426,504	2.5%
Supplies and Materials	345,309	286,290	289,153	1.0%
Other Services and Charges	1,094,869	1,080,807	1,140,605	5.5%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	(123,300)	-	-100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,649,999</b>	<b>3,611,371</b>	<b>3,856,262</b>	<b>6.8%</b>
<b><u>Research and Strategic Projects</u></b>				
Personnel Services	784,377	839,176	950,688	13.3%
Supplies and Materials	110	750	750	0.0%
Other Services and Charges	313,285	124,721	260,121	108.6%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,097,772</b>	<b>964,647</b>	<b>1,211,559</b>	<b>25.6%</b>

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
PROPOSED BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2022 - Expenditures by Division by Type**

	<b>FY 20 Actual</b>	<b>FY 21 Adopted</b>	<b>FY22 Proposed</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<b><u>Support Services</u></b>				
Personnel Services	23,513	45,773	260,110	468.3%
Supplies and Materials	56,840	128,100	128,100	0.0%
Other Services and Charges	2,522,666	2,336,810	2,140,893	-8.4%
Capital Outlay	31,894	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	87,550	90,177	92,882	3.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,722,463</b>	<b>2,600,860</b>	<b>2,621,985</b>	<b>0.8%</b>
<b><u>Grants</u></b>				
Personnel Services	-	-	-	-
Supplies and Materials	-	-	-	-
Other Services and Charges	-	-	-	-
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	12,670	150,000	150,000	0.0%
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,670</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b><u>Total Planning Department</u></b>				
Personnel Services	17,822,166	18,793,297	19,567,829	4.1%
Supplies and Materials	443,826	470,540	466,703	-0.8%
Other Services and Charges	5,896,846	4,561,257	4,740,651	3.9%
Capital Outlay	31,894	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	150,000	150,000	0.0%
Chargebacks	(3,229,450)	(3,326,323)	(3,083,385)	-7.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,965,282</b>	<b>20,648,771</b>	<b>21,841,798</b>	<b>5.8%</b>
Transfer to the Development Review Special Revenue Fund (DR-SRF)			500,000	2.4%
Total FY22 Proposed Budget including Transfer to DR-SRF			22,341,798	8.2%



## MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT - POSITIONS/WORKYEARS

## POSITION DETAIL BY DIVISION BY FUND

	FY 20 Actual		FY 21 Adopted		FY 22 Proposed	
	POS	WYS	POS	WYS	POS	WYS
<b><u>Office of the Planning Director</u></b>						
Full-Time Career	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Career Total</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent		-		-		-
Chargebacks		(0.23)		(0.15)		-
Less Lapse		-		-		-
<b>Subtotal Director's Office</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>6.77</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>6.85</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>
<b><u>Management Services</u></b>						
Full-Time Career	17.00	17.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	2.00	1.60	2.00	1.60
<b>Career Total</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>11.00</b>	<b>10.60</b>	<b>11.00</b>	<b>10.60</b>
Term Contract	1.00	0.75	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent		-		-		-
Chargebacks		-		-		-
Less Lapse		(0.84)		(0.97)		(2.24)
<b>Subtotal Management Services</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>16.91</b>	<b>11.00</b>	<b>9.63</b>	<b>11.00</b>	<b>8.36</b>
<b><u>Communications Division</u></b>						
Full-Time Career	-	-	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Part-Time Career			-	-	-	-
<b>Career Total</b>		-	<b>10.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>
Term Contract		-		-		-
Seasonal/Intermittent		-		-		-
Chargebacks		-		-		-
Less Lapse		-		-		(0.16)
<b>Subtotal Communications Division</b>			<b>10.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>9.84</b>
<b><u>Countywide Planning &amp; Policy</u></b>						
Full-Time Career	19.00	19.00	20.00	20.00	21.00	21.00
Part-Time Career	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.50	-	-
<b>Career Total</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>19.50</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>20.50</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>21.00</b>
Term Contract		-		-		-
Seasonal/Intermittent		-		-		-
Chargebacks		(0.10)		(0.15)		-
Less Lapse		(1.01)		(1.00)		(0.51)
<b>Subtotal Countywide Planning &amp; Policy</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>18.39</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>19.35</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>20.49</b>
<b><u>Downcounty Planning</u></b>						
Full-Time Career	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Career Total</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>16.00</b>
Term Contract		-		-		-
Seasonal/Intermittent		-		-		-
Chargebacks		(3.50)		(4.05)		(4.71)
Less Lapse		(0.81)		(0.80)		(0.56)
<b>Subtotal Downcounty Planning</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>11.69</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>11.15</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>10.73</b>

## MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT - POSITIONS/WORKYEARS

## POSITION DETAIL BY DIVISION BY FUND

	FY 20 Actual		FY 21 Adopted		FY 22 Proposed	
	POS	WYS	POS	WYS	POS	WYS
<b><u>Mid-County Planning</u></b>						
Full-Time Career	21.00	21.00	21.00	21.00	21.00	21.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Career Total</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>21.00</b>
Term Contract		-		-		-
Seasonal/Intermittent		-		-		-
Chargebacks		(4.80)		(4.45)		(4.50)
Less Lapse		(1.10)		(1.07)		(0.90)
<b>Subtotal Mid-County Planning</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>15.10</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>15.48</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>15.60</b>
<b><u>Upcounty Planning</u></b>						
Full-Time Career	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Part-Time Career	1.00	0.70			-	-
<b>Career Total</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>20.70</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>20.00</b>
Term Contract		-		-		-
Seasonal/Intermittent		-		-		-
Chargebacks		(5.65)		(5.90)		(5.80)
Less Lapse		(1.02)		(0.99)		(0.82)
<b>Subtotal Upcounty Planning</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>14.03</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>13.11</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>13.38</b>
<b><u>Intake &amp; Regulatory Coordination</u></b>						
Full-Time Career	19.00	19.00	18.00	18.00	19.00	19.00
Part-Time Career	1.00	0.90	-	-	-	-
<b>Career Total</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>19.90</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>19.00</b>	<b>19.00</b>
Term Contract		-		-		-
Seasonal/Intermittent		-		-		-
Chargebacks		(9.27)		(8.00)		(6.99)
Less Lapse		(0.86)		(0.83)		(0.59)
<b>Subtotal Intake &amp; Regulatory</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>9.77</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>9.17</b>	<b>19.00</b>	<b>11.42</b>
<b><u>Information Technology &amp; Innovation</u></b>						
Full-Time Career	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00
Part-Time Career						
<b>Career Total</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>18.00</b>
Term Contract		-		-		-
Seasonal/Intermittent		-		-		-
Chargebacks		-		(0.85)		-
Less Lapse		(0.97)		(0.95)		(0.68)
<b>Subtotal Information Tech &amp; Innovation</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>17.03</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>16.20</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>17.32</b>
<b><u>Research &amp; Strategic Projects</u></b>						
Full-Time Career	7.00	7.00	6.00	6.00	7.00	7.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Career Total</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>
Term Contract		-		-		-
Seasonal/Intermittent		-		-		-
Chargebacks		-		-		-
Less Lapse		-		-		(0.16)
<b>Subtotal Research &amp; Strategic Projects</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>6.84</b>
<b><u>Total Planning Department</u></b>						
Full-Time Career	144.00	144.00	145.00	145.00	148.00	148.00
Unfunded Career	3.00	-	3.00		3.00	
Part-Time Career	3.00	2.10	3.00	2.10	2.00	1.60
<b>Career Total</b>	<b>150.00</b>	<b>146.10</b>	<b>151.00</b>	<b>147.10</b>	<b>153.00</b>	<b>149.60</b>
Term Contract	1.00	0.75	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent		-		-		-
Chargebacks		(23.55)		(23.55)		(22.00)
Less Lapse		(6.61)		(6.61)		(6.62)
<b>Grand Total Planning Department</b>	<b>151.00</b>	<b>116.69</b>	<b>151.00</b>	<b>116.94</b>	<b>153.00</b>	<b>120.98</b>

Montgomery County Planning Department: FY22 Proposed Work Program Crosswalk of Work Years												
(Division to Work Program Elements)												
		FY22 Proposed	Director's Office	Management Services	Communications	Countywide Planning & Policy	Downcounty Planning	Mid-County Planning	Upcounty Planning	Intake & Regulatory Coordination	Information Technology & Innovation	Research & Strategic Projects
	Total Workyears for FY21	149.60	7.00	10.60	10.00	21.00	16.00	21.00	20.00	19.00	18.00	7.00
	Less: Lapse	(6.62)	0.00	(2.24)	(0.16)	(0.51)	(0.56)	(0.90)	(0.82)	(0.59)	(0.68)	(0.16)
	Funded WY	142.98	7.00	8.36	9.84	20.49	15.44	20.10	19.18	18.41	17.32	6.84
	<b>Program: MASTER PLANNING PROGRAM</b>											
	<b>Plans</b>											
Programs projected to end in FY21	Germantown Plan for Town Sector Zone											
New for FY22	Life Sciences/Great Seneca Science Corridor Plan Amendment Phase 2	1.18	0.08		0.50	0.05		0.50				0.05
	Silver Spring Communities Master Plan	0.77	0.08		0.35	0.05	0.25				0.02	0.02
	University Boulevard Corridor Plan	1.63	0.08		0.40	0.05	0.05	1.00				0.05
	Clarksburg Master Plan Amendment	1.67	0.08		0.45	0.05			1.00		0.04	0.05
Carried over from prior years. Will continue in FY22	Takoma Park Minor Master Plan Amendment	3.90	0.08		0.40	0.20	3.10				0.02	0.10
	Fairland/Briggs Chaney Minor Master Plan Amendment	1.72	0.08		0.42	0.20			1.00			0.02
	Pedestrian Master Plan	1.47	0.08		0.35	1.00					0.04	
	Rustic Roads Functional Master Plan Update	1.31	0.05		0.30	0.20			0.75		0.01	
	Great Seneca Science Corridor Plan Amendment Phase 1	1.62	0.08		0.27	0.25		1.00			0.02	
	Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Sector Plan	4.20	0.08		0.40	0.50	2.98	0.10	0.10		0.02	0.02
	Corridor Forward: The I-270 Transit Plan	2.61	0.08		0.52	1.00		1.00			0.01	
	Shady Grove Sector Plan - Minor Master Plan Amendment	0.58	0.02		0.14	0.10		0.30			0.02	
	Ashton Village Center Sector Plan	0.47	0.02		0.05				0.40			
	Thrive Montgomery 2050 General Plan Update	1.36	0.20		0.42	0.10		0.20	0.10	0.20	0.04	0.10
	Historic Preservation Functional Master Plan – Updates and Implementation	1.14	0.02		0.12	1.00						
	<b>Public Policies Planning and Coordination</b>											
	Master Plan Staging/Monitoring	1.27	0.10		0.00	0.80	0.10	0.10	0.10		0.02	0.05
	Public Project Support including Mandatory Referrals	3.21	0.10		0.00	1.00	0.10	1.00	1.00		0.01	
	<b>Special Projects</b>											
Programs projected to end in FY21	Urban Loading and Delivery Management Study											
	Complete Streets Design Guide/Roadway Functional Classification System											
	Preserving Community Value of Ethnically Diverse Retail Centers											
New for FY22	Commercial Space Adaptability Study	0.70	0.06	0.00				0.02			0.02	0.60
	Bikeway Branding Plan	0.51	0.06	0.25	0.20							
	E-Commerce and Logistics Industry Trends and Needs Assessment	0.78	0.06	0.05	0.05						0.02	0.60
	Wheaton Downtown Study	1.58	0.06	0.25				1.00			0.02	0.25
	Access Management Study	0.87	0.06	0.00	0.60	0.01	0.20					
	Innovative Housing Tool Kit	2.02	0.06	0.10	0.50	0.01	1.00	0.10				0.25
	Redlining/Segregation Mapping Tool.	2.70	0.06	0.66	1.00	0.01	0.20	0.10			0.02	0.65
Carried over from prior years. Will continue in FY22	Equity Opportunity Index	1.29	0.06	0.30	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.05			0.02	0.75
	Growth & Infrastructure Policy Update (Subdivision Staging Policy)	1.65	0.05	0.05	1.50	0.01					0.04	
	Agriculture Initiatives	0.20		0.00					0.20			
	Mixed Use Development: Current Status and Future Trends	0.10	0.06	0.00			0.02				0.02	
	Predictive Safety Analysis	0.86	0.06	0.20	0.60							
	Burial Sites	0.71	0.02	0.18	0.50						0.01	
	Placemaking Initiatives	0.42	0.20	0.00			0.05	0.10	0.05		0.02	
	Advancing the Pike District	0.51	0.07	0.18	0.05			0.20			0.01	
	Design Excellence Initiatives	1.17	0.59	0.16			0.01	0.20	0.20		0.01	
	Environmental Policy, Planning & Sustainability	1.60	0.02	0.10	0.05	1.00	0.01	0.20	0.20		0.02	
	Special Projects	5.49	1.30	0.20	1.15	1.70	0.01	0.40	0.05		0.02	0.66
	<b>SUB-TOTAL MASTER PLANNING</b>	<b>53.27</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>8.67</b>	<b>14.30</b>	<b>6.73</b>	<b>8.77</b>	<b>5.40</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>4.22</b>
	<b>Program: REGULATORY PLANNING PROGRAM</b>											
	<b>Regulatory Policy Development/Amendment</b>											
	Zoning Text Amendments (ZTA)/Subdivision Regulation Amendments (SRA)	0.95	0.06			0.75	0.02			0.10	0.02	
	<b>Land Use Regulations</b>											
	Concept, Sketch, Project and Site Plan Reviews and Amendments	10.72	0.07	0.05	0.49	2.50	3.00	2.80	1.70	0.01	0.10	0.10
	Conditional Use (Special Exceptions)	2.83	0.03		0.05	0.20	0.50	1.70	0.35			
	Forest Conservation Reviews, Inspections & Enforcement	9.68	0.02			0.70	1.50	2.00	5.46			
	Historic Area Work Permits	2.12			2.00	0.01		0.10			0.01	
	Local and Corrective Map Amendments and Development Plan Amendments	0.54	0.02	0.05	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.15		0.02	
	Pre-Application Meetings (Pre-Application Meetings/Guidance)	3.15	0.04		0.50	1.50	1.00	1.00	0.10		0.01	
	Regulatory Enforcement and Building Permit Review	2.12	0.01		0.50	0.20	0.20	0.20	1.20	0.01		
	(Previously called Preliminary Plans/Subdivision Plans)	10.99	0.07		0.10	2.20	1.50	3.20	3.90		0.02	
	<b>SUB-TOTAL REGULATORY PLANNING</b>	<b>43.10</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>6.73</b>	<b>8.30</b>	<b>11.10</b>	<b>12.96</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.10</b>
	<b>Program: INFORMATION RESOURCES</b>											
	<b>Public Information</b>											
	Information Services	5.59	0.06			0.05	0.01			1.45	4.00	0.02
	Information Systems/Geographic Information Systems (IS/GIS)	5.03	0.02			0.10	0.01	0.10	0.10	0.20	4.50	
	Research - Demographics, Housing and Other (Research Projects)	2.35	0.06			0.50	0.01	0.10	0.18			1.50
	<b>SUB-TOTAL INFORMATION RESOURCES</b>	<b>12.97</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>1.65</b>	<b>8.50</b>	<b>1.52</b>
	<b>Program: MANAGEMENT/ADMINISTRATION</b>											
	<b>Governance</b>											
	Work Program Management	10.36	0.80	0.80	0.26	1.00	1.00	1.70	1.40	1.40	1.50	0.50
	Work Program Support	16.94	1.50	7.26	0.80	1.10	0.95	1.13	1.00	2.20	0.50	0.50
	<b>Agency Support</b>											
	Information Technology	6.34	0.08		0.06							6.20
	<b>SUB-TOTAL MANAGEMENT/ADMINISTRATION</b>	<b>33.64</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>8.06</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>1.95</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>8.20</b>	<b>1.00</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>142.98</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>8.36</b>	<b>9.84</b>	<b>20.49</b>	<b>15.44</b>	<b>20.10</b>	<b>19.18</b>	<b>18.41</b>	<b>17.32</b>	<b>6.84</b>
	Funded Workyears	142.98	7.00	8.36	9.84	20.49	15.44	20.10	19.18	18.41	17.32	6.84
	Variance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Montgomery County Planning Department: FY22 Analytic Allocation of cost by Program (Division to Work Program Elements)											
		FY22 Proposed	Personnel *	Professional Services	Publication	Other Costs	Sub Total	DR Chargeback	Total		
		Total Funded Workyears for FY22	149.60								
		Lapse	(6.62)								
		Funded WY	142.98								
<b>Program: MASTER PLANNING PROGRAM</b>											
<b>Plans</b>											
Program Ending in FY21											
	Germantown Plan for Town Sector Zone										
New for FY22	Life Sciences/Great Seneca Science Corridor Plan Amendment Phase 2	1.18	\$161,491			\$27,478	\$188,970		\$188,970		
	Silver Spring Communities Master Plan	0.77	\$105,380			\$17,931	\$123,311		\$123,311		
	University Boulevard Corridor Plan	1.63	\$223,077			\$37,957	\$261,035		\$261,035		
	Clarksburg Master Plan Amendment	1.67	\$228,551			\$38,889	\$267,440		\$267,440		
Carried over from prior years. Will continue in FY22	Takoma Park Minor Master Plan Amendment	3.90	\$533,743	\$50,000		\$90,818	\$674,561		\$674,561		
	Fairland/Briggs Chaney Minor Master Plan Amendment	1.72	\$235,394	\$75,000		\$40,053	\$350,447		\$350,447		
	Pedestrian Master Plan	1.47	\$201,180			\$34,232	\$235,412		\$235,412		
	Rustic Roads Functional Master Plan Update	1.31	\$179,283			\$30,506	\$209,789		\$209,789		
	Great Seneca Science Corridor Plan Amendment Phase 1	1.62	\$221,709			\$37,725	\$259,433		\$259,433		
	Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Sector Plan	4.20	\$574,800			\$97,805	\$672,604		\$672,604		
	Corridor Forward: The I-270 Transit Plan	2.61	\$357,197			\$60,779	\$417,976		\$417,976		
	Shady Grove Sector Plan - Minor Master Plan Amendment	0.58	\$79,377			\$13,506	\$92,883		\$92,883		
	Ashton Village Center Sector Plan	0.47	\$64,323			\$10,945	\$75,268		\$75,268		
	Thrive Montgomery 2050 General Plan Update	1.36	\$186,126			\$31,670	\$217,796		\$217,796		
	Historic Preservation Functional Master Plan - Updates and Implementation	1.14	\$156,017	\$20,000		\$26,547	\$202,564		\$202,564		
<b>Public Policies Planning and Coordination</b>											
	Master Plan Staging/Monitoring	1.27	\$173,809	\$25,000		\$29,574	\$228,383		\$228,383		
	Public Project Support including Mandatory Referrals	3.21	\$439,311			\$74,751	\$514,062		\$514,062		
<b>Special Projects</b>											
Programs Ending in FY21	Complete Streets Design Guide/Roadway Functional Classification System										
	Growth & Infrastructure Policy Update (Subdivision Staging Policy)										
	Preserving Community Value of Ethnically Diverse Retail Centers										
	Urban Loading and Delivery Management Study										
New for FY22	Commercial Space Adaptability Study	0.70	\$95,800	\$60,000		\$16,301	\$172,101		\$172,101		
	Bikeway Branding Plan	0.51	\$69,797	\$25,000		\$11,876	\$106,673		\$106,673		
	E-Commerce and Logistics Industry Trends and Needs Assessment	0.78	\$106,749	\$75,000		\$18,164	\$199,912		\$199,912		
	Wheaton Downtown Study	1.58	\$216,234	\$75,000		\$36,793	\$328,027		\$328,027		
	Access Management Study	0.87	\$119,066	\$50,000		\$20,260	\$189,325		\$189,325		
	Innovative Housing Tool Kit	2.02	\$276,451	\$50,000		\$47,039	\$373,491		\$373,491		
	Redlining/Segregation Mapping Tool	2.70	\$369,514	\$100,000		\$62,874	\$532,389		\$532,389		
Carried over from prior years. Will continue in FY22	Equity Opportunity Index	1.29	\$176,546			\$30,040	\$206,586		\$206,586		
	Growth & Infrastructure Policy Update (Subdivision Staging Policy)	1.65	\$225,814	\$25,000		\$38,423	\$289,237		\$289,237		
	Agriculture Initiatives	0.20	\$27,371			\$4,657	\$32,029		\$32,029		
	Mixed Use Development: Current Status and Future Trends	0.10	\$13,686			\$2,329	\$16,014		\$16,014		
	Predictive Safety Analysis	0.86	\$117,697			\$20,027	\$137,724		\$137,724		
	Burial Sites	0.71	\$97,169			\$16,534	\$113,702		\$113,702		
	Placemaking Initiatives	0.42	\$57,480	\$100,000		\$9,780	\$167,260		\$167,260		
	Advancing the Pike District	0.51	\$69,797			\$11,876	\$81,673		\$81,673		
	Design Excellence Initiatives	1.17	\$160,123			\$27,246	\$187,368		\$187,368		
	Environmental Policy, Planning & Sustainability	1.60	\$218,971			\$37,259	\$256,230		\$256,230		
	Special Projects	5.49	\$751,346	\$30,000		\$127,844	\$909,190		\$909,190		
	<b>SUB-TOTAL MASTER PLANNING</b>	<b>53.27</b>	<b>\$7,290,378</b>	<b>\$760,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,240,487</b>	<b>\$9,290,865</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$9,290,865</b>		
<b>Program: REGULATORY PLANNING PROGRAM</b>											
<b>Regulatory Policy Development/Amendment</b>											
	Zoning Text Amendments (ZTA)/Subdivision Regulation Amendments (SRA)	0.95	\$130,014			\$22,122	\$152,137		\$152,137		
<b>Land Use Regulations</b>											
	Concept, Sketch, Project and Site Plan Reviews and Amendments	10.72	\$1,467,108			\$249,634	\$1,716,743	(\$1,443,758)	\$272,985		
	Conditional Use (Special Exceptions)	2.83	\$387,306			\$65,902	\$453,207		\$453,207		
	Forest Conservation Reviews, Inspections & Enforcement	9.68	\$1,324,777			\$225,416	\$1,550,193		\$1,550,193		
	Historic Area Work Permits	2.12	\$290,137		\$11,000	\$49,368	\$350,505		\$350,505		
	Local and Corrective Map Amendments and Development Plan Amendments	0.54	\$73,903			\$12,575	\$86,478		\$86,478		
	Pre-Application Meetings (Pre-Application Meetings/Guidance)	3.15	\$431,100			\$73,353	\$504,453		\$504,453		
	Regulatory Enforcement and Building Permit Review	2.12	\$290,137			\$49,368	\$339,505	(\$173,251)	\$166,254		
	Subdivision Plans (Preliminary, Administrative, Minor) and Amendments	10.99	\$1,504,060			\$255,922	\$1,759,981	(\$1,400,445)	\$359,536		
	<b>SUB-TOTAL REGULATORY PLANNING</b>	<b>43.10</b>	<b>\$5,898,541</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$11,000</b>	<b>\$1,003,661</b>	<b>\$6,913,202</b>	<b>(\$3,017,454)</b>	<b>\$3,895,748</b>		
<b>Program: INFORMATION RESOURCES</b>											
<b>Public Information</b>											
	Information Services	5.59	\$765,031			\$130,173	\$895,204	(\$158,813)	\$736,391		
	Information Systems/Geographic Information Systems (IS/GIS)	5.03	\$688,391	\$80,000		\$339,228	\$1,107,619		\$1,107,619		
	Research - Demographics, Housing and Other (Research Projects)	2.35	\$321,614	\$59,086		\$54,724	\$435,424		\$435,424		
	<b>SUB-TOTAL INFORMATION RESOURCES</b>	<b>12.97</b>	<b>\$1,775,037</b>	<b>\$139,086</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$524,125</b>	<b>\$2,438,247</b>	<b>(\$158,813)</b>	<b>\$2,279,434</b>		
<b>Program: MANAGEMENT/ADMINISTRATION</b>											
<b>Governance</b>											
	Work Program Management	10.36	\$1,417,840			\$241,251	\$1,659,091		\$1,659,091		
	Work Program Support	16.94	\$2,318,359			\$394,478	\$2,712,838		\$2,712,838		
<b>Agency Support</b>											
	Information Technology	6.34	\$867,674	\$364,440		\$621,708	\$1,853,822		\$1,853,822		
	<b>SUB-TOTAL MANAGEMENT/ADMINISTRATION</b>	<b>33.64</b>	<b>\$4,603,873</b>	<b>\$364,440</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,257,438</b>	<b>\$6,225,751</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$6,225,751</b>		
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>142.98</b>	<b>\$19,567,829</b>	<b>\$1,263,526</b>	<b>\$11,000</b>	<b>\$4,025,710</b>	<b>\$24,868,065</b>	<b>(\$3,176,267)</b>	<b>\$21,691,798</b>		
										Grant	\$150,000
										<b>*FY22 Proposed Budget</b>	<b>\$21,841,798</b>
										Transfer To Development Review Special Revenue Fund	\$500,000
										<b>*FY22 Proposed Budget including Transfer to Development Review Special Revenue Fund</b>	<b>\$22,341,798</b>

\* Proposed Budget does not include compensation marker, OPEB PayGo and OPEB prefunding. They are budgeted in the Administration Fund's non-departmental account.

## **Special Revenue Fund (SRF) Synopsis**

The **Traffic Mitigation Special Revenue Account (SRA)** supports the regulatory process to ensure compliance with traffic mitigation agreements that were Planning Board requirements for the approved developments. Revenues are received from developers on an annual basis. This account is designated to pay for the independent monitoring of traffic mitigation agreements and to ensure that each achieves and maintains its trip reduction goal. Audits are conducted by a consultant hired by the Planning Department.

The **Historic Preservation SRA** was originally established to manage funds derived from the annual contract between Montgomery County and the Planning Department to partially fund staff support to the Montgomery County Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and other activities. The support was phased out in FY15. The historic preservation special revenue fund remained in place as a source of funding for grant projects and sale of publications. Beginning in FY21, Historic Preservation grants are tracked through the Commission's grant tracking software in the operating budget. The proceeds from the sale of publications will also be recorded in the operating budget. The remaining fund balance will be used to scan Historic Preservation files for archive purposes.

The **Map Sales SRA** account was formerly known as the GIS Data Sales SRA. The GIS Data SRA was created to accumulate the revenue needed to contract for countywide GIS data updates. These updates occur on a three-year basis for Planimetric data, and a six-year basis for topographic data (LiDAR) as dictated by the County GIS strategic plan. Revenue for this fund used to come from the sale of GIS data to the development community. In FY15, the sale of digital GIS data was ended at the request of the Montgomery County Council and by State law enacted for providing open data to the public. As planned, the remaining balance of the Map Sales SRF was exhausted in late FY20 to pay for the latest Countywide GIS update and this SRF was closed. Going forward, maintenance of County GIS base map data will be budgeted in the ITI division of the Planning Department on a three-year cycle.

The **Forest Conservation Penalty SRA** collects funds from property owners that have received administration citations and administrative civil penalties. By law, the money collected in this fund must be used to administer the program. Funds have been used to reimburse hearing examiners used in violation cases, obtain transcripts for appeals, planting of new trees and forests, and obtaining equipment and training necessary for the forest conservation inspectors to perform their duties.

The **Development Review SRA** was created to collect fees generated from the submission of development applications. A certain portion of the costs associated with the review of plans may be recovered through fees. Treating this portion separately from the remainder of the Planning Department's budget served to reduce pressure on both the Administration Fund and the Spending Affordability Guidelines. Costs have been defined broadly to reflect not only the time spent by reviewers in the analysis of development applications, but also additional support costs associated with administrative and tech team staff, public information staff, legal staff, and a certain portion of other support services, such as technology support and GIS. Revenues are defined as the fees received for record plats, preliminary plans of subdivisions, administrative subdivisions, sketch plans, project plans, and site plans and amendments to those plans.

The **Forest Conservation SRA** was created in response to the implementation of the Montgomery County Forest Conservation Law. This fund was created to allow some developers to pay into a fund in lieu of finding an off-site location to meet the forest planting requirements. Developers using the fund must pay for reforestation. Funds are used to meet the reforestation obligations that developers pass onto M-NCPPC through the planting of new forests, maintenance of planted forests and planting urban canopy trees. Funds are occasionally used as leverage to help secure grants from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources and other organizations to enable additional forest planting and habitat restoration. In 2020, the Planning Department consolidated and expanded the planting programs under the Reforest Montgomery umbrella. By leveraging relationships with the Montgomery County Parks Department, nurseries, non-profit organizations and private land owners, the Forest Conservation SRF is being used to: meet the forest planting obligations passed from applicants to the Planning Department through an in-lieu fee payment; provide free shade trees, on a limited basis, to private property owners within priority funding areas; fund a \$40 rebate coupon for trees purchased from participating nurseries; plant conservation easements that never contained forest; and partner with organizations in the county to create new forests on private land.

FY22 Master Plan and Major Projects Schedule

Master Plan & Major Projects	2020					2021					2022					2023																			
	FY21					FY22					FY23					FY24																			
	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M
Germantown Plan for Town Sector Zone																																			
Complete Streets Design Guide/Roadway Functional Class System																																			
Shady Grove Sector Plan - Minor Master Plan Amendment																																			
Ashton Village Center Sector Plan																																			
Thrive Montgomery 2050 General Plan Update																																			
Rustic Roads Functional Master Plan Update																																			
Great Seneca Science Corridor Plan Amendment Phase 1																																			
Corridor Forward: The I-270 Transit Plan																																			
Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Sector Plan																																			
Pedestrian Master Plan																																			
Takoma Park Minor Master Plan Amendment																																			
Fairland/Briggs Chaney Minor Master Plan Amendment																																			
Life Sciences/Great Seneca Science Corridor Plan Amendment Phase 2																																			
Silver Spring Communities Master Plan																																			
University Boulevard Corridor Plan																																			
Clarksburg Master Plan Amendment																																			
Subdivision Staging Policy Update																																			
Preserving Community Value of Ethnically Diverse Retail Centers																																			
Advancing the Pike District																																			
Urban Loading and Delivery Management Study																																			
Predictive Safety Analysis																																			
Mixed Use Development: Current Status and Future Trends																																			
Equity Opportunity Index																																			
Access Management Study																																			
Innovative Housing Tool Kit																																			
Redlining/Segregation Mapping Tool																																			
Commercial Space Adaptability Study																																			
E-Commerce and Logistics Industry Trends and Needs Assessment																																			
Wheaton Downtown Study																																			

Staff  
 Planning Board  
 Planning Board Draft  
 CE Review & Council Noticing Period  
 Hearing  
 Council Review  
 Commission Adoption, SMA  
 Montgomery County Elections





Marc Elrich  
County Executive

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Christopher Conklin  
Director

October 9, 2020

Ms. Gwen Wright, Director  
Montgomery County Planning Department  
2425 Reedie Drive, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Wheaton, Maryland 20902

Dear Ms. Wright:

The passage of the Montgomery County Bicycle Master Plan introduced two new types of bikeways; “neighborhood greenways” and “breezeways”. For both new bikeway types, branding is a central element used to distinguish routes from other bike infrastructure through wayfinding, public art, naming, signage, and more.

I was recently informed that the Montgomery County Planning Department is submitting a scope of work to develop a Countywide Bikeway Branding Program Guidelines and a supporting toolkit. As the Montgomery County Department of Transportation will ultimately be responsible for implementing the major branding elements along neighborhood greenways and breezeways as they are constructed, I am writing to confirm that we would like to partner on these efforts. Staff from the Division of Transportation Engineering (DTE) and Division of Traffic Engineering & Operations will be available for these efforts.

Currently, DTE is conducting a pilot study for the Aspen Hill Neighborhood Greenway and the Grove Street Neighborhood Greenway. Branding and wayfinding will be a critical element for both projects.

Partnering with the Planning Department on the Bikeway Branding Program Plan will ensure that our projects meet the goals and vision of the Bicycle Master Plan and the Planning Department. If you have any questions concerning this partnership, please call me, at 240-777-7198, or Corey Pitts at 240-777-7217.

Sincerely,

  
Chris Conklin (Oct 10, 2020 09:08 EDT)

Christopher R. Conklin, Director  
Department of Transportation

**Office of the Director**

101 Monroe Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor · Rockville, Maryland 20850 · 240-777-7170 · 240-777-7178 FAX  
[www.montgomerycountymd.gov](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov)