

PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVAL OF FY26 OPERATING BUDGET

Description

Seeking approval of the Planning Department's FY26 Proposed Budget funding and staffing levels.

Completed: 11-19-2024

MCPB
Item No.
10
11-21-2024

Montgomery County
Planning Board
2425 Reedie Drive,
Floor 14
Wheaton, MD 20902

Planning Staff

<i>JK</i>	Jason K. Sartori, Planning Director, Jason.Sartori@montgomeryplanning.org
<i>BB</i>	Bridget Broullire, Deputy Planning Director, Bridget.Broullire@montgomeryplanning.org
<i>RAK</i>	Robert Kronenberg, Deputy Planning Director, Robert.Kronenberg@montgomeryplanning.org
<i>KW</i>	Karen Warnick, Management Services Division Chief, Karen.Warnick@montgomeryplanning.org
<i>CM</i>	Carl Morgan, Acting Budget Manager, Management Services Division, Carl.Morgan@montgomeryplanning.org

Summary:

- The Planning Department is seeking approval of its FY26 Proposed Budget funding and staffing levels.
- The FY26 Operating Budget request is **28,082,947**, which is an **increase of \$1,517,162** or 5.7%, over the FY25 Adjusted Adopted budget.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND.....	3
BACKGROUND.....	3
SECTION 2: FY26 NEW INITIATIVE – PLACEMAKING COORINATOR	5
FY26 NEW INITATIVE – PLACEMAKING COORDINATOR.....	5
SECTION 3: FY26 LAPSE, FEES/REVENUES, AND SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS	7
FY26 LAPSE AND STAFFING.....	7
FEE AND REVENUE ESTIMATES	7
SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS.....	7
INTERNAL SERVICE FUND (ISF).....	9
SECTION 4: ATTACHMENTS	10
ATTACHMENT A - FY26 BUDGET SUMMARY CHART WITH NEW INITIATIVES LIST	10
ATTACHMENT B – FY26 PROPOSED EXPENDITURE BUDGET BY DIVISION	11
ATTACHMENT C – FY26 PROPOSED POSITIONS/WORKYEARS BY DIVISION	14
ATTACHMENT D – FY26 SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS (SRF) – SYNOPSIS DESCRIPTION.....	16
ATTACHMENT E – FY26 PROPOSED MASTER PLAN/MAJOR PROJECT SCHEDULE.....	18
SECTION 5: SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS	19
SUMMARY.....	19
NEXT STEPS.....	19

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND

BACKGROUND

The Planning Department had its first FY26 operating budget work session with the Planning Board on October 24, 2024. Since the October work session, the Planning Department has received new information regarding the personnel projections and has made a few changes to our proposed budget. The Planning Department's updated **FY26 Proposed Budget request is \$28,082,947**, which is an **increase of \$1,517,162, or 5.7%**, over the FY25 Adjusted Adopted budget.

Since the October 24 Planning Board meeting, the Planning Department has made the following changes to the FY26 Proposed Budget.

- 1) The base budget Salaries and Benefits amount has been adjusted to reflect the budget transfer for the classification and compensation study, changes in retirement and benefits costs, and other minor salary adjustments.
- 2) The chargebacks for the CIO and Commission-wide IT that was in the October memo were not final numbers. The updated chargeback amount is based on the final departmental share of the contracted rates for the Microsoft licenses.
- 3) The Major Known Commitment for the Project Dox Regulatory System was projected at \$110,000 in the October memo. We have received an updated estimate of \$130,000.
- 4) The department modified the request regarding the conversion of the part-time position to full-time by changing the funding request to \$0. The Planning Department will absorb the \$5,725 increase.
- 5) At the Fall 2024 Semiannual presentation to the Montgomery County Council, the Planning Department received praise from the Council for the successful Damascus Placemaking Festival in October 2024. The Council expressed interest in expanding and enhancing placemaking initiatives in the county. To build on this momentum and to advance the recommendations in the Department's Strategic Plan, a **new dedicated Placemaking Coordinator position (Planner III, grade 28, \$133,957)** within the Director's Office is now being requested for this FY26 Budget request. **See [Section 2](#) for the details.**

The Planning Department prepared our budget request including new initiatives/critical needs we believe are essential for our expanding and evolving work program to plan for the future of Montgomery County. These **one-time new initiatives total \$201,300, an increase of 0.8%** over the FY25 Adopted Budget.

In addition, the Planning Department is requesting **\$715,431 or 2.7% for on-going new initiatives**, including funding for three new positions and \$300,000 in on-going master plan support.

[Section 3](#) of this memo includes information about the Planning Department's FY26 proposed lapse and staffing levels, fees and revenues, and special revenue funds. The Development Review Special Revenue Fund (DR-SRF) is the largest of these funds. The bulk of revenue to the DR-SRF comes from development application fees but this is often not enough to cover the chargebacks. The DR-SRF receives a transfer from the Administration Fund to cover expenses not covered by fees. For FY26, the Planning Department is requesting to **increase the transfer from the Administration Fund to the DR-SRF by \$550,000** bringing the total transfer to \$1,500,000. More information is provided in [Attachment D - FY26 Special Revenue Funds – Synopsis Description](#).

[Section 4](#) contains the following attachments for your reference.

Attachment		Pages
A	FY26 Budget Summary Chart with New Initiatives List	10
B	FY26 Proposed Expenditure Budget by Division	11-13
C	FY26 Proposed Positions/Workyears by Division	14-15
D	FY26 Special Revenue Funds – Synopsis Description	16-17
E	FY26 Master Plan and Major Projects Schedule	18

SECTION 2: FY26 NEW INITIATIVE – PLACEMAKING COORINATOR

FY26 NEW INITIATIVE – PLACEMAKING COORDINATOR

FY26 On-Going Work Program Initiative	
PLACEMAKING COORDINATOR – PLANNER III	
Director's Office	
Budget Request	\$133,957 (Grade 28, 1.0 WY) (mid-point plus benefits)
Description	<p>Placemaking Coordinator Placemaking puts planning in action, engaging residents and business owners in the planning process and enabling them to directly shape their communities. The Planning Department continues to receive more requests for Placemaking activities than can be undertaken with our current staffing and budget resources. Additionally, the department recently adopted a Placemaking Strategic Plan which calls for further embedding placemaking as a core function into our master planning and regulatory review efforts. A dedicated position within the Director's Office is therefore needed to perform the following tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand Placemaking's Reach: Keep up with ever-increasing requests from community groups to undertake placemaking activities within their neighborhoods, with a focus on underserved communities. • Build Capacity for Placemaking: Train and support division staff doing placemaking and collaborate with county agencies to deliver joint placemaking projects. Support community stakeholders undertaking placemaking, build local placemaking champions and celebrate neighborhoods beyond the traditional master planning engagement efforts. • Support Master Plan Implementation: Use placemaking initiatives as a bridge between master plan recommendations and permanent capital investments. Use demonstration projects to highlight the value and build support for delivering infrastructure facilities and amenities identified by the community during the planning process. • Maximize Impact of Placemaking Investments: Pursue additional funding through grants, competitions etc. and build partnerships with non-profits and mission-based organizations to counter rising costs and tailor the scope of placemaking projects to meet community needs.
Objectives Achieved	<p>The position will advance several key recommendations from Thrive Montgomery 2050. Expanding placemaking opportunities across the county will enable more communities to benefit from short- and long-term improvements to their neighborhoods. Expanding placemaking within disadvantaged Community Equity Index areas will ensure we celebrate the county's diversity, improve the quality of life of our most vulnerable residents and support small businesses. Placemaking projects will also serve as platforms for encouraging physical activity and social interaction, fostering a shared sense of purpose, and belonging for our residents.</p> <p>This position will also enable the Department to achieve several Strategic Plan actions including Action 2.2.1 Support and strengthen resident participation in planning efforts, and Action 2.2.5 Advancing and funding the Department's</p>

	<p><i>Placemaking Strategic Plan</i>, both of which support Strategy 2.2 <i>Intentionally engaging residents in all planning efforts, with a focus on people who are underrepresented.</i></p> <p>The position will be directly tasked with Action 5.7.5 <i>Pursue funding necessary to advance placemaking efforts across the county</i> and. Action 5.7.6 <i>Create guidelines and standards to encourage placemaking within public rights-of-way.</i></p> <p>Through engagement and partnership building, the position will implement Action 1.4.5 <i>Develop partnerships with local middle and high schools to educate students about the planning field</i>, Action 2.1.6 <i>Leverage and maintain Planning staff relationships built through masterplan efforts</i>, Action 2.5.3 <i>Build relationships with nonprofits to better engage them in Planning efforts</i>, Action 2.5.5 <i>Increase awareness about how the Department collaborates with partners</i> and Action 2.6.2 <i>Crowdsource ideas/conduct competitions for community members to submit ideas.</i></p>
Measures of Success	<p>A greater number of placemaking projects are undertaken annually by the Planning Department. Placemaking is more strongly embedded into our master planning and regulatory review functions. More county agencies, residents and mission-based organizations are doing placemaking projects across the county.</p>

SECTION 3: FY26 LAPSE, FEES/REVENUES, AND SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

FY26 LAPSE AND STAFFING

In FY24, the Planning Department budgeted lapse rate was increased from 4.5% to 5.5% to both reflect the reality of the department’s vacancy rate and to provide a reduction to meet the County Executive’s recommendation and the County Council’s approved budget. The 5.5% lapse rate continued in FY25 and is proposed for FY26. The FY26 proposed lapse of 8.40 workyears is based on the FY25 adopted budgeted staffing level of 153 positions (152.80 workyears).

The Planning Department is requesting the following positions in the FY26 proposed budget:

1. Climate Initiatives Planner IV Full-time Position Countywide Planning and Policy Division	1 position	1.0 WY	\$156,645
2. Organizational Development Specialist Full-time Position Management Services Division	1 position	1.0 WY	\$126,499
3. Placemaking Coordinator Planner III Full-time Position Director’s Office	1 position	1.0 WY	\$133,957
4. Visual Media and Imaging Specialist I Convert PT position (0.8 WY) to FT position (1.0 WY) Communications Division		0.2 WY	No funding requested
Total	3 positions	3.2 WY	\$415,431

FEE AND REVENUE ESTIMATES

The majority of the Department’s budget is tax supported, funded through the Administration Fund. The Department anticipates **receiving \$276,200 from service charges and other program fees** in FY26 in the Administration Fund. There are also revenues received through charges for services, fees for materials and established Special Revenue Funds.

WATER QUALITY PROTECTION FUND (WQPF) APPROPRIATION

The Department receives an appropriation in revenue from the Water Quality Protection Fund (WQPF) to offset costs that will be incurred in FY26 to provide specific activities consistent with the intent of the WQPF such as compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements.

For FY26, the Department is requesting an increase of \$24,049 (a 5.5% increase) for an **overall appropriation of \$505,019** to cover the FY25 compensation increases. An increase for FY25 compensation was not included in the FY25 budget request due to the uncertainty of the compensation request being approved.

SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

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.

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 \$2,467,540. The proposed FY26 budget reflects **revenues of \$3,180,800, expenditures of \$4,953,703, and an ending balance of \$2,194,637.** This includes an **FY26 \$1,500,000 transfer from the Administration Fund to the DR-SRF.**

The largest, or most notable, special revenue fund is the Development Review Special Revenue Fund (DR-SRF), which 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-SRF. 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, financial 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 total chargebacks to the DR-SRF for FY26 are \$4,190,653. Of this, the chargeback for MC Planning staff is \$3,880,284 for 23.7 work years. MC Planning is not proposing to increase the chargebacks in FY26. Central Administrative Services chargebacks from the Legal Department, the Finance Department, and Corporate IT for their services to the DR-SRF are proposed to increase \$25,415 (9%) from \$284,954 to \$310,369 for FY26.

The Department has traditionally requested a transfer from the Administration Fund into the DR-SRF in recognition of the fact that revenues may not cover the costs of our review efforts. This transfer has historically been in the range of \$300,000 to \$1,700,000 each year. The fund did not perform well in FY20, FY21 and FY24, which depleted some of the gains from previous years. The transfer from the Administration Fund to the DR-SRF fund in FY22, FY23 and FY24 was \$500,000 per year. For FY25, the transfer from the Administration Fund to the DR-SRF was increased to a total of \$950,000 cover increases in the FY25 chargebacks and for part of the workyears for three new Planning staff added in FY25. In FY24, the revenues collected were \$2,399,568 which was \$225,432 less than the budgeted \$2,625,000. At the same time, the chargeback expenditures are consistent. Even with the \$500,000 transfer in, the fund balance was reduced by \$700K to \$1.9M in FY24.

In the current fiscal year, FY25, the revenues in the first 4 months are slightly higher than they were at the same time in FY24. Extrapolating out, the revenues may reach \$100K higher than the budgeted amount. Even with that extra revenue, the fund balance will decrease by \$500K in FY25 to \$1.4M. The fund balance minimum for reserve was set at \$1.2M in FY19. Based on current history, the Planning Department proposes to keep the revenues flat in FY26 and only increase chargebacks for the CAS departments. Without an increase in the transfer, the fund

balance at the end of FY26 would drop to \$700K. The department proposes increasing the transfer by \$550K to a total of \$1.5M to maintain the required fund reserve balance.

The chart below shows the FY26 proposed revenues and expenditures for the Special Revenue Funds. A synopsis description of the special revenue funds included in the FY26 proposed budget are in [Attachment D](#).

Planning Department FY26 Special Revenue Fund (SRF) Summary	*FY26 Estimated Beginning Balance	FY26 Proposed Revenue	FY26 Proposed Expenditures	FY26 Projected Ending Balance
Environmental/Forest Conservation Penalties	\$30,843	\$10,800	\$41,000	\$643
Development Review SRF	\$1,288,589	\$2,660,000	\$4,192,103	(\$243,514)
Forest Conservation Fund	\$1,150,719	\$510,000	\$720,600	\$940,119
Total Before Transfer In	\$2,467,540	\$3,180,800	\$4,953,703	\$694,637
DR-SRF Transfer In		\$1,500,000		\$1,500,000
Total after Transfer In	\$2,467,540	\$4,680,800	\$4,953,703	\$2,194,637

Note: * Estimated Beginning FY26 balance is the estimated FY25 Year-end balance

INTERNAL SERVICE FUND (ISF)

The Commission's Capital Equipment Internal Service Fund (CE-ISF) was set up to establish an economical method of handling large equipment purchases. The fund spreads the cost of an asset over its useful life instead of burdening any one fiscal year with the expense. Departments use the CE-ISF to finance the purchase of equipment having a useful life of at least six (6) years. All revenue and costs associated with the financing of such equipment are recorded in the Internal Service Fund. The financing authority of the CE-ISF may be carried over from year to year. This means that if the total authorized amount of financing is not utilized during a particular fiscal year, any remaining funding may be carried over to succeeding fiscal years.

For FY26, the Commission is proposing new purchases of \$497,500 for the Montgomery Planning Department:

- \$435,000 – Complete phase 2 of the Wheaton HQ Auditorium audio-visual (A/V) upgrade by replacing the existing A/V mixer, which is nearly five years old and has fallen out of warranty. The A/V mixer is a critically important component that routes all inputs and outputs as well as audio and video in the room.
- \$62,500 – Replace the Core Switch at Saddlebrook – the current switch is expected to reach the end of life in December 2025. The total cost is \$125,000 and will be split 50/50 with Parks.

The Planning Department has sufficient funds in the CE-ISF that have carried over from previous years to pay for these purchases. The department is asking for approval to spend these funds rather than requesting to finance the purchases.

SECTION 4: ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A - FY26 BUDGET SUMMARY CHART WITH NEW INITIATIVES LIST

MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT PRELIMINARY FY26 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST			
FY25 ADOPTED ADJUSTED BUDGET *		\$ 26,565,785	
FY26 BASE BUDGET CHANGES			
Salaries and Benefits **		\$88,873	
CPI Increase for Contracts and Supplies		98,600	
Adjustment – Risk Management, Long Term Disability, Unemployment, and Legal Chargeback		6,573	
Major Known Commitments		320,000	
Adjustments in Departmental Chargebacks to CIO and Commission Wide IT		86,385	
Subtotal – Base Budget Changes		\$ 600,431	+2.3%
ONGOING INITIATIVES – NEW			
FY26 Ongoing Master Plan Support		300,000	
FY26 Ongoing New Positions		415,431	
Full-time Position – Climate Initiatives – Planner IV		\$156,237	
Full-time Position – Organizational Development – Admin Specialist III		\$125,237	
Full-time Position – Placemaking Coordinator - Planner III		\$133,957	
Convert Part-Time Position to Full-Time Position – Visual Media and Imaging Specialist I		\$0	
Subtotal – New Ongoing Initiatives		\$ 715,431	+2.7%
ONE-TIME WORK PROGRAM INITIATIVES – NET CHANGE			
Less: FY25 One-Time Work Program Initiatives		(418,700)	
FY26 One-Time Work Program Initiatives/New Funding Requests		620,000	
Housing Needs Assessment and Preferences (HNAP)		200,000	
Shaping Corridor Focused Growth		250,000	
Retail Market Analysis and Strategy Update		90,000	
Green Streets Guidelines		80,000	
Subtotal – One-Time Work Program Initiatives		\$ 201,300	+0.8%
NET CHANGE FROM FY25 ADOPTED TO FY26 PROPOSED BUDGET		\$ 1,517,162	+5.7%
FY26 PROPOSED BUDGET		\$ 28,082,947	
TRANSFER INCREASE FROM ADMINISTRATION FUND TO DR-SRA***		\$ 550,000	
Notes:			
* The FY25 Adopted Adjusted Budget does not include \$150,000 in Grants as they are accounted for separately.			
** Salary and Benefits total does not include compensation marker or OPEB. They are budgeted in the Administration Fund's non-departmental account.			
*** Increase transfer from Admin Fund to DR-SRA of \$550,000 for base budget increase bringing the total transfer request to \$1.5M.			

ATTACHMENT B – FY26 PROPOSED EXPENDITURE BUDGET BY DIVISION

MONTGOMERY COUNTY ADMINISTRATION FUND
 Expenditures by Division by Type
 PROPOSED BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2026

	FY 24	FY 25	FY 25	FY 26	%
Planning Department	Actual	Adopted	Adjusted Adopted	Proposed	Change
Office of The Planning Director					
Personnel Services	1,485,618	1,683,987	1,770,889	1,893,070	6.9%
Supplies and Materials	10,444	7,500	7,500	5,900	-21.3%
Other Services and Charges	200,548	356,200	356,200	781,100	119.3%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1,696,610	2,047,687	2,134,589	2,680,070	25.6%
Management Services					
Personnel Services	1,267,011	1,340,465	1,403,232	1,535,879	9.5%
Supplies and Materials	1,393	2,500	2,500	1,590	-36.4%
Other Services and Charges	(1,577)	10,950	10,950	8,300	-24.2%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1,266,827	1,353,915	1,416,682	1,545,769	9.1%
Communications Division					
Personnel Services	1,370,261	1,620,475	1,677,521	1,652,666	-1.5%
Supplies and Materials	14,941	16,500	16,500	11,860	-28.1%
Other Services and Charges	530,656	397,160	397,160	437,390	10.1%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1,915,858	2,034,135	2,091,181	2,101,916	0.5%
Information Technology and Innovation					
Personnel Services	2,536,887	2,863,829	2,965,561	2,990,528	0.8%
Supplies and Materials	102,039	321,090	321,090	217,628	-32.2%
Other Services and Charges	1,730,071	1,257,500	1,257,500	1,581,100	25.7%
Capital Outlay	24,128	75,000	75,000	75,000	0.0%
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-
Total	4,393,125	4,517,419	4,619,151	4,864,256	5.3%
Research and Strategic Projects					
Personnel Services	925,566	1,091,014	1,144,590	1,140,735	-0.3%
Supplies and Materials	367	773	773	1,500	94.0%
Other Services and Charges	141,809	125,894	125,894	216,850	72.2%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1,067,742	1,217,681	1,271,257	1,359,085	6.9%

MONTGOMERY COUNTY ADMINISTRATION FUND
Expenditures by Division by Type
PROPOSED BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2026

Planning Department	FY 24 Actual	FY 25 Adopted	FY 25 Adjusted Adopted	FY 26 Proposed	% Change
Downcounty Planning					
Personnel Services	2,332,190	2,363,606	2,470,220	2,551,185	3.3%
Supplies and Materials	2,028	5,000	5,000	2,510	-49.8%
Other Services and Charges	105,714	66,100	66,100	17,600	-73.4%
Capital Outlay		-	-	-	-
Other Classifications		-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	(624,578)	(668,299)	(668,299)	(668,299)	0.0%
Total	<u>1,815,354</u>	<u>1,766,407</u>	<u>1,873,021</u>	<u>1,902,996</u>	<u>1.6%</u>
Midcounty Planning					
Personnel Services	2,976,427	3,032,345	3,163,141	3,222,516	1.9%
Supplies and Materials	712	1,800	1,800	2,870	59.4%
Other Services and Charges	129,809	143,200	143,200	22,600	-84.2%
Capital Outlay		-	-	-	-
Other Classifications		-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	(624,578)	(668,299)	(668,299)	(668,299)	0.0%
Total	<u>2,482,370</u>	<u>2,509,046</u>	<u>2,639,842</u>	<u>2,579,687</u>	<u>-2.3%</u>
Upcounty Planning					
Personnel Services	2,817,818	3,400,424	3,530,767	3,450,138	-2.3%
Supplies and Materials	679	2,500	2,500	3,240	29.6%
Other Services and Charges	57,736	17,100	17,100	23,800	39.2%
Capital Outlay		-	-	-	-
Other Classifications		-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	(702,650)	(856,419)	(856,419)	(856,419)	0.0%
Total	<u>2,173,583</u>	<u>2,563,605</u>	<u>2,693,948</u>	<u>2,620,759</u>	<u>-2.7%</u>
Intake and Regulatory Coordination					
Personnel Services	2,476,263	2,656,949	2,773,366	2,823,028	1.8%
Supplies and Materials	6,018	9,505	9,505	4,770	-49.8%
Other Services and Charges	13,115	20,900	20,900	28,710	37.4%
Capital Outlay		-	-	-	-
Other Classifications		-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	(1,483,374)	(1,687,267)	(1,687,267)	(1,687,267)	0.0%
Total	<u>1,012,022</u>	<u>1,000,087</u>	<u>1,116,504</u>	<u>1,169,241</u>	<u>4.7%</u>
Countywide Planning and Policy					
Personnel Services	3,123,170	3,603,629	3,754,463	3,833,488	2.1%
Supplies and Materials	3,440	3,950	3,950	4,340	9.9%
Other Services and Charges	222,961	176,300	176,300	485,500	175.4%
Capital Outlay		-	-	-	-
Other Classifications		-	-	-	-
Chargebacks		-	-	-	-
Total	<u>3,349,571</u>	<u>3,783,879</u>	<u>3,934,713</u>	<u>4,323,328</u>	<u>9.9%</u>

MONTGOMERY COUNTY ADMINISTRATION FUND
Expenditures by Division by Type
PROPOSED BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2026

Planning Department	FY 24 Actual	FY 25 Adopted	FY 25 Adjusted Adopted	FY 26 Proposed	% Change
Support Services					
Personnel Services	209,302	215,229	215,229	279,662	29.9%
Supplies and Materials	82,630	128,100	128,100	149,200	16.5%
Other Services and Charges	2,100,002	2,314,564	2,314,564	2,380,613	2.9%
Capital Outlay	146,072	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	108,337	117,004	117,004	126,365	8.0%
Total	2,646,343	2,774,897	2,774,897	2,935,840	5.8%
Grants					
Personnel Services	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies and Materials	-	-	-	-	-
Other Services and Charges	3,046	150,000	150,000	150,000	0.0%
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-
Total	3,046	150,000	150,000	150,000	0.0%
Total Planning Department					
Personnel Services	21,520,513	23,871,952	24,868,979	25,372,895	2.0%
Supplies and Materials	224,691	499,218	499,218	405,408	-18.8%
Other Services and Charges	5,233,890	5,035,868	5,035,868	6,133,563	21.8%
Capital Outlay	170,200	75,000	75,000	75,000	0.0%
Other Classifications	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	(3,326,843)	(3,763,280)	(3,763,280)	(3,753,919)	-0.2%
Total	23,822,451	25,718,758	26,715,785	28,232,947	5.7%

ATTACHMENT C – FY26 PROPOSED POSITIONS/WORKYEARS BY DIVISION

MONTGOMERY COUNTY POSITIONS/WORKYEARS
POSITION DETAIL BY DIVISION BY FUND

PLANNING DEPARTMENT	FY 24 Actual		FY 25 Budget		FY 26 Proposed	
	POS	WYS	POS	WYS	POS	WYS
DIRECTOR'S OFFICE						
Full-Time Career	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	8.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
Career Total	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	8.00
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less Lapse	-	(0.56)	-	-	-	-
Subtotal Director's Office	7.00	6.44	7.00	7.00	8.00	8.00
MANAGEMENT SERVICES						
Full-Time Career	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	9.00	9.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
Career Total	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	9.00	9.00
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less Lapse	-	(0.46)	-	-	-	-
Subtotal Management Services	8.00	7.54	8.00	8.00	9.00	9.00
COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION						
Full-Time Career	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	11.00	11.00
Part-Time Career	1.00	0.80	1.00	0.80	-	-
Career Total	11.00	10.80	11.00	10.80	11.00	11.00
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less Lapse	-	(0.54)	-	-	-	-
Subtotal Communications Division	11.00	10.26	11.00	10.80	11.00	11.00
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION						
Full-Time Career	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
Career Total	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less Lapse	-	(1.03)	-	(1.34)	-	(1.37)
Subtotal Information Technology & Innovation	18.00	16.97	18.00	16.66	18.00	16.63
RESEARCH AND STRATEGIC PROJECTS						
Full-Time Career	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
Career Total	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less Lapse	-	(0.37)	-	-	-	-
Subtotal Research & Strategic Projects	7.00	6.63	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00
DOWNCOUNTY PLANNING						
Full-Time Career	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
Career Total	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks	-	(4.00)	-	(4.00)	-	(4.00)
Less Lapse	-	(0.85)	-	(1.12)	-	(1.14)
Subtotal Downcounty Planning	16.00	11.15	16.00	10.88	16.00	10.86

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY POSITIONS/WORKYEARS
POSITION DETAIL BY DIVISION BY FUND**

PLANNING DEPARTMENT	FY 24 Actual		FY 25 Budget		FY 26 Proposed	
	POS	WYS	POS	WYS	POS	WYS
MIDCOUNTY PLANNING						
Full-Time Career	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
Career Total	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks		(4.00)		(4.00)		(4.00)
Less Lapse		(1.08)		(1.42)		(1.45)
Subtotal Midcounty Planning	20.00	14.92	20.00	14.58	20.00	14.55
UPCOUNTY PLANNING						
Full-Time Career	21.00	21.00	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
Career Total	21.00	21.00	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks		(4.50)		(5.30)		(5.30)
Less Lapse		(1.12)		(1.48)		(1.51)
Subtotal Upcounty Planning	21.00	15.38	23.00	16.22	23.00	16.19
INTAKE AND REGULATORY COORDINATION						
Full-Time Career	19.00	19.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Part-Time Career	-	-	-	-	-	-
Career Total	19.00	19.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks		(9.50)		(10.40)		(10.40)
Less Lapse		(0.92)		(1.19)		(1.21)
Subtotal Intake & Regulatory Coordination	19.00	8.58	20.00	8.41	20.00	8.39
COUNTYWIDE PLANNING AND POLICY						
Full-Time Career	22.00	22.00	23.00	23.00	24.00	24.00
Part-Time Career	1.00	0.80	-	-	-	-
Career Total	23.00	22.80	23.00	23.00	24.00	24.00
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks		-		-		-
Less Lapse		(1.30)		(1.68)		(1.72)
Subtotal Countywide Planning and Policy	23.00	21.50	23.00	21.32	24.00	22.28
TOTAL PLANNING						
Full-Time Career	148.00	148.00	152.00	152.00	156.00	156.00
Unfunded Career	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
Part-Time Career	2.00	1.60	1.00	0.80	-	-
Career Total	151.00	149.60	153.00	152.80	156.00	156.00
Term Contract	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Intermittent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chargebacks		(22.00)		(23.70)		(23.70)
Less Lapse		(8.23)		(8.23)		(8.40)
Grand Total Planning Department	151.00	119.37	153.00	120.87	156.00	123.90
SPECIAL REVENUE FUND*						
Workyears		22.00		23.70		23.70

ATTACHMENT D – FY26 SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS (SRF) – SYNOPSIS DESCRIPTION

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 Development Review (Planning Department). The FY26 proposed revenue budget for Planning's Special Revenue Funds is \$3,180,200 and the FY26 proposed expenditure budget is \$4,953,703.

The **Environmental/Forest Conservation Penalty SRF** 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 SRF** 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, finance 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.

For FY26, the Planning Department is proposing to increase the chargeback to the DR-SRF by \$25,415. This includes chargeback increases of \$16,835 from the Legal Department, \$3,920 from the Finance Department, and \$4,660 from Corporate IT for their services. The Planning Department is not proposing to increase the chargebacks in FY26.

The Department has traditionally requested a transfer from the Administration Fund into the DR-SRF in recognition of the fact that revenues may not cover the costs of our review efforts. This transfer has historically been in the range of \$300,000 to \$1,700,000 each year. The fund did not perform well in FY20, FY21 and FY24 which depleted some of the gains from previous years. The transfer from the Administration Fund to the DR-SRF fund in FY22, FY23 and FY24 was \$500,000 per year. In FY25, the transfer was increased to \$950,000 to cover compensation increases and new work years added in FY25. in the proposed FY26 chargebacks. For FY26, the Planning Department is proposing to increase the transfer by \$550,000 to a total of \$1,500,000 to cover the difference between the budgeted revenues and the budgeted chargebacks.

The **Forest Conservation SRF** was created in response to the implementation of the Montgomery County Forest Conservation Law. This fund was created to allow 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 Department of Parks, 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 \$50 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.

The **Traffic Mitigation SRF** was set up to support the regulatory process to ensure compliance with traffic mitigation agreements that were Planning Board requirements for certain approved developments. Revenues were received from developers on an annual basis. This account was designated to pay for the independent monitoring of traffic mitigation agreements and to ensure that each achieves and maintains its trip reduction goal. Audits were conducted by a consultant hired by the Planning Department. Since adoption of Bill 36-18 in 2019, traffic mitigation has been handled differently in the county through Montgomery County Department of Transportation. The Planning Department does not anticipate any new traffic mitigation agreements adding revenue to this SRF. When the two the current agreements are completed, this SFR will be closed.

SECTION 5: SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

SUMMARY

The Planning Department has put great thought into preparing the FY26 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 FY26 budget request shows our commitment to continue to provide the best services possible to County residents with an 5.7% increase for our base budget and new initiatives.

NEXT STEPS

Full Commission approves the FY26 Proposed Budget Resolution	December 19, 2024
M-NCPPC submits Proposed Budget in Brief according to statutory mandate to County Executive and County Council	January 15, 2025
County Executive makes recommendations	March 15, 2025
County Council hold Public Hearings on budget	April 2025
County Council Reviews M-NCPPC Budget	April & May 2025
Montgomery and Prince George's County Councils Meet	May 2025
County Councils Adopt Budget	May 2025