

Follow-Up to FY 2014 Budget Questions

1. Councilmember Hall (M&C meeting 3/18/13)

What is the additional cost of providing a 1.75% COLA for all regular employees for FY 2014 (the proposed budget included a 1.25% COLA)?

\$170,000 for all funds (\$136,000 is General Fund) - salary increase
\$17,000 for all funds (\$13,000 is General Fund) - benefits increase
 \$187,000 for all funds (\$149,000 is General Fund) - total increase

In addition, below is what a 2.00% COLA would cost (this was asked various times throughout the budget process).

\$256,000 for all funds (\$205,000 is General Fund) - salary increase
\$25,000 for all funds (\$20,000 is General Fund) - benefits increase
 \$281,000 for all funds (\$225,000 is General Fund) - total increase

2. Councilmember Hall (M&C meeting 4/1/13 and prior budget meetings)

What is the cost of two additional police officers, and what is the current need for additional police officers?

Two additional officers will cost \$238,000 in FY 2014. This figure includes salary, benefits, equipment and supplies, uniforms, and vehicles.

The Rockville City Police Department's (RCPD) number of sworn officers has remained flat since it was last increased from 54 to 57 in 2008. Since 2008, the City's population has grown by approximately 2.5%. If the Mayor and Council were to authorize additional officers, they would first be assigned to the core mission of the police department, which is uniform patrol. There is an average of 90 police calls for service a day within the Rockville City limits. RCPD handles an average of 73% of the total patrol calls for service in the City.

It is difficult to compare Rockville's officers per capita to national and regional averages because of Rockville's unique hybrid system, which includes overlap with the Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD). With the move of both the MCPD headquarters and the County Police District One station out of Rockville into Gaithersburg, we will see a reduction in overall MCPD presence.

3. Councilmember Newton (email 3/28/13)

What is our budget for Hometown Holidays - both this year and last year?

- FY 2014 \$165,690
- FY 2013 \$165,690
- FY 2012 \$149,500

For the last 10 years, what did we pay for the Hometown Holidays headliner?

- FY 2013 \$18,000 - Sunny Sweeney/The Dirty Gur'nahs (co-headliners)
- FY 2012 \$35,000 - Easton Corbin
- FY 2011 \$35,000 - Taj Mahal (replaced George Clinton and P-Funk All Stars)
- FY 2010 \$25,000 - Soul Asylum
- FY 2009 \$25,000 - The Wailers
- FY 2008 \$50,000 - Rick Springfield
- FY 2007 \$40,000 - KC and the Sunshine Band
- FY 2006 \$40,000 - Blues Traveler
- FY 2005 \$100,000 - Hootie and the Blowfish
- FY 2004 \$80,000 - Live

4. Councilmember Pierzchala (M&C meeting 4/1/13)

What would the 5-year forecast look like if it included a 1.75% COLA increase starting in FY 2014?

Please see **ATTACHMENT B** for an updated General Fund five-year forecast. Below are the changes to the assumptions for this update. Assuming these changes, there is approximately \$367,000 unobligated for FY 2014.

- Increase in the FY 2013 fund balance of \$700,000 (this will be reflected in the May 2013 budget amendment)
- Increase in FY 2014 revenues from other governments of \$1.6 million (reflects increased HUR, police protection aid, and tax duplication)
- Increase in FY 2015 through FY 2018 revenues from other governments of \$203,000 per year for the restoration of the police protection aid
- COLA equal to 1.75% per year from FY 2014 through FY 2018
- Increase in transfer to CIP of \$1.12 million for FY 2014
- Minor adjustment to Mayor and Council compensation as discussed on April 8
- Addition of \$10,777 in FY 2014 to replace the CDBG funds that were reduced due to sequestration

5. Councilmember Pierzchala (M&C meeting 4/1/13)

What is the impact of sequestration on income tax revenue?

After discussions with the State of Maryland's Bureau of Revenue Estimates and a review of Montgomery County's adjustments due to sequestration (they are assuming a 2.8% increase from FY 2013 adopted to FY 2014), staff is comfortable with the conservative estimates included in the FY 2014 budget and FY 2015 through FY 2018 forecast. The FY 2014 budget shows an increase of 1.8% over the FY 2013 adopted budget. Since this revenue source is difficult to predict for all jurisdictions, City staff will stay in contact with the State throughout FY 2014 to ensure that the actual income tax revenue is consistent with the adopted budget.

6. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page x: Demographic statistics, table i-9: How did we lose half our American Indian/Alaska native base in the last 12 years? Who do we think the "Other" category consists of?

The demographic information in this table is from the 1990, 2000, and 2010 Census. Staff is not aware of why the American Indian/Alaska native base decreased from 2000 to 2010 and, unfortunately, the Census does not provide supplemental information. One theory is that the residents that identified with that group in 2000 identified with another group in 2010 (such as "Other").

As stated by the US Census, the "Other" category includes all other responses not included in the White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian and Native Hawaiian or the Other Pacific Islander race categories. Respondents reporting entries such as multiracial, mixed, or interracial in response to the race question are included in this category.

7. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page x: Demographic statistics, table i-10: How did the miles of storm sewer almost double from 2000 to 2012?

The number of miles of storm drain lines (page X, Table i-10) increased between 2000 and 2012 due to the inclusion of large new developments, including King Farm and Falls Grove and an intensive in-house effort to digitize the storm drain lines from the paper files into the geographical information system (GIS). Staff continues compiling stormwater infrastructure into a GIS data layer and believes the current numbers reflect the actual number of storm drain miles in the City.

8. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page x: How did the number of playgrounds drop from 1990 to 2000?

Over the years, the City has replaced smaller pieces of play equipment that are in close proximity to one another with one larger piece of play equipment in a central location. This explains why the number of playgrounds appears to decrease at times.

9. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 1-2: Graph 1-1: How much extra do we expect to receive in 2014 and 2015 when the Woodmont and King Farm agreements expire?

The City will receive approximately \$36,000 in additional property tax revenues from Woodmont Country Club beginning April 2014 and approximately \$7,000 in additional property tax revenues from King Farm beginning August 2015. These figures are based on the current assessed values and the current tax rate of \$0.292.

10. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 1-5: Fines and Forfeitures: It's mentioned several times that the \$1.2 million the City saw from red-light cameras isn't expected to be repeated, as driver behavior will change. But the City is installing another five cameras in FY14 -- won't these fresh new cameras mean much higher overall revenues from red-light camera fines, even if the cameras that existed in FY13 pull in less per camera? Adopted in FY13 was \$654,500 -- how has the actual number compared to that so far? Do we have any plans to install cameras past FY14? Are the FY14 camera locations expected to be as busy as the existing locations?

The redlight camera revenue budget was amended up to \$1,858,500 in March. As of March 31, the City had received \$1.035 million in revenue. The amended FY 2013 budget is based on the original five cameras that were activated in August 2012, plus an additional three cameras that were recently installed and began issuing citations on April 15. Two more cameras are expected to go live by the end of FY 2013, bringing the City's total to ten cameras for FY 2014. There are currently no plans to install additional redlight cameras.

Before selecting the locations for the redlight cameras, staff sought input from the City's Department of Public Works, Traffic and Transportation Division, whose staff was able to take into consideration traffic volume and number of crashes. In addition, the vendor completed a "validation" study, which took into account the volume of traffic and the number of violations that occurred at each proposed intersection. The majority of the City's redlight camera locations are on heavily traveled roadways.

Since the first five cameras were installed in August 2012, the City has experienced a dramatic decrease in the average number of citations per month – evidence that the program is working. Staff anticipates additional spikes in citation figures when the remaining cameras go live, but it is possible that those spikes will not be as large as this initial August 2012 spike, as motorists are now aware of the new technology that captures right turn on red violations.

The proposed FY 2014 redlight camera revenue budget assumes ten cameras with an average of 200 citations per camera per month, for a total of 24,000 citations and \$1.8 million in revenue. Staff will carefully track the progress of the program and update the budget during FY 2014 if necessary.

11. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 3-14 and 16: Enterprise funds -- Water and sewer funds: To the extent that getting the fund balance into positive territory depends on strategic bond issues, does it make sense for us to accelerate those and get ahead of the curve?

Yes, but it depends on the level of debt we are prepared to accept relative to the overall operating expenses. There have been a confluence of events that occurred after the adoption of the program to replace the City's water mains that have

negatively impacted the Water Fund, such as the 24-inch water main breaks, the cost allocation plan, water plant upgrades, water tank issues, and ongoing efforts to meet increasing stringent water quality standards (in addition to the water main replacement program). The last time the Mayor and Council had outside expertise review the funds was in 2006 when the City established an entirely new rate system. Staff supports bringing in outside expertise to provide options to the Mayor and Council, at an approximate cost of \$50,000. There is sufficient appropriation within the FY14 proposed budget. Both the Water and Sewer funds' funding situations are not going to correct themselves without some hard decisions being made about how to generate sufficient revenues while maintaining some degree of fair and competitive usage rates for the City's customers.

12. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 3-18: Table 3-32: What accounts for the refuse fund overtime? Why is it up significantly over FY12?

The overtime budget within the Recycling and Refuse cost center is used for collection on holidays and on sliding days. There is also overtime associated with collecting debris from large storms, such as the summer 2012 derecho and Hurricane Sandy.

The FY 2012 overtime budget was adopted at \$144,860, but only \$72,579 was spent in FY 2012. In lieu of overtime in FY 2012, the Recycling and Refuse cost center used more temporary agency personnel (labor ready), which is included in contractual services category. When comparing what was actually spent in FY 2012 to the adopted FY 2013 budget, there is a significant increase. However, between adopted FY 2012 and adopted FY 2013, overtime decreased from \$144,860 to \$116,090 to better align actual overtime costs and contractual services costs.

13. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 3-24: Table 3-43: How much remains in RedGate's reserves?

As of the City's last audited financial statements on June 30, 2012, the reserves (in this case, reserves is the cash balance in the fund) equaled \$164,899. According to the City's latest quarterly financial report, there is \$43,744 cash in the fund. Cash outlays during FY 2013 include employee compensation and the annual principal and interest payments associated with the outstanding debt. It is likely that the RedGate Fund's cash reserves will be depleted by the end of FY 2013.

14. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 3-24: Table 3-44: What is the actual effect of our handling the depreciation and amortization costs? There's no cash out the door, is there?

There is no cash outlay for depreciation and amortization because the cash was spent when the assets were purchased; however, there is a cash outlay for the annual principal and interest payments associated with the outstanding debt. This is

difficult to see in the budget book because the City's budget is presented using a full accrual basis of accounting, not a cash basis.

15. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 3-28: Speed cameras: Is there an easy way to get the numbers on how much revenue comes in per camera in each year it's in place? (e.g., "Camera 1: first-year revenue: \$[X]: second year revenue: [.6X]" etc.)

The City's speed camera program consists of both fixed-pole cameras (which stay in one location and cannot be moved) and mobile cameras (both mobile vans and portable camera units), which staff can move as they see fit to target areas with reported speed problems. The City's vendor is able to provide the number of citations issued per location. Revenue usually lags behind by a month to up to several years per citation, so looking at citations issued as opposed to revenue received gives you a better picture of violation trends.

The table below shows the number of citations issued by fixed pole speed camera locations each fiscal year, as well as the number of citations issued by the top ten mobile van and portable camera unit locations. There are 41 identified mobile speed camera locations, all listed on the City's website at <http://www.rockvillemd.gov/police/speedcameras.htm#locations>. Only the top ten citation-generating locations are shown below. Note that the number of citations generated varies by location each year, so the highest generating location one year may not be the highest generating location the next year.

Fixed Pole Speed Camera Locations				
Location	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
2100 Blk Baltimore Road s/b	11,042	3,540	2,443	2,131
2200 Blk Wootton Pkwy n/b	8,132	2,624	1,519	1,456
2200 Blk Wootton Pkwy s/b	7,481	2,235	1,222	1,107
400 Blk W. Montgomery Ave w/b	6,107	2,295	2,124	1,370
600 Great Falls Rd n/b	837	3,988	1,750	1,191
700 Twinbrook Pkwy n/b	688	3,246	2,181	1,452
550 Redland Blvd e/b	818	2,970	1,653	1,223
500 Blk W. Montgomery Ave e/b	3,266	1,223	1,164	734
Top Ten Mobile Van Locations (actual locations differ by year)				
Location	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
1	4,765	2,460	1,358	832
2	3,380	1,821	740	796
3	1,528	1,213	667	592
4	1,088	1,174	622	509
5	942	968	583	450
6	632	455	312	301
7	599	454	286	299
8	586	389	238	121
9	488	332	153	101
10	404	241	130	76
Top Ten PCU Locations (actual locations differ by year)				
Location	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
1	N/A	2,356	5,735	5,550
2	N/A	837	3,933	4,643
3	N/A	819	3,716	3,099
4	N/A	788	2,395	2,943
5	N/A	572	2,350	2,291
6	N/A	456	2,157	1,997
7	N/A	371	2,109	1,292
8	N/A	364	1,648	1,201
9	N/A	280	1,280	1,173
10	N/A	267	1,147	1,117

16. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 3-33: Table 3-68: The 2005 general improvement bonds have relatively high interest rates; are these in a position where we can refinance? Can we refinance everything over, what was it on the last round of refinances, 2.1%?

Generally, the City can proceed with a refunding when the bonds reach their first call date (usually ten years after the issue date). Staff is currently working with the City's financial advisor to refund the 2004 issue (call date is March 14, 2014) and will look to refunding the 2005 issue next year. The current rates are as good as or even better than the rates we received on our 2013 bond issue; therefore, we are looking at every opportunity available.

17. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 3-33: Table 3-67: These figures, dropping to \$675k in 2031, are what it would look like only if we never floated another bond?

That is correct. Table 3-67 represents the current principal and interest payments associated with the City's current debt. As indicated in the footnote, these numbers do not include the bond issues being proposed for FY 2014 and FY 2017. We update these schedules with the actual interest and principal payments only after the bonds are issued.

18. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 3-35: Table 3-75: Debt per capita with and without parking: Which should we be paying attention to? In FY18, are we at 75% of our goal ratio, or only 29%?

Generally, the debt per capita (without parking) would be the best indicator of the City's tax supported debt; however, since the Parking Fund receives a transfer from the General Fund each year to help pay for debt service, one could argue that the parking debt is indirectly tax-supported and should be included in the calculation. We provide the per capita statistic with and without parking to address both approaches.

The maximum debt per capita is \$1,225. This dollar amount is not necessarily a target or goal that we are striving for, but rather an upper boundary set by policy that we should not exceed.

19. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 3-37: Table 3-86: Is this lighting just for Welsh Park? Are there other needs that are not being funded?

The \$380,000 shown in FY 2015 is just for Welsh Park lighting. Page 33 of the proposed FY 2014 CIP shows the project sheet for the Outdoor Security Lighting project (420-900-6B91). In addition to the Welsh Park needs, this project sheet identifies \$250,000 (unfunded) in FY 2016 for the replacement of City Hall parking lot lights.

20. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 3-38: Table 3-89: Is this enough to be socking away?

The \$500,000 shown in FY 2014 is only for design and acquisition planning services for the Maryland/Dawson Extended project (420-850-5C11). The project sheet, which can be found on page 54 of the proposed FY 2014 CIP, shows \$11.5 million (unfunded) in future years for the actual right-of-way acquisition and construction. Staff anticipates that a developer and development income tax monies will pay the costs to build the extension.

21. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 3-40: Do I read these right to be cumulative, so that every time \$500 shows up in an entry, it's a \$500 extra expense from that point forward? (So, for example, FY18 sidewalk costs are \$6,000 higher than FY14?)

Correct, the operating cost impacts of CIP projects are generally ongoing costs associated with the completion of a project. For the Sidewalks example you chose, each new sidewalk comes with an ongoing maintenance expense, including signs, landscaping, and snow removal on select sidewalks. The cost of that maintenance is added to the base operating budget as an ongoing cost.

22. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 4-3: Personnel: Benefits were up only 2 percent this year from last. Why are they expected to go up 10% a year starting in FY15?

While the City's retirement contributions are estimated to remain flat under the current system, other benefits such as health care, dental, life insurance, workers compensation, and unemployment insurance are estimated to increase. Staff's estimates are conservative due to the fluctuations associated with employee benefits.

It is important to remember that the City reduced the total number of FTEs from FY 2013 to FY 2014 and also removed the car allowance and 10% supplemental retirement from the vacant director positions (note: the Recreation and Parks Director may maintain the car allowance benefit). See question #45 for more information on the savings from the reduced director benefits.

23. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 5-4: Table 5-11: How is the Mayor & Council spending \$108,000 on contractual services?

Under contractual services (page 5-4, Table 5-11), the Division of the Mayor and Council pays for legal notices, Mayor and Council travel, and citywide memberships. Below is the detailed breakdown:

- \$13,700 for legal advertisements/notices for elections, public hearings, etc.
- \$10,000 for travel – Mayor and Council to National League of Cities (NLC), Maryland Municipal League (MML), etc.
- \$85,120 for dues, fees, publications – citywide memberships to Council of Governments (\$43,560), MML (\$35,000), Sister Cities (\$680), Chamber of Commerce (\$1,050), NLC (\$4,770), Maryland Mayors Association (\$60)

24. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 5-6: Office of the City Clerk: They have some temporary help. Where is this being accounted for? (Literally, where? I don't have any issue with their having temporary help.)

All full-time and temporary employee wages are summarized in the City Clerk's budget under Salary and Wages in Table 5-17, page 5-6; however, temporary wages are separated out on page 16-13 by department (\$7,030 for this department). In addition, the Staffing Summary by Division table on page 5-2 (Table 5-7) shows that the temporary employees equal 0.2 FTEs for FY 2014.

25. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 7-3: Second to last paragraph: What's it costing for us to become ADA compliant with closed captioning?

The FY 2014 proposed budget includes \$28,720 so the City can become fully ADA compliant with FCC closed-captioning requirements.

26. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 7-12: Table 7-33: What does it mean exactly to have an 80 percent tweet click-through rate?

This performance measure gauges if the City's followers are taking the extra step to learn more about City programs, videos or news releases. In a Twitter message, there are only 140 characters available; having a high click-through rate is an important measure of how interactive our followers are with the City's messaging.

There are currently 2,494 followers on three City Twitter accounts: @rockville11, @rockville411, and @alertrockville. The click-through rate is determined by click-through divided by impressions. For example, this past week, we posted 49 tweets and received 57 clicks which equates to a 116% click through rate.

27. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 8-2: CPDS: Improving processes here is a top goal of the Mayor and Council. How can the Mayor and Council contribute to the City's achieving this goal? (there is additional information on the development review process under question #73)

The Mayor and Council can help achieve this goal by appropriating an additional \$65,000 in the FY 2014 Community Planning and Development Services budget; the funds would be used to hire a consultant and outside legal counsel to design a single development process and to draft the new codes related to the new process. The goal of this project is to create a seamless and unified process that will be easier for applicants and citizens to follow in a timely and efficient manner. The City will focus on several areas, including zoning, forest and tree preservation, stormwater management, sediment control, and the comprehensive transportation report (CTR).

In addition to the \$65,000 in CPDS, the proposed budget includes an additional \$56,000 in the Forestry Development Review cost center (Recreation and Parks Department) in response to concerns about the length of time it currently takes to process forestry related plans. This funding will provide contractual assistance (20 hours per week, 40 weeks per year), which will allow regular staff to spend more time on plan review.

28. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 8-10: CDBG: We are losing \$11k to the sequester. From where can we make this up?

The sequester has caused a 5.1% cut to the Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) projects that were approved by the Mayor and Council on November 5, 2012. The Mayor and Council could use General Fund money to mitigate the reduction in the Federal grant. In order to do this, the Mayor and Council should direct staff to increase the CPDS budget by a one-time allocation of \$10,777 for FY 2014. If this is the will of the Mayor and Council, staff has identified funds to accomplish this goal (this is an assumption included under question #4 – update to 5-year forecast).

29. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 11-5: Figure 11-1: New e-mail, etc, system: Cost is said to come out of existing e-mail support contract. How is this going to work, and will it work? This is a top Mayor and Council priority.

The City will use its existing consultant contract to evaluate other email alternatives. The purpose of this contract is to assist with email support, and it exists in lieu of a full-time position. Once a proposal is submitted and approved, additional funding will be needed for a pilot study and/or to purchase a new system. This additional funding was not included in the FY 2014 proposed budget.

It is important to remember that the consultant's evaluation will consider all of the functions of the current Lotus Notes system, including eGenda, citizens service requests (CSRs), and room reservations. Implementing the results of this evaluation will be one of the top priorities for the new IT director.

30. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 11-7: Table 11-17: What is this "citywide public Wi-Fi" about which you speak?

The City provides free Wi-Fi at most City government facilities used by the public, including City Hall, Thomas Farm Community Center, Glenview Mansion, F. Scott Fitzgerald Theatre, the Nature Center, the Senior Center, the Swim Center, Lincoln Park Community Center, and Twinbrook Recreation Center. This performance measure tracks the uptime of these Wi-Fi connections to ensure this service is provided to the public with the least level of interruption. Staff will update the wording of the performance measure to ensure that it is clear.

31. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 11-7: Table 11-18: Are we finally rid of all of our pagers?

Yes, the City no longer has pagers.

32. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 12-5: Table 12-17: First item: Could it be time to raise this target?

The Department continually strives to do better. The stated goal will be raised for the adopted budget book to reflect an increased goal of 85%, as shown below.

	Actual FY12	Target FY13	Est. Act. FY13	Target FY14
Increase the percent of Citizen Survey respondents rating Rockville’s overall police services as “excellent” or “good” to 85%	77%	77%	81%	85%

33. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 12-6: Supplemental information: What proportion of U.S. police departments are accredited? (Only if this is easily available: What proportion of police departments similar to ours are accredited?)

There are 17,000 police agencies in the United States. At this time, 620 police departments in the United States are fully accredited, and approximately another 150 have a partial accreditation status (accredited communication center, accredited forensic labs, accredited property rooms, etc.). There are ten departments outside of the United States that are accredited (seven in Canada, two in Mexico, one in Barbados). Of our particular size and category, there are 165 accredited agencies.

34. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 12-21: Table 12-74: Why was the position moved from Field Services to Special Operations?

As part of a cooperative venture with Montgomery County, a Rockville police officer is currently assigned to the County Drug Intervention Unit for one year. His duties in the Street Crimes Unit in the Special Operations Bureau will continue to be accomplished through this position transfer from Field Services.

35. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 13-12: Table 13-48: First performance measure: What's the goal here?

The goal is to maintain or increase the percentage of Rockville residents satisfied with the streetlight service we provide. We will update the performance measure language to state this goal. For FY 2014, the performance measure will state, "Maintain or increase the percent of Citizen Survey respondents rating street lighting as "excellent" or "good" at or above 62%."

36. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 14-28: Supplemental Information: Is \$50 per quarter adequate to really help people? Should this be raised?

The Senior Assistance Fund subsidizes costs for center membership, programs, club activities, and trips. Eligible seniors may receive up to \$50 per quarter for trips and up to \$50 per quarter for programs. This fund does not provide emergency financial assistance; it is strictly to assist seniors in affording the cost of participation in recreation activities. Funding for this program comes strictly from donations and is not taxpayer supported; therefore, the fund can only pay out as much as it receives in donations.

37. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 14-45: First paragraph: Not a Budget Question: What's the latest with the Rockville Rooftop? Is there new management there?

VisArts will be managing the 2013 season, providing activities and events in line with its mission of engaging the community in the visual arts and providing opportunities for artistic exploration, education and participation. Staff is currently working on a comprehensive RFP for future management of The Rooftop. The RFP will be advertised this summer, with the goal of having a multi-year contract in place to begin the calendar 2014 season.

38. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 14-56: Table 14-178: First performance measure: Is it the same 2 parks that aren't meeting standards year-to-year?

Yes, Montrose Park and Twinbrook Park consistently fail to meet the standards each year. Both parks are heavily used, especially on weekends and evenings, because of lighted courts. The major reason they are not meeting the standard is the volume of trash left on the sport courts at both locations. This year, we are installing additional trash cans at both locations to address this problem. We hope to see more use of the cans and less trash left on the courts.

39. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 14-60: Graph 14-8: What accounts for the pansy drop from FY11 to FY14?

Deer were destroying pansies at Beall Dawson House and Friends Park. Staff made the decision to no longer plant pansies in those locations, accounting for the overall decline in pansy plantings.

40. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 14-62: Table 14-200: How much would it cost to get us on the optimum pruning schedule? How much would it cost to get us halfway there? The Performance Measures in Table 14-199 are not being met, which is a rarity in this budget document, and I can only imagine that it has something to do with the pruning schedule being so stretched out.

Street tree block pruning is done through contracts, with the City Forester managing the contracts. Approximately \$300,000 in contractual services funding would be required to reach a seven- to eight-year pruning cycle for street trees, which staff believes is the optimum schedule. Adding this level of funding would more than double the current contracts for street tree pruning and would require additional administrative support (temporary or part-time regular employee) in this cost center.

41. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

Page 16-12: Line item 0226, M&C: What are we paying \$87,000 for? How is this accounted for in the Mayor and Council Department budget?

Under contractual services (line item 0226), the Department of the Mayor and Council pays for citywide memberships and the City Clerk's memberships and registration fees. Below is the detailed breakdown:

- COG - \$43,560
- MML - \$35,000
- Sister Cities - \$680
- Chamber of Commerce - \$1,050
- NLC - \$4,770
- MMA - \$60
- City Clerk memberships and registration fees - \$1,950

42. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

General question: How much would it cost to bond \$1-5 million additional? What impact would bonds in that range have on our debt ratios over the next five years?

At current borrowing rates, a \$1 million borrowing commitment results in an increased average annual debt service burden of \$64,000. An additional \$5 million in debt would result in an increase of \$320,000 in debt service costs. Our current debt ratios could handle an additional \$5 million in issued bonds; however, we would need to increase our transfer from the General Fund to the Debt Service Fund to cover the additional debt service costs.

43. Councilmember Moore (email 4/7/13)

General question: A lot of performance measures get added to the budget. Are others also being removed?

Staff reviews all performance and workload measures every year and adds or deletes measures when necessary. We look at things like how we are measuring the success of a program or cost center, what new aspects of a program should be measured, and what a reader of the budget document would want to know about a program. In addition to our internal review, a part of the annual GFOA awards program is the review and comment on our performance measures by GFOA reviewers. GFOA comments on the usefulness in communicating information and the consistency of measures from year to year. On occasion, we will get suggestions from the GFOA reviewers that we incorporate into the next year's budget.

44. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(1.) Page 3-2; Table 3-2: Is there a relatively facile way to parse a potential overall City Staff salary increase of either 1.75% or 2.00% among the General Fund and all funds, or should I simply try to identify the required \$149,000 or \$225,000 in savings from the General Fund, respectively, and let the City Staff figure-out the "all funds" impact? While I've already identified \$149,000 in General Fund savings for the 1.75%, I confess that I haven't yet found the \$225,000 for the 2.00%, and I'm committed to both leaving the reserves at 16.9% (pages 3-2 & 4-4; Tables 3-3 & 4-3), and also to no discrimination whatsoever between the Senior Staff and the rank-and-file in this effort.

If the majority of the Mayor and Council want to increase the COLA to 1.75% (or 2.00%), the General Fund will most likely utilize the additional revenues from other governments in order to maintain a balanced budget, while the remaining funds would rely on fund reserves since these funds are not required to balance overall expenses with revenues. The revised forecast (**ATTACHMENT B**) assumes an increase to 1.75%, as recommended by the City Manager.

45. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(2.) Page 3-2; Table 3-2: Are there any reportable savings from the governing body's adoption of the revised City policy adjusting and circumscribing the car allowance last year?

Yes, the FY 2014 adopted budget will not include a car allowance for the directors of Human Resources or Information Technology. This equates to \$10,800 in General Fund savings (included in the "Personnel" category). In addition to not including the car allowance, all three vacant director positions will not have the additional 10% retirement benefit included. This equates to a savings of approximately \$48,000 for the three directors in FY 2014.

The City Manager, in consultation with the executive recruitment firm, does not believe that the reduced benefits will impose an impediment in the recruitment process. The current salary range and benefits package should be sufficient to attract high quality candidates for each of the director positions; however, should the reduced benefits become an obstacle in the hiring process, some adjustment in approach may be necessary.

The first position that did not receive the car allowance was the City Manager. This change saved the City approximately \$4,050 in FY 2013 (partial year) and will save an additional \$5,400 for FY 2014 and future years.

46. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(3.) Page 3-18; Table 3-32; and page 13-1; Table 13-3: Exact same question as Councilmember Moore: Why the significant increases in Public Works overtime? Could I perhaps have just 20%-40% of that or more (\$15,000 to \$30,000) to help fund an overall City Staff increase of 1.75% or 2.00%, please?

In the proposed FY 2014 budget, the largest increase in overtime within the Department of Public Works is in the Operations and Maintenance Division. The additional overtime is for snow and ice (+\$20,610), water systems maintenance (+\$19,570) and sewer maintenance (+\$23,460) services and is funded by the General, Water, and Sewer Funds, respectively.

Staff does not recommend reducing these overtime accounts because they are calculated based on the most recent five-year averages and are used to fund emergency water and sewer main repairs along with snow and ice removal.

47. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(5.) Pages 7-1 & 7-2; Tables 7-1,7-3, 7-7, & 7-8: Is the plan to sustain the nearly-20% reductions in the Department of the City Manager for the out-years, please?

Yes, any savings realized from the elimination of the three vacant positions and the elimination of the Organization Development cost center will continue for the out years.

48. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(6.) Pages 8-4, 8-17, & 8-23: There are no reported significant projected revenue increases for the major CPDS cost-centers which generate revenue. Are Rockville's development and inspection fees at least tracking with the cost to the City of providing these services? Do we need to explore increasing them?

The planning, building, and safety fees are included under the regulatory programs category of the City's Financial Management Policies. As stated in the Financial Management Policies, cost recovery goals for these types of services should be 100 percent unless there are reasons why staff would recommend a fee below the policy goal. These fees were comprehensively reviewed and updated as part of the user fee study and were updated in June 2011. At that time, the fees of surrounding jurisdictions were used to help establish the City's levels.

The building and safety fees collected by the Inspection Services Division cover a large portion of the expenditures for this Division (Table 8-1 and Table 8-2 on Page 8-1). However, the fees collected by the Planning and Zoning Division are significantly less than annual expenditures (Table 8-1 and Table 8-2 on Page 8-1). Staff has recommended fees below the policy goal in planning and zoning for the reasons of benchmarking fees to the neighboring jurisdictions, the ability of the community to pay, and to promote compliance with regulations.

49. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(7.) Pages 10-1 & 14-1; Tables 10-1 & 14-1: These entries do not appear to reflect the costs of yet-to-be-hired new department heads for Human Resources and Recreation & Parks in FY2014, but it's possible that such projected expenses were carried-forward from FY2013. Is that the case here, please?

The FY 2014 proposed budget includes salary and benefits for both the vacant Human Resources and Recreation and Parks Director positions.

50. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(8.) Page 11-5: Figure 11-1: New e-mail, etc., system.

Please see the response to Question 29.

51. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(9.) Pages 12-1, 12-2, & 12-9; Tables 12-7, 12-29, & 12-30: Can the additional State of Maryland funding for police services fully cover the cost of salaries and benefits for the additional 2 RCPD officers which I have proposed in FY2014? If not, how much do I need to find in the General Fund -- and all funds -- to cover the cost?

The cost for two additional police officers is approximately \$238,000, which includes salaries, benefits, vehicles, and equipment. The additional State grant will add \$203,000 to the budget, leaving a gap of \$35,000 (all General Fund). If the majority of the Mayor and Council want to authorize additional officers, this gap

could be funded with another revenue source that has come in higher than anticipated, such as tax duplication.

52. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(10.) Page 13-1; Table 13-3: Please see question (3.), supra.

Please see the response to Question 46.

53. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(11.) Page 14-1; Table 14-1: Please see question (7.), supra.

Please see the response to Question 49.

54. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(12.) Page 14-6; Table 14-48: Just a question here. As some of us have discussed, is there an appetite to consider reserving an additional 0.5% per capita (for a total of 1.5% per capita) for the Arts in Public Places fund? If so, I'm interested to learn of the City Manager's suggestions regarding the additional \$32,000 required for such an increase, and also whether it would be appropriate, in the opinion of the City Manager and the City Attorney, to enact a revision at this time to Chapter 4 of the City Code in this regard, please?

The Art in Public Places fund has an estimated 6/30/13 fund balance of over \$342,000. While the proposed FY 2014 budget plans the use of approximately \$100,000 of that balance, the fund balance would equal at least \$240,000 at the close of FY 2014. Staff does not recommend transferring additional taxpayer supported funds to this account given the large fund balance.

55. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(13.) Page 16-12: Line items 0122 & 0123: How soon could we move to either an Alternate 1 or Alternate 2 proposal for new employees' hybrid or defined contribution benefit plans? Could we do it in this pending budget vote? If so, can we bank the \$11,000 or \$23,000, respectively, in this FY2014 budget, according to the will of the governing body, please?

The City could move to alternative 1 or 2 as per the March 2013 Pension Plan Design Study by the Hay Group as soon as the Mayor and Council approve a Plan amendment which would include an effective date for the change to apply. Making this change would not bank the \$11,000 or the \$23,000 for FY 2014, but savings would be bankable in the future based on an updated valuation report. Regardless of any plan amendment changes, the City contributes what the actuary recommends in the valuation report (which is relatively static to a point in time). The Mayor and Council should only consider a change of this magnitude for the longer-term savings.

The Pension Plan Design Study can be found at:

http://www.rockvillemd.gov/government/commissions/retirement/reports/PensionPlanDesignStudy_March_%205.pdf

56. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(14.) Pages 16-12 to 16-14; Line items 0104, 0201, 0204, 0206, 0214, 0226, 0233, 0258, 0310, 0323, 0332. How sustainable -- and how consonant with the City Manager's priorities and needs -- would JFH's proposed reductions to the following entries be, if at all?:

- A. Non-Police overtime: -3% (\$20,853)
- B. Consultants: -2% (\$11,921)
- C. Bank & Investment Services: -1% (\$1,152)
- D. Outside Training: -1% (\$3,643)
- E. Data Processing Services: -1% (\$4,368)
- F. Dues, Fees, & Publications: -1% (\$2,141)
- G. Contract Services - Other: -3% (\$54,306)
- H. Non-Departmental Credit Card Charges: -1% (\$1,100)
- I. Outside Printing Fees: -1% (\$1,091)
- J. Electricity Consumption: -1% (\$24,317)
- K. Program Supplies: -1% (\$1,694)
- L. City manager's Contingency: -2.5% (\$14,500)
- M. Maintaining a Reserve Balance of 16.9%, as proposed: (\$10,555)

Subtotal: \$151,641.00 -- this achieves the \$149,000 required from the General Fund to provide a 1.75% City Staff salary increase -- across all levels of the City Staff, without discrimination.

Many of the suggested reductions would be difficult to execute if the City's goal is to maintain current services and programs. Staff have already included a 1.75% COLA in the revised forecast (**ATTACHMENT B**). If the majority of the Mayor and Council want to increase the COLA to 2.00%, the General Fund will utilize the additional revenues received from other governments in order to maintain a balanced budget, while the remaining funds would rely on fund reserves since these funds are not required to balance overall expenses with revenues.

57. Councilmember Hall (email 4/7/13)

(15.) Similar to Councilmember Moore's penultimate inquiry, how much would it cost us to bond-out as much as \$5 million in the next five years? We already require at least \$1 million in City pedestrian safety investments to address identified pedestrian safety challenges to which we have committed in the Julius West Middle School environment, the former Stonestreet Bridge environment, and the Pumphrey's Funeral Home environment. We have also, during this past session, approved a development at Twinbrook Metro Place that is even more dense and massive than the Town Center development approved by the City's governing body a decade ago; this may also require additional City-funded pedestrian safety improvements. Additionally, there are unmet facility and infrastructure maintenance and upgrade needs. What's our cost for bonding-out \$5 million for these requirements, if we choose to do so?

At current borrowing rates, a \$1 million borrowing commitment results in an increased average annual debt burden of \$64,000. An additional \$5 million in debt would result in an increase of \$320,000 in debt service costs.

58. Councilmember Newton (M&C drop-in 4/8/13)

Please provide a history of the City's contribution to the caregiver agencies.

The information below was gathered from past budget books. Information prior to FY 2001 would require staff to retrieve budget books from offsite archives. If more information is needed, please let us know.

- FY 2001 - \$340,000
- FY 2002 - \$360,000
- FY 2003 - \$373,000
- FY 2004 - \$356,725
- FY 2005 - \$371,794
- FY 2006 - \$400,294
- FY 2007 - \$426,800
- FY 2008 - \$444,500
- FY 2009 - \$465,150
- FY 2010 - \$507,875
- FY 2011 - \$553,270
- FY 2012 - \$568,240
- FY 2013 - \$595,240
- FY 2014 - \$595,240 (proposed)

59. Councilmember Moore (Citizens Forum 4/8/13)

What is the total cost of the senior taxi coupon book program?

The adopted FY 2013 budget for the cost of the taxi coupons was \$45,300. The proposed FY 2014 budget figure is the same.

60. Councilmember Pierzchala (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

Is it possible to go to a straight fee instead of a per citation fee for the speed camera and redlight camera vendors?

Staff would need to do a thorough analysis of any potential flat fee or tiered fee photo enforcement program to ensure that the program would continue to recover its full cost under such a pricing structure. The City currently pays its vendor a fee per paid citation. There was a bill before the Maryland General Assembly that would have required future speed camera enforcement contracts to utilize flat fee or tiered pricing; however, the bill died. This bill was prompted by a concern that vendors had a financial incentive to issue tickets under a fee per citation pricing structure. Trained City staff review every redlight citation processed by the vendor and make a determination whether or not to actually issue the citation. Only sworn

police officers can approve speed camera citations. Staff errs on the side of caution when deciding which citations to issue.

61. Councilmember Pierzchala (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

Could the City go to a 30 day warning period for new camera installations?

The three redlight cameras that were most recently installed were in place and operating for more than 30 days before the start of issuing citations on April 15. The City will continue this practice of allowing the cameras to be in operation for a minimum of 30 days prior to issuing citations.

62. Councilmember Pierzchala (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

Under what conditions is a redlight camera ticket issued?

According to Maryland Law TA 21-202, a vehicle facing a steady red signal must come to a complete stop at the near side of the intersection at the stop line or, if there is no stop line, prior to the crosswalk and before entering the intersection, and remain stopped as long as the signal is red. Unless a sign prohibits turning on a red signal, after coming to a complete stop as prescribed, the vehicle may cautiously enter the intersection and make the turn.

The photo sequence of the redlight camera is set to initiate if the speed of the vehicle at a set distance prior to the stop line is at or above 13 mph. As the vehicle continues to move past the stop line, a vehicle is not cited if its speed going across the line drops below 13 mph. The speed of the vehicle as it travels across the stop line is the exit speed. If the vehicle had an exit speed of 13 mph or above but slowed down to less than 13 mph shortly afterwards, the vehicle will still be cited in accordance with the law stated above.

The 13 mph threshold is only a technical parameter which tells the computer when to start initiating the photo sequence and which events to disregard as a potential violation. It is only after a subjective review of the photographs and video that the Department concludes that a violation has indeed occurred. As a result, just because the lights flash does not necessarily equate to a citation being issued.

63. Councilmember Pierzchala (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

Please provide an overview piece that can be handed out to the public on the speed camera and redlight camera programs.

Information is available on the City's website on the photo enforcement programs using the following links:

Redlight Camera Program: <http://www.rockvillemd.gov/police/redlight.html>

Speed Camera Program: <http://www.rockvillemd.gov/police/speedcameras.htm>

64. Councilmember Pierzchala (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

Look at different options for getting the utility funds into compliance with Financial Management Policies, or consider changing the policies to reflect the 10-year rate setting period.

The last time the Mayor and Council had outside expertise review the funds was in 2006 when the City established an entirely new rate system. Staff supports bringing in outside expertise to provide options to the Mayor and Council. Both the Water and Sewer Funds' funding situations are not going to correct themselves without some hard decisions being made about how to generate sufficient revenues while maintaining some degree of fair and competitive usage rates for the City's customers.

If a majority of the Mayor and Council agree with this approach, they should direct staff to pursue outside expertise, at a cost of approximately \$50,000. There is sufficient appropriation within the FY14 proposed budget..

65. Councilmember Moore (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

What is the cost per ton to collect recycling?

The City is paid a per tonnage rate for recyclables collected within the City (accounted for as revenue to the Refuse Fund). This per tonnage rate is set by a commodities market and has fluctuated over the past couple of years. It is now averaging about \$50 per ton down from a high of \$98. This revenue helps to moderate the refuse utility rate charged to residents.

On the expense side, the City no longer separates its expenses for refuse, recycling, yardwaste, etc. so it is difficult to calculate the total direct operating costs associated with the collection of just recycling. One cost that we can separate out is the processing fee of \$30.00 per ton and transportation fee of \$22.50 per ton for the City's single stream recycling. When the City is paid a per tonnage rate of \$52.50 or above, the City's revenues offset the fees associated with delivering the recycling materials to the processor. Any time the City is paid less than \$52.50 per ton, the City is essentially paying for the disposal of recycling materials.

One thing to remember when evaluating the cost of recycling is that Montgomery County Code prohibits recyclables from being combined with the regular refuse stream. Since the Montgomery County Transfer Station is our only possible receiving point for our refuse, we must continue collecting recyclables separate from the regular refuse stream.

66. Councilmember Pierzchala (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

Are we being penalized because we are the leader in the State for stormwater management programs? Are we setting a standard that is difficult to maintain?

Staff does not believe the City is being penalized for those areas in which we are leading the State of Maryland. We anticipate stricter requirements under our future new National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. We believe that our current program will be more closely in line with new permit requirements than other communities. Communities that currently are not performing to the state standards will likely have to invest more time and money to bring their programs to a satisfactory level under the new permits. Additionally, since MDE has stated that we will receive credit for stormwater improvements made since 2008, we already have a good start towards meeting the 20% additional treatment requirement of the new permit. Rockville has the advantage of an existing fee structure, inspection program, and pond and stream projects that will count toward the new permit requirement. Additional information is provided below about our current program and the anticipated requirements under the new permit.

The first major change we anticipate in our new National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit is the requirement for communities to treat an additional 20% of impervious area to certain standards. The stormwater facility standard is anticipated to be based on a year that certain MDE standards were in place to receive full credit and perhaps a second year where a lower standard was in place for partial credit. Therefore, communities with a higher amount of treated impervious area meeting the standard will have less untreated area to be multiplied by the 20%. Since most stormwater treatment facilities are built when development or redevelopment occurs, the largest influence on the amount of untreated impervious area is the amount of development that has occurred before and after the creditable standards were implemented.

After speaking with MDE, staff anticipates that the date used for the new requirements to go into effect will be 2008. This is good news because we potentially have five pond projects (Maryvale; Lakewood: Carnation Dr./I-270; College Garden; and Horizon Hill) that were or will be finished in 2008 or later and therefore, count 100% towards the new permit requirement. With a higher amount of treated impervious area credited with meeting the standard, less untreated impervious area is subject to additional treatment under the new permit. Additionally, six stream improvement restoration projects (Alsace Lane; Cabin John Lower Stream; Woodley Gardens; Glenora Tributary; and Dogwood Park) were or will be finished in 2008 or later; however, we are unsure exactly how stream restoration will count.

The second major change we anticipate is more reporting and verification that communities are performing the inspections of stormwater facilities and construction sites; maintenance of stormwater facilities; and illicit discharge detection and elimination. Those communities that currently are not performing

these requirements to a satisfactory level will likely have to invest more money in hiring inspectors and performing more maintenance. Therefore, we believe that our current program level in these areas will be more closely in line with new permit requirements than other communities who may have been underperforming in these areas.

Finally, there are other elements of our program that are not included in the permit such as storm drain line inspection and maintenance. Our storm drain maintenance is integral to a sustainable preventive maintenance program, and our utility fee provides a sustainable method to fund our program. Other communities faced with increased requirements under a new NPDES permit may be forced to develop and implement a stormwater fee. This will take significant time and resources, which the City has already incurred.

67. Mayor Marcuccio (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

Why did the overall Human Resources budget decrease by 1% from adopted FY 2013 to proposed FY 2014?

The net decrease in the Human Resources budget is due to reductions in recruitment funding, tuition reimbursement, and the elimination of the car allowance and the 10% supplemental retirement for the director position.

Please see question #45 for more information on the savings from the reduced director benefits.

68. Mayor Marcuccio (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

Please provide detail on the change in IT revenues from FY 2013 to FY 2014.

During the FY 2013 budget process, staff projected a 5% increase in revenues from Comcast Franchise Fees. This increase was based on the FY 2012 Comcast Franchise Fee revenue which was increasing each quarter. Staff believed that this trend would continue into FY 2013. During FY 2013, the revenue received from Comcast Franchise fees has not risen to the level predicted so proposed FY 2014 budgeted revenues for this item were reduced to more closely meet expectations.

69. Councilmember Newton (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

Provide actual statistics related to the zoning inspectors sign review responsibilities and workload.

At the meeting on April 8, the Mayor and Council requested staff to provide them with information on the how the sign regulations in the Zoning Ordinance are being enforced. This is in response to a complaint regarding the proliferation of illegal "bandit" signs along Rockville Pike during the weekends.

The issue of posting illegal signs comes principally from two aspects. First, there is turnover in store management over time. New managers may not be familiar with

Rockville's sign regulations and begin posting these signs. The Zoning Inspector normally confiscates any illegal signs still found on Monday. Since January 2012, 562 illegal signs have been confiscated and discarded. The City's Zoning Inspector has conducted weekend inspections in the past, including twice last fall. It is important to note that when such work is conducted outside of normal business hours, the regular duties of the position go unattended during that time. These duties include processing sign permit applications, supporting the Sign Review Board, performing site inspections of new development for compliance with the code and approved conditions, and related enforcement matters.

First-time offenders are either sent a notice of violation or receive a personal visit from the inspector. If the signs re-appear, a fine may be imposed. Sign violations include: prohibited signs; signs erected without a permit; temporary signs with no permit; signs on utility or light poles and cabinets; portable signs; and balloons, pennants and banners.

The other aspect is that some businesses will game the system. They know that sign enforcement is normally only done during weekdays so they post their signs on Friday evenings and collect them on Sunday evenings. If and when the inspector does find such signs from repeat offenders, a notice of violation and fine is sent to them as well.

Currently, the fine for a violation is \$100 for the first day, and \$200 for each subsequent day the violation remains. Under State law as set forth in Section 11-202 of the Land Use Article, the maximum fine for municipal violations is \$500.

Rigorous enforcement of these sign violations on the weekend would involve either authorizing regular overtime or hiring another inspector. Another possible measure would be to have the City's current inspector perform periodic weekend inspections, perhaps on a quarterly basis. However, as mentioned above, this approach comes at the sacrifice of the other regular duties of the inspector.

70. Councilmember Moore (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

What is the cost of an additional zoning inspector (related to sign discussion)?

The total cost of a 1.0 FTE Zoning Inspector II is \$86,000, which includes salary and the most common benefit elections.

71. Councilmember Moore (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

If the City were to issue more bonds in FY 2014 what projects would staff recommend move forward? Please prioritize unfunded projects.

If the Mayor and Council were to issue more bonds in FY 2014, staff recommends moving up portions of the Civic Center Improvements and Swim and Fitness Center Renovations projects from FY 2017, or other needs identified such as structural

concerns with the South Indoor Pool. Many of the items planned for FY 2017 could be done concurrently with the projects planned for FY 2014.

Staff would not recommend funding any Transportation Program Area projects with bond proceeds because we recommend utilizing the one-time increase in FY 2014 Highway User Revenues (HUR) to fund \$1.12 million that is currently unfunded. We recommend including an additional \$600,000 for Bridge Rehabilitation, \$500,000 for Accessible Pedestrian Signals, and \$20,000 for Street Lighting Improvements.

72. Budget Office (M&C meeting 4/8/13)

Detail the change in the Mayor and Council compensation between the FY 2014 proposed and the FY 2014 current compensation figures. Include both the compensation figures and the benefits associated with the Mayor and Council positions.

<u>Individual Mayor and Council Compensation</u>			
	FY 2013 Adopted	FY 2014 Proposed	FY 2014 Revised
Mayor	\$25,800*	\$28,050**	\$26,581***
Council	\$20,600	\$22,450**	\$21,265***

* Rounded to the nearest \$100 – actual is \$25,750.

** Compensation Commission recommendation, presented March 2011 – rounded to nearest \$50.

*** Authorized level per Resolution 14-11, adopted May 2011.

<u>Combined Mayor and Council Compensation and Benefits*</u>			
	FY 2013 Adopted	FY 2014 Proposed	FY 2014 Revised
Compensation	\$108,200	\$117,850	\$111,660
Benefits	\$15,840	\$39,110	\$38,620
TOTAL	\$124,040	\$156,960	\$150,280

* Totals are rounded to the nearest \$10.

73. Councilmember Newton (Discussion with City Manager 4/9/13)

Please provide more information on the \$65,000 increase for a consultant to assist with improving the development review process that was presented at the Mayor and Council meeting on April 8.

One of the Mayor and Council's priority action items for this year is to streamline the permitting and site plan review process. Common complaints include the length of time the process takes, the inconsistencies across the different development codes, and the complexity of the process for both applicants and stakeholders to track over a 1-2 year review period.

In fact, there are 15 documents that regulate a typical site plan (i.e. zoning, stormwater manual and ordinance, sediment control manual and ordinance, "road code", forest conservation manual and ordinance, publicly accessible art, etc.). In the current process, there are 17 different sets of plans or reports that must be submitted to three different departments with various application forms and fees.

Each code also has different timeframes for review that often conflict. The site plan and permitting activities should be designed as a single service that the City provides to its customers. This will improve customer service as well as staff efficiency and quality control.

This item, budgeted at \$65,000 for FY 2014, will be used to supplement staff resources to create a unified site plan and permitting process which is seamless and integrated. The consultants will be used to facilitate the "mapping" or flow-charting of a new process and legal assistance to draft the code revisions that will be necessary to implement these new procedures. There will be a significant amount of detailing new procedures and drafting code revisions including, but not limited to:

- reduce the 17 stages and plan sets while insuring that all required data is provided
- convert multiple application form from various departments
- adopt common review and comment timeframes for staff and applicants
- create a streamlined process for single-family homes
- review all codes and manuals to identify text amendments needed to implement new procedures

While the staff is capable of the complexities of this work, they do not have the time to focus fully on this while doing daily tasks. This is technical, legal, and time-consuming work that will require hours of collaboration, reinvention, and code drafting. Successful completion within the next year will only be possible if staff is supported and supplemented with outside resources.

74. Councilmember Newton (Discussion with City Manager 4/9/13)

Please provide background on the number and types of permits issued each year, including the relationship between of the number of permits to the number of FTEs assigned to the Inspection Services Division.

In the Inspection Services Division (ISD), there are two types of inspectors - Fire Codes and Construction Codes Inspectors (page 8-24, Table 8-66). The number of Fire Codes Inspectors has remained the same at 2.0 Full Time Equivalents (FTEs). The number of Construction Codes Inspectors has decreased from 5.0 FTEs to 4.0 FTEs. During the years of aggressive development, the City had 5.0 FTEs performing general inspections. In January 2011 (for the FY 2012 budget), ISD completed a reorganization of inspectors and plans reviewers that resulted in one Construction Codes Inspector position being converted into a Fire Code Plans Examiner position (page, 8-23, Table 8-62).

The type of inspections has also changed over the years. When Falls Grove and King Farm were being developed, there were far more inspections being performed on single family houses. These types of inspections took less time as they were not as complex and time consuming as today's inspections of the larger projects the City is now seeing. Currently, the Construction Codes Inspectors' workloads (See "Average

number of general inspections per FTE" workload measure on page 8-24, Table 8-65) are on the higher side of what is preferred. Should the number of inspections continue to increase, the City might be in a situation where an additional Construction Codes Inspector is needed.

75. Councilmember Newton (Discussion with City Manager 4/9/13)

Currently there is no easy way to contact an employee after normal business hours because the main phone line is not answered after 5:00 pm. What are some options that we might consider to give residents a way to contact employees directly after normal business hours?

Normal business hours at City Hall are Monday through Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm. Currently, if a resident wants to contact an employee after these hours he/she must know the employee's direct phone number.

In order to contact employees after hours, the Mayor and Council could consider directing staff to include a phone directory on the City's website. This directory could include the direct phone numbers of all department directors, division/cost center managers, and main department lines. Residents could then go to the City's website to obtain a direct phone number. There is no additional cost for this option; however, it would take staff time to create this online directory.

Another option would be to utilize the City's current phone system to create a staff directory that the caller could navigate by employee name. This method would be possible under the City's current phone system so there is no additional cost; however, similar to the online directory, it would take staff time to create this phone system directory.

A third option would be to hire a part-time regular or temporary employee to sit at the front desk after hours. This employee would be available to answer questions and forward calls if needed. The cost would range from \$15 to \$23 per hour (plus benefits if it is a part-time regular employee). Currently, when there is a night meeting at City Hall, there is a part-time regular employee that sits at the front desk. Another option to consider is to have this employee answer the main phone line. The only downside with this approach is that the front desk coverage would not be consistent from week to week, and would depend on the weekly meeting schedule.

An important consideration to all three approaches is that employees are generally not available outside of normal business hours to answer their phones. As a result, the caller will likely have to leave a voicemail that staff will return the following business day.

76. Councilmember Newton (Discussion with City Manager 4/9/13)

There is a need for City Hall to be open on Saturday morning so that residents can use the kiosk located in the lobby to pay citations. What does this involve?

Opening City Hall for several hours on Saturday would involve hiring a part-time regular or temporary employee to sit at the front desk. This employee would be available to answer questions if needed.

In lieu of adding a part-time regular or temporary employee, the Mayor and Council could consider adding an additional kiosk to the 24-hour operation's center of the police station. A resident could stop by at any time, day or night, to pay a citation using the kiosk. The downside to this approach is that there would be no one available to answer questions if needed.

The cost of an additional kiosk is approximately \$3,500.

77. Councilmember Hall (email 4/13/13)

(1.) Page 39; Senior Center Improvements: Will the emergency generator to be installed provide sufficient energy for use of the entire Senior Center as a cooling facility or as an otherwise fully-functional emergency shelter, or just select portions of it? How many persons can be accommodated under emergency generator power at the Senior Center, please?

The Senior Center generator should be able to power the whole building; however, due to the building's size, some of the A/C units may not be connected to the generator. The building can hold approximately 520 people, so it could be a "Warming and Charging Center" for that many people, and portions of the building could be a "Cooling Center" for approximately 300 people, depending on the capacity of the generator. The Senior Center cannot be used as a fully-functioning emergency shelter as it does not have shower facilities. It can be used as a day shelter but not overnight.

78. Councilmember Hall (email 4/13/13)

(2.) Pages 40-41; Swim and Fitness Center Improvements/Renovations: Emergency generator unavailability was an issue during last July's derecho. Should we perhaps be looking to add emergency generator capabilities to the proposed FY2014 CIP for this purpose? What would it cost? If there's an appetite for increased investment in this regard, what would the City Manager recommend, please?

Staff would need to hire a contractor to perform an engineering study and develop construction cost estimates to install electrical connections and switch gear necessary for connecting a generator at the Swim and Fitness Center. Staff believes that multiple generators would be needed to power the entire center. The cost of the actual generator construction would not be known until the engineering study was complete. The Swim and Fitness Center would be one of the staff's priority locations for an additional emergency generator.

79. Councilmember Hall (email 4/13/13)

(3.) Page 55; Pedestrian Safety Improvements: The proposed \$877,200 does not appear to include any of the required pedestrian safety investments to address identified projects in the JWMS environment, the former Stonestreet Bridge environment, or the Pumphrey's Funeral Home environment, unless "traffic calming at one high-accident location" on Falls Rd. and "[c]omplete Streets improvements on S. Stonestreet Ave." are intended to capture some of those. Could we get a bit more detail on what's included in the proposed FY2014 CIP, please? Could we likewise receive the City Manager's recommendations if the governing body were interested in investing an additional \$1 million or so to remedy those and other priority pedestrian safety challenges, please?

The proposed FY 2014 budget includes the following pedestrian and bicycle safety projects to enhance safety in the wider East Rockville area:

- Construct bicycle lanes and sidewalk along South Stonestreet Avenue adjacent to the Rockville Metro Station (\$100,000 design and \$440,000 construction).
- In conjunction with the above project, repave South Stonestreet Avenue and Park Road, including new pavement and pedestrian crosswalk markings (\$150,000).
- Capital Bikeshare - 19 dock station installations tentatively proposed on the east side of the Rockville Metrorail station entrance (equipment and installation equals \$57,000 and annual operating cost for the first year equals \$24,000).
- Assess and add new streetlights in the neighborhood as needed (\$20,000 to \$30,000 total) – the City Manager recommends an additional \$20,000 from HUR funds be allocated to address concerns addressed by the Mayor and Council at the meeting on April 15
- Construct sidewalk on Southlawn Lane between North Horners Lane and Gude Drive (\$14,000 design and \$300,000 construction).
- Additional East Rockville sidewalk requests (\$50,000 to \$100,000, if needed).

The aforementioned projects total approximately \$1.2 million. The projects take advantage of a variety of funding sources, which include a grant, developer funds, transportation demand management funds, speed camera funds, and regular capital project funds. It is important to note that the above costs are estimates; due to the wide mix of funding sources, some with specific limitations, there is little to no flexibility to substitute alternative projects. Despite this limitation, staff built in flexibility to the streetlight improvements and sidewalk projects, proposing to meet with East Rockville residents and business owners to prioritize the sidewalk and streetlight locations.

The proposed \$877,200 will mostly fund the South Stonestreet Avenue improvements (mentioned in the first bullet above) and pedestrian improvements in the Twinbrook area near the metro station. Funds appropriated for "traffic calming at one high-accident location" were partially used in FY 2013 to install the rapid flashing beacons on North Washington at Dawson's Market, and will also fund

a speed indicator sign to be installed on eastbound Maryland Avenue east of Julius West Middle School.

80. Councilmember Hall (email 4/13/13)

(4.) Page 59; Street Lighting Improvements: Apropos of Question 3, supra, this entry does not appear to include street lighting improvements in the S. Stonestreet corridor, for which "problems or safety issues have been identified" (See, "Description"; first sentence) during the course of the Stonestreet Bridge replacement discussion. How much more should be added to the FY2014 CIP to provide such improvements, please?

The FY 2014 budget includes a \$100,000 in the Street Lighting Improvements CIP project to install and upgrade streetlights in different neighborhoods, including a \$30,000 set aside for the East Rockville area.

Based on the discussion during the April 15 Mayor and Council worksession, \$20,000 will be added to this project (from HUR funds) to improve lighting at three different under-paths (at Park Road under the CSX bridge, First Street between MD355 and MD586, and South Stonestreet Avenue ramp leading to eastbound Veirs Mill Road). Staff will also communicate with East Rockville Citizens Association to ensure their streetlight concerns are met.

81. Councilmember Hall (email 4/13/13)

(5.) Page 83; Sewer Rehabilitation: What does the Project Snapshot depict, please?

This picture represents the "before" and "after" pictures of a manhole that was lined with an epoxy coated resin (similar to the cured-in-place lining process used in pipes). This was a manhole located in Woodley Gardens Park that was rehabilitated in FY 2011. The "before" picture depicts the presence of groundwater seeping into the manhole (the white deposits on the wall). Groundwater infiltration is excess flow entering the sanitary sewer system, which limits the overall wastewater flow capacity, increases treatment costs for the larger volume, and may result in sanitary sewer overflows. Reduction of infiltration into our sanitary sewer system is a primary goal of the sanitary sewer rehabilitation program. The "after" picture represents a successful rehabilitation of a leaking manhole.

82. Councilmember Hall (email 4/13/13)

(6.) Page 98; Vehicles for City Use: What is the number of hybrid or natural gas-powered vehicles in the City's inventory, please? What is the status of the City's vehicle-replacement effort to retire eligible gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles for higher-efficiency, less-polluting vehicles, in all classes, please?

There are no hybrid/natural gas vehicles in the City's fleet. The cost of hybrid vehicles is approximately 40% more than the current standard replacement, making them less cost effective than gas-powered vehicles. The diesel engine is still the most fuel efficient internal combustion engine. Over the past decade, regulations have been put in place requiring diesel engine manufacturers to produce engines

with increasingly lower emissions; every year, the manufacturers of both gas and diesel vehicles have produced more fuel efficient vehicles, so the City still lowers emissions and increases fuel efficiency when replacing older vehicles with newer gas and diesel vehicles.

City staff continues to monitor the alternative fuel market for possible City use. While natural gas seems to be promising, there are significant upfront costs involved, including possible modifications to the new fleet maintenance facility. Staff will continue to research what it would take to replace portions of its fleet with natural gas powered vehicles in order to determine the cost effectiveness of this new technology.

83. Councilmember Hall (email 4/13/13)

7. Page 14-39; Figure 14-11: Chase and Helping Hands are selected to receive as much as 14% less in FY2014, even though Table 14-129 makes clear that the need for their services is increasing. The \$3,400 cut to the Latino Outreach Program (LOP) is likewise remarkable, given that Table 14-129 forecasts a two-thirds increase in demand, and that Table 14-128 also demonstrates that the graduation rate has still not reached 50%. Having made a Mayor and Council determination last year to commit all CDBG funding to housing efforts, I wonder if we shouldn't also consider reallocating some of the \$595,240 in caregiver funding away from the RHE Family Fun Game Night, Hope Housing, and Horizon House (which got a 43% boost) to Chase and Helping Hands, and even the LOP, please? In the alternative, please assign to me the task of finding the \$7,900 needed to make Chase, Helping Hands, and the LOP whole, and I'll gladly do it, in the absence of a compelling reason to reduce the funding to those programs. I guess what I'm asking is: "Is there, in fact, a compelling reason to cut funding for Chase, Helping Hands, and the LOP, please?"

While the need for services has increased throughout the County, the City's caregiver grant funding was distributed according to the quality of the application, the number of Rockville residents served, and past performance. The goal of this grant program is to provide human services to Rockville residents; just because a program is meeting a regional need does not necessarily mean it is meeting that need for Rockville residents.

Both the community panel and the staff panel who reviewed the caregiver grant applications noted that the Chase Partnership House stated that it had served zero Rockville residents in FY 2012 and zero City residents in the first six months of FY 2013. The application spoke of program growth, but the figures provided failed to back that up. As this grant funding is set aside to help Rockville residents, the decision was made to reduce funding for this program since it has shown a decrease in service to Rockville residents.

The Helping Hands Shelter application was incomplete, and the budget submitted as part of its application indicated more revenues than expenses.

The Latino Outreach Program reported declining participation figures, so the decision was made to reduce funding in order to fund programs with increasing enrollment. This program's projected number of Rockville residents to be served in FY 2012 was 350, but the actual number served was 148.

84. Councilmember Hall (email 4/13/13)

(8.) Page 14-39; Figure 14-11: Thank you for preserving the REAP funding. As demonstrated in Table 14-122 and elsewhere, the need among our residents here is constant and growing. This is most appreciated.

Thank you. Yes, the REAP funding was proposed at \$60,000, which is made up of \$56,000 from the General Fund and \$4,000 from the Special Revenue Fund.

85. Councilmember Hall (email 4/13/13)

(9.) Page 14-40; Figure 14-12: The proposed contribution formula for the Rockville Scholarship Foundation (RSF) is, in my own view, unrealistic. The RSF is short 3 board members and has virtually no meaningful fundraising resources. The current proposal appears to me to do little more than to set them on a fool's errand, unfortunately. \$2,500 cannot sustain this longstanding City program (which actually helped to get one of my sisters through college 20 years ago). Here's an alternative thought: the Rockville Chamber of Commerce walked-away from its partnership with the City and the RSF two years ago, as we all know. I propose that the City increase its contribution to the RSF to \$5,000, contingent upon the Chamber's agreement to re-engage in this previously-mutually-rewarding trilateral partnership and to contribute the remaining \$5,000 for the RSF in FY2014, and also committing to re-partnering with the RSF and the City in succeeding years (my thanks to a fellow Councilpersonmember for the balanced wisdom of this approach). If the Chamber will do this, then I will commit to support the Chamber's \$20,000 request for the Rockville Rewards program, to which the Chamber also no longer provides any funding. I will commit to find the additional \$22,500 to fund this proposal in the FY2014 Operating Budget. Any thoughts, please?

Based on the proposed budget, the City would offer a \$2,500 base grant and match any contribution up to \$7,500. For example, if the Chamber were to re-engage in this partnership, and donate \$7,500 to the Foundation, then the City would give the Rockville Scholarship Foundation \$10,000 (\$2,500 base + \$7,500 to match the Chamber's \$7,500). This would equal a total of \$17,500 for the Foundation (\$10,000 from the City and \$7,500 from the Chamber). If the City will be the sole sponsor of the Foundation, then scholarships should be awarded only to City residents.

The City Manager is recommending this approach in order to get the Scholarship Foundation to re-engage the Chamber, or to engage one or more new sponsors. One important factor that we consider when evaluating grant applications is the fund raising efforts of the organizations and their reliance on the City to fully fund their program.

If a majority of the Mayor and Council would like to fund the Chamber’s Rockville Rewards program, then direction should be given to staff at the upcoming budget worksessions. The Chamber received \$20,000 for Rockville Rewards in FY 2013 and are requesting \$20,000 for FY 2014.

86. Councilmember Hall (email 4/13/13)

(10.) Page 14-40; Figure 14-12: Are there any figures on registrations or participation for the Rockville Science Center activities, please? I was unable to identify any information in Tab 14 of the Proposed FY2014 Operating Budget, but I may have missed it.

This level of detail is not included in the proposed FY 2014 budget; however, the figures below were taken from the Rockville Science Center’s FY 2014 grant application.

Science Center Reported Participation	FY12 Act.	FY13 Est.	FY14 Proj.
Number of Science Café events	11	16	20
Number of participants in monthly Science Café	660	880	960
Number of summer camps conducted	5	7	9
Number of students in summer camps	55	84	100
Number of robotics competition teams supported	3	9	9
Number of students in robotics competition teams	48	65	65
Number of Explorations! science outings	6	8	10
Number of participants in Explorations! science outings	89	160	180
Number of exhibits placed at local events	7	6	8
Number of visitors at local events with Science Center exhibits	2,600	2,000	3,000

87. Councilmember Moore (M&C meeting 4/15/13)

Please provide a comparison of CIP unfunded projects from the last several years.

Please see **ATTACHMENT C** for the summary of unfunded projects from FY 2009 through FY 2013. Since the recession, many projects were removed from the list because they did not focus on maintaining current infrastructure. This approach, combined with planned debt issues, reduced the total number and dollar amount of unfunded projects over the years.

88. Councilmember Moore (email 4/16/13)

Would it be prudent for us to start socking away money for the eventual major repairs to and/or replacement of our long-span bridges? Or do we envision issuing bonds to take care of that when the time arrives?

From staff’s perspective, it would be preferable to issue bonds for a significant long-term improvement project. Issuing bonds allows the costs to be spread over a longer-term period, which promotes intergenerational equity.

89. Councilmember Newton (phone 4/23/13)

What would it cost to increase the hours of the current Senior Outreach Worker from 20 to 30 hours per week, and what would it cost to increase from 20 to 40 hours per week?

The cost to increase the current 0.5 FTE (20 hours per week) Senior Outreach Worker to a 0.8 FTE (30 hours per week) would be approximately \$30,000, and the cost to increase this position to a 1.0 FTE (40 hours per week) would be approximately \$47,000. These amounts include increased salary and the cost for the most commonly elected benefits for which this position would be eligible.