

Program Listing Sheet
Mayor's Budget FY 2017

Department	Program Name	Program Cost	Overhead Costs	Total Costs	FTE's	Quadrant
ADOT	Bus Service - Fixed Routes	\$ 2,514,552.33	\$ 41,133.91	\$ 2,555,686.24	45.4	1
ADOT	ADA Complementary Paratransit	\$ 314,982.19	\$ 532,413.97	\$ 847,396.16	3.5	1
DNEP	Stormwater Quality Management	\$ 124,394.50	\$ 15,472.69	\$ 139,867.19	1.09	1
DNEP	Stormwater Management Permits & Inspections	\$ 215,091.16	\$ 28,595.04	\$ 243,686.20	2.06	1
DNEP	Urban Forestry	\$ 193,184.76	\$ 26,777.69	\$ 219,962.45	1.37	1
DNEP	Wastewater Pretreatment	\$ 139,319.21	\$ 22,060.94	\$ 161,380.15	1.03	1
DPW	Street Repair	\$ 907,348.04	\$ 155,519.64	\$ 1,062,867.68	10.2	1
DPW	Building Maintenance	\$ 1,807,722.28	\$ 309,036.62	\$ 2,116,758.90	5.26	1
DPW	Fleet Management & Maintenance (inc. ADOT)	\$ 2,091,783.13	\$ 291,988.02	\$ 2,383,771.15	14	1
DPW	Water Reclamation Facility	\$ 3,854,294.05	\$ 843,912.01	\$ 4,698,206.06	0	1
DPW	Sewer Collection	\$ 1,535,997.29	\$ 244,055.94	\$ 1,780,053.23	6.34	1
DPW	Water Plant	\$ 2,177,062.80	\$ 394,251.00	\$ 2,571,313.80	13.63	1
DPW	Water Distribution	\$ 1,494,277.54	\$ 306,707.21	\$ 1,800,984.75	14.8	1
DPW	Stormdrain Maintenance & Repair	\$ 342,939.70	\$ 51,687.53	\$ 394,627.23	3.17	1
DPW	Snow & Ice Removal	\$ 85,977.19	\$ 11,045.40	\$ 97,022.59	0	1
DPW	Sidewalk Repair	\$ 601,560.37	\$ 98,132.69	\$ 699,693.06	6.6	1
DPW	Flood Management Program	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		1
Fire	Emergency Medical Services (EMS)	\$ 9,791,177.64	\$ 1,162,128.10	\$ 10,953,305.74	81.21	1
Fire	Fire Suppression	\$ 3,393,799.19	\$ 440,218.85	\$ 3,834,018.04	24.47	1
Mayor's Office	Special Projects	\$ 342,009.32	\$ 72,363.23	\$ 414,372.55	1	1
Planning & Zoning	Historic Preservation	\$ 432,324.18	\$ 61,146.36	\$ 493,470.54	2.73	1
Planning & Zoning	Current Planning	\$ 633,648.50	\$ 65,681.64	\$ 699,330.14	4.2	1
Planning & Zoning	Economic Development	\$ 397,547.11	\$ 57,857.46	\$ 455,404.57	2.2	1
Police	Patrol	\$ 6,866,472.30	\$ 855,195.87	\$ 7,721,668.17	60.2	1
Police	Special Operations	\$ 2,745,236.63	\$ 321,901.73	\$ 3,067,138.36	22	1
Police	Intelligence	\$ 462,080.72	\$ 58,630.94	\$ 520,711.66	4	1
Police	Investigations	\$ 1,385,397.57	\$ 171,162.69	\$ 1,556,560.26	11.7	1
Recreation & Parks	Pip Moyer - Facility Operations	\$ 509,848.57	\$ 132,598.82	\$ 642,447.39	8.22	1
Recreation & Parks	Pip Moyer - Member Services	\$ 227,744.44	\$ 63,790.89	\$ 291,535.33	5.76	1
Recreation & Parks	Parks Maintenance	\$ 1,448,592.43	\$ 251,972.32	\$ 1,700,564.75	15.74	1
Recreation & Parks	Stanton Center	\$ 484,870.29	\$ 112,915.90	\$ 597,786.19	9.4	1
Recreation & Parks	Operate City Dock	\$ 306,506.04	\$ 77,742.23	\$ 384,248.27	5.42	1
Recreation & Parks	Operate & Supervise City Waters	\$ 200,454.97	\$ 25,950.81	\$ 226,405.78	1.6	1
Sub-Total Quadrant 1		\$ 48,028,196.44	\$ 7,304,048.14	\$ 55,332,244.58	388.30	

Program Listing Sheet
Mayor's Budget FY 2017

Department	Program Name	Program Cost	Overhead Costs	Total Costs	FTE's	Quadrant
ADOT	Garages	\$ 1,769,523.00	\$ 359,831.30	\$ 2,129,354.30	0	2
ADOT	Parking Operations	\$ 708,338.48	\$ 249,303.72	\$ 957,642.20	9.6	2
ADOT	Parking Meter Collections & Maintenance	\$ 192,042.41	\$ 66,903.84	\$ 258,946.25	2.1	2
ADOT	Taxi Management	\$ 75,849.80	\$ 8,225.98	\$ 84,075.78	0.6	2
DNEP	Port Wardens	\$ 33,068.23	\$ 2,653.82	\$ 35,722.05	0.22	2
DNEP	Plans Review	\$ 392,944.98	\$ 48,926.72	\$ 441,871.70	3.67	2
DNEP	Inspections	\$ 802,810.98	\$ 106,498.62	\$ 909,309.60	7.8	2
DNEP	Commerical Property Enforcement	\$ 139,299.83	\$ 16,552.28	\$ 155,852.11	1.18	2
DPW	Residential Refuse & Yard Waste	\$ 1,618,661.82	\$ 309,355.51	\$ 1,928,017.33	2.11	2
DPW	Curbside Recycling	\$ 322,262.86	\$ 63,560.90	\$ 385,823.76	0	2
DPW	Capital Project Management	\$ 648,790.19	\$ 68,390.12	\$ 717,180.31	3.7	2
DPW	Utilities Engineering	\$ 61,945.76	\$ 10,314.39	\$ 72,260.15	0.53	2
DPW	Traffic Engineering	\$ 143,772.79	\$ 12,369.60	\$ 156,142.39	0.53	2
DPW	Traffic Control & Maintenance	\$ 323,096.66	\$ 53,859.95	\$ 376,956.61	3.85	2
Fire	Special Operations	\$ 1,558,901.11	\$ 169,918.24	\$ 1,728,819.35	10.67	2
Fire	Code Enforcement	\$ 1,282,721.41	\$ 156,231.59	\$ 1,438,953.00	11.05	2
Fire	Plans Review	\$ 104,890.05	\$ 13,141.51	\$ 118,031.56	0.50	2
Fire	Emergency Management	\$ 786,968.00	\$ 62,200.23	\$ 849,168.23	4.8	2
Planning & Zoning	Comprehensive Planning	\$ 318,810.36	\$ 44,945.66	\$ 363,756.02	1.2	2
Police	Support Services	\$ 2,858,139.50	\$ 358,023.94	\$ 3,216,163.44	24.5	2
Police	Crime Scene Services	\$ 619,004.84	\$ 48,958.83	\$ 667,963.67	5.5	2
Police	Communications	\$ 1,290,531.19	\$ 187,002.42	\$ 1,477,533.61	13.7	2
Police	Community Relations	\$ 908,009.14	\$ 112,064.66	\$ 1,020,073.80	7.9	2
Recreation & Parks	Operate Boat Ramps	\$ 13,129.96	\$ 2,083.89	\$ 15,213.85	0.17	2
	Sub-Total Quadrant 2	\$ 16,973,513.35	\$ 2,531,317.72	\$ 19,504,831.07	115.88	

Program Listing Sheet
Mayor's Budget FY 2017

Department	Program Name	Program Cost	Overhead Costs	Total Costs	FTE's	Quadrant
DNEP	Private Property Enforcement	\$ 139,557.98	\$ 23,361.63	\$ 162,919.61	1.7	3
DNEP	Rental Licensing	\$ 370,208.75	\$ 80,746.99	\$ 450,955.74	3.64	3
DNEP	ABC Inspections	\$ 12,796.64	\$ 29,103.33	\$ 41,899.97	0.24	3
DPW	Market House	\$ 218,183.81	\$ 31,841.45	\$ 250,025.26	0	3
DPW	PW Inspections	\$ 128,642.44	\$ 15,743.34	\$ 144,385.78	1.06	3
Fire	Public Education/Community Relations	\$ 40,547.87	\$ 4,902.00	\$ 45,449.87	0.3	3
Planning & Zoning	Community Programs and Grant Administration	\$ 200,481.07	\$ 21,303.71	\$ 221,784.78	1.2	3
Police	Drug Enforcement Unit	\$ 962,794.77	\$ 111,789.56	\$ 1,074,584.33	7.4	3
Police	Maintenance	\$ 255,294.02	\$ 26,622.80	\$ 281,916.82	1.6	3
Recreation & Parks	Fitness & Wellness	\$ 287,009.81	\$ 50,438.07	\$ 337,447.88	3.17	3
Recreation & Parks	Latchkey	\$ 350,688.51	\$ 84,332.22	\$ 435,020.73	7.47	3
Recreation & Parks	Sports	\$ 274,889.14	\$ 55,692.95	\$ 330,582.09	2.6	3
Recreation & Parks	Camps & Classes	\$ 411,113.77	\$ 88,702.91	\$ 499,816.68	7.5	3
Recreation & Parks	Operate Pumpout Boat	\$ 62,272.55	\$ 10,846.46	\$ 73,119.01	0.75	3
	Sub-Total Quadrant 3	\$ 3,714,481.13	\$ 635,427.42	\$ 4,349,908.55	38.63	
DPW	Streetscape Maintenance	\$ 1,932,723.62	\$ 304,857.41	\$ 2,237,581.03	19.4	4
DPW	Maps and Records	\$ 174,057.04	\$ 23,344.01	\$ 197,401.05	1.59	4
Recreation & Parks	Employee Wellness	\$ 15,414.49	\$ 6,125.42	\$ 21,539.91	0.5	4
Recreation & Parks	Truxton Park Pool	\$ 122,850.55	\$ 33,914.61	\$ 156,765.16	2.82	4
Recreation & Parks	Operate Chandler Dock	\$ 63,493.83	\$ 14,464.47	\$ 77,958.30	0.6	4
	Sub-Total Quadrant 4	\$ 2,308,539.53	\$ 382,705.92	\$ 2,691,245.45	24.91	
ADOT	Grants and Administration	\$ 548,722.50	\$ 64,760.00	\$ 613,482.50	3.4	Spread over ADOT
	Sub-Total Unassigned	\$ 548,722.50	\$ 64,760.00	\$ 613,482.50	3.40	
	Grand Total	\$ 71,573,452.95	\$ 10,918,259.20	\$ 82,491,712.15	571.12	

Annapolis Department of Transportation	FTE's	Ranking
ADA Complimentary Paratransit	3.5	1
Program Description: ADA paratransit provides curb-to-curb transit service for persons whose disabilities prevent them from using fixed route bus service, as required by the Federal Legislation (ADA 1990). ADA paratransit offers a comparable level of service to that provided by regular bus service. The paratransit service offered by Annapolis Transit is origin-to-destination service for people with disabilities unable to ride fixed route bus service. Service is curb-to-curb within 3/4 mile of any fixed route service and is for any trip purpose.		# of Units Provided
		5129 pass. trips
Performance Measures		
1. Revenue hours		
2. Ridership		
3. Complaints		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
ADA Act of 1990; 49 Code of Federal Regulations							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
General public with disabilities							
Numbers Served							
6204 service hours							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?							
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	314,982.19
Overhead	41,133.91
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	356,116.10
Less Grants	198,382.00
Total Net Cost	157,734.10

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	198,382.00
Total Sources	198,382.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	314,982.19
Overhead	41,133.91
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	356,116.10
Net Cost Recovery	(157,734.10)

Unit Cost	69.43
-----------	-------

Annapolis Department of Transportation								FTE's	Ranking
Bus Service - Fixed Route								45.4	1
Program Description: Program focuses on efficient operation of reliable, safe, affordable, convenient and accessible bus transportation to effectively meet the needs of people who live, work and visit Annapolis and its immediate County surroundings. It is essential to the economic and social quality of life of all citizens of Annapolis. Program also provides critical response in emergencies. City wide bus transportation minimizes traffic congestion and reduces air pollution.									# of Units Provided
									592,230 pass. trips
Performance Measures									
1. Revenue Hours									
2. Ridership									
3. Percent on-time performance									

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	2,514,552.33
Overhead	532,413.97
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	3,046,966.30
Less Grants	1,040,243.00
Total Net Cost	2,006,723.30
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	585,885.02
Grants	1,040,243.00
Total Sources	1,626,128.02
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	2,514,552.33
Overhead	532,413.97
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	3,046,966.30
Net Cost Recovery	(1,420,838.28)

Unit Cost	5.14
-----------	------

Annapolis Department of Transportation	FTE's	Ranking
Parking Meter Collection and Maintenance	2.1	2
Program Description This program collects and deposits cash receipts from various locations; collects, sorts and deposits monies from parking meters and transit fare cans. Program provides repair and maintenance for 400 parking meters and 5 parking kiosks. On average, up to 12 parking meters/kiosks are repaired daily due to credit card and other foreign objects getting stuck in meters. Employees in this program respond to customer complaints in reference to parking meter malfunctions.		# of Units Provided
		26,399
Performance Measures 1. Number of Complaints 2. units repaid on time.		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, businesses, employees, visitors							
Numbers Served							
			400 meters/ 5 kiosks				
Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
				X			
Lead Department If NO, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
			X				
External Provider of Service If YES, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
				X			
Outsource If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
			X				
Cost Recovery If YES, How much?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
				X			
Other information This program to be outsourced effective July 2016.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	192,042.41
Overhead	66,903.84
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	258,946.25
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	258,946.25
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	-
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	192,042.41
Overhead	66,903.84
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	258,946.25
Net Cost Recovery	(258,946.25)
Unit Cost	9.81

Annapolis Department of Transportation								FTE's	Ranking
Parking Operations								9.6	2
Program Description: This program provides planning, developing and managing parking activities within the City. The enforcement of parking code for on-street parking and residential parking are the main activities of this program. During special events, parking enforcement officers assist with parking control. The administrative component focuses on responding to customer concerns about parking parking citation adjustments and defending the city in court proceedings involving parking citations.									# of Units Provided
									26,399
Performance Measures									
1. Number of complaints									
2. Number of citations issued/month									
3. Revenue/month									

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	708,338.48
Overhead	249,303.72
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	957,642.20
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	957,642.20
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	2,375,444.63
Grants	
Total Sources	2,375,444.63
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	708,338.48
Overhead	249,303.72
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	957,642.20
Net Cost Recovery	1,417,802.43

Unit Cost	36.28
-----------	-------

Annapolis Department of Transportation								FTE's	Ranking																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Taxi Management								0.6	2																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Program Description This is inspection and enforcement work covering ground transportation services operating within the City of Annapolis. This program is to ensure hat all taxicab owners and divers, their vehicles and operations comply with all City and State laws and ordinances. Inspections of taxicabs for cleanliness, mechanical safety is also a funcion of this program. The taxi manager or insector performs inspections on a pre-notice or random basis and also investigates complaints.									# of Units Provided																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
									250 Taxicabs																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Performance Measures: 1. Customer complaints 2. Percent meter compliance.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
<table><tr><th></th><th>Federal</th><th>State</th><th>County</th><th>Charter</th><th>Code</th><th>Grant</th><th>Discretion</th></tr><tr><td>Mandated? (Y/N)</td><td>N</td><td>N</td><td>N</td><td>N</td><td>Y</td><td>N</td><td>N</td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">Mandate Reference(s)</td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">City Code 7.48</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Internal</td><td>External</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>Customer Type (Y/N)</td><td></td><td></td><td>N</td><td>Y</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>Program Users</td><td colspan="7">Taxi Drivers and owners</td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">Transit Operations</td></tr><tr><td>Numbers Served</td><td colspan="3"></td><td>250</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>YES</td><td>NO</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>Other Dept's Provide Service</td><td colspan="3"></td><td>X</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>If YES, Who?</td><td colspan="3">DPW</td><td colspan="4"></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>YES</td><td>NO</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>Lead Department</td><td colspan="3"></td><td>X</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>If NO, Who?</td><td colspan="7"></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>YES</td><td>NO</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>External Provider of Service</td><td colspan="3"></td><td>X</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>If YES, Who?</td><td colspan="7"></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>YES</td><td>NO</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>Outsource</td><td colspan="3"></td><td>X</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>If YES, Who? If NO, Why?</td><td colspan="3">Private providers</td><td colspan="4"></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>YES</td><td>NO</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>Cost Recovery</td><td colspan="3"></td><td>X</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>If YES, How much?</td><td colspan="7"></td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">Other information</td></tr></table>									Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion	Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Mandate Reference(s)								City Code 7.48											Internal	External				Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y				Program Users	Taxi Drivers and owners							Transit Operations								Numbers Served				250							YES	NO				Other Dept's Provide Service				X				If YES, Who?	DPW										YES	NO				Lead Department				X				If NO, Who?											YES	NO				External Provider of Service				X				If YES, Who?											YES	NO				Outsource				X				If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	Private providers										YES	NO				Cost Recovery				X				If YES, How much?								Other information								<table><tr><th colspan="2">BUDGETARY ANALYSIS</th></tr><tr><td>Program Cost</td><td>75,849.80</td></tr><tr><td>Overhead</td><td>8,225.98</td></tr><tr><td>Capital Overhead</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>DPW Admin</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Total Cost</td><td>84,075.78</td></tr><tr><td>Less Grants</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Total Net Cost</td><td>84,075.78</td></tr></table> <table><tr><th colspan="2">COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS</th></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Sources of Funds</td></tr><tr><td>Program Fees</td><td>47,728.35</td></tr><tr><td>Grants</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Total Sources</td><td>47,728.35</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Uses of Funds</td></tr><tr><td>Operational Expenses</td><td>75,849.80</td></tr><tr><td>Overhead</td><td>8,225.98</td></tr><tr><td>Capital Overhead</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>DPW Admin</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Total Uses of Funds</td><td>84,075.78</td></tr><tr><td>Net Cost Recovery</td><td>(36,347.43)</td></tr></table> <table><tr><td>Unit Cost</td><td>336.30</td></tr></table>		BUDGETARY ANALYSIS		Program Cost	75,849.80	Overhead	8,225.98	Capital Overhead		DPW Admin		Total Cost	84,075.78	Less Grants		Total Net Cost	84,075.78	COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS		Sources of Funds		Program Fees	47,728.35	Grants		Total Sources	47,728.35	Uses of Funds		Operational Expenses	75,849.80	Overhead	8,225.98	Capital Overhead		DPW Admin		Total Uses of Funds	84,075.78	Net Cost Recovery	(36,347.43)	Unit Cost	336.30
	Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Mandate Reference(s)																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
City Code 7.48																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
			Internal	External																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
Program Users	Taxi Drivers and owners																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
Transit Operations																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Numbers Served				250																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
Other Dept's Provide Service				X																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
If YES, Who?	DPW																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
Lead Department				X																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
If NO, Who?																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
External Provider of Service				X																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
If YES, Who?																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
Outsource				X																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	Private providers																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
Cost Recovery				X																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
If YES, How much?																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Other information																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
BUDGETARY ANALYSIS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Program Cost	75,849.80																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
Overhead	8,225.98																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
Capital Overhead																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
DPW Admin																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Total Cost	84,075.78																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
Less Grants																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Total Net Cost	84,075.78																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Sources of Funds																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Program Fees	47,728.35																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
Grants																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Total Sources	47,728.35																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
Uses of Funds																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Operational Expenses	75,849.80																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
Overhead	8,225.98																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
Capital Overhead																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
DPW Admin																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Total Uses of Funds	84,075.78																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
Net Cost Recovery	(36,347.43)																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										
Unit Cost	336.30																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										

Neighborhood & Environmental Programs	FTE's	Ranking
Stormwater Management Permits & Inspections	2.06	1
Under this program, proposed developments and building projects requiring a grading permit are reviewed and construction sites are inspected for compliance with City Code 17.10, Stormwater Management, and City Code 17.08, Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control. This program is also responsible for the coordination of the receipt, tracking and release of grading bonds and stormwater management agreements. Work under this program is performed by the stormwater engineer plans reviewer and the environmental compliance inspector with support from supervisory and administrative staff.		# of Units Provided
Performance Measures		
Percentage for grading permits inspected biweekly for sediment and erosion control compliance.		
Number of plans reviewed within target review times.		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)	17.10 & 17.08						
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Applicants for grading permits. Residents and Businesses.							
Numbers Serviced							
Permits: 45 Inspections: 439 Plans Review: 386							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service			x				
If YES, Who?		DPW					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			x				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			x				
If YES, Who?		Anne Arundel County Soil Conservation					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			x				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?		If privatized or taken over by county.					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			x				
If YES, How much?		FY 2015 \$67,855.35					
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	215,091.16
Overhead	28,595.04
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	243,686.20
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	243,686.20
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees FY15	67,855.35
Grants	
Total Sources	67,855.35
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	215,091.16
Overhead	28,595.04
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	243,686.20
Net Cost Recovery	(175,830.85)
Unit Cost	

Neighborhood & Environmental Programs	FTE's	Ranking
Stormwater Quality Management	1.09	1
<p>This program is responsible for the City's compliance with mandates of the EPA's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) programs and the City's Watershed Implementation Plan in response to the EPA mandated stormwater nutrient reduction goals.</p> <p>Activities under this program include, but are not limited to, coordination of all major stormwater quality projects done by the City and our non-profit partners, education and inspection for compliance with pollution prevention requirements, tracking and reporting of NPDES and MS4 requirements and tri-annual inspections of all stormwater facilities in the City. The director, chief of environmental programs, environmental program coordinator and environmental compliance inspector are responsible for the activities under this program.</p> <p>programs and the City's Watershed Improvement Plan in response to the EPA mandated stormwater nutrient reduction goals.</p> <p>Performance Measures</p>		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users	City Residents						
Numbers Serviced							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service		x					
If YES, Who?		DPW					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department		x					
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service				x			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				x			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery				x			
If YES, How much?							
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	124,394.50
Overhead	15,472.69
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	139,867.19
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	139,867.19
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	124,394.50
Overhead	15,472.69
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	139,867.19
Net Cost Recovery	(139,867.19)

Unit Cost	
-----------	--

Neighborhood & Environmental Programs	FTE's	Ranking
Urban Forestry	1.37	1
<p>This program provides for the care, maintenance and planting of trees owned by the city pursuant to City Code 14.12, Trees. This includes trees in the city right-of-way and trees on city property, including parks. These services are provided by contractors overseen by the city's arborist. The inspection of tree related complaints and coordination with BGE about tree pruning are also included in this program.</p> <p>This program also provides for the review of tree removal permits for private trees adjacent to the right-of-way and all proposed development, building and grading activities for compliance with City Code 17.09, Trees in Development Areas, and the Forest Conservation Act.</p>		# of Units Provided
<p>Performance Measures</p> <p>Respond to and initiate action to 100% of hazardous tree complaints within 24 hours of discovery.</p> <p>Number of plan reviews completed within their target review times.</p>		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	Y	N		Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)	14.12 & 17.09						
	<u>Internal</u>		<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)	Y		Y				
Program Users	Projects under FCA review, tree removal permits, trees pruned, planted, hazard, or removed.						
Numbers Serviced	Reviews: 223 Permits Issued: 36						
Other Dept's Provide Service	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
If YES, Who?	P&Z		X				
Lead Department	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
If NO, Who?	X						
External Provider of Service	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
If YES, Who?							
Outsource	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	X						
Cost Recovery	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
If YES, How much?	\$8,430.00						
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	193,184.76
Overhead	26,777.69
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	219,962.45
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	219,962.45
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	8,430.00
Grants	
Total Sources	8,430.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	193,184.76
Overhead	26,777.69
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	219,962.45
Net Cost Recovery	(211,532.45)

Unit Cost	
-----------	--

Neighborhood & Environmental Programs	FTE's	Ranking
Wastewater/ Pretreatment	1.03	1
This program provides for the review of proposed commercial permits, continuous permit and monitoring of sewer users for high strength and or prohibited sanitary sewer discharges for compliance with City Code 16.16, Sewer Service. This program is mandated by the EPA’s Clean Water Act. Under this program, commercial establishments with sanitary waste discharges, other than domestic, have continuous permits and their wastewater is test two to four times per year by a contracted laboratory. Staff actively monitors, permits and bills approximately 350 commercial accounts under this program, including the Naval Academy.		# of Units Provided
		325 Permits
Performance Measures		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users	Certain Businesses						
Numbers Served	325 Permits						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?				X			
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department If NO, Who?			X				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service If YES, Who?			X				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			X				
			Yes, if privatized. Cost could be higher.				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery If YES, How much?			x				
			\$49,160 Discharge Permits				
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	139,319.21
Overhead	22,060.94
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	161,380.15
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	161,380.15
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees FY 2015	49,160.00
Grants	
Total Sources	49,160.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	139,319.21
Overhead	22,060.94
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	161,380.15
Net Cost Recovery	(112,220.15)

Unit Cost	501.64
-----------	--------

Neighborhood & Environmental Programs	FTE's	Ranking
Commercial Property Enforcement	1.18	2
This program covers the permit review and inspection for zoning requirements & enforcement, administers use and occupancy (U&O) inspections and issues licenses. The zoning enforcement inspector is responsible for coordinating the opening of every business in the City. This inspector works as an ombudsman for commercial permit applicants focusing on small business ventures, providing them personal direction and information sharing regarding each step of business development for prospective site review, permit application to use and occupancy.		# of Units Provided
		112 U & O Inspections
Performance Measures Number of new or expanded businesses. Number of pre-application meetings held.		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	Y	Y		Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users	Businesses						
Numbers Served							
	112 U & O Inspections						
Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?			X				
			FMO & PZ				
Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If NO, Who?			X				
External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				X			
Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			City has the most interest in seeing that we help our businesses through the permit process.				
Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, How much?			X				
\$19,475							
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	139,299.83
Overhead	16,552.28
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	155,852.11
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	155,852.11
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees FY2015	19,475.00
Grants	
Total Sources	19,475.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	139,299.83
Overhead	16,552.28
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	155,852.11
Net Cost Recovery	(136,377.11)
Unit Cost	1,411.30

Neighborhood & Environmental Programs	FTE's	Ranking
Inspections	7.8	2
The inspections program under the DNEP budget covers the inspection of projects for compliance with the Building, Electrical, Plumbing, Mechanical, Energy, ADA, Green Building and Life Safety Codes. Six inspectors (3 building, 1 electrical, 1 mechanical/life safety, 1 plumbing) inspect construction projects to ensure that the projects are built according to their approved plans. DNEP inspectors are also responsible for determining the fitness for occupancy of buildings following structural damage caused by water, fire or falling trees. In addition to their regular duties, every inspector (including the property maintenance inspectors) serve in an on-call rotation for emergency property damage assessment.		# of Units Provided
		8757 Inspections
Performance Measures		
Number of Inspections Conducted		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	Y	Y		Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Businesses, Residents and City projects.							
Numbers Served							
Inspections: 8757							
Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				X			
Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If NO, Who?			X				
External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				X			
Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, How much?			\$490,982.02	X			
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	802,810.98
Overhead	106,498.62
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	909,309.60
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	909,309.60
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	480,982.02
Grants	
Total Sources	480,982.02
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	802,810.98
Overhead	106,498.62
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	909,309.60
Net Cost Recovery	(428,327.58)

Unit Cost	105.47
-----------	--------

Neighborhood & Environmental Programs	FTE's	Ranking
Plans Review	3.67	2
The plans review element of the DNEP budget receives permit applications, completes permit review and issues Building, Electrical, Plumbing, Mechanical, Fence, Vendor, Fence and other permits. Plans are reviewed by the architectural plans reviewer and all of the building and trade (plumbing, electrical, mechanical) inspectors. DNEP administrative staff serve as the administrators for the all the permits issued by the department and the Fire Marshal's Office.		# of Units Provided
Performance Measures		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	Y	Y		Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)		Y	Y	Y			
Program Users							
Businesses, Residents and City projects.							
Numbers Serviced							
Issued Permits: 3771 Plan Reviews: 1662							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service			X				
If YES, Who?		P&Z, FMO, & DPW					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			X				
			In the past some of the permits were reviewed by a third party. Cost were higher and not available up front. Reviews also took longer.				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?		\$241,826.97					
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	392,944.98
Overhead	48,926.72
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	441,871.70
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	441,871.70
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees FY 2015	241,826.97
Grants	-
Total Sources	241,826.97
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	392,944.98
Overhead	48,926.72
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	441,871.70
Net Cost Recovery	(200,044.73)

Unit Cost

Neighborhood & Environmental Programs	FTE's	Ranking
Port Wardens	0.22	2
<p>The authority of the Board of Port Wardens is established by City Code, Title 15, Harbors and Waterfront Areas. The Port Wardens regulate the placement, erection and construction of structures and other barriers within or on the waters of the city. Applications for marine construction are reviewed by staff for regulatory compliance and placed on a monthly hearing agenda for the Board’s review. Primary staff support is provided by the Chief of Environmental Programs, with assistance by the Office of the Harbormaster.</p> <p>There are five Board members appointed by the City Council for three year terms. The Board typically reviews 30 – 40 applications annually over 8 – 10 hearings. They also review enforcement actions taken by the Harbormaster, annual mooring applications, temporary permits for boat shows, and conceptual plans for future hearing applications.</p>	# of Units Provided	
<p>Performance Measures</p> <p>Number of scheduled hearings for which there is a quorum.</p> <p>Attendance by each Board Member.</p> <p>Number of applications reviewed.</p>		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
Title 15							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Businesses, Residents and City projects.							
Numbers Serviced							
Issued Permits: Maritime: 22 Port Wardens: 16							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service			X				
If YES, Who?		P&Z & Harbor Master					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service							
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
			Would need to investigate if these can be done by another jurisdiction that is not responsible for City's compliance.				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?		\$11,678.76					
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	33,068.23
Overhead	3,653.82
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	36,722.05
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	36,722.05
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees FY2015	11,678.76
Grants	
Total Sources	11,678.76
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	33,068.23
Overhead	3,653.82
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	36,722.05
Net Cost Recovery	(25,043.29)

Unit Cost

Neighborhood & Environmental Programs	FTE's	Ranking
ABC Inspections	0.24	3
Businesses holding Alcoholic Beverage Licenses as per City Code Section 7.12. are inspected twice a year under this program. Inspections are conducted for compliance with alcoholic beverage license, property maintenance and life-safety code requirements. Inspections are conducted by the after hours inspector or by a property maintenance inspector if the after hours inspector position is vacant.		# of Units Provided
		144 <i>Inspections</i>
Performance Measures Number of inspections conducted. Number of correction notices issued.		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	Y	N		Y	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
7.12							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)				X			
Program Users							
Numbers Served							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department				X			
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service							
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery				X			
If YES, How much?							
Other information							
DNEP does not collect fees for the inspection. However, the City Clerk's office collects a fee for the licensing.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS		
Program Cost		12,796.64
Overhead		29,103.33
Capital Overhead		
DPW Admin		
Total Cost		41,899.97
Less Grants		
Total Net Cost		41,899.97
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS		
Sources of Funds		
Program Fees		
Grants		
Total Sources		-
Uses of Funds		
Operational Expenses		12,796.64
Overhead		29,103.33
Capital Overhead		
DPW Admin		
Total Uses of Funds		41,899.97
Net Cost Recovery		(41,899.97)

Unit Cost	293.70
-----------	--------

Neighborhood & Environmental Programs	FTE's	Ranking
Private Property Enforcement	1.7	3
The four inspectors, three property maintenance and one after hours inspector, investigate complaints and conduct inspections related to residential and commercial property maintenance under City Code 17.40 and 17.48 and the International Property Maintenance Code. The inspectors under this program issue correction notices for violation, citations with fines and represents DNEP in court. The inspections, mostly exterior, are conducted throughout the city sometimes in response to complaints.		# of Units Provided
		1102 Cases
Performance Measures		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N		Y	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
17.40 & 17.48							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, visitors, businesses, landlords & tenants.							
Numbers Serviced							
1102 Cases		403 Complaints					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource							
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?		\$30,270.00					
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	139,557.98
Overhead	23,361.63
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	162,919.61
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	162,919.61
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	30,270.00
Grants	
Total Sources	30,270.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	139,557.98
Overhead	23,361.63
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	162,919.61
Net Cost Recovery	(132,649.61)
Unit Cost	150.37

Neighborhood & Environmental Programs	FTE's	Ranking
Rental Licensing	3.64	3
Under this program, DNEP licenses and inspects approximately 7500 rental properties in the City per city code section 17.44, the International Property Maintenance Code. This program covers single family homes, multifamily units, apartment complexes and hotels. With the exception of approved apartment complexes, most units are licensed and inspected annually. As part of the licensing process, the Maryland Department of Environment requires that the City collect lead compliance information for all rentals built before 1978. Properties found to be not in compliance with the city code are issued correction notices. Citations with fines are issued if not corrected. Three property maintenance inspectors conduct the inspections and code enforcement under this program and an administrative staff person handles application processing. During the FY16 the program will begin inspections of 750 Housing Authority of City of Annapolis units.		# of Units Provided
		7716 Rental Units
Performance Measures Number of inspections conducted. Number of correction notices issued.		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N		Y	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
17.44							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, Landlords, tenants, Housing Authority & Businesses.							
Numbers Serviced							
7716 Units							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource							
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery							
If YES, How much?		\$773,825					
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	370,208.75
Overhead	80,746.99
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	450,955.74
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	450,955.74
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees FY 2015	773,825.00
Grants	
Total Sources	773,825.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	370,208.75
Overhead	80,746.99
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	450,955.74
Net Cost Recovery	322,869.26

Unit Cost	59.29
-----------	-------

Department of Public Works		FTE's	Ranking
Building Maintenance		5.26	1
This program provides for the maintenance and repair of all 203,638 square feet of City buildings and facilities. The object is to keep the buildings in a safe and operable condition.		# of Units Provided	
		203,638 sq ft	
Performance Measures 1. Work orders completed 2. Janitorial cost per square feet of building space 3. Energy cost per square feet of building space			

	Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s) Charter: Art. VI, Sct 10 b Code: 2.40.30							
			Internal	External			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	N			
Program Users	City Staff						
Numbers Served	625 City employees						
Other Dept's Provide Service			YES	NO			
If YES, Who?	Rec & Parks						
Lead Department			YES	NO			
If NO, Who?							
External Provider of Service			YES	NO			
If YES, Who?	Contractors						
Outsource			YES	NO			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	A significant portion of the building maintenance work is performed by contractors. Of the \$1.755 million total budget, only \$530,000 (30%) is for salaries. The balance is for contracted services and materials/supplies.						
Cost Recovery			YES	NO			
If YES, How much?	X						
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	1,738,607.99
Overhead	309,036.62
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	69,114.29
Total Cost	2,116,758.90
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	2,116,758.90

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	1,738,607.99
Overhead	309,036.62
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	69,114.29
Total Uses of Funds	2,116,758.90
Net Cost Recovery	(2,116,758.90)

Unit Cost	10.39
-----------	-------

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Fleet Management and Maintenance	14	1
This program provides for the management, maintenance and repair of all 309 City vehicles. The object is to economically keep the vehicles in a safe and operable condition.		# of Units Provided
		309 vehicles
Performance Measures		
1. PM-to-Repair ratio		
2. Number of road calls		
3. Average miles per gallon for the fleet		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Code: 2.40.30							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	N			
Program Users							
City employees							
Numbers Serviced							
625 City employees							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?	Private garages, Government agencies (State and County)						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			X				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	A function such as parts management could be outsourced after fleet consolidation is completed.						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?	A significant portion of ADOT fleet maintenance costs is recoverable from MTA.						
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	1,145,570.83
Overhead	172,140.81
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	23,951.19
Total Cost	1,341,662.83
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	1,341,662.83
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	1,145,570.83
Overhead	172,140.81
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	23,951.19
Total Uses of Funds	1,341,662.83
Net Cost Recovery	(1,341,662.83)

Unit Cost	4,341.95
-----------	----------

Annapolis Department of Transportation	FTE's	Ranking
Vehicle Maintenance	0	1
Program Description This program provides repair and maintenance of heavy duty buses and support vehicles for the ADOT. This is skilled work involving efficient performance of a variety of automotive repairs and machinists. Task performed require a thorough knowledge of vehicle preventative maintenance and purchasing practices. Work also includes planning and scheduling to facilitate sufficient vehicles are available for daily service, and insure that vehicles meet State vehicle operating requirements.		# of Units Provided
		22 buses/ 11 suppt veh
Performance Measures 1. PM Schedule Compliance of over 95% 2. Percent Uptime of over 90% 3. Reduce road calls by 50%.		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
By accepting grant funds, city agrees to comply with Federal/State mandated requirements.							
	<u>Internal</u>		<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)	Y		Y				
Program Users							
Transit Operations							
Numbers Serviced							
33 vehicles and mechanical equipment							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service	X						
If YES, Who?	DPW						
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department	X						
If NO, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Outsource	X						
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			Private providers				
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?							
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	922,261.11
Overhead	119,847.21
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	1,042,108.32
Less Grants	315,000.00
Total Net Cost	727,108.32

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	315,000.00
Total Sources	315,000.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	922,261.11
Overhead	119,847.21
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	1,042,108.32
Net Cost Recovery	(727,108.32)

Unit Cost	31,579.04
-----------	-----------

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Flood Management Program	0	1
This program provides planning, public outreach, engineering, program management, and project management for initiatives related to a Flood Management Program. The initial objective of the program is reduce the impacts and frequency of tidal floods. The program will investigate the ability to leverage City funding by seeking grants, in-kind services and other governmental assistance to secure necessary funding for plan development and implementation.	# of Units Provided	
	1 program	
Performance Measures 1. Number of annual tidal flood events in the City 2. Annual economic cost of tidal flood events in the City 3. Annual total value of grants received by the City for tidal flood mitigation		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users							
Residences and commercial businesses							
Numbers Serviced							
Thousands							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service			X				
If YES, Who?			DPW, P&Z, DNEP & OEM				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department				X			
If NO, Who?			Collaboration between DPW, P&Z, DNEP & OEM				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			This is a City function to manage a flood mitigation program.				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?			The City is anticipating that grant funding will be available to offset the cost of the flood management program.				
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	
Overhead	
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	-
Less Grants	1,000,000.00
Total Net Cost	(1,000,000.00)
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	1,000,000.00
Total Sources	1,000,000.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	
Overhead	
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	-
Net Cost Recovery	1,000,000.00
Unit Cost	

Department of Public Works		FTE's	Ranking
Sewer Collection		6.34	1
This program collects and transports sanitary sewage from customers throughout the City. This involves operations and maintenance of the City's sewage collection system consisting of a network of sewer pipes, pump stations and other associated equipment. The objective of the program is to collect and transport all sewage produced in the City (including the Naval Academy) in accordance with all applicable Federal, State and local regulations.			# of Units Provided
			Approximately 1.5 billion gallons of wastewater collected annually
Performance Measures			
1. Number of sewer overflows			
2. Linear feet of sewer lines cleaned annually			
3. Number of sewer-related calls received annually			

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Federal - 40CFR122-125,NPDES, State - COMAR 26.03,26.04, 26.08, Charter - Art. VI, Sect. 10b, City Code - 2.40.30							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, Businesses, City buildings							
Numbers serviced							
11,200 sewer customers							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?				X			
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department If NO, Who?			X				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?			Other Govt agencies (State & County), private water companies				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
Many government agencies across the country have outsourced or privatized their sewer collection systems. It is a decision that should not be made lightly, but has proven to be successful for some agencies, and problematic for others. Additionally, many areas of the country have independent water and/or sewer authorities that serve broad geographical areas that may include multiple governmental jurisdictions.							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?			100% of cost is recovered via the sewer rates.				
Other information							
FY15 Sewer: \$8,384,809.86 (including penalties, interest and CFA's)							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	1,492,309.19
Overhead	244,055.94
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	43,688.10
Total Cost	1,780,053.23
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	1,780,053.23
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	8,384,809.86
Grants	
Total Sources	8,384,809.86
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	1,492,309.19
Overhead	244,055.94
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	43,688.10
Total Uses of Funds	1,780,053.23
Net Cost Recovery	6,604,756.63
Unit Cost	
	0.0012

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Sidewalk Repair	6.6	1
This program provides for the maintenance and repair of the City's sidewalks. Work includes repair of small sidewalk areas that present a potential hazard to pedestrians. Repair/replacement of larger sidewalk areas is completed by the City's sidewalk contractor. The objective of the program is to economically keep the sidewalks in a safe condition.	# of Units Provided	
	All sidewalks along the 90 mile street system	
Performance Measures 1. Annual linear feet of sidewalks replaced 2. Overall condition index of the City sidewalks 3. Annual number of trip and fall claims		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Charter - Art. VI, Sect. 10b, City Code - 14.04.010							
	<u>Internal</u>		<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)	Y		Y				
Program Users							
Residents, Visitors							
Numbers serviced							
Many thousand residents and visitors who walk around town.							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service			X				
If YES, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department	X						
If NO, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service	X						
If YES, Who?	Contractors						
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Outsource			X				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
The replacement of large sidewalk areas (greater than five sidewalk panels) is already outsourced to contractors. Time sensitive repair of small sidewalk areas (trip hazards) is completed by the City crew, and should not be outsourced as quick response is needed for many of the smaller repairs.							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?							
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	579,435.37
Overhead	98,132.69
Capital Overhead	-
DPW Admin	22,125.00
Total Cost	699,693.06
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	699,693.06

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	579,435.37
Overhead	98,132.69
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	22,125.00
Total Uses of Funds	699,693.06
Net Cost Recovery	(699,693.06)

Unit Cost

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Snow & Ice Removal	0	1
<p>This program provides for the removal of snow and ice from City streets, plus sidewalks at City buildings and facilities. The budget includes materials (salt), equipment and overtime wages; snow removal performed during working hours is charged to the division to which the employee is assigned. During snow events, there is not a more critical function for the City's Public Works crews. The objective of the program is to keep the streets and assigned sidewalks in a safe and passable condition.</p> <p>Performance Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of snow removal within plan goals 2. Tons of salt used annually 3. Total personnel time on snow and ice removal 		# of Units Provided
		90 miles of streets

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Charter - Art. VI, Sect. 10b							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, Visitors, City facilities							
Numbers serviced							
Many thousands							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service			X				
If YES, Who?			Rec & Parks Dept and Fire Dept provide support				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?			Contractors				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
Possible but not recommended. This work is performed by City personnel who are assigned other tasks during normal weather conditions. DPW crews are supported by other departments, and are supplemented by contractors during heavy snows.							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery				X			
If YES, How much?							
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	82,676.00
Overhead	11,045.40
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	3,301.19
Total Cost	97,022.59
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	97,022.59

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	82,676.00
Overhead	11,045.40
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	3,301.19
Total Uses of Funds	97,022.59
Net Cost Recovery	(97,022.59)

Unit Cost	1,062.01
-----------	----------

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Storm Drain Maintenance and Repair	3.17	1
<p>This program maintains all aspects of the City's storm drain system. This involves the City's stormwater system consisting of a network of storm drain pipes, inlets, outfalls, water quality features, and other associated equipment. The objective of the program is to operate and maintain the City's municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) in accordance with all applicable Federal, State and local regulations.</p> <p>Performance Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Linear feet of storm water pipes cleaned annually 2. Number of stormwater inlets cleaned annually 3. Annual violations of the City's NPDES permit 	# of Units Provided	
	Entirety of the storm drain system, which is approximately 75 miles of storm drain pipes	

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Federal - 40CFR122.32, NDPES, State - COMAR 26.03 and 26.17, Charter - Art. VI, Sec. 10b, Code 2.40.30							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Residents and commercial businesses, visitors and City buildings							
Numbers Serviced							
Many thousands							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?		Contractors					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			X				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
The management of the City's growing inventory of stormwater facilities (including maintenance and operations) could be contracted to a firm with expertise in the hydrology, hydraulics, flora and other aspects of the stormwater quality and conveyance systems.							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?		Cost Recovery via the Stormwater Fee.					
Other information							
FY 2015 Stormwater: \$932,925.19							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	333,246.84
Overhead	51,687.53
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	9,692.86
Total Cost	394,627.23
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	394,627.23
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	932,925.19
Grants	
Total Sources	932,925.19
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	333,246.84
Overhead	51,687.53
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	9,692.86
Total Uses of Funds	394,627.23
Net Cost Recovery	538,297.96
Unit Cost	
	5,261.70

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Street Repair	10.2	1
This program provides for the maintenance and repair of the City's 90 miles of streets. Work includes pothole repair, cut out and repair of deteriorated areas, and any other work required to keep the streets in a safe and operable condition.		# of Units Provided
		90 miles of City streets
Performance Measures		
1. Weighted average “Remaining Surface Life” of City streets		
2. Annual potholes repaired		
3. Annual centerline miles of asphalt resurfacing		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Charter - Art. VI, Sec. 10b, Code - 2.40.30							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, visitors, State and County agencies, people working in Annapolis							
Numbers Serviced							
Many thousands							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?		Contractors					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
The major repair of streets, including pavement resurfacing, is already outsourced to contractors. The City's street crew provides timely and responsive repairs of minor street issues such as potholes and cutouts.							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery				X			
If YES, How much?							
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	867,031.37
Overhead	155,519.64
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	40,316.67
Total Cost	1,062,867.68
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	1,062,867.68
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	867,031.37
Overhead	155,519.64
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	40,316.67
Total Uses of Funds	1,062,867.68
Net Cost Recovery	(1,062,867.68)

Unit Cost	12,015.01
-----------	-----------

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Water Distribution	14.8	1
This program distributes potable water throughout the City. This involves operations and maintenance of the City's water distribution system consisting of a network of pipes, valves and other associated equipment. The objective of the program is to distribute safe, high quality drinking water in accordance with all applicable Federal, State and local regulations.		# of Units Provided Approximately 1.3 billion gallons annually
Performance Measures 1. Number of emergency water outages 2. Number of fire hydrants flushed annually 3. Number of water valves operated annually		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Federal - 40 CFR 141; State - COMAR 26; Charter - Art. VI, Sec. 10b; Code - 2.40.30							
	<u>Internal</u>		<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)	Y		Y				
Program Users							
Residents, visitors, State and County agencies, people working in Annapolis							
Numbers Served							
12,200 water customers							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service			X				
If YES, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department	X						
If NO, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service	X						
If YES, Who?	Other Govt agencies (State and County), private water companies						
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Outsource			X				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
Many government agencies across the country have outsourced or privatized their water systems. It is a decision that should not be made lightly, but it has proven to be successful for some agencies, and problematic for others. Additionally, many areas of the country have independent water and/or sewer authorities that serve broad geographical areas that may include multiple governmental jurisdictions.							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery	X						
If YES, How much?	100% of cost is recovered via the water rates.						
Other information							
FY15: \$7,205,464.35 (including penalties, interest and CFA's)							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	1,423,828.72
Overhead	306,707.21
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	70,448.82
Total Cost	1,800,984.75
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	1,800,984.75

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	1,423,828.72
Overhead	306,707.21
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	70,448.82
Total Uses of Funds	1,800,984.75
Net Cost Recovery	(1,800,984.75)

Unit Cost	0.0014
-----------	--------

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Water Production		
	13.63	1
This program produces potable water for the City. This involves operations and maintenance of the City's groundwater wells, water treatment plant, and elevated storage tanks. The objective of the program is to economically produce safe, high quality drinking water that meets all applicable Federal, State and local regulations.		# of Units Provided
		Approximately 1.3 billion gallons annually
Performance Measures		
1. Number of water quality issues annually		
2. Annual Water Loss Percentage		
3. Annual water production		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Federal - 40 CFR 141; State - COMAR 26; Charter - Art. VI, Sec. 10b; Code - 2.40.30							
	<u>Internal</u>		<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)	Y		Y				
Program Users							
Residents, visitors, State and County agencies, people working in Annapolis							
Numbers Served							
12,200 water customers							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service			X				
If YES, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department	X						
If NO, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service	X						
If YES, Who?			Other Govt agencies (State & County), private water companies				
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Outsource			X				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
Many government agencies across the country have outsourced or privatized their water treatment plants. It is a decision that should not be made lightly, but it has proven to be successful for some agencies, and problematic for others. Additionally, many areas of the country have independent water and/or sewer authorities that serve broad geographical areas that may include multiple governmental jurisdictions.							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery	X						
If YES, How much?			100% of cost is recovered via the water rates.				
Other information							
FY15: \$7,205,464.35 (including penalties, interest and CFA's)							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	2,074,374.70
Overhead	394,251.00
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	102,688.10
Total Cost	2,571,313.80
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	2,571,313.80

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	7,205,464.35
Grants	
Total Sources	7,205,464.35
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	2,074,374.70
Overhead	394,251.00
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	102,688.10
Total Uses of Funds	2,571,313.80
Net Cost Recovery	4,634,150.55

Unit Cost	0.0020
-----------	--------

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Water Reclamation Facility	0	1
This program provides funding to Anne Arundel County Public Works for the operations and maintenance of Annapolis Water Reclamation Facility, a sewage treatment plant co-owned by the City and County. The objective of the program is to treat all sewage produced in the City (including the Naval Academy) in accordance with all applicable Federal, State and local regulations.		# of Units Provided Approximately 1.5 billion gallons of City wastewater treated annually
Performance Measures N/A - County operation		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Federal - 40 CFR , NPDES; State - COMAR 26; County - By Agreement; Charter - Art. VI, Sec. 10b							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, visitors, State and County agencies, people working in Annapolis							
Numbers Served							
11,200 sewer customers							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?	Operations & maintenance is performed by AACo Public Works						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	The Annapolis Water Reclamation Facility is operated by the County.						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?	100% of cost is recovered via the sewer rates.						
Other information							
FY15 Sewer: \$8,384,809.86 (including penalties, interest and CFA's)							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	3,800,000.00
Overhead	843,912.01
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	54,294.05
Total Cost	4,698,206.06
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	4,698,206.06
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	3,800,000.00
Overhead	843,912.01
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	54,294.05
Total Uses of Funds	4,698,206.06
Net Cost Recovery	(4,698,206.06)
Unit Cost	0.0031

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Capital Project Management	3.7	2
This program provides for the management of the City's annual capital improvement program. Project managers/engineers oversee the work of design consultants and construction contractors in the implementation of capital projects. The object is to carry out the capital program in a safe, timely and cost effective manner. During FY13-FY16, the annual CIP averaged \$13.0 million per year.		# of Units Provided
Performance Measures		15 projects per year (4-year average)
1. Annual value of capital construction work completed 2. % of CIP projects delivered within 2 months of approved baseline schedule 3. % of CIP projects delivered within the approved baseline budget		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Charter: Art. VI, Sect. 10b							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, visitors, State and County agencies, City departments							
Numbers Served							
All users of City infrastructure, including streets, sidewalks, utilities and buildings.							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?	Consultants						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
	Although it is possible to outsource this function to an engineering firm, there would be a significant loss in the indepth knowledge and familiarity that the City's engineers have with the City's infrastructure and buildings.						
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
	A portion of the project management (salaries) cost for this program is recovered from the capital project funding. The project management cost can be up to 5% of the total project cost.						
If YES, How much?							
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	630,177.09
Overhead	68,390.12
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	18,613.10
Total Cost	717,180.31
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	717,180.31
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	630,177.09
Overhead	68,390.12
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	18,613.10
Total Uses of Funds	717,180.31
Net Cost Recovery	(717,180.31)
Unit Cost	48,591.10

Department of Public Works		FTE's	Ranking																																																																																																																																																																																																
Curbside Recycling		0	2																																																																																																																																																																																																
<p>This program provides collection and disposal of single stream recyclable materials. All 8,800 residences in the City receive collection of recyclable materials once a week. The collection and disposal services are outsourced to Bates Trucking Company. The City manages and oversees the collection services and performs all customer service functions. The objective of the program is to provide recycling services in an economical, safe and high quality manner.</p> <p>Performance Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diversion rate of solid waste 2. Annual revenue from recyclable materials 3. Number of validated recycling complaints received 		# of Units Provided																																																																																																																																																																																																	
		8,800 residences																																																																																																																																																																																																	
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Federal</th> <th>State</th> <th>County</th> <th>Charter</th> <th>Code</th> <th>Grant</th> <th>Discretion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mandated? (Y/N)</td> <td>Y</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> <td>Y</td> <td>N</td> <td>N</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">Mandate Reference(s)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">Federal: 40CFR246.201.5 Code: 10.16</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Internal</td> <td>External</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Customer Type (Y/N)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>N</td> <td>Y</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">Program Users</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">City Residents</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">Numbers Serviced</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">8,800 residential units</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Dept's Provide Service</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td>NO</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If YES, Who?</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>X</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lead Department</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td>NO</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If NO, Who?</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>X</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>External Provider of Service</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td>NO</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If YES, Who?</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>X</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Recycling companies</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outsource</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td>NO</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If YES, Who? If NO, Why?</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>X</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cost Recovery</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td>NO</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>X</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="7">Curbside recycling is part of the solid waste enterprise fund. The refuse fees fund most of the cost of the recycling program. However, the City also gets rebates based on the market value of the recyclable materials. During FY2015, the City received \$25,772 in recycling rebates. Furthermore, the recycling program has a large cost avoidance component. Every ton of material recycled reduces the solid waste disposal cost by \$58.16. During 2014, at total of 3426.72 tons were recycled, with a cost avoidance of \$199,298.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">If YES, How much?</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">Other information</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">FY2015 Recycling: \$33,435.39</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion	Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Mandate Reference(s)								Federal: 40CFR246.201.5 Code: 10.16											Internal	External				Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y				Program Users								City Residents								Numbers Serviced								8,800 residential units								Other Dept's Provide Service			YES	NO				If YES, Who?				X				Lead Department			YES	NO				If NO, Who?			X					External Provider of Service			YES	NO				If YES, Who?			X		Recycling companies			Outsource			YES	NO				If YES, Who? If NO, Why?				X				Cost Recovery			YES	NO							X						Curbside recycling is part of the solid waste enterprise fund. The refuse fees fund most of the cost of the recycling program. However, the City also gets rebates based on the market value of the recyclable materials. During FY2015, the City received \$25,772 in recycling rebates. Furthermore, the recycling program has a large cost avoidance component. Every ton of material recycled reduces the solid waste disposal cost by \$58.16. During 2014, at total of 3426.72 tons were recycled, with a cost avoidance of \$199,298.							If YES, How much?								Other information								FY2015 Recycling: \$33,435.39							
	Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion																																																																																																																																																																																												
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N																																																																																																																																																																																												
Mandate Reference(s)																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Federal: 40CFR246.201.5 Code: 10.16																																																																																																																																																																																																			
			Internal	External																																																																																																																																																																																															
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y																																																																																																																																																																																															
Program Users																																																																																																																																																																																																			
City Residents																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Numbers Serviced																																																																																																																																																																																																			
8,800 residential units																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Other Dept's Provide Service			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																																																															
If YES, Who?				X																																																																																																																																																																																															
Lead Department			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																																																															
If NO, Who?			X																																																																																																																																																																																																
External Provider of Service			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																																																															
If YES, Who?			X		Recycling companies																																																																																																																																																																																														
Outsource			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																																																															
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?				X																																																																																																																																																																																															
Cost Recovery			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																																																															
			X																																																																																																																																																																																																
	Curbside recycling is part of the solid waste enterprise fund. The refuse fees fund most of the cost of the recycling program. However, the City also gets rebates based on the market value of the recyclable materials. During FY2015, the City received \$25,772 in recycling rebates. Furthermore, the recycling program has a large cost avoidance component. Every ton of material recycled reduces the solid waste disposal cost by \$58.16. During 2014, at total of 3426.72 tons were recycled, with a cost avoidance of \$199,298.																																																																																																																																																																																																		
If YES, How much?																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Other information																																																																																																																																																																																																			
FY2015 Recycling: \$33,435.39																																																																																																																																																																																																			
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">BUDGETARY ANALYSIS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Program Cost</td> <td>312,570.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overhead</td> <td>63,560.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Overhead</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DPW Admin</td> <td>9,692.86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Cost</td> <td>385,823.76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less Grants</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Net Cost</td> <td>385,823.76</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				BUDGETARY ANALYSIS		Program Cost	312,570.00	Overhead	63,560.90	Capital Overhead		DPW Admin	9,692.86	Total Cost	385,823.76	Less Grants		Total Net Cost	385,823.76																																																																																																																																																																																
BUDGETARY ANALYSIS																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Program Cost	312,570.00																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Overhead	63,560.90																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Capital Overhead																																																																																																																																																																																																			
DPW Admin	9,692.86																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Total Cost	385,823.76																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Less Grants																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Total Net Cost	385,823.76																																																																																																																																																																																																		
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2">Sources of Funds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Program Fees</td> <td>33,435.39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Sources</td> <td>33,435.39</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Uses of Funds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operational Expenses</td> <td>312,570.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overhead</td> <td>63,560.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Overhead</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DPW Admin</td> <td>9,692.86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Uses of Funds</td> <td>385,823.76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net Cost Recovery</td> <td>(352,388.37)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS		Sources of Funds		Program Fees	33,435.39	Grants		Total Sources	33,435.39	Uses of Funds		Operational Expenses	312,570.00	Overhead	63,560.90	Capital Overhead		DPW Admin	9,692.86	Total Uses of Funds	385,823.76	Net Cost Recovery	(352,388.37)																																																																																																																																																																								
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Sources of Funds																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Program Fees	33,435.39																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Grants																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Total Sources	33,435.39																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Uses of Funds																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Operational Expenses	312,570.00																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Overhead	63,560.90																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Capital Overhead																																																																																																																																																																																																			
DPW Admin	9,692.86																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Total Uses of Funds	385,823.76																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Net Cost Recovery	(352,388.37)																																																																																																																																																																																																		
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unit Cost</td> <td>43.84</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Unit Cost	43.84																																																																																																																																																																																														
Unit Cost	43.84																																																																																																																																																																																																		

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Residential Refuse and Yard Waste Collections and Disposal	2.11	2
This program provides collection and disposal of residential refuse and yard waste. All 8,800 residences in the City receive collection of refuse and yard waste once a week. The collection and disposal services are outsourced to Bates Trucking Company. The City manages and oversees the collection services and performs all customer service functions. The objective of the program is to provide solid waste services in an economical, safe and high quality manner, in accordance with all Federal, State and local government regulations.		# of Units Provided
8,800 residences		
Performance Measures		
1. Number of validated customer complaints received		
2. Total tonnage of refuse and yard waste collected		
3. Total tonnage of solid waste diverted from landfill		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Federal - 40CFR243,60.1440, State - COMAR 26.03, Charter - Art. VI, Sect. 10b, City Code - 10.16							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, City facilities							
Numbers serviced							
8,800 residences							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?			Waste hauling companies				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			Program was outsourced in 2012.				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?			All costs are recovered via the Refuse Fee (enterprise fund).				
Other information							
FY 2015 Solid Waste: \$3,101,109.80							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	1,557,063.01
Overhead	309,355.51
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	61,598.81
Total Cost	1,928,017.33
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	1,928,017.33
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	3,101,109.80
Grants	
Total Sources	3,101,109.80
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	1,557,063.01
Overhead	309,355.51
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	61,598.81
Total Uses of Funds	1,928,017.33
Net Cost Recovery	1,173,092.47

Unit Cost	219.09
-----------	--------

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Traffic Control and Maintenance	3.85	2
This program provides a wide variety of services including maintenance and repair of street signs, signals, traffic markings, painted curbs, and downtown flags. The objective is to keep the City's 90 miles of streets and all associated equipment and markings in a safe and operable condition.	# of Units Provided	
	26 Traffic Signals 3,782 Signs/Poles/Markers 75,000' of red/yellow curb	
Performance Measures 1. Annual number of signs fabricated 2. Annual traffic signal repairs 3. Annual linear feet of curb painting		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Federal - 23 CFR 655; State - COMAR 11.04.14; Charter - Art. VI, Sec. 10b; Code - 12.08.04							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, visitors, State and County agencies, people working in Annapolis							
Numbers Served							
Many thousands who use the City's street system							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?					Other Government agencies (State and County)		
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
This work is sensitive in that it involves maintenance, repair and operations of the City's traffic signals, street signs and traffic markings. This type of work is best performed by City employees.							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery				X			
If YES, How much?							
Other information							
For Unit Cost - used 90 miles of street							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	306,871.66
Overhead	53,859.95
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	16,225.00
Total Cost	376,956.61
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	376,956.61

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	306,871.66
Overhead	53,859.95
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	16,225.00
Total Uses of Funds	376,956.61
Net Cost Recovery	(376,956.61)

Unit Cost	4,271.62
-----------	----------

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Traffic Engineering	0.53	2
This program provides traffic engineering to resolve difficult and complex traffic issues that arise throughout the City. Traffic studies are performed and engineering solutions are developed to improve traffic. The object is to keep the streets and all associated equipment and markings in a safe and operable condition.		# of Units Provided
		10 complex issues and 100 less complicated requests each year
Performance Measures 1. Average time to complete traffic requests 2. Number of traffic requests investigated and resolved annually 3. Number of traffic accidents in the City annually		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Federal - 23 CFR 655; State - COMAR 11.04.14; Charter - Art. VI, Sec. 10b; Code - 12.08.04							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, visitors, State and County agencies, people working in Annapolis							
Numbers Served							
Many thousands who use the City's street system							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?	Traffic Engineering Firms/Consultants						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			X				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
This is work that could be performed by a consultant hired to provide as-needed traffic engineering support. Although the cost may increase, the level of expertise and responsiveness to requests could improve.							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery				X			
If YES, How much?							
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	141,103.74
Overhead	12,369.60
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	2,669.05
Total Cost	156,142.39
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	156,142.39
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	141,103.74
Overhead	12,369.60
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	2,669.05
Total Uses of Funds	156,142.39
Net Cost Recovery	(156,142.39)
Unit Cost	1,437.33

Department of Public Works								FTE's	Ranking
Utilities Engineering								0.53	2
This program provides utilities engineering to resolve difficult and complex water and sewer system issues that arise throughout the City. Water and sewer studies are performed and engineering solutions are developed to improve the operations of utilities in the City. The object is to keep the utilities, with all their associated equipment and systems, in a safe and operable condition.								# of Units Provided	
								Water: 1.3 billion gal Sewer: 1.5 billion gal	
Performance Measures 1. Response time for utilities engineering requests 2. Number of utilities engineering requests annually 3. Number of emergency engineering requests annually									

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Federal - 40 CFR; State - COMAR 26.03; Charter - Art. VI, Sec. 10b; Code - 2.40.30							
		<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)		Y	Y				
Program Users							
Residents, visitors, State and County agencies, people working in Annapolis							
Numbers Served							
12,200 water customers, 11,200 sewer customers							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service			X				
If YES, Who?							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department		X					
If NO, Who?							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service		X					
If YES, Who? Engineering Firms/Consultants							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Outsource			X				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
Although it is possible to outsource this function to an engineering firm, there would be a significant loss in the indepth knowledge and familiarity that the City's utilities engineer has with the complex water and sewer systems.							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery		X					
If YES, How much? 100% of cost is recovered via the water and sewer rates.							
Other information							
FY15 Water: \$7,205,464.35 (including penalties, interest and CFA's)							
FY15 Sewer: \$8,384,809.86 (including penalties, interest and CFA's)							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	59,581.26
Overhead	3,395.89
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	2,669.50
Total Cost	65,646.65
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	65,646.65
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	59,581.26
Overhead	3,395.89
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	2,669.50
Total Uses of Funds	65,646.65
Net Cost Recovery	(65,646.65)
Unit Cost	

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Market House	0	3
This program provides management, common area operations and maintenance, and repair of Market House. This involves functions such as utilities, custodial services, refuse and recycling collection, manager, and building maintenance and repair. The Market House vendors reimburse the City for all operating expenses. The objective of the program is to operate and maintain Market House in a safe and high quality manner.		# of Units Provided
		6 individual stalls
Performance Measures 1. Number of vendor stalls leased 2. Full recovery of all operating expenses 3. Amount of revenue-based additional rent collected		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Code: 7.28.020							
	<u>Internal</u>		<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)	N		Y				
Program Users							
Residents and visitors							
Numbers Serviced							
Thousands of Market House customers							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service			X				
If YES, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department	X						
If NO, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Outsource			X				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			The Market House Manager position is already contracted.				
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?			Cost Recovery via operating expense payments from the vendors.				
Other information							
Program Fees = Rents collected for FY 2015							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	156,585.00
Overhead	31,841.45
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	61,598.81
Total Cost	250,025.26
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	250,025.26
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	167,788.66
Grants	
Total Sources	167,788.66
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	156,585.00
Overhead	31,841.45
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	61,598.81
Total Uses of Funds	250,025.26
Net Cost Recovery	(82,236.60)

Unit Cost	41,670.88
-----------	-----------

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Public Works Inspection	1.06	3
This program provides for the permitting, inspection, and code compliance of work being done in the City's public right-of-way by franchise utilities, contractors, property owners and other parties. The objective of the program is to ensure that the City's streets and sidewalks remain in a safe condition.		# of Units Provided Approximately 500 right-of-way inspections each year
Performance Measures 1. Time required to process street and sidewalk permits 2. Cost recovery of program 3. Number of complaints received		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Charter: Art. VI, Sect. 10b							
	<u>Internal</u>		<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)	N		Y				
Program Users							
Residents, commercial businesses, and franchise utilities.							
Numbers serviced							
Several hundred							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service	X						
If YES, Who?	Coordinates closely with DNEP on matters involving code compliance.						
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department	X						
If NO, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Outsource			X				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	Inherently governmental function						
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery	X						
If YES, How much?	A total of \$1785 was collected during FY-14 for right-of-way permits.						
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	123,585.30
Overhead	15,743.34
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	5,057.14
Total Cost	144,385.78
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	144,385.78
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	123,585.30
Overhead	15,743.34
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	5,057.14
Total Uses of Funds	144,385.78
Net Cost Recovery	(144,385.78)

Unit Cost	293.97
-----------	--------

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Maps and Records	1.59	4
<p>This program maintains and provides (on request) the City's property maps and records. This program differs from the City's GIS function in that GIS provides electronic geographic information primarily for internal City use, whereas the maps and records function provides hard copy plat, property, roadway, as-built documents for use by property owners, developers, engineering firms and internal City users. The objective of the program is to ensure that the City's critical property documents are maintained, preserved and provided upon request, allowing them to be useful tools for residents, businesses and other entities working in the City.</p> <p>Performance Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of requests for information/documents 2. Cost recovery of program 3. Number of complaints received 		# of Units Provided
		Approximately 800 requests are filled each year

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Charter: Art. VI, Sect. 10b							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Residents and commercial businesses, franchise utilities, City departments							
Numbers Serviced							
Approximately 800 customers per year							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			This is a City function to manage its maps and records.				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			X				
If YES, How much?			A total of \$655 was collected during FY14 for printing and copying of maps and records.				
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	166,190.37
Overhead	23,344.01
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	7,866.67
Total Cost	197,401.05
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	197,401.05
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	166,190.37
Overhead	23,344.01
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	7,866.67
Total Uses of Funds	197,401.05
Net Cost Recovery	(197,401.05)
Unit Cost	
	251.80

Department of Public Works	FTE's	Ranking
Streetscape Maintenance	19.4	4
This program provides for the maintenance of the high visibility areas of the City, including sweeping, trash and recycling collection, graffiti and sticker removal, weed control, right-of-way mowing, and other duties as required. Downtown areas with focused coverage include Susan Campbell Park, Market House, Main Street, Church and State Circles, and West Street. The objective of the program is to economically keep the streets and sidewalks within the assigned areas in a clean and safe condition.		# of Units Provided 90 miles of streets mechanically swept. West St and Historic District hand swept.
Performance Measures 1. Total street sweeper miles 2. Total annual graffiti-removal locations 3. Number of complaints received		

	Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Mandate Reference(s)							
Code - 2.40.30							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users							
Residents, visitors (especially downtown), people who work in Annapolis							
Numbers Served							
Many thousands							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				X			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			X				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			X				
If YES, Who?		Contractors					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				X			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
There are companies that provide similar services to those performed by the streetscape crew. However, the City would lose a tremendous resource that provides immediate response to any possible issue that arises in the City. They are the City's labor force that keeps the downtown area looking good, but also moves furniture and boxes, puts up the City Hall Christmas tree, works during and cleans after special events, and generally provides whatever other services may be required.							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery				X			
If YES, How much?							
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	1,855,953.38
Overhead	304,857.41
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	76,770.24
Total Cost	2,237,581.03
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	2,237,581.03
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	1,855,953.38
Overhead	304,857.41
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	76,770.24
Total Uses of Funds	2,237,581.03
Net Cost Recovery	(2,237,581.03)
Unit Cost	
	24,862.85

Fire Department	FTE's	Ranking
Emergency Medical Services (EMS)	81.21	1
Program Description The Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Division exists to provide emergency and non-emergent health care, rescue and related services to the citizens and visitors of the City of Annapolis and to provide medical transportation to the appropriate health care facility. Personnel respond to medical emergencies with Basic Life Support (BLS) and Advanced Life Support (ALS) intervention. Personnel also assist in conducting Inspections and augment fire suppression staffing.		# of Units Provided
		7,487

Performance Measures # of units provided is the annual Number of EMS responses. Other Performance Measures breakdowns would be annual Fees collected for EMS Transports (FY15 was approximately \$1.3 million with approximately a 70% collection rate) and Cardiac Arrest Survival Rate (currently 25%, the National average is currently approximately 10%).

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Mandate Reference(s)							
Charter Art 6 Sect 4, Code Chapter 2 Section 2.32.010							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Yes	Yes			
Program Users	Public						
Numbers Served	<u>7,487</u>						
Annual Number of EMS Responses							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				No			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department				Fire			
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service				Possible			
If YES, Who?	Private Company may, AACo may						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				Possible			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	Private EMS transport, AACo possible						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery				Yes			
If YES, How much?	FY16 anticipated \$1.4 million in billing fees collected						
Other information	Outsourcing to private EMS may increase response times, decrease level of service and there is potential for vendor going out of business leaving City without any EMS Services for citizens and visitors. Outsourcing to AACo would result increased response times and a loss of revenue. Increased VEBA is needed to cover added benefit costs. Increased revenues in billing may require increased budget to pay out billing fees.						

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	9,791,177.64
Overhead	1,162,128.10
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	10,953,305.74
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	10,953,305.74

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees (FY15 Actual)	1,330,246.66
Grants	
Total Sources	1,330,246.66
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	9,791,177.64
Overhead	1,162,128.10
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	10,953,305.74
Net Cost Recovery	(9,623,059.08)

Unit Cost	1,462.98
-----------	----------

Fire Department		FTE's	Ranking
Suppression		24.47	1
Program Description	Fire Suppression includes the personnel to staff apparatus (Fire Engines, Ladder Trucks, Medic Units and Duty Battalion Chief) to respond to Fire, EMS and other emergency and non-emergency incidents. The fire companies also conduct Pump Outs, Safety Inspections and Public Safety displays, etc. They do snow and ice removal at Fire Stations. They are responsible for daily maintainance and cleaning of fire stations, apparatus and training needed for all required Federal, State and Local mandates.		# of Units Provided
			1,353
Performance Measures		The number of Annual Fire Responses is listed as our # of Units Provided (average 1353). We would also measure performance by the number of Fire Fatalities (0 over the last three Fiscal Years) in Annapolis and number of Annual Training Hours (average 20,666.50).	

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Mandate Reference(s)							
Charter Art 6 Sect 4, Code Chapter 2 Sect 2.32.010							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Yes	Yes			
Program Users	Public						
Numbers Served	<u>1,353</u>						
Number of Annual Fire Responses							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				No			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			Fire				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			Possible				
If YES, Who?		AACo may					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			Possible				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			AACo may				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery				No			
If YES, How much?							
Other information Outsourcing to AACo would result in reduced services, increased response times and lower ISO rating which would raise insurance costs, etc. Increased VEBA is needed to cover added benefits costs. Actual dollar fire loss for the citizens of Annapolis was less than half a million dollars last Fiscal Year. Actual minimum staffing assigned to fire suppression is 3 personnel on each fire engine and ladder truck.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	3,393,799.19
Overhead	440,218.85
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	3,834,018.04
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	3,834,018.04

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	3,393,799.19
Overhead	440,218.85
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	3,834,018.04
Net Cost Recovery	(3,834,018.04)

Unit Cost	2,833.72
-----------	----------

Fire Department	FTE's	Ranking
Code Enforcement	11.05	2
Program Description The Fire Marshal's Office exists to enforce the City of Annapolis and State of Maryland Fire Prevention Code. This is achieved through conducting fire safety inspections of both new construction and existing buildings. The Office is staffed by four full-time employees and augmented by personnel assigned to Suppression, EMS and FESU duties. The Code Enforcement goal is to preserve life and property from fire and other related hazards through fire prevention and code enforcement. An ancillary duty is to serve as AFD - PIO.		# of Units Provided
		1,287
Performance Measures # of units provided is the Annual Number of Addresses where General Fire Safety Inspections were conducted. Other Performance Measures breakdown would be the percentage of buildings inspected in the annual target cycle (100%) and the Annual Number of Permits Inspections (362/year).		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Mandate Reference(s)							
Code Chapter 2 Section 2.32.040							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Yes	Yes			
Program Users	Public						
Numbers Served	1287						
Annual Number of Addresses where Fire Safety Inspections were Conducted							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service			Yes				
If YES, Who?	DNEP and P & Z						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			Fire				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			Possible				
If YES, Who?	AACo may						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			Possible				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	DNEP or AACo could do inspections						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			Yes				
If YES, How much?	Citizens pay for inspections through permit fees						
Other information	Outsourcing may result in increased costs, delay in turn around times, loss of efficiency and cause safety issues as we use these regular inspections to familiarize our personnel with hazards of buildings and locations. Increased VEBA funding is needed to cover added benefits costs.						

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	1,282,721.41
Overhead	156,231.59
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	1,438,953.00
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	1,438,953.00
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees (FY15 Actual)	17,715.32
Grants	
Total Sources	17,715.32
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	1,282,721.41
Overhead	156,231.59
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	1,438,953.00
Net Cost Recovery	(1,421,237.68)
Unit Cost	1,118.07

Fire Department	FTE's	Ranking
Emergency Management	4.8	2
Program Description: The Office of Emergency Management safeguards the City by coordinating planning and response to major events, large scale emergencies, and disasters, and by engaging in prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery operations.		# of Units Provided 37
Performance Measures # of Units Provided is the Annual number of Activations of the Emergency Operations Center or mobilization of resources in response to major incidents and events. (5 activations and 32 responses avg/yr). Other Performance Measurements are the annual amount of homeland security grant funding to meet the needs of the City of Annapolis and every Department. (\$804,445.92 average per year) and the number of annual emergency management plans that are created, maintained and updated as required by grant funding and others that increase the security and resiliency of the City (6 average/year).		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Mandate Reference(s)							
Charter Article VI Sec. 4, Code Chapter 11.48, Grants - Fed. & State							
	<u>Internal</u>		<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)	Yes		Yes				
Program Users	Public, private, and non-profit organizations						
Numbers Served	In excess of 40,000						
COA Population and Visitors to our Jurisdiction							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service	All City Depts.						
If YES, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department	Fire						
If NO, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service	X						
If YES, Who?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Outsource	Possible but not advisable; see "other information" below						
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery	Substantial grant funding received (see above)						
If YES, How much?	exceeds the costs of running the Office						
Other information							
Outsourcing could result in loss of City homeland security grant funding for Police, Fire, Public Works, and other City Departments, the loss of mitigation and disaster reimbursement funding, in addition to a reduction in services to the City.							
Increased VEBA is needed to cover added benefits costs. During activation of the Emergency Operations Center, OEM staff is supported by numerous employees of the City.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	786,968.00
Overhead	62,200.23
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	849,168.23
Less Grants	487,523.00
Total Net Cost	361,645.23
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	487,523.00
Total Sources	487,523.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	786,968.00
Overhead	62,200.23
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	849,168.23
Net Cost Recovery	(361,645.23)
Unit Cost	
	22,950.49

Fire Department		FTE's	Ranking
Plans Review		0.5	2
Program Description	Review of all plans for Fire Safety and Code compliance submitted for new and modified buildings in the City of Annapolis. Some of the minor plans reviews are conducted in-house by the Captain assigned to the Fire Marshal's Office. Other more complex plans are sent to a professional Fire Protection Engineer. Fees leveled by the Fire Protection Engineer are generally recouped through the permit fee process. Estimated annual cost is \$30,000.		# of Units Provided
			565
Performance Measures		# of Units Provided is the annual total number of Permit plans reviewed. Performance Measures breakdown would be the annual total number of Permit plans reviewed in-house (425/year) and the annual total number of Permit plans reviewed by Fire Protection Engineer (140/year).	

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Mandate Reference(s) State MD 29.06.01, Code Chap 2 Sect 2.32.040							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Yes	Yes			
Program Users	Public						
Numbers Served	565						
Annual Total Number of Plans Reviewed							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service			Yes				
If YES, Who?	DNEP and P & Z						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			Fire				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			Yes				
If YES, Who?	Engineering Company						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			Possible				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	Engineering Company						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			Yes				
If YES, How much?	Plans Reviewer is paid for through Permit Fees						
Other information Outsourcing could result in higher costs, delays in completion and lack of quality. Increased VEBA funding is needed to cover added benefits costs. As more plans are reviewed, the Fire Department budget needs to be increased to absorb the additional Fire Protection Engineer fees.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	104,890.05
Overhead	13,141.51
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	118,031.56
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	118,031.56
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees (FY15 Actual)	22,145.00
Grants	
Total Sources	22,145.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	104,890.05
Overhead	13,141.51
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	118,031.56
Net Cost Recovery	(95,886.56)
Unit Cost	208.91

Fire Department	FTE's	Ranking
Special Operations	10.67	2
Program Description Services to include: HazMat (responds to chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive incidents), FESU (responds to suspicious packages and bomb squad services, conducts investigations of fires as required by NFPA and ISO), Marine (Operation of fireboat to provide EMS and firefighting services for marine and structural fires in non-hydrant areas), Bike Medics (responds during congested traffic special events for EMS) and Tactical Medics (responds with Annapolis Police for EMS support of their SWAT Team).		# of Units Provided
		857
Performance Measures # of Units Provided is total annual number of Special Operations responses. The Performance Measures breakdown would be for Number of Explosives Units Responses (143), Number of Fire Boat Responses (79) and Number of HazMat Responses (95).		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Mandate Reference(s)							
Code Art 6 Sect 4, Chapter 2 Sect 2.32.010, Federal & State Grants							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Yes	Yes			
Program Users							
Public							
Numbers Served					<u>857</u>		
Total Number of Annual Special Operations Responses							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				No			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			Fire				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			Possible				
If YES, Who?		AACo may					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			Possible				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			AACo may				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			Yes				
If YES, How much?		OEM Grants and possible revenues					
Other information Outsourcing may result in reduction of services, increased response times and loss of grant funds. Increased VEBA funding is needed to cover added benefits costs. The Bomb Squad receives operating funding through Federal and State grants. The Fireboat was funded through Federal and State Grants.							
FY 2015 Payment for Services: \$39,811.00							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	1,558,901.11
Overhead	169,918.24
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	1,728,819.35
Less Grants	90,081.00
Total Net Cost	1,638,738.35
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees (FY15 Actual)	39,811.00
Grants	90,081.00
Total Sources	129,892.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	1,558,901.11
Overhead	169,918.24
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	1,728,819.35
Net Cost Recovery	(1,598,927.35)

Unit Cost	2,017.29
-----------	----------

Fire Department	FTE's	Ranking
Public Education/Community Relations	0.3	3
Program Description Development, delivery and administration of Public Education and Community Relations. Formal programs are given for audiences of elementary school aged children and senior citizens. These are augmented by less formal programs such as fire station visits, parades, static displays and other community events. They conduct the Juvenile Fire Setters Intervention Program (JFSIP) which is a national program in conjunction with the Criminal Justice System to intervene with youth at risk of setting fires.		# of Units Provided
		184
Performance Measures # of Units Provided is the annual total Number of Public Education Programs conducted. Other Performance Measures would be the annual number of Smoke Detectors/CO Monitors issued or installed (156/year) and the annual number of Juvenile Fire Setters Intervention Programs processed (2/year).		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Yes	Yes			
Program Users	Public						
Numbers Served				<u>184</u>			
Total Number of Annual Public Education Programs							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				No			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department				Fire			
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service				Possible			
If YES, Who?		Contractual company possibly					
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				Possible			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			Contractual Company possibly				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery				No			
If YES, How much?		Possible with grants and/or donations					
Other information Outsourcing would result in increased costs. Increased VEBA funding is needed to cover added benefits costs. While no one is assigned full-time to this duty, we currently have the responsibilities shared among the Fire Marshal's Office staff and the Fire Department Station staff.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	40,547.87
Overhead	4,902.00
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	45,449.87
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	45,449.87
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	40,547.87
Overhead	4,902.00
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	45,449.87
Net Cost Recovery	(45,449.87)
Unit Cost	247.01

Mayor's Office	FTE's	Ranking
Special Events	1	1
Program Description	# of Units Provided	
Special Projects includes special events sponsored by the Mayor including; MLK Jr. Events; New Year's Eve Celebrations, 4th of July Fireworks the Emancipation Day Celebration; funding for the Kunta Kinte Memorial at City Dock; and other miscellaneous event related expenses. The other aspect of the Special Projects Program is the Community Grants Program. This includes line item grant recipients: Four Rivers (ALSCHA) \$25,000; Wiley Bates Legacy Center \$25,000; Annapolis Youth Services Bureau \$25,000. The remaining Community Grants funding is allocated among the applicants for each fiscal year. This also includes the money allocated to the Arts in Public Places Commission.		
Performance Measures		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)				Y			
Program Users	Citizens of Annapolis						
Numbers Served	36,000 +/-						
				<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>		
Other Dept's Provide Service				Y			
If YES, Who?	Finance						
				<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>		
Lead Department							
If NO, Who?	See below						
				<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>		
External Provider of Service					N		
If YES, Who?							
				<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>		
Outsource					N		
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
				<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>		
Cost Recovery					N		
If YES, How much?							
Other information							
Management of Special Projects is split between the Mayor's Office (Events) and Finance (Community Grants)							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS			
Program Cost			342,009.32
Overhead			72,363.23
Capital Overhead			
DPW Admin			
Total Cost			414,372.55
Less Grants			
Total Net Cost			414,372.55
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS			
Sources of Funds			
Program Fees			
Grants			
Total Sources			-
Uses of Funds			
Operational Expenses			342,009.32
Overhead			72,363.23
Capital Overhead			
DPW Admin			
Total Uses of Funds			414,372.55
Net Cost Recovery			(414,372.55)
Unit Cost			

Planning and Zoning	FTE's	Ranking
Current Planning	4.2	1
Program Description		# of Units Provided
Maintains primary responsibility for processing various development review applications for compliance with the Zoning and Subdivision ordinances of the City as well as State laws that are implemented locally. Staffs various boards and commissions such as the Zoning Board of Appeals and Planning		972
Performance Measures		
This includes tracking the number of development applications received, reviewed and approved. Tracking building permit reviews, zoning certificates and assistance to other departmental agencies and property owners.		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>			
Mandated? (Y/N)		YES			YES					
Mandate Reference(s)										
Land Use Article of State Code, Title 20, 21, and 22 of City Code										
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>						
Customer Type (Y/N)				YES						
Program Users										
City Residents and Businesses										
Numbers Served										
1600										
Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>						
If YES, Who?			YES							
			DNEP, DPW, ADOT, LAW, P&R, AFD, APD, Health, DNR							
Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>						
If NO, Who?			YES							
External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>						
If YES, Who?				NO						
Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>						
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?				NO						
			Consistency in applying regulatory design reqmts.							
Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>						
If YES, How much?			YES							
			FY 15 Applicable Fees: \$76,599.52							
Other information										
Quadrant 1										

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	633,648.50
Overhead	65,681.64
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	699,330.14
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	699,330.14
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees (FY15 Actual)	76,599.52
Grants	
Total Sources	76,599.52
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	633,648.50
Overhead	65,681.64
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	699,330.14
Net Cost Recovery	(622,730.62)
Unit Cost	719.48

Planning and Zoning		FTE's	Ranking
Economic Development		2.2	1
Program Description Coordinating Economic Development initiatives with Anne Arundel County per Memorandum of Understanding. Providing Small and Minority Business Enterprise services for local business development and maintaining the Main Street Annapolis partnership to promote historic preservation, community revitalization and economic development			# of Units Provided
Performance Measures			276
Includes activities such as tracking the number of property searches and business contacts, number of community events attended, the number of small businesses receiving assistance, and amount of research and analysis conducted for the various economic development initiatives identified in the strategic plan.			

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)							YES
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)				YES			
Program Users							
Business and governmental organizations							
Numbers Served							
38,000							
Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If NO, Who?			YES				
External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?				NO			Currently partnering with AA County
Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, How much?				NO			
Other information							
Quadrant 2							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	397,547.11
Overhead	57,857.46
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	455,404.57
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	455,404.57

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	397,547.11
Overhead	57,857.46
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	455,404.57
Net Cost Recovery	(455,404.57)

Unit Cost	1,650.02
-----------	----------

Planning and Zoning	FTE's	Ranking
Historic Preservation	2.73	1
Program Description		# of Units Provided
Preserve the authentic character and promote quality stewardship of properties within the Annapolis Historic District. Promote historic preservation as integral to community revitalization, economic development and envrionmental sustainability. Heighten awareness of the value of cultural heritage and historic preservation.		384
Performance Measures		
The activities in this program include tracking the number of applications received for improvements to buildings in the historic district as well as possible landmark properties, tax credit applications and tracking the number of reports, studies, analysis and property searched conducted. Also includes tracking a number of education and outreach efforts conducted by this division.		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)		YES			YES		
Mandate Reference(s)							
Land Use Article, Title 21.56 of City Code							
		<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)			YES				
Program Users							
City residents and businesses							
Numbers Serviced							
4,000							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service			NO				
If YES, Who?							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department		YES					
If NO, Who?							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service			NO				
If YES, Who?							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Outsource			NO				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	State requirement for certification of local government						
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery		YES					
If YES, How much?	FY 15 Applicable fees: \$29,933.58						
Other information							
Quadrant 1							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	432,324.18
Overhead	61,146.36
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	493,470.54
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	493,470.54
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees (FY15 Actual)	29,933.58
Grants	
Total Sources	29,933.58
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	432,324.18
Overhead	61,146.36
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	493,470.54
Net Cost Recovery	(463,536.96)
Unit Cost	1,285.08

Planning and Zoning								FTE's	Ranking																																																																																																																																																																																
Comprehensive Planning								1.2	2																																																																																																																																																																																
Program Description									# of Units Provided																																																																																																																																																																																
Prepares, monitors and implements the Comprehensive Plan. Participates in the annual Capital Programming and Budgeting process. Performs sector studies and neighborhood plans. Undertakes special studies and functional planning as needed. Manages traffic studies as part of development review process. Seeks grants in pursuit of long and short range planning priorities. Represents Mayor at the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board.									168																																																																																																																																																																																
Performance Measures																																																																																																																																																																																									
Includes tracking all the activities associated with different programs included in the Program Description. Therefore community meetings, correspondence, master plans, traffic studies, sector studies would be accounted for the performance measures in this program.																																																																																																																																																																																									
<table><thead><tr><th></th><th><u>Federal</u></th><th><u>State</u></th><th><u>County</u></th><th><u>Charter</u></th><th><u>Code</u></th><th><u>Grant</u></th><th><u>Discretion</u></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Mandated? (Y/N)</td><td></td><td>YES</td><td></td><td></td><td>YES</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">Mandate Reference(s)</td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">Land Use Article, Titles 20, 21, and 22 of City Code</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td><u>Internal</u></td><td><u>External</u></td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>Customer Type (Y/N)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>YES</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">Program Users</td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">City residents and businesses</td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">Numbers Served</td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">38,000</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Other Dept's Provide Service</td><td><u>YES</u></td><td><u>NO</u></td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">If YES, Who?</td><td>YES</td><td></td><td colspan="3">DPW, ADOT, P&R, DNEP</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Lead Department</td><td><u>YES</u></td><td><u>NO</u></td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">If NO, Who?</td><td>YES</td><td></td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">External Provider of Service</td><td><u>YES</u></td><td><u>NO</u></td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">If YES, Who?</td><td></td><td>NO</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Outsource</td><td><u>YES</u></td><td><u>NO</u></td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">If YES, Who? If NO, Why?</td><td></td><td>NO</td><td colspan="3">Studies are outsourced and managed by city staff</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Cost Recovery</td><td><u>YES</u></td><td><u>NO</u></td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">If YES, How much?</td><td>YES</td><td></td><td colspan="3">10% administrative fee charge to Traffic Impact Studies</td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">Other information</td></tr><tr><td colspan="8">Quadrant 2</td></tr></tbody></table>									<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>	Mandated? (Y/N)		YES			YES			Mandate Reference(s)								Land Use Article, Titles 20, 21, and 22 of City Code											<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>				Customer Type (Y/N)				YES				Program Users								City residents and businesses								Numbers Served								38,000								Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				If YES, Who?			YES		DPW, ADOT, P&R, DNEP			Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				If NO, Who?			YES					External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				If YES, Who?				NO				Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				If YES, Who? If NO, Why?				NO	Studies are outsourced and managed by city staff			Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				If YES, How much?			YES		10% administrative fee charge to Traffic Impact Studies			Other information								Quadrant 2									
	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>																																																																																																																																																																																		
Mandated? (Y/N)		YES			YES																																																																																																																																																																																				
Mandate Reference(s)																																																																																																																																																																																									
Land Use Article, Titles 20, 21, and 22 of City Code																																																																																																																																																																																									
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>																																																																																																																																																																																					
Customer Type (Y/N)				YES																																																																																																																																																																																					
Program Users																																																																																																																																																																																									
City residents and businesses																																																																																																																																																																																									
Numbers Served																																																																																																																																																																																									
38,000																																																																																																																																																																																									
Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																																																																																																					
If YES, Who?			YES		DPW, ADOT, P&R, DNEP																																																																																																																																																																																				
Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																																																																																																					
If NO, Who?			YES																																																																																																																																																																																						
External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																																																																																																					
If YES, Who?				NO																																																																																																																																																																																					
Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																																																																																																					
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?				NO	Studies are outsourced and managed by city staff																																																																																																																																																																																				
Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																																																																																																					
If YES, How much?			YES		10% administrative fee charge to Traffic Impact Studies																																																																																																																																																																																				
Other information																																																																																																																																																																																									
Quadrant 2																																																																																																																																																																																									

Planning and Zoning		FTE's	Ranking																																																																																																								
Community Programs and Grant Administration		1.2	3																																																																																																								
Program Description Ensures efficient performance of the housing and community development activities of the City. Administers the City's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the Clay Street Community Legacy Program, the Rental Allowance Program, the HOME Initiative Program and the Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit Program. Coordinates activities with nonprofit service providers, City departments and agencies.			# of Units Provided																																																																																																								
Performance Measures			216																																																																																																								
This includes tracking the number of initiatives completed in the CDBG, tracking the number of grants provided through the CDGB process, tracking the number of individuals that received assistance through the Rental Allowance, HOME or MPDU programs and activities completed associated with the implementation of the CDBG.																																																																																																											
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>Federal</u></th> <th><u>State</u></th> <th><u>County</u></th> <th><u>Charter</u></th> <th><u>Code</u></th> <th><u>Grant</u></th> <th><u>Discretion</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mandated? (Y/N)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mandate Reference(s) CDBG</td> <td colspan="7"></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u>Internal</u></td> <td><u>External</u></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Customer Type (Y/N)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Program Users</td> <td colspan="7">City residents, homeless, LMI neighborhoods, Children, Disabled</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Numbers Served</td> <td colspan="7">4,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u>YES</u></td> <td><u>NO</u></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lead Department If NO, Who?</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u>YES</u></td> <td><u>NO</u></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>External Provider of Service If YES, Who?</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u>YES</u></td> <td><u>NO</u></td> <td colspan="3">Anne Arundel Community Development Services</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outsource If YES, Who? If NO, Why?</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u>YES</u></td> <td><u>NO</u></td> <td colspan="3">The Housing Rehabilitation Program already outsourced</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cost Recovery If YES, How much?</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u>YES</u></td> <td><u>NO</u></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other information quadrant 3</td> <td colspan="7"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>	Mandated? (Y/N)						YES		Mandate Reference(s) CDBG											<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>				Customer Type (Y/N)				YES				Program Users	City residents, homeless, LMI neighborhoods, Children, Disabled							Numbers Served	4,000							Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				Lead Department If NO, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				External Provider of Service If YES, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	Anne Arundel Community Development Services			Outsource If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	The Housing Rehabilitation Program already outsourced			Cost Recovery If YES, How much?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				Other information quadrant 3							
	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>																																																																																																				
Mandated? (Y/N)						YES																																																																																																					
Mandate Reference(s) CDBG																																																																																																											
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>																																																																																																							
Customer Type (Y/N)				YES																																																																																																							
Program Users	City residents, homeless, LMI neighborhoods, Children, Disabled																																																																																																										
Numbers Served	4,000																																																																																																										
Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																							
Lead Department If NO, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																							
External Provider of Service If YES, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	Anne Arundel Community Development Services																																																																																																						
Outsource If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	The Housing Rehabilitation Program already outsourced																																																																																																						
Cost Recovery If YES, How much?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																							
Other information quadrant 3																																																																																																											
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">BUDGETARY ANALYSIS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Program Cost</td> <td>200,481.07</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overhead</td> <td>21,303.71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Overhead</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DPW Admin</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Cost</td> <td>221,784.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less Grants</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Net Cost</td> <td>221,784.78</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				BUDGETARY ANALYSIS		Program Cost	200,481.07	Overhead	21,303.71	Capital Overhead		DPW Admin		Total Cost	221,784.78	Less Grants		Total Net Cost	221,784.78																																																																																								
BUDGETARY ANALYSIS																																																																																																											
Program Cost	200,481.07																																																																																																										
Overhead	21,303.71																																																																																																										
Capital Overhead																																																																																																											
DPW Admin																																																																																																											
Total Cost	221,784.78																																																																																																										
Less Grants																																																																																																											
Total Net Cost	221,784.78																																																																																																										
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2">Sources of Funds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Program Fees</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Sources</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Uses of Funds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operational Expenses</td> <td>200,481.07</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overhead</td> <td>21,303.71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Overhead</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DPW Admin</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Uses of Funds</td> <td>221,784.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net Cost Recovery</td> <td>(221,784.78)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS		Sources of Funds		Program Fees		Grants		Total Sources	-	Uses of Funds		Operational Expenses	200,481.07	Overhead	21,303.71	Capital Overhead		DPW Admin		Total Uses of Funds	221,784.78	Net Cost Recovery	(221,784.78)																																																																																
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS																																																																																																											
Sources of Funds																																																																																																											
Program Fees																																																																																																											
Grants																																																																																																											
Total Sources	-																																																																																																										
Uses of Funds																																																																																																											
Operational Expenses	200,481.07																																																																																																										
Overhead	21,303.71																																																																																																										
Capital Overhead																																																																																																											
DPW Admin																																																																																																											
Total Uses of Funds	221,784.78																																																																																																										
Net Cost Recovery	(221,784.78)																																																																																																										
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unit Cost</td> <td>1,026.78</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Unit Cost	1,026.78																																																																																																						
Unit Cost	1,026.78																																																																																																										

Police Department								FTE's	Ranking																																																																																																																																																
Intelligence								4	1																																																																																																																																																
Program Description Provides vital information of ongoing threats community activities, involved in special investigations and information gathering to better prepare for enforcement and deployment efforts. Conducts all threatgroup investigations, gang investigations, crime related to aforementioned groups. Assist in certain internal investigations upon request of departments. Provides real time intelligence updates and threat awareness and preparedness. Assists in criminal investigations, fugitive tracking and apprehension, cellular tracking and all other intelligence gathering. Video retrievals, cell phone and Computer information retrieval. Asssit in criminal and drug investigations. Assists in alcohol enforcement and complainece efforts for the City.								# of Units Provided																																																																																																																																																	
								2,948																																																																																																																																																	
Performance Measures (See Appendix 3) 1) Number of complaints investigated 2) Number of fugitive apprehensions made 3) Number of cases assisted with																																																																																																																																																									
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>Federal</u></th> <th><u>State</u></th> <th><u>County</u></th> <th><u>Charter</u></th> <th><u>Code</u></th> <th><u>Grant</u></th> <th><u>Discretion</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mandated? (Y/N)</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mandate Reference(s)</td> <td colspan="7">All federal, state and local laws, procedures and ordinaces, All City and departmental policies and procedures</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u>Internal</u></td> <td><u>External</u></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Customer Type (Y/N)</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Program Users</td> <td colspan="7">Citizens / all public in general / Internal investigations / Judicial systems / Gang investigations</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Numbers Served</td> <td colspan="7">Investigated more than 800+ to include criminal, gang, alcohol complaints, threat groups, etc, 78 fugitive warrants, 546 camera install, 1359 cell tracks, 600+ CIS case assistance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Dept's Provide Service</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td><u>YES</u></td> <td><u>NO</u></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If YES, Who?</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lead Department</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td><u>YES</u></td> <td><u>NO</u></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If NO, Who?</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td>YES</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>External Provider of Service</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td><u>YES</u></td> <td><u>NO</u></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If YES, Who?</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td>YES</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Other jurisdictions/Agencies</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outsource</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td><u>YES</u></td> <td><u>NO</u></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If YES, Who? If NO, Why?</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td>YES</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Can be but not prudent or cost effective to do so</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cost Recovery</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td><u>YES</u></td> <td><u>NO</u></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If YES, How much?</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td>Yes</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8"> Other information 1) Grant funding and allocations derived from sources to account for recovery Forfeitures for FY2015: \$215,870.93: Money held in Revolving Fund w/ limitations on expense. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>											<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>	Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Mandate Reference(s)	All federal, state and local laws, procedures and ordinaces, All City and departmental policies and procedures										<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>				Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y				Program Users	Citizens / all public in general / Internal investigations / Judicial systems / Gang investigations							Numbers Served	Investigated more than 800+ to include criminal, gang, alcohol complaints, threat groups, etc, 78 fugitive warrants, 546 camera install, 1359 cell tracks, 600+ CIS case assistance							Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				If YES, Who?				NO				Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				If NO, Who?			YES					External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				If YES, Who?			YES		Other jurisdictions/Agencies			Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			YES		Can be but not prudent or cost effective to do so			Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				If YES, How much?			Yes					Other information 1) Grant funding and allocations derived from sources to account for recovery Forfeitures for FY2015: \$215,870.93: Money held in Revolving Fund w/ limitations on expense.							
	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>																																																																																																																																																		
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y																																																																																																																																																		
Mandate Reference(s)	All federal, state and local laws, procedures and ordinaces, All City and departmental policies and procedures																																																																																																																																																								
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>																																																																																																																																																					
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y																																																																																																																																																					
Program Users	Citizens / all public in general / Internal investigations / Judicial systems / Gang investigations																																																																																																																																																								
Numbers Served	Investigated more than 800+ to include criminal, gang, alcohol complaints, threat groups, etc, 78 fugitive warrants, 546 camera install, 1359 cell tracks, 600+ CIS case assistance																																																																																																																																																								
Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																																																																					
If YES, Who?				NO																																																																																																																																																					
Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																																																																					
If NO, Who?			YES																																																																																																																																																						
External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																																																																					
If YES, Who?			YES		Other jurisdictions/Agencies																																																																																																																																																				
Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																																																																					
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			YES		Can be but not prudent or cost effective to do so																																																																																																																																																				
Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>																																																																																																																																																					
If YES, How much?			Yes																																																																																																																																																						
Other information 1) Grant funding and allocations derived from sources to account for recovery Forfeitures for FY2015: \$215,870.93: Money held in Revolving Fund w/ limitations on expense.																																																																																																																																																									
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">BUDGETARY ANALYSIS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Program Cost</td> <td>462,080.72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overhead</td> <td>58,630.94</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Overhead</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DPW Admin</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Cost</td> <td>520,711.66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less Grants</td> <td>7,343.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Net Cost</td> <td>513,367.88</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>										BUDGETARY ANALYSIS		Program Cost	462,080.72	Overhead	58,630.94	Capital Overhead		DPW Admin		Total Cost	520,711.66	Less Grants	7,343.78	Total Net Cost	513,367.88																																																																																																																																
BUDGETARY ANALYSIS																																																																																																																																																									
Program Cost	462,080.72																																																																																																																																																								
Overhead	58,630.94																																																																																																																																																								
Capital Overhead																																																																																																																																																									
DPW Admin																																																																																																																																																									
Total Cost	520,711.66																																																																																																																																																								
Less Grants	7,343.78																																																																																																																																																								
Total Net Cost	513,367.88																																																																																																																																																								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2">Sources of Funds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Program Fees</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>7,343.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Sources</td> <td>7,343.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Uses of Funds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operational Expenses</td> <td>462,080.72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overhead</td> <td>58,630.94</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Overhead</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DPW Admin</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Uses of Funds</td> <td>520,711.66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net Cost Recovery</td> <td>(513,367.88)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>										COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS		Sources of Funds		Program Fees		Grants	7,343.78	Total Sources	7,343.78	Uses of Funds		Operational Expenses	462,080.72	Overhead	58,630.94	Capital Overhead		DPW Admin		Total Uses of Funds	520,711.66	Net Cost Recovery	(513,367.88)																																																																																																																								
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS																																																																																																																																																									
Sources of Funds																																																																																																																																																									
Program Fees																																																																																																																																																									
Grants	7,343.78																																																																																																																																																								
Total Sources	7,343.78																																																																																																																																																								
Uses of Funds																																																																																																																																																									
Operational Expenses	462,080.72																																																																																																																																																								
Overhead	58,630.94																																																																																																																																																								
Capital Overhead																																																																																																																																																									
DPW Admin																																																																																																																																																									
Total Uses of Funds	520,711.66																																																																																																																																																								
Net Cost Recovery	(513,367.88)																																																																																																																																																								
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unit Cost</td> <td>176.63</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>										Unit Cost	176.63																																																																																																																																														
Unit Cost	176.63																																																																																																																																																								

Police Department	FTE's	Ranking
Investigations	11.7	1
<p>Program Description</p> <p>Departments Criminal Investigations of all major reported crimes such as Murder, Rapes, Robberies, Burglaries, Thefts, serious assaults, all other crimes deemed worthy of specific investigative continuance, Assist with certain city and department internal investigations when requested. Assists other agencies in partnership and parallel investigations</p>		# of Units Provided
<p>Performance Measures (See Appendix 2)</p> <p>1) Number of reported crimes investigated</p> <p>2) Number of other complaints investigated</p> <p>3) Number of closures and arrests</p>		665

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Mandate Reference(s)	All State, federal and local laws and ordinances; departmental and city policies and procedures, State and federal regulations and policies						
Customer Type (Y/N)	<u>Internal</u>		<u>External</u>				
Program Users	Citizens / all public in general / Internal investigations						
Numbers Served	Investigated or reviewed more than 665 reported criminal offences annually, closed more than 396 cases						
Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department If NO, Who?	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service If YES, Who?	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Outsource If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery If YES, How much?	<u>YES</u>		<u>NO</u>				
Other information							
Grant funding and allocations derived from sources to account for recovery							
Forfeitures for FY2015: \$215,870.93: Money held in Revolving Fund w/ limitations on expense.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	1,385,397.57
Overhead	171,162.69
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	1,556,560.26
Less Grants	180,258.33
Total Net Cost	1,376,301.93
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	180,258.33
Total Sources	180,258.33
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	1,385,397.57
Overhead	171,162.69
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	1,556,560.26
Net Cost Recovery	(1,376,301.93)
Unit Cost	2,340.69

Police Department								FTE's	Ranking
PATROL								60.2	1
Program Description									# of Units Provided
First line of police service, response for police request and calls for service, enforcement of criminal and traffic laws, pedestrian crossing and all other related police responses.									
								36,000+	
Performance Measures (See Appendix 1)									
1) Number of responses to emergency and non-emergency calls for service									
2) Number of self initiated activities									
3) Number of quality of life patrols and visibility checks									

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	6,866,472.30
Overhead	855,195.87
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	7,721,668.17
Less Grants	577,193.36
Total Net Cost	7,144,474.81
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees (Avg. FY15&16)	260,000.00
Grants	577,193.36
Total Sources	837,193.36
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	6,866,472.30
Overhead	855,195.87
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	7,721,668.17
Net Cost Recovery	(6,884,474.81)

Unit Cost	214.49
-----------	--------

Police Department	FTE's	Ranking
Operations / Special Operations	22	1
Program Description		# of Units Provided
Provides all specialized enforcement and deployment efforts that meets department and community needs, Assists other agencies with specialized needs. Provides support to all other programs and sections within the department. Provides targeted enforcement in crime affected areas. Incorporated specialized services of the department, to including, bike units, marine unit, K-9 Unit, SWAT, etc		36,000+
Performance Measures (See Appendix 6)		
1) Responses to emergency and non-emergency calls for service		
2) Number of Special Events worked		
3) Number specialized deployments or operations		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Mandate Reference(s)	All federal, state and local laws and ordinances, all departmental and city policies and procedures,						
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users	Citizens / all public in general						
Numbers Served	36k+ residence of the City and surrounding areas, responded to 8,655 calls for service, 5,434 additional requests, 1100 reports, 18 special events, etc						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service			YES				
If YES, Who?	Aaco Pd, MD Capital PD, NSA Pd. Etc.						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			YES				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service				Yes			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				NO			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			Yes				
If YES, How much?	FY15 Payment for Services: \$153,458.33						
Other information							
1) Grant funding and allocations derived from sources to account for recovery							
2) Special Events- Billible overhead of 12.085% added to each billed special event							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	2,745,236.63
Overhead	324,901.73
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	3,070,138.36
Less Grants	118,168.56
Total Net Cost	2,951,969.80
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees (FY15 Actual)	153,458.33
Grants	118,168.56
Total Sources	271,626.89
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	2,745,236.63
Overhead	324,901.73
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	3,070,138.36
Net Cost Recovery	(2,798,511.47)

Unit Cost	85.28
-----------	-------

Police Department		FTE's	Ranking																																																																																																																																																								
Communications		13.7	2																																																																																																																																																								
Program Description Handles 911 call, citizen call for assistance, dispatch calls to officers for response, complete necessary computer checks though MVA, Courts, National Systems, etc. Dispatches more than 36,200 calls for service annually. Recieves more than (88,141) callls into the call center to include (10288) 911 calls and (78,853) general calls, with a total of 88,054 actual talk minutes between staff and the public.		# of Units Provided																																																																																																																																																									
		33,843																																																																																																																																																									
Performance Measures (See Appendix 9) 1) Number of calls (emergency/non-emergency) to dispatch 2) Amount of Talk-time interaction with staff and public 3) Amount of time from receipt of call to being dispatched																																																																																																																																																											
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Federal</th> <th>State</th> <th>County</th> <th>Charter</th> <th>Code</th> <th>Grant</th> <th>Discretion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mandated? (Y/N)</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>N</td> <td>Y</td> <td>N</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">Mandate Reference(s) - State/Federal Laws and Regulations, State/Federal MOU,</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Internal</td> <td>External</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Customer Type (Y/N)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>N</td> <td>Y</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Program Users</td> <td colspan="7">Citizens / all public in general</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Numbers Served</td> <td colspan="7">33843 call for service annually, 87413 total calls into the center, 10288- 911 specific calls, 92,118 minutes of actual talk time.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Dept's Provide Service</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td>NO</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If YES, Who?</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lead Department</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td>NO</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If NO, Who?</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>External Provider of Service</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td>NO</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If YES, Who?</td> <td colspan="7">AACO Communications Center</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outsource</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td>NO</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If YES, Who? If NO, Why?</td> <td colspan="7">Can be but not prudent to do so</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cost Recovery</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td>NO</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>If YES, How much?</td> <td colspan="7">Grant funding as shown</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">Other information</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8">1) Grant funding derived from County 911 fees</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion	Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Mandate Reference(s) - State/Federal Laws and Regulations, State/Federal MOU,											Internal	External				Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y				Program Users	Citizens / all public in general							Numbers Served	33843 call for service annually, 87413 total calls into the center, 10288- 911 specific calls, 92,118 minutes of actual talk time.							Other Dept's Provide Service			YES	NO				If YES, Who?			YES					Lead Department			YES	NO				If NO, Who?			YES					External Provider of Service			YES	NO				If YES, Who?	AACO Communications Center							Outsource			YES	NO				If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	Can be but not prudent to do so							Cost Recovery			YES	NO				If YES, How much?	Grant funding as shown							Other information								1) Grant funding derived from County 911 fees							
	Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion																																																																																																																																																				
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N																																																																																																																																																				
Mandate Reference(s) - State/Federal Laws and Regulations, State/Federal MOU,																																																																																																																																																											
			Internal	External																																																																																																																																																							
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y																																																																																																																																																							
Program Users	Citizens / all public in general																																																																																																																																																										
Numbers Served	33843 call for service annually, 87413 total calls into the center, 10288- 911 specific calls, 92,118 minutes of actual talk time.																																																																																																																																																										
Other Dept's Provide Service			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																							
If YES, Who?			YES																																																																																																																																																								
Lead Department			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																							
If NO, Who?			YES																																																																																																																																																								
External Provider of Service			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																							
If YES, Who?	AACO Communications Center																																																																																																																																																										
Outsource			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																							
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	Can be but not prudent to do so																																																																																																																																																										
Cost Recovery			YES	NO																																																																																																																																																							
If YES, How much?	Grant funding as shown																																																																																																																																																										
Other information																																																																																																																																																											
1) Grant funding derived from County 911 fees																																																																																																																																																											
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">BUDGETARY ANALYSIS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Program Cost</td> <td>1,290,531.19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overhead</td> <td>187,002.42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Overhead</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DPW Admin</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Cost</td> <td>1,477,533.61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less Grants</td> <td>325,152.43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Net Cost</td> <td>1,152,381.18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				BUDGETARY ANALYSIS		Program Cost	1,290,531.19	Overhead	187,002.42	Capital Overhead		DPW Admin		Total Cost	1,477,533.61	Less Grants	325,152.43	Total Net Cost	1,152,381.18																																																																																																																																								
BUDGETARY ANALYSIS																																																																																																																																																											
Program Cost	1,290,531.19																																																																																																																																																										
Overhead	187,002.42																																																																																																																																																										
Capital Overhead																																																																																																																																																											
DPW Admin																																																																																																																																																											
Total Cost	1,477,533.61																																																																																																																																																										
Less Grants	325,152.43																																																																																																																																																										
Total Net Cost	1,152,381.18																																																																																																																																																										
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2">Sources of Funds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Program Fees</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>325,152.43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Sources</td> <td>325,152.43</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Uses of Funds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operational Expenses</td> <td>1,290,531.19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overhead</td> <td>187,002.42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Overhead</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DPW Admin</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Uses of Funds</td> <td>1,477,533.61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net Cost Recovery</td> <td>(1,152,381.18)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS		Sources of Funds		Program Fees		Grants	325,152.43	Total Sources	325,152.43	Uses of Funds		Operational Expenses	1,290,531.19	Overhead	187,002.42	Capital Overhead		DPW Admin		Total Uses of Funds	1,477,533.61	Net Cost Recovery	(1,152,381.18)																																																																																																																																
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS																																																																																																																																																											
Sources of Funds																																																																																																																																																											
Program Fees																																																																																																																																																											
Grants	325,152.43																																																																																																																																																										
Total Sources	325,152.43																																																																																																																																																										
Uses of Funds																																																																																																																																																											
Operational Expenses	1,290,531.19																																																																																																																																																										
Overhead	187,002.42																																																																																																																																																										
Capital Overhead																																																																																																																																																											
DPW Admin																																																																																																																																																											
Total Uses of Funds	1,477,533.61																																																																																																																																																										
Net Cost Recovery	(1,152,381.18)																																																																																																																																																										
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unit Cost</td> <td>43.66</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Unit Cost	43.66																																																																																																																																																						
Unit Cost	43.66																																																																																																																																																										

Police Department	FTE's	Ranking
Community Relations	7.9	2
Program Description		# of Units Provided
Community programs and outreach. Public Information and social media outreach. Hispanic relations, community and youth programs. Citizens Police Academy, community watch, other community programs. Auto theft prevention programs, 1,972 crime reports send via email alone (including daily reports and vital reports), Social Media outlets for immediate community notifications		36,000+
Performance Measures (See appendix 7)		
1) Personnel and time dedicated to community and youth outreach		
2) Personnel and time dedicated to community meetings		
3) Number of business and residential security assessments		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mandate Reference(s)	Departmental rules and regulations, grant allocations, local, state and federal programs requirements,						
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users	Citizens / all public in general						
Numbers Served	36k+ residence of the City and surrounding communities, 7 sponsored community prog, attended 180+ community meetings, 100+ business and residential surveys						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service			YES				
If YES, Who?	Parks and Rec						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			YES				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service				Yes			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			YES				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	Can be but not prudent to do so						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			Yes				
If YES, How much?	Grant funding as shown						
Other information							
1) Grant funding and allocations are derived from sources to account for recovery							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	908,009.14
Overhead	112,064.66
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	1,020,073.80
Less Grants	158,781.74
Total Net Cost	861,292.06
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	158,781.74
Total Sources	158,781.74
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	908,009.14
Overhead	112,064.66
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	1,020,073.80
Net Cost Recovery	(861,292.06)

Unit Cost	28.34
-----------	-------

Police Department								FTE's	Ranking
Crime Scene Services								5.5	2
Program Description									
Responsible for all major crime evidence collections and comparisons. Assists all units with processing of crime scenes, photography, fingerprinting comparisons, prepares evidence for further testing and preparation for court prosecutions. Coordinates laboratory processing of collected items with AACo., MSP, PGCo and outside processing companies for items such as DNA.									
Performance Measures (See Appendix 5)								# of Units Provided	155+
1) Number of crime scenes processed									
2) Number of pieces of evidence processed and logged									
3) Number of evidence items sourced out for analysis (DNA, GSR, etc.)									
								</	

Police Department		FTE's	Ranking
Support Services			
Program Description		24.5	2
Provides day to day services for the Department. Support Services includes a variety of units within the department to accomplish these day to day functions. The functions include Fiscal support, Purchasing, Central Records, Warrant Control, Reception, Education and Training, Recruitment, Evidence Control, Information Technology, Crime Analysis, Internal Affairs, Professional Standards, CALEA, MD Safe Streets, Special Projects. This program provides all essential services and fuctions to maintain police services, legal requirements and mandates, professional standards and internal controls, recordkeeping and reporting, mandated staffing support and training, HR support, public and other agency partnerships, customer service		# of Units Provided	
		43,732+	
Performance Measures (See Appendix 10)			
1) Number of records kept and (UCR) crimes reported accounted for			
2) Number of training and career development opportunities provided			
3) Number of applicants investigated and processed for hire.			

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mandate Reference(s)	City and Departmental Policy and Procedures / State and federal laws and procedures,						
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users	Departmental Employees, Other City employees and the public in general						
Numbers Served	170+ Employees of the City, 700+ warrants, 5600+ reports processed						
	114 officers trained, 1148+ part I offences tracked, etc. , 36K Citizens assisted						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service			Yes				
If YES, Who?	Other agencies, MIT, Outside contractors, HR,						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			YES				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			YES				
If YES, Who?	DPW/ Outside contractors at a cost						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			YES				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	Some Can be but not prudent or cost effective						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			Yes				
If YES, How much?	Grant fundings as shown						
Other information							
1) Grant funding derived from sources to account for recovery of salaries and other funds							
2) Approx. 29K attributed to generated revenue from vehicle disposal, records assistance, off road vehicle fees, online auctions of seized or abandoned property							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	2,858,139.50
Overhead	358,023.94
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	3,216,163.44
Less Grants	44,980.63
Total Net Cost	3,171,182.81

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	44,980.63
Total Sources	44,980.63
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	2,858,139.50
Overhead	358,023.94
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	3,216,163.44
Net Cost Recovery	(3,171,182.81)

Unit Cost	73.54
-----------	-------

Police Department	FTE's	Ranking
Drug Enforcement	7.4	3
Program Description		# of Units Provided
Conducts all major drug investigations throughout the City. Conducts all drug related investigations weather major, minor, long term or short term to combat drug related criminal activities. Assists Criminal Investigations with information gathering and parallel case cooperation and assistance. Assists other agencies with parallel drug investigations and investigations that are incorporated within the City. Provides cooperations with other agencies upon request. works in conjunction with state and federal forfeiture programs. Monies obtained through seizures are placed into police specific funds only to be used for additional enforcement efforts, NOT GENERAL USE SPENDING.		36,000+
Performance Measures (SEE APPENDIX 4)		
1) Number of drug complaints investigated		
2) Number of Search Warrants obtained		
3) Number of seizures		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mandate Reference(s)	All federal, state, and local laws and ordinances, Departmental and City policies and procedures,						
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users	Citizens / all public in general (more than 36,000 residence of the City plus citizens in neighboring agencies)						
Numbers Served	Investigated more than 198 major and some minor drug and gun related offences, obtained more than 78 search warrants and arrested 250+ individuals						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				NO			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			YES				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			YES				
If YES, Who?			Other jurisdictions/Agencies				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			YES				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			Can be but not prudent or cost effective to do so				
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			Yes				
If YES, How much?							
Other information							
Grant funding and allocations from all sources to account for recovery							
Forfeitures for FY2015: \$215,870.93: Money held in Revolving Fund w/ limitations on expense.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	962,794.77
Overhead	111,789.56
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	1,074,584.33
Less Grants	13,585.99
Total Net Cost	1,060,998.34

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	13,585.99
Total Sources	13,585.99
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	962,794.77
Overhead	111,789.56
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	1,074,584.33
Net Cost Recovery	(1,060,998.34)

Unit Cost	29.85
-----------	-------

Police Department	FTE's	Ranking
Maintenance	1.6	3
Program Description	All building and vehicle maintenance relative to and affecting the Police Department. Some vehicle maintenances are outsourced depending on complexity, time associated with repairs and costs. Continual upkeep of Police department building, cells, offices, detachment of OEM (within the building) etc..	# of Units Provided
		3,254
Performance Measures (See Appendix 8) 1) Number of vehicles maintained 2) Number of service calls made for repair to facility 3) Number of employees and citizens utilizing the facility		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Mandate Reference(s)	Federal, state and local policies and procedure and laws and codes						
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	N			
Program Users	Departmental Employees and anyone operating departmental vehicles						
	Anyone entering or working at the facility.						
Numbers Serviced	170+ Employees of the City and other visitors to the facility (3000+)						
	84+/- departmental vehicles						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service			Yes				
If YES, Who?	DPW /Central services						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			YES				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			YES				
If YES, Who?	DPW/ Outside contractors at a cost						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource			YES				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	Can be but not prudent or cost effective to do so						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			Yes				
If YES, How much?	Grant funding as shown						
Other information							
1) Grant funding and allocations derived from sources to account for recovery							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	255,294.02
Overhead	26,622.80
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	281,916.82
Less Grants	2,937.51
Total Net Cost	278,979.31

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	2,937.51
Total Sources	2,937.51
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	255,294.02
Overhead	26,622.80
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	281,916.82
Net Cost Recovery	(278,979.31)

Unit Cost	86.64
------------------	--------------

Recreation & Parks Department - Harbormaster Division		FTE's	Ranking
Operate and Supervise City Waters		1.6	1
Program Description The Harbormaster Division is charged with enforcement of City Code Title 15. Most of our enforcement activity occurs within this program. This includes managing the authorized uses of our public waterways; enforce City Code, collect fees, issue Warnings, Civil Citations, Impound Boats, perform minor repairs, greet visitors and answer questions.			# of Units Provided
			1,400
Performance Measures Approximately 1,400 Transactions in FY-2015			

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	Y				Y	Y	
Mandate Reference(s)	Title 15 Annapolis City Code; and 33CFR110.159 (5) Numerous Grant Covenants - out to 2033						
		<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)		Y	Y				
Program Users	Boaters, Tourists, Residents, others						
Numbers Served	Approximately 1,400 transactions in FY-2015 No count of phonecalls, radio calls and walk-in information requests						
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service			No				
If YES, Who?							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department		YES					
If NO, Who?							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service			No				
If YES, Who?							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Outsource			No				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?		See Below					
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery		YES					
If YES, How much?		FY2015: \$549,289.00; \$287,227.64 (Boat Show)					
Other information	While outsourcing is theoretically possible, it is unlikely that commercial for profit enterprise would accept the terms and conditions under Grant Covenants. Further, enforcing City Code can only be profitable if the Contractor were very aggressive with visitors and tourists fines for minor infractions. Very few for profit enterprises will be acceptable to Grantor Agencies to substitute as responsible parties.						
SecNav Delegation und 33CFR110.159(5) can not be conveyed to a non-governmental entity.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	200,454.97
Overhead	25,950.81
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	226,405.78
Less Grants	50,000.00
Total Net Cost	176,405.78
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	50,000.00
Total Sources	50,000.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	200,454.97
Overhead	25,950.81
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	226,405.78
Net Cost Recovery	(176,405.78)

Unit Cost	161.72
-----------	--------

Recreation & Parks Department - Harbormaster Division	FTE's	Ranking
Operate City Dock	5.42	1
Program Description The Harbormaster Division is staffed primarily with seasonal employees (retirees, high school & college students). These part-time employees meet and greet boaters arriving at City Dock; assist them in arriving and tying-up their boats, answer questions, collect fees, answer telephone and radio calls including walk-in tourists; and perform minor repairs within their capabilities. They enforce City Code, issue Warnings, Civil Citations and Impound Boats when ordered.		# of Units Provided
Performance Measures 7,117 Transactions in FY-2015		7,117

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)					Y	Y	
Mandate Reference(s)	Title 15 Annapolis City Code; and 33CFR110.159 (5) Numerous Grant Covenants - out to 2033						
		<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)		Y	Y				
Program Users	Boaters, Tourists, Residents, others						
Numbers Served	7,117 monetary transactions in FY-2015 No count of phonecalls, radio calls and walk-in information requests						
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?			No				
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department If NO, Who?		YES					
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service If YES, Who?			No				
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Outsource If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			No				
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery If YES, How much?		YES		FY2015: \$549,289.00; \$287,227.64 (Boat Show)			
Other information	While outsourcing is theoretically possible, it is unlikely that commercial for profit enterprise would accept the terms and conditions under Grant Covenants. It should also be noted that boaters electricity fees fully subsidize the public street lights along Dock Street.						

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	306,506.04
Overhead	77,742.23
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	384,248.27
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	384,248.27
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	306,506.04
Overhead	77,742.23
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	384,248.27
Net Cost Recovery	(384,248.27)

Unit Cost	53.99
-----------	-------

Recreation and Parks	FTE's	Ranking
Park Maintenance	15.74	1
Program Description Maintenance of Parks and Athletic Fields to include, trash removal, mowing and minor repairs to amenities. Also includes cleaning and maintenance of restrooms and concession buildings, tree trimming, special event setup/take down, graffiti removal, snow plowing of parking lots and other miscellaneous items. The current budget is spent over a wide area of expenses. Salaries (fulltime and seasonal), contracted services, tools and equipment, equipment maintenance and parts, facility cleaning supplies, facility fixtures (lighting,plumbing), turf and ballfield maintenance (seed, top soil and ball diamond mix), utilities (electric and phone service), ice melt, mulch, fixing and or replacing park amenities (benches, picnic table, trash and recycle cans)		# of Units Provided 207.5 acres
Performance Measures 41 Park Properties 207.5 Acres of Parkland Cost per acre to maintain parks = \$7,003 (based on FY2016 Budget)		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users Citizens							
Numbers Served 85% of residents indicated they use parks in the 2013 Citizen Survey.							
Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department If NO, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service If YES, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery If YES, How much?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	1,448,592.43
Overhead	251,972.32
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	1,700,564.75
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	1,700,564.75
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	6,470.00
Grants	
Total Sources	6,470.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	1,448,592.43
Overhead	251,972.32
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	1,700,564.75
Net Cost Recovery	(1,694,094.75)
Unit Cost	8,195.49

Recreation and Parks	FTE's	Ranking
Pip Moyer Recreation Center - Facility Operations	8.22	1
Program Description Custodial Staffing and Supplies, Facility Monitoring/Supervision, Maintenance and Minor Repairs to the Building. Much of the current budget is spent in staffing, cleaning supplies, fixing facility fixtures (lighting, plumbing, plumbing fixtures) equipment repairs, replacement of worn out building amenities (chairs and tables), contracted services for repairs and the cost of utilities.		# of Units Provided
		106,463
Performance Measures Members 1,947 (1,374 Resident, 573 Non-resident) Total Visits by Members 106,463 (does not include attendance for youth sports spectators or rentals)		

	Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
			Internal	External			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users Citizens and employees							
Numbers Served 1,947 members and 346 rentals							
Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?			YES	NO			
Lead Department If NO, Who?			YES	NO			
External Provider of Service If YES, Who?			YES	NO			
Outsource If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			YES	NO			
Cost Recovery If YES, How much?			YES	NO			
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	509,848.57
Overhead	132,598.82
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	642,447.39
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	642,447.39
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	883,879.81
Grants	
Total Sources	883,879.81
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	509,848.57
Overhead	132,598.82
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	642,447.39
Net Cost Recovery	241,432.42
Unit Cost	6.03

Recreation and Parks		FTE's	Ranking
Pip Moyer Recreation Center - Member Services		5.76	1
Program Description Front Desk Customer Service Staff - responsible for collecting membership fees and registering customers for activities, classes and rentals. Provides general information to customers and guests. Expenses pay for front desk staff, ballocity staff and technology software costs associated with registering for programs or renting facilities.			# of Units Provided
			106,463
Performance Measures Members 1,947 (1,374 Resident, 573 Non-resident) Total Visits by Members 106,463 (does not include attendance for youth sports spectators or rentals)			

	Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users							
Citizens and employees							
Numbers Served							
1,947 members and 346 rentals							
Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If NO, Who?			YES				
External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?			YES		Fitness component is offerer by other providers - YMCA and Commercial Fitness Clubs		
Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?				NO	Building is a community resource and also recovers costs		
Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, How much?			YES		\$883,879.81 in FY2015		
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	227,744.44
Overhead	63,790.89
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	291,535.33
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	291,535.33

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	227,744.44
Overhead	63,790.89
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	291,535.33
Net Cost Recovery	(291,535.33)

Unit Cost	2.74
-----------	------

Recreation and Parks	FTE's	Ranking
Stanton Center	9.4	1
Program Description Provide recreational activities and supervision of activities; custodial services and minor repairs to the building; Coordinate Non-Profit partnerships with Community Organizations that use the building. Activities include afterschool homework clubs, Get Smart Club (afterschool homework assistance), DAFINA, Maryland Food Bank - Supper Food Service Program, Summit School "Literacy Counts" Program, Friday Night Out, STAIR – Starting The Adventure In Reading, Youth Open Gym, Adult Open Gym, Girls are Great at Science "GAGAS", Young Engineers and Scientist (Y.E.S.), SRATCH, Zastro Simms Youth Basketball League (ZSYBL), 8 and under Instructional Basketball League, Basketball Fundamentals Classes, Art Classes, Summer Enrichment Camp, Hook A Kid On Golf Expenditures include staffing for activities, supplies and equipment for recreation activities, custodian staffing, custodian supplies, minor building repairs and utilities.		# of Units Provided
		32,414
Performance Measures Total visits by citizens and participants = 32,414		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users							
Citizens							
Numbers Serviced							
32,414							
Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If NO, Who?			YES				
External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?				NO			
				A Community Service - free or reduced cost programs for children.			
Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, How much?			YES				
			\$12,937 in FY2015				
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	484,870.29
Overhead	112,915.90
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	597,786.19
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	597,786.19
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	12,937.00
Grants	
Total Sources	12,937.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	484,870.29
Overhead	112,915.90
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	597,786.19
Net Cost Recovery	(584,849.19)

Unit Cost	18.44
-----------	-------

Recreation & Parks Department - Harbormaster Division	FTE's	Ranking
Operate Boat Ramps	0.17	2
Program Description The Harbormaster Division Operates three (3) boat ramps within the City Two (2) at Truxtun Park that are modern concrete ramps, recently rebuilt with Federal and State Grant Funds One (1) in West Annapolis on Tucker Street, which is a nylon mesh covered gravel ramp rebuilt and operated entirely with City Funds		# of Units Provided
		1695
Performance Measures 1695 Transactions in FY-2015		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)					Y	Y	
Mandate Reference(s)	Title 15 Annapolis City Code; and Grant Covenant Grant Covenants out to 2039						
		<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>				
Customer Type (Y/N)		Y	Y				
Program Users	Boaters, Tourists, Residents, others						
Numbers Served	1,695 paid transactions in 2015						
Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
			No				
Lead Department If NO, Who?		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
		YES					
External Provider of Service If YES, Who?		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
			No				
Outsource If YES, Who? If NO, Why?		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
			No				
		See Below					
Cost Recovery If YES, How much?		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
		YES					
			\$18,788 in FY-2015				
Other information	While outsourcing is theoretically possible, it is unlikely that commercial for profit enterprise would accept the terms and conditions under Grant Covenants. Like many Public Facilities, our Boat Ramps produce limited return It is unlikely that very many commercial for profit enterprises would be acceptable to Grantor Authorities for substitution of responsible party obligations The actual number of boaters serviced is unknown, due to Voluntary Fee payment system.						

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	13,129.96
Overhead	2,083.89
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	15,213.85
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	15,213.85
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	18,788.00
Grants	
Total Sources	18,788.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	13,129.96
Overhead	2,083.89
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	15,213.85
Net Cost Recovery	3,574.15

Unit Cost	8.98
-----------	------

Recreation and Parks	FTE's	Ranking
Camps and Classes	7.5	3
Program Description This program includes Summer Camps, Dance Classes, Enrichment Classes, Martial Arts Classes and other specialty classes. We offer 43 summer camps. They include Splash Camps, Truxtun Park Day Camp, Kids Camp, Recreation and Enrichment Camps, Ballet Camps and Spirit of America Boating Camps. We offer 20 dance classes a week (week in the Fall and Spring Seasons. In addition to four pre-school programs two times a year, 4 special events which are the Adult Easter Egg Hunt, Daddy Daughter Dance, and 2 Yard Sales. Use of funds are for instructor salaries and material and supplies.		# of Units Provided
Performance Measures Total number of participant visits = 19,498 (Classes and Special Programs = 5,848 Camps = 13,650)		19,498

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users							
Citizens							
Numbers Served							
19,498							
Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If NO, Who?			YES				
External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?				NO			
							Classes are provided as a community service and are moderately priced to provide access to a variety of socio-economic demographics.
Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, How much?			YES				\$131,236.25 in FY2015
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	411,113.77
Overhead	88,702.91
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	499,816.68
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	499,816.68
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	131,236.25
Grants	
Total Sources	131,236.25
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	411,113.77
Overhead	88,702.91
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	499,816.68
Net Cost Recovery	(368,580.43)
Unit Cost	25.63

Recreation and Parks	FTE's	Ranking
Fitness and Wellness	3.17	3
Program Description		# of Units Provided
Provides Fitness and Wellness Activities and Classes at Pip Moyer Recreation Center. Offer 40 Fitness Classes - 9 Cycle classes, 14 Yoga/Pilates Classes, 11 Cardio Classes and 6 Strength Classes. Pilates Classes. Also, coordinates the "Let's Move" Program, Mighty Milers and the Truxtun Youth Triathlon. The expenditures for the fitness classes are to pay the instructors and purchase equipment needed to conduct the class. Other expenditures for fitness include maintenance and replacement of cardio and strength fitness equipment.		18,498
Performance Measures		
Number of adults registered in activities = 18,002 in fitness classes (not including members who use the Strength and Cardio Room equipment)		
Number of children registered in events and programs = 496		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
Grant from Batimore Ravens for Mighty Milers - youth exercise program.							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users							
Citizens							
Numbers Served							
18,498							
Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If NO, Who?			YES				
External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?			YES		Fitness classes provided by commercial fitness providers.		
Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?				NO	Fitness instructors are already contracted.		
Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, How much?			YES		\$8,740 in FY2015		
Other information							
Fitness classes are provided to Pip Moyer Recreation Center Members free with membership.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	287,009.81
Overhead	50,438.07
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	337,447.88
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	337,447.88
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	8,740.00
Grants	
Total Sources	8,740.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	287,009.81
Overhead	50,438.07
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	337,447.88
Net Cost Recovery	(328,707.88)
Unit Cost	
18.24	

Recreation and Parks	FTE's	Ranking
Latchkey	7.47	3
Program Description		# of Units Provided
Provide before school and after school child care in 8 Annapolis Area Elementary Schools during the school year, August - June. Annapolis Elementary, Eastport Elementary, Georgetown East Elementary, Germantown Elementary, Hillsmere Elementary, Tyler Heights Elementary, Walter S. Mills-Parole Elementary and West Annapolis Elementary. Use of funds is spent on salaries, and supplies/materials and equipment.		39,600
Performance Measures		
220 children registered for the program x 180 school days = 39,600 total participation (number served throughout the school year FY2015)		

	Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users							
Citizens							
Numbers Served							
39,600							
Other Dept's Provide Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Lead Department			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If NO, Who?			YES				
External Provider of Service			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Outsource			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			YES				
							Rec and Parks Department is the outsource for the School System. Program employees are contractual employees.
Cost Recovery			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
If YES, How much?			YES				
							\$334,014 in FY2015
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	350,688.51
Overhead	84,332.22
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	435,020.73
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	435,020.73
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	334,014.00
Grants	
Total Sources	334,014.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	350,688.51
Overhead	84,332.22
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	435,020.73
Net Cost Recovery	(101,006.73)

Unit Cost	10.99
-----------	-------

Recreation & Parks Department - Harbormaster Division	FTE's	Ranking
Operate Pumpout Boat(s)	0.75	3
Program Description The Harbormaster Division Operates a Pumpout Boat providing a nearly year round service to the boating public. This also provides a valuable environmental benefit to those residents owning waterfront property and the public beaches and shores within the City. This function is 100% Grant Funded with 75% Federal and 25% State funding over approximately the last thirty years Within Grant Covenant Terms and Conditionsd, the City also is permitted to retain the Revenue earned.		# of Units Provided
		3,103
Performance Measures		
3,103 Transactions in FY-2015 77,502 gallons of effluent disposed		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)						Y	
Mandate Reference(s)	Grant Covenants out to 2021						
Customer Type (Y/N)		<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>				
		Y	Y				
Program Users	Boaters, Tourists, Residents, others						
Numbers Served	3,103 Transactions in FY-2015; 77,502 gallons of effluent removed						
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Other Dept's Provide Service			No				
If YES, Who?							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Lead Department		YES					
If NO, Who?							
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
External Provider of Service		Yes					
If YES, Who?	12 Marinas Provide Stationary Pumpout Facilities						
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Outsource			No				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	We are already the "Outsource" for Fed & State						
		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>				
Cost Recovery		YES					
If YES, How much?	FY2015: \$549,289.00; \$287,227.64 (Boat Show)						
Other information	We are already the "Outsource" for Fed & State 100% Grant Funded Program. We are also the owners of a pumpout boat that was purchased and repowered with Grant funds. Current grant covenants obligate us thru 2021.						
<i>Our boat is the ONLY pumpout service provided within City Waters during the Winter months.</i>							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	62,272.55
Overhead	10,846.46
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	73,119.01
Less Grants	60,000.00
Total Net Cost	13,119.01

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	60,000.00
Total Sources	60,000.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	62,272.55
Overhead	10,846.46
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	73,119.01
Net Cost Recovery	(13,119.01)

Unit Cost	23.56
-----------	-------

Recreation and Parks	FTE's	Ranking
Sports	2.6	3
Program Description		# of Units Provided
Youth Leagues: Youth Basketball (6 different leagues), Baseball (6 different leagues) - expenditures for youth leagues are umpires/referees and equipment/materials/supplies and scorekeepers (basketball only) - each vary by league size and age.		2,969
Adult Leagues: Softball (4 Leagues), Volleyball (3 Leagues), Basketball (1 league) - expenditures are for referees/umpires and equipment/materials/supplies and scorekeepers/field monitors - each vary by sport/activity.		
Youth Classes: Boxing, Fencing, Floor Hockey, Indoor Baseball, Mixed Sports & Games, Rock Climbing, Volleyball, Hello Horse, Martial Arts, Basketball, Tennis - expenditures for youth classes are for instructors and equipment/materials/supplies - each vary by sport/activity		
Adult Classes: Boxing, Tennis - expenditures are for instructors and equipment/materials/supplies - each varies by sport/activity		
Camps: Basketball, Soccer, Rock Climbing, Skateboarding, Mixed Sports, Tennis, Karate, Volleyball, Lacrosse, Flag Football, Softball, Baseball expenditures for youth camps are instructors and equipment/materials/supplies - each vary by sport/activity		
Performance Measures:		
Number of registered Youth participants = 1,609 Number of Adult Participants: 1,360 TOTAL PARTICIPANTS: 2,969		
Number of athletic field rentals = 69		

	Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
Customer Type (Y/N)			Internal	External			
			N	Y			
Program Users							
Citizens							
Numbers Serviced							
2,969							
Other Dept's Provide Service			YES	NO			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Lead Department			YES	NO			
If NO, Who?			YES				
External Provider of Service			YES	NO			
If YES, Who?				NO			
Outsource			YES	NO			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			YES				
				Portions of service are contracted - umpires, referees and instructors.			
Cost Recovery			YES	NO			
If YES, How much?			YES				
			\$286,596 in FY2015				
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	274,889.14
Overhead	55,692.95
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	330,582.09
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	330,582.09
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	286,596.00
Grants	
Total Sources	286,596.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	274,889.14
Overhead	55,692.95
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	330,582.09
Net Cost Recovery	(43,986.09)
Unit Cost	
	111.34

Recreation and Parks	FTE's	Ranking
Employee Wellness	0.5	4
Program Description Provide fitness and wellness activities for city employees.		# of Units Provided
		90
Performance Measures Number of employees and family members participating in activities = 90 (number as of Dec 15th - program began in September 2015)		

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Mandate Reference(s) Grant from Batimore Ravens for Mighty Milers - youth exercise program.							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users Empolyees							
Numbers Served 90							
Other Dept's Provide Service If YES, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department If NO, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service If YES, Who?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource If YES, Who? If NO, Why?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery If YES, How much?			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other information Program paid for through Self Insurance Fund.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	15,414.49
Overhead	6,125.42
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	21,539.91
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	21,539.91
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	
Grants	
Total Sources	-
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	15,414.49
Overhead	6,125.42
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	21,539.91
Net Cost Recovery	(21,539.91)
Unit Cost	239.33

Recreation & Parks Department - Harbormaster Division		FTE's	Ranking
Operate Channidler Dock		0.6	4
<p>Program Description The Harbormaster Division Operates the Chandler Dock (formerly known as "Fawcetts") under a management lease Agreement with the current property owners. Revenue is produced from boaters willing to pay a premium rate to have reserved for their convenience immediately adjacent to City Dock, the naval Academy and Historic Downtown Annapolis.</p>			# of Units Provided
			287
<p>Performance Measures</p> <p>287 Transactions in FY-2015</p>			

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Charter</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Discretion</u>
Mandated? (Y/N)							Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
			<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>			
Customer Type (Y/N)			Y	Y			
Program Users	Boaters, Tourists, Residents, others						
Numbers Serviced	287 Boats paid transactions in 2015. With the size of these boats we estimate the program services approximately 1,200 people per year.						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Other Dept's Provide Service				No			
If YES, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Lead Department			YES				
If NO, Who?							
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
External Provider of Service			Yes				
If YES, Who?	49 commercial Marinas Provide docking facilities						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Outsource				No			
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?	We are already the "Outsource"						
			<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>			
Cost Recovery			YES				
If YES, How much?	\$53,278 in FY-2015						
Other information	We are the "Outsource" for the property owners						
We have operated Chandler Dock for approximately five years. The City is already the property owner on all adjacent sides including the waterfront on both sides of the Chandler Dock.							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	63,493.83
Overhead	14,464.47
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	77,958.30
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	77,958.30
COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	53,278.00
Grants	
Total Sources	53,278.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	63,493.83
Overhead	14,464.47
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	77,958.30
Net Cost Recovery	(24,680.30)

Unit Cost	271.63
------------------	--------

Recreation and Parks		FTE's	Ranking
Truxton Pool		2.82	4
Program Description Operation of the Truxton Pool to include general swim, swim lessons, pool parties and swim clubs/teams. Expenditures include the cost of Coaches, Lifeguards, pool chemicals, pool supplies and contracted maintenance.			# of Units Provided
			22,685
Performance Measures Number of general swim and pool party attendees = 9,065 Swim Lessons = 621 children Swim Teams = 10,179 (175 participants at forty practice times during the summer and four swim meets with 3,179 swimmers) Master Swimmers = 2,820 (47 registered participants at 60 time slots during the summer)			

	Federal	State	County	Charter	Code	Grant	Discretion
Mandated? (Y/N)	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Mandate Reference(s)							
			Internal	External			
Customer Type (Y/N)			N	Y			
Program Users							
Citizens							
Numbers Served							
9065 (plus swim lessons, swim teams and Masters Swimmers who register only once)							
			YES	NO			
Other Dept's Provide Service				NO			
If YES, Who?							
			YES	NO			
Lead Department			YES				
If NO, Who?							
			YES	NO			
External Provider of Service			YES				
If YES, Who?					No other public pools - only private clubs. County has an indoor pool.		
			YES	NO			
Outsource			YES				
If YES, Who? If NO, Why?					Pool maintenance already outsourced. Will be preparing an RFP to analyze outsourcing of entire Pool operation.		
			YES	NO			
Cost Recovery			YES				
If YES, How much?					\$57,410 in FY2015		
Other information							

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS	
Program Cost	122,850.55
Overhead	33,914.61
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Cost	156,765.16
Less Grants	
Total Net Cost	156,765.16

COST RECOVERY ANALYSIS	
Sources of Funds	
Program Fees	57,410.00
Grants	
Total Sources	57,410.00
Uses of Funds	
Operational Expenses	122,850.55
Overhead	33,914.61
Capital Overhead	
DPW Admin	
Total Uses of Funds	156,765.16
Net Cost Recovery	(99,355.16)

Unit Cost	6.91
-----------	------