



County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 7, 2014
TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Susan W. Datta, Chief Financial Officer 
SUBJECT: Responses to FY 2015 BOS Budget Questions – Package 3

Attached for your review is Package 3 of responses to Board questions on the FY 2015 budget. Additional questions and responses will be included in subsequent packages. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me.

The following responses are included in this package:

Question Number	Question	Supervisor	Pages
	<i>Questions 1-11 answered in Package 1 dated March 11, 2014</i>		<i>1-24</i>
	<i>Questions 12-35 answered in Package 2 dated March 31, 2014</i>		<i>25-54</i>
36	Please outline the savings that would be achieved by a one percent, across the board, non-personnel spending reduction on the County side of the budget.	Cook	55
37	Please identify the revenue gained from a five percent increase in SACC fees, exempting children eligible for free and reduced lunch.	Cook	56
38	What would be the operational implications of further managing vacancies to achieve a target of a \$5 million reduction in personnel costs?	Cook	57
39	How much of the Sheriff's budget supports service of process for private legal matters and how much of that cost is recovered from fees charged for service?	Cook	58
40	Please provide a summary of the square footage of County facilities and School facilities.	Gross	59-60
41	The Budget Consideration Item reduction " <i>Reduce ACE catalog mailings</i> " has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have	Herrity	61
42	The Budget Consideration Item reduction " <i>Eliminate the \$500,000 funding within the Environmental Improvement Program</i> " has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	62-63
43	The Budget Consideration Item reduction " <i>Reduce communication positions over two years by 25 percent</i> " has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	64
44	The Budget Consideration Item reduction " <i>Reallocate revenues from the Wedgewood property</i> " has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	65
45	The Budget Consideration Item reduction " <i>Reduce deputies in civil proceedings</i> " has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	66



County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

46	The Budget Consideration Item reduction “Reduce the Contributory Fund by \$750,000” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	67
47	The Budget Consideration Item reduction “Eliminate the Consumer Affairs Branch” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	68
48	The Budget Consideration Item reduction “Delay the full staffing of the Providence Community Center” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have. Are there other staffing options including the use of volunteers to handle some of the areas proposed to be staffed?	Herrity	69
49	The Budget Consideration Item reduction “Eliminate the Environmental Coordinator position” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	70-71
50	The Budget Consideration Item reduction “Reduce Parktakes mailings” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	72
51	The Budget Consideration Item reduction “Eliminate the \$500,000 funding for Energy Education and outreach parties” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	73-74
52	Please provide a breakdown of all costs associated with the eCart program across all schools and departments in FCPS.	Herrity	75-76
53	Please provide a breakdown of all restricted and unrestricted reserves (as defined by GASB 54) available to FCPS and their historical balances.	Herrity	77-78
54	Please estimate cost savings from a realignment of the eight clusters into four administrative areas as was the case prior to the adoption of the cluster system in FY 2002.	Herrity	79-80
55	Does Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) subsidize the cost of FCPS summer camps or does the tuition charged fully cover the costs of the programs?	McKay	81

Attachment

cc: Edward L. Long Jr., County Executive
Patricia Harrison, Deputy County Executive
David J. Molchany, Deputy County Executive
David M. Rohrer, Deputy County Executive
Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Cook

Question: Please outline the savings that would be achieved by a one percent, across the board, non-personnel spending reduction on the County side of the budget.

Response: For General Fund Direct Expenditures, a one percent reduction would equate to a reduction of approximately \$3 million in non-personnel services budgets. This level of reduction would be on top of a number of years of no increases in these budgets despite increasing costs for the County. Of the total more than \$2 million would be generated from five agencies and would impact categories of expenditures where there is no flexibility, therefore impacting programs and service delivery.

The Police Department and Fire and Rescue Department would generate just over \$500,000. This level of reduction would potentially limit the ability of the agencies to make necessary contributions for vehicle replacement as there is limited discretionary funding in these operating budgets. The Fire and Rescue Department has already identified a shortfall in funding for vehicle replacement and the increases necessary to meet the requirements were deferred last year as part of the annual budget process and are on the list of reductions provided at the Board's request to defer again. Another \$400,000 in reductions would come from the Facilities Management Department, severely limiting the ability of the County to fund contracted custodial and security services given the lack of flexibility in the other large operating expense categories such as leases and utilities. Finally the Department of Family Services and Department of Health would have to eliminate programs such as General Relief (which is also already on the list of reductions provided at the Board's request) and significantly reduce expenditures for contracted health clinic services to meet the \$1.1 million reduction that would be required. Many of the operating expenses in Human Service agencies are reimbursed from the State so the programs that generate savings are limited.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Cook

Question: Please identify the revenue gained from a five percent increase in SACC fees, exempting children eligible for free and reduced lunch.

Response: The School-Age Child Care (SACC) program supports working families by providing child care services (both during the school year including spring, summer, and winter vacations and during the summer) to children in kindergarten through sixth grade, as well as older children with disabilities. During the school year, approximately 10,000 children are served in 138 SACC centers located in 137 Fairfax County Public Schools and one recreation center. The school year SACC program operates a before-school program, operating from 7:15 A.M. until school begins, as well as an after-school program running from the end of the school day until 6:15 P.M. SACC winter, spring, and summer programs are provided in consolidated school sites throughout the County. Separate fees are paid for each of the SACC programs.

Fees are collected from parents as payment for child care services. SACC parent fees are reviewed annually and are typically adjusted based on increased program costs (primarily driven by annual compensation increases to employees). SACC parent fees are designed to recover the full cost of the program. However, families with an adjusted household income of less than \$52,000 are eligible to participate on the sliding fee scale; therefore, SACC parent fees are estimated to cover approximately 80 percent of SACC program costs. The net cost to the County is less than \$9.0 million. Full cost recovery is not possible due to the County's commitment to provide subsidized child care to families with low-incomes and children with special needs.

In recent years, in an effort to address the budget shortfall, fees have been increased based on a flat percentage. Over the past five fiscal years, fees have increased nearly 24 percent. For example, in FY 2009 a full paying parent was charged \$125 per month for the SACC before-school program and \$276 per month for the SACC after-school program for a combined monthly fee of \$401. In FY 2014, a full paying parent is charged \$154 per month for the SACC before-school program and \$340 per month for the SACC after-school program for a combined monthly fee of \$494. If another 5 percent is added in FY 2015, a full paying parent will be charged \$162 per month for the SACC before-school program and \$357 per month for the SACC after-school program for a combined monthly fee of \$519. This would be a 29 percent increase from FY 2009.

The FY 2015 Advertised Budget Plan includes a proposed fee increase of 1.3 percent which is consistent with the proposed compensation increases for employees and will generate \$0.5 million in additional revenue. However, if the 1.3 percent across the board fee increase was replaced with a fee increase of 5 percent for families not on the sliding fee scale, an additional \$0.9 million in revenue would be generated. Please note, a 5 percent increase generates \$1.4 million; however, the Advertised budget includes \$0.5 million in additional revenue so the net increase from the Advertised budget is \$0.9 million.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Cook

Question: What would be the operational implications of further managing vacancies to achieve a target of a \$5 million reduction in personnel costs?

Response: A \$5 million reduction in personnel services budgets would be significant, increasing the current overall 8 percent budgeted position turnover to 8.6 percent. This 8 percent level is already an increase over historical levels, in many cases doubling the rate for some agencies. While the increases in position turnover were necessary to balance the budget in prior years, the ability of departments to meet their service delivery requirements has been impacted and further significant reductions in funding without commensurate reductions in service delivery expectations are not sustainable.

The Police Department, Fire and Rescue Department, Department of Family Services (DFS) and Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board (CSB) make up more than 50 percent of the salary base supported by the General Fund so a proportional spread of a \$5 million increase in position turnover would have the largest impact on those agencies. Given the criticality of the functions, the increasing workloads in such areas as self-sufficiency and domestic violence and the already high budgeted rates for DFS and CSB, no further increase in position turnover is recommended for them.

If the Police Department, Fire and Rescue Department, Department of Family Services and Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board were exempted, the remaining agencies would then be required to take even more significant reductions to reach \$5 million. As examples, the Department of Tax Administration (DTA), the Park Authority and the Fairfax County Public Library would each need to keep the equivalent of two more positions vacant the entire year. These three departments already have higher than average budgeted position turnover based on prior year budget reductions so increasing their rates would result in rates approaching 12 percent for DTA and Parks and assuming the same service requirements these levels of vacancies cannot be maintained.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Cook

Question: How much of the Sheriff's budget supports service of process for private legal matters and how much of that cost is recovered from fees charged for service?

Response: For purposes of this response, "private legal matters" has been defined as a request for the Sheriff to serve and/or execute civil process issued from citizens, businesses or firms. These entities, as described in the Virginia State Code, have the right to choose the Sheriff to process and their serve civil process (such as a levy, writs for recovering property, evictions, orders or summons). Some of these processes also include simple notices that have not been generated by the courts.

In FY 2013, the Sheriff's Office made 171,598 attempts to serve/execute civil process which reflects only a portion of the work of the Civil Enforcement Section of the Court Services Division. Among other duties, the Civil Enforcement Section is responsible service of legal process, such as capiases, subpoenas, distresses, seizures, absentee ballots and protective custody orders.

Estimating how many of the attempts to serve/execute civil process that were private legal matters after the fact is difficult as there is no data that separates private legal matters from the overall category total. Internal staff estimate that no more than 10 percent of the overall services/executions of civil process would be private legal matters. The staff time required to serve these private legal matters are usually straightforward notices and equates to less than 0.5 FTE annually. Any minimal revenue generated is collected by the Office of the Sheriff but is passed through to the State.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Gross

Question: Please provide a summary of the square footage of County facilities and School facilities.

Response: Below is a table including approximate square footage at both County Government and County School facilities:

Department	Approximate Square Feet	Notes
County Facilities Management Department	8,600,000	193 facilities and structures
County Park Structures	1,400,000	374 structures
County Housing and Community Development	3,000,000	75 housing sites with more than 7,281 bedrooms
Total County Estimate	13,000,000	
Fairfax County Public Schools	27,000,000	196 schools/administrative buildings, 990 temporary classrooms
Total FCPS Estimate	27,000,000	
Grand Total Estimate	40,000,000	

The General Obligation bond program supports the square footage noted above; however, County bonds also support other capital programs that are not measured by square footage. For example, the current County bond program supports capital contributions to WMATA and the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority (NVRPA), as well as road construction and stormwater flood control improvements. In addition, Park bonds support facility renewal and construction as well as land acquisition, athletic fields and trails. Since 1991, the voters have approved County referenda totaling \$1.36 billion. Of this amount, \$601 million or 44 percent is related to projects that do not contribute to the total County square footage above. In addition, in most cases, land acquisition, development of athletic fields, and trails have accounted for between 20 and 100 percent of recent Park bond referendum. For example, in fall 2006, the voters approved \$25 million for Parks of which \$10 million was for land acquisition, \$10 million for athletic field development and \$5 million for trails and stream crossing. Assuming at least 50 percent of Park bonds over the years have supported non-square footage related items, an additional \$156.5 million in Park bonds would bring the total of non-square footage related bonds to \$757.5million or 56 percent. Therefore more than half of the County program is dedicated to infrastructure that is not included in the total County square footage numbers above. In the same period, School bond sales have totaled \$2.89 billion.

It is important to note that the County maintains over 23,000 acres of park land, 274 athletic fields, 5 major commercial revitalization areas, over 300 bus shelters, 13 park and ride surface lots, 40,000 public street signs, 229 miles of asphalt trails, 425 miles of concrete sidewalk, 64 pedestrian bridges, 17 miles of roadway service drives and 4 miles of County maintained roads that do not meet the standard for acceptance into the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) maintenance system. None of this infrastructure and land is included in the County square footage numbers above.

The attached chart from the [FY 2015 – FY 2019 Capital Improvement Program](#) includes the entire 20 year history of all Bond Referenda.

TABLE F
20-YEAR HISTORY OF REFERENDA
(\$ in millions)

Date	Schools	Trans./ Roads	Public Safety	County Parks	Regional Parks	Adult Deten.	Juv. Deten.	NIP/ CRP	Comm. Revit.	Storm Drain.	Library	Human Services	County Total
2013	\$250.00												
2012			\$55.00	\$63.00	\$12.00					\$30.00	\$25.00		\$185.00
2011	\$252.75												
2010		\$120.00											\$120.00
2009	\$232.58												
2008				\$65.00	\$12.00								\$77.00
2007 ¹	\$365.20	\$110.00											\$110.00
2006			\$125.00	\$25.00									\$150.00
2005	\$246.33												
2004		\$165.00		\$65.00	\$10.00						\$52.50	\$32.50	\$325.00
2003	\$290.61												
2002			\$60.00	\$20.00									\$80.00
2001	\$377.96												
2000													
1999	\$297.21												
1998			\$99.92	\$75.00	\$12.00								\$186.92
1997	\$232.85												
1996													
1995	\$204.05												
1994													
1993	\$140.13												
1992		\$130.00											\$130.00
1991													
Total	\$2,889.67	\$525.00	\$339.92	\$313.00	\$46.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$30.00	\$77.50	\$32.50	\$1,363.92

¹ The 2007 School Referendum totaled \$365,200,000 of which \$315,200,000 was for school improvement needs and \$50,000,000 was for a County vehicle maintenance facility for school buses and other County vehicles. The maintenance facility will be funded from the County's capacity allocation, as approved by the Board of Supervisors on May 7, 2007.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Reduce ACE catalog mailings*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: The following response was prepared by Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS):

The ACE catalog is actually produced at a low cost using a bulk mail rate and the latest print technologies. The cost per catalog is 28 cents per unit and is actually less than the cost of sending a postcard at the rate of 33 cents per unit. No money from the Fairfax County Public Schools operating fund is used in the production and distribution of the catalog. The money is provided by tuition paid by students taking ACE courses. An electronic copy of the ACE Classes catalog is available on the divisionwide website along with an online registration system. The catalog continues to be printed and mailed to citizens as a way to generate business and support potential students who do not have access to the Internet or a home computer. The catalog is provided to other county agencies and support partners including workforce development agencies, the library system, and family services for whom ACE programs provide work related training for individuals.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Eliminate the \$500,000 funding within the Environmental Improvement Program*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: FY 2015 includes \$535,000 for Environmental projects which were selected by the Environmental Improvement Program Committee. This Committee annually conducts a rigorous project selection process and prioritizes projects which support the Board-adopted Environmental Agenda. With the Environmental Agenda in mind, the Committee uses specific project criteria, solicits requests from County agencies for project proposals, interviews project teams and ranks each proposal. The Environmental program has been funded primarily by a General Fund transfer in Fund 30010, County Construction and Contributions since FY 2004. Funding in FY 2015 would support:

- \$150,000 to continue the Invasive Plant Removal Program. The Park Authority manages this volunteer program in order to restore hundreds of acres of important natural areas and protect the tree canopy. Currently more than 7,700 trained volunteer leaders have contributed 26,000 hours of service since the Program’s inception in 2005, improving over 1,000 acres of parkland.
- \$75,000 for Energy Education and Outreach initiatives. This program is intended to increase the awareness of Fairfax County residents and businesses regarding their energy consumption and to encourage them to reduce consumption.
- \$10,000 for the Green Purchasing Program. This program is designed to support environmental attributes during the County’s procurement process. Fairfax County has a current inventory of more than 2,400 contracts and emphasizing environmental attributes such as recycling, energy efficiency, durability and reduced toxicity during the procurement process can contribute to the purchase of green products, creating fiscal and environmental savings.
- \$30,000 for a Watershed Protection and Energy Conservation Matching Grant Program. This program is intended to promote community engagement around sustainability and conservation issues. The program would provide financial incentives to empower homeowners through their associations to implement on-the-ground sustainability projects. Projects would improve water quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and conserve energy and water.
- \$170,000 for lighting retrofits and upgrades at Fairfax County Park Authority facilities. Lighting will be upgraded to LED fixtures and lighting controls will be installed to manage operating hours more efficiently. These energy saving retrofit replacements will reduce approximately 80 percent of energy usage, improve lighting, reduce the Greenhouse gas inventory and contribute to the dark skies initiative.

- \$92,000 to install Water Smart web-based irrigation controllers utilizing new weather technology at 20 Park facilities that have existing irrigation systems, reducing water usage.
- \$8,000 to install a Weather Station for efficient water usage at Greendale Golf Course. This system will help measure air temperature, relative humidity, barometric pressure, rainfall, and other weather indicators in order to modify watering requirements. It is estimated that installing this weather station could save 10 million gallons of water per year, an estimated cost savings of more than \$50,000 per year.

A reduction of \$535,000 in FY 2015 would eliminate any funding for new innovative and sustainable environmental projects and would impact the County's ability to realize savings associated with energy efficient LED lighting at park facilities, reduce water usage, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, educate the public about energy consumption and the purchase of green products and eliminate the invasive plant removal program.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Reduce communication positions over two years by 25 percent*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: Fairfax County has a total of 56 positions that perform communication related activities. Of this total, 48 are funded by the General Fund. The total cost of these positions, including both salary and benefits, is slightly over \$5.2 million. As a result, a 25 percent reduction, phased in over a period of two years, would generate savings of \$1.3 million when fully realized. It is unclear that this reduction could be achieved through natural attrition over the two year period.

A reduction of this size would have a significant impact on County operations and, ultimately, communications with the public and employees. It would impede the timely publication of emergency information (such as during the derecho, Hurricane Sandy, multiple major snowstorms, etc.) and affect the number of platforms that could be used, an important consideration in today’s multichannel/multimedia world. This reduction would also impact the County’s ability to provide strategic communications; coordinate media relations efforts; publish quality website content (and meet ADA requirements); promote/market events and issues of interest to the community; and, deliver information on mobile devices. In addition, employee communications, which are critical to the success of an organization, would be impacted both within agencies and countywide as a result of this reduction.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Reallocate revenues from the Wedgewood property*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: Redirection of \$4,000,000 from revenues generated from Wedgewood Apartments (Mason District) would eliminate the Bridging Affordability Program and significantly restructure the Blueprint project in FY 2015. The reductions would eliminate the FY 2015 allocation for the Bridging Affordability rental subsidy program (approximately \$1.95 million) and 41 percent (approximately \$2.05 million) of the Blueprint Project allocation (\$5 million). Without the Bridging Affordability allocation, approximately 62 fewer households would be able to lease homes under the program. As a result of reducing the Blueprint Project by \$2.05 million the project would be unable to meet the Blueprint goal of preserving/developing up to 160 units of affordable housing, and would likely be used for smaller scale private/partnership acquisitions.

This redirection would impede the County’s ability to continue to address the goals of the Ten-Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness, as well as the goals of the Housing Blueprint. Just as critically, the Bridging Affordability program is an integral component of the FCRHA’s Moving to Work Plan, and serves as the gateway to the Total Housing Reinvention Initiative for Individual Success, Vital Services and Economic Empowerment (THRIVE) Housing Continuum.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Reduce deputies in civil proceedings*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: As requested by the Board of Supervisors on March 25, 2014, savings of \$850,000 could be achieved by reducing the number of Deputy Sheriffs available to staff civil courtroom proceedings from 24 to 14, an almost 42 percent reduction.

Taking this reduction would reduce the level of security and orderliness for Judges, Courthouse employees, and the public. Judges are given the difficult task of confronting the opposing litigants and resolving hotly contested issues; the Deputies are provided for their support and protection. Eliminating 10/10.0 Deputies would reduce the ability to control the environment of the Courthouse before the outbursts occur and again in getting the quick backup needed to respond to a violent situation. If this proposal is adopted, the Courtroom will continue to be video monitored from a central location and Judges will be able to confidentially contact security immediately should any issues arise that may require security presence; however, the response will take a period of time and as has been expressed previously by the Judges, they have considerable concerns with any reductions in this area and would oppose this proposal.

As the Board will recall, as part of the FY 2014 Advertised Budget Plan, two separate reductions in this area were proposed. First, a reduction of 3/3.0 FTE positions and \$255,000 was included to eliminate deputy presence from various classes of Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court (JDRC) and some Circuit Court less emotionally capricious civil hearings. Second, a reduction of \$85,000 and 1/1.0 FTE position was included eliminating the Deputy presence in JDRC status hearings, thought to be the least combative type of case. There are currently 24 Deputies that provide security at all civil hearings; the proposed FY 2014 reduction would have removed a total of four Deputies, for a total of 20.

As part of their deliberations on the FY 2014 Advertised Budget Plan, the Board decided to restore three of the four positions noted above and as a result, the FY 2014 Adopted Budget Plan only included a reduction of 1/1.0 FTE eliminating the Deputy presence in JDRC status hearings. At the time of the reduction, staff were under the impression that this reduction would have very limited impact as these hearings mostly involved the judge with lawyers. Subsequent to the adoption of the budget, staff heard from the judges and other court personnel that in fact, many status hearings in Juvenile court included litigants. As a result of this new information, as part of the *FY 2013 Carryover Review*, the Board approved the restoration of this position.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Reduce the Contributory Fund by \$750,000*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: The amount included in the FY 2015 Advertised Budget Plan for Fund 10030, Contributory Fund, is \$15,385,015 and reflects an increase of \$1,990,259 or 14.9 percent over the FY 2014 Adopted Budget Plan funding level of \$13,394,756. This increase is primarily due to increases of \$1,750,000 for the Fairfax 2015 World Police and Fire Games based on contractual requirements associated with the games, and \$1,100,000 for the Inova Translational Medicine Institute to establish a partnership based on direction from the Board of Supervisors. These increases were partially offset by a decrease of \$750,000 based on the elimination of operating deficit support to the Lorton Arts Foundation. Additional adjustments, which total a net decrease of \$109,741, were also included based primarily on legal requirements, per capita calculations, contractual or regional commitments, or based on membership dues.

It should be noted that about 80 percent of the funding included in the Contributory Fund is based on a specific formula, membership dues or contractual or regional commitments by the County. Consequently, to generate savings of \$750,000, the remaining 20 percent of contributions would require a 25 percent reduction. A reduction of this size would have a significant impact on most of the contributory organizations as Fairfax County provides a large share of their total revenue and, in some cases, is the sole source of revenue. It is important to note that in order to balance the budget in FY 2010 and FY 2011, contributory funding was reduced \$765,870 and \$831,081, respectively.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Eliminate the Consumer Affairs Branch*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: Fairfax County’s Consumer Affairs Branch (CAB) is authorized by the Code of Virginia §15.2-963, to resolve consumer complaints by means of voluntary mediation or arbitration under the Virginia Consumer Protection Act. This is accomplished with a General Fund budget of \$635,376. This total includes seven full time positions: 1/1.0 FTE Consumer Specialist III, 2/2.0 FTE Consumer Specialists II, 2/2.0 FTE Consumer Specialists I, 1/1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant IV, and 1/1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant II. There are four additional positions: 1/1.0 FTE Consumer Specialists II, 1/1.0 FTE Consumer Specialist I, and 2/2.0 FTE Administrative Assistants II which are fully funded by the County’s Cable Fund as these positions support cable-related complaints. The elimination of this program would result in the reduction of seven positions which are fully supported by the General Fund. The remaining four positions fully supported by the Cable Fund would be reassigned within the agency and would continue to provide cable-related services.

The Consumer Affairs Branch mediated 1,195 complaints and responded to 6,119 advice inquiries while recovering savings of over \$560,000 for Fairfax County consumers in FY 2013. Additionally, the branch conducts over 160 community outreach events, including topics on the home and community, online safety, scams, finances, and shopping; publishes the quarterly Informed Consumer e-Newsletter and podcast; provides staff support to the Consumer Protection Commission and Tenant-Landlord Commission; educates and supports over 2,000 homeowners’ associations, condominium unit owners’ associations, and civic associations; and hosts the *Your Community Your Call* consumer television program shown on Fairfax County Government Channel 16.

This reduction would result in the elimination of local mediation and arbitration for consumers conducting business in Fairfax County. Consumers with tenant-landlord, auto repair, home improvement, and other complaints would have to contact the Commonwealth of Virginia’s Office of the Attorney General’s Consumer Protection section or initiate litigation. Over 2,000 community associations would no longer have a source for information about common interest communities. Consumer educational seminars held with FCPS, civic associations, and the faith community would be discontinued. Community outreach efforts such as Channel 16 programming, newsletters, and podcasts would end. The County’s Tenant-Landlord Commission would be abolished as there would be no staff support or County services provided in this area. While Consumer Affairs has a net cost of \$635,376 in FY 2015, staff recovered \$560,261 for Fairfax County consumers in FY 2013.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Delay the full staffing of the Providence Community Center*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have. Are there other staffing options including the use of volunteers to handle some of the areas proposed to be staffed?

Response: The proposed FY 2015 Advertised Budget Plan Providence Community Center (PCC) budget of \$1,396,099 reflects an October 1 opening that includes funding for the Department of Neighborhood and Community Services (DNCS), Department of Family Services (DFS), Facilities Management Division (FMD), Fund 50000, Federal/State Grant Fund and Employee Benefits expenses. Based on current construction information from FMD, the opening of the facility has been delayed until the beginning of calendar year 2015, which results in modest cost savings. While the one-time operating costs associated with any new facility is unchanged, the staffing and recurring operating costs including FMD custodial services and DFS congregate meals for the elderly and transportation services would be reduced. The postponement of the center opening until January 2015 will result in a savings of approximately \$395,000.

Personnel	\$184,500
Fringe	\$53,500
Operating/WPFO	\$157,000
Total	\$395,000

The staffing model proposed for PCC incorporates the extensive use of volunteers and is thus consistent with other DNCS facilities. Among many other duties, DNCS center volunteers teach classes, serve congregate meals to older adults, support the summer meals program for children, coach youth sports teams, plan community events, answer phones, and serve as front desk support. The staffing model of the PCC is consistent with other DNCS facilities of similar size and scope and is required to ensure consistency in program delivery and quality assurance.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Eliminate the Environmental Coordinator position*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: The FY 2015 budget includes an amount of \$135,843 in personnel services and an estimated \$57,326 in fringe benefits for a total of \$193,169 to support the Environmental Coordinator position within the County Executive Office’s budget. This position was originally approved as part of the *FY 1998 Third Quarter Review*. Under the general direction of the Deputy County Executive, the Environmental Coordinator serves as the County’s expert and catalyst for the implementation of cross-organizational actions, program policy, initiatives and efforts that directly support the Board of Supervisors’ vision, goals and policies related to Environmental Stewardship, Sustainability and Energy. The Environmental Coordinator briefs and advises the Board of Supervisors, the County Executive, and Deputy County Executive on new regulations, provides analysis on the scope and impact of these regulations and provides expert counsel on how they can be implemented within the County to support the County’s environmental and energy and other related strategic initiatives. This position provides technical direction and oversight to County agencies to ensure compliance and continuity of operations and alignment with federal and state mandates, laws, regulations and policies. Using a team-based approach, the coordinator position is responsible for supervising technical, special assignment and clerical staff, as required, to initiate and coordinate the development and implementation of cross-organizational strategic and tactical environmental programs and policy for the county on major issues such as water supply planning, storm water, air quality, energy efficiency and conservation, ecological and natural resources and climate change. The Coordinator serves as the primary point of contact to represent the county on all regional and state air quality, water supply, energy and climate change matters and efforts and acts to advocate Board-adopted policy to the business community, environmental organizations and county residents. In addition the Coordinator initiates legislative proposals and negotiates with state counterparts/regulators and representatives from the development industry, concerned citizen groups and Board of Supervisor members on proposed statewide environmental and natural resource protection legislation.

The Environmental Coordinator supports and carries out the policies and goals in the Board’s Environmental Agenda and other related documents that contain Board-adopted environmental policy and administers the Environmental Improvement Program to include the Fairfax County Sustainability Initiatives publication and the projects funding process.

This position ensures coordination and collaboration among County departments, businesses and residents, which is critical to achieving operational and programmatic continuity, efficiency and sustainability. Stronger alignment among County agencies, the business community, environmental organizations, commissions and councils and county residents will streamline resources, spur creativity and efficacy and institutionalize sustainability principles.

The Environmental Coordinator provides staff support to the Board of Supervisors' Environmental Committee, the Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC), the County's Environmental Coordinating Committee, the County's Energy Efficiency and Conservation Coordinating Committee and works closely with the Planning Commission's Environment Committee. This position must work closely with and gain the trust of both County agencies, as well as other stakeholders, including County businesses and residents. The Environmental Coordinator operates at a very high level, with a broad range of complexity, impact, and level of responsibility assigned. Prior to the creation of this position, County agencies conducted their environmental and energy efforts largely without coordination and collaboration across departmental and project "silos", which was inefficient.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Reduce Parktakes mailings*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: The General Fund no longer supports funding for the mailing of the Parktakes Magazine. General Fund support was completely eliminated in FY 2010. Since FY 2010, funding to support mailing of Parktakes has been fully supported by Fund 80000, the Park Revenue Fund. In FY 2013, the actual cost for mailing Parktakes was \$124,752. In addition, the cost to print the publication also paid for in Fund 80000, Park Revenue Fund was \$486,494 in FY 2013. Parktakes magazine is distributed to subscribers only. The magazine is distributed on a quarterly basis to correspond with the park class calendar. Mass distribution to every household in the county was eliminated in the mid-1990s, allowing substantial savings in both printing and mailing costs. Only those who want to receive the magazine now receive it. Park Authority staff continues to be vigilant with subscriber roles, regularly deleting those who no longer want to receive the publication. In addition, an electronic version of Parktakes was introduced with the winter 2010 issue. Currently, 42,824 subscribers receive the electronic version, representing cost savings of nearly \$166,000 annually. Advertising sales help to defer 23 percent of Parktakes printing and mailing costs annually and over the last several years, the Park Authority has lowered production costs by reducing the size of the average issue by 10 pages.

Parktakes is the Park Authority’s most important marketing vehicle. Since the winter 2010 issue, Parktakes subscribers have had the option of receiving the publication in either print or digital format. Digital Parktakes was originally offered purely as a cost saving strategy, with the hopes that most subscribers would switch to that format once it was offered. While the digital subscriber base has grown rapidly, more than three-fourths of subscribers prefer the printed version of the publication. Throughout this period of economic stagnation, when many households have cut back on discretionary spending, the Park Authority has been able to increase enrollment in Park Revenue Fund programs by 27 percent while at the same time reducing Parktakes costs by 17 percent.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Eliminate the \$500,000 funding for Energy Education and outreach parties*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: As part of the *FY 2010 Third Quarter Review*, a total of \$9,642,600 was appropriated to several capital projects associated with the award of a U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) approved by the Board of Supervisors on December 7, 2009. This grant funding was awarded to Fairfax County as a result of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009. One of the projects approved as part of this grant was funding associated with a pilot program called ***Energy Action Fairfax*** designed to increase the awareness of Fairfax County residents regarding their personal energy consumption and to encourage them to reduce that consumption. The development and implementation of this branded residential energy education and outreach program was undertaken by GolinHarris International pursuant to a competitively-bid contract awarded in November 2011. The total amount of the federal grant expended for this pilot program was \$428,852.71. All funding associated with this project was expended by October 2012 based on 3-year term of the grant. There is not an additional \$500,000 budgeted in FY 2015 for the Energy Education and Outreach pilot program; however, an amount of \$75,000 has been included in FY 2015 to support the continuation of ***Energy Action Fairfax***. This funding is included within the total \$535,000 budgeted in Fund 30010, County Construction and Contributions for Environmental projects. The entire \$535,000 has also been proposed for elimination; therefore should the reduction of \$535,000 be initiated, an additional \$75,000 for Energy Outreach would not be available for reduction in FY 2015.

Major activities in developing and implementing the initial residential ***Energy Action Fairfax*** program included proposing program names and logos, developing messaging and branding, creating informational materials and content for the program website, establishing contacts with community organizations, and preparing for and hosting numerous events with participating communities, including workshops focused on home energy efficiency and energy audit events at the homes of community volunteers.

The pilot program relied on three distinct but inter-related approaches to energy education and outreach: direct engagement with homeowner and civic associations, a social media and marketing “push,” and a user-friendly website that serves to “pull” residents and web-visitors to the site and program. The direct engagement aspect provided the peer-to-peer contact essential to behavior change; it also generated content for the marketing efforts. Program objectives included educating citizens about their energy consumption both at home and in the workplace, explaining the energy assessment (audit) process, and encouraging residents to undertake energy-savings measures. The program also educated residents about the expected direct benefits and costs of typical improvements and considerations for evaluating and prioritizing recommended improvements.

Although the pilot program ended with the expiration of the EECBG award term, the county has worked to develop a strategic plan that will serve to guide future Energy Action Fairfax program efforts and initiatives in both the residential and commercial sectors. The plan recognizes that there are a variety and range of resources that the ***Energy Action Fairfax*** program can and should draw upon to leverage its messages, such as local agencies, community organizations, business associations, faith groups, and educational institutions. The plan also recognizes that implementation of the ***Energy Action Fairfax*** program should not rely on an outside contractor, as did the pilot program, but instead should be the responsibility of county staff to the extent possible. The plan supplements this framework with short- and longer-term objectives and initiatives. One short-term objective is the redesign and restructure of the ***Energy Action Fairfax*** website. Current information will be streamlined and updated and content relevant to business owners, managers, and tenants will be added. The redesigned site will include less text and more pictures, interactivity and videos, including business-oriented videos. Additional features will be added to the website in a second phase, including one or more blogs and rotating “success stories” highlighting noteworthy residential and commercial efforts. Another short-term objective is the establishment of a green-certification program to provide greater visibility for energy-efficiency and conservation efforts already underway.

The first phase of this ongoing program will focus on the commercial sector, as ENERGYSTAR, LEED, and other established commercial certification programs provide ready resources to identify likely commercial participants. The second phase will address the residential sector.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Please provide a breakdown of all costs associated with the eCart program across all schools and departments in FCPS.

Response: The following response was prepared by Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS):

eCART is a key component of the technology-enhanced instructional model used in FCPS that enables differentiated instruction, reinforces learning, and addresses individual needs of students. eCART also supports the work of collaborative teams. eCART includes a Curriculum Repository used to manage and share the program of studies, assessment items, and instructional resources. Currently the repository includes the standards, benchmarks, and indicators for 212 content areas (subjects), 101,487 instructional resources (including lesson plans), and 40,749 assessment items. eCART also includes the Horizon assessment system that provides for teacher-created, as well as, district-created assessments. In SY 2012-2013 students completed 4,797,106 assessments—only 20 percent were district mandated assessments. Further, EDSL provides for the longitudinal data reporting of student assessment results in alignment with the standards, benchmarks, and indicators.

The eCART budget covers the costs for the Curriculum Repository, Horizon, and EDSL. The budget is differentiated between recurring maintenance funds necessary to use eCART and development funds to cover enhancements requested by the schools. The maintenance and development budgets are detailed below.

The annual maintenance and support budget for FCPS eCART effective in FY 2014, including budgeted positions, is \$2.7 million. The annual maintenance budget breaks down as follows:

- Hosting and maintenance costs for FCPS eCART applications: \$1.4 million
 - Horizon assessment application hosting and maintenance
 - eCART Resource Search and Retrieval tool software maintenance
 - EDSL eCART data warehouse and reporting application software maintenance
 - Curriculum Repository software maintenance
- Application support staff funding: Hourly - \$0.1 million
- Processing assessment results for the more than 950,899 paper and pencil assessments administered: Contracted - \$0.1 million

- Printing and distribution of over 66,000 booklets supporting the two district assessment administrations each year: Contracted - \$30,000
- Budgeted positions (8.0 FTEs including benefits): \$1.1 million
 - 4.0 Instructional Services FCPS 24/7 Learning curriculum area specialists
 - 1.0 Instructional Services eCART Program Manager
 - 1.0 PLA psychometrician supporting assessment and assessment item analysis
 - 2.0 IT technical specialists providing support for EDSL eCART

In addition to the annual maintenance budget, there is \$1.1 million for development. The development budget addresses mandatory overhaul of the curriculum to align with the Standards of Learning, as well as enhancements requested by the schools. The FY 2014 development budget breaks down as follows:

- Instructional Services curriculum development to align with state standards and to refresh assessments and instructional resources for the new school year: \$0.4 million
- Curriculum Repository enhancements to support new question types that students will experience on SOL tests and to provide a more “Google-like” instructional resource search: \$0.1 million
- EDSL enhancements to support reporting longitudinal assessment results, to provide enhanced dashboards to support cumulative standards, benchmarks, and indicators performance, and provide reports on school public and private assessments: \$0.4 million
- Northrop Grumman and Blackboard support for the items above: \$0.2 million

The total FY 2014 budget, including maintenance and development, is \$3.8 million. Note that the FY 2015 advertised budget includes a \$0.3 million budget reduction for eCART.

In addition, Project Management Oversight Committee (PMOC) funding of \$0.2 million was used in FY 2014 to support eCART; however, this funding is not part of the annual eCART budget. PMOC funding is not dedicated to a specific project and may be allocated to other initiatives in future years.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Please provide a breakdown of all restricted and unrestricted reserves (as defined by GASB 54) available to FCPS and their historical balances.

Response: The following response was prepared by Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS):

The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) provides an overview of FCPS' financial position and result of operations as of June 30th each year. The CAFR is prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) and the fund balance categories are defined by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) No. 54.

	General Fund	Capital Projects Fund	Nonmajor Governmental Funds	Total Governmental Funds
FUND BALANCES:				
Nonspendable:				
Prepaid Items	\$ 259,266	\$ -	\$ 26,010	\$ 285,276
Inventories	-	-	1,439,480	1,439,480
Restricted:				
Capital Projects	-	108,385,281	-	108,385,281
Adult and Community Education	-	-	584,155	584,155
Food Service	-	-	14,223,643	14,223,643
Grant Programs, Summer Fund and Remediation	-	-	14,781,072	14,781,072
Committed:				
Flexibility Reserve	8,000,000	-	-	8,000,000
Subsequent Fiscal Year's Budget	65,740,509	-	-	65,740,509
VRS Reserve	16,910,502	-	-	16,910,502
Assigned:				
Other Schools Operations	63,244,323	-	-	63,244,323
Set Aside for FY 2015 Budget	45,029,032	-	-	45,029,032
Major Maintenance	3,550,970	-	-	3,550,970
Bus Replacement - Purchase	3,000,000	-	-	3,000,000
Set Aside for FY 2014 Initiatives	4,982,156	-	-	4,982,156
Unassigned	3,271,563	-	-	3,271,563
Total Fund Balance	<u>\$ 213,988,321</u>	<u>\$ 108,385,281</u>	<u>\$ 31,054,360</u>	<u>\$ 353,427,962</u>

The chart above is included as part of the Financial Section in the FY 2013 CAFR, <http://www.fcps.edu/fs/comptroller/docs/reports/cafr2013.pdf>, and is provided to enhance user understanding regarding the information presented in financial statements. Governmental fund balances are reported in classifications that comprise a hierarchy based primarily on the extent to which the FCPS School Board is bound to honor constraints on the specific purposes for which amounts in those funds can be spent. As required by GASB 54, fund balances in the CAFR are presented in the following five reporting categories:

- **Nonspendable:** Fund balances that cannot be spent as they are not expected to be converted to cash or they are legally or contractually required to remain intact. This classification includes prepaid items and inventories.

- **Restricted:** Fund balances that are constrained by external parties, constitutional provisions, or enabling legislation. Included in this classification are funds from Food and Nutrition Services, Grants and Self-Supporting Programs, Adult and Community Education Programs, and School Construction. These fund balances have been primarily accumulated from external sources, including bond proceeds, and their use is restricted to these programs.
- **Committed:** Fund balances that impose constraints by the action of the School Board. The items represented in this category (the flexibility reserve, VRS reserve, and FY 2014 budgeted beginning balance) had been approved by the Board as part of the FY 2012 Final Budget Review, FY 2013 Midyear Budget Review, and the FY 2013 Third Quarter Review.
- **Assigned:** Fund balances that are resources set aside for particular purposes, but are neither restricted nor committed. Included in this category are the actions taken as part of the FY 2013 Final Budget Review which allocated funding for major maintenance, bus replacement, other school operations, and FY 2014 initiatives.
- **Unassigned:** Fund balance that is not constrained for any particular purpose. Included in this category are the audit adjustments recognized after the FY 2013 Final Budget Review and available to the School Board for future budget development.

The budgetary fund statement presents available fund balances by their intended functional purpose as approved by the School Board. The chart below provides the reconciliation of the School Operating fund statement ending balance to the CAFR fund balance.

Fund Balance Reconciliation			
Category	Item	CAFR FY 2013 Amount	FY 2013 Final Budget Review Amount
Committed	VRS Reserve	\$16,910,502	\$16,910,502
	FY 2014 Budgeted Beginning Balance	65,740,509	65,740,509
	School Board Flexibility Reserve	8,000,000	8,000,000
Assigned	Undelivered Orders	36,083,968	36,083,968
	Textbook Replacement Fund	906,531	906,531
	Schools/Projects Carryover	22,281,755	22,281,755
	Department Carryover	4,878,600	4,878,600
	Preventive Maintenance	1,200,000	1,200,000
	Bus Replacement Purchase	3,000,000	3,000,000
	Working Conditions Standards	235,000	235,000
	Division Counsel	490,625	490,625
	Music Program Assessments Costs	300,000	300,000
	Licensure Requirements	350,000	350,000
	Major Maintenance	3,550,970	3,550,970
	Join BOS/SB Synthetic Turf Initiative	1,500,000	1,500,000
	FY 2015 Budget Beginning Balance	45,029,032	45,029,032
Nonspendable and Unassigned	Year End Audit Adjustments - Prepaid Items	259,266	*
	Year End Audit Adjustments	3,244,587	*
	ER Daniels Trust and the Gift Fund	26,976	**
Ending Balance, June 30		\$213,988,321	\$210,457,492

* Due to the timing of the FY 2013 Final Budget Review, audit adjustments including prepaid items totaling \$3,503,853 were recognized at the FY 2014 Midyear Budget Review.

** ER Daniels Trust and the Gift Fund are not reflected in budget statements.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Please estimate cost savings from a realignment of the eight clusters into four administrative areas as was the case prior to the adoption of the cluster system in FY 2002.

Response: The following response was prepared by Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS):

FCPS previously reorganized from 4 areas to 8 clusters. The primary purpose of the reorganization from three Area Offices into eight Clusters was to improve instructional leadership and support. Reducing the “span of control” for the first level of supervision above principals, from about 65 schools each to approximately 25, increased the onsite monitoring, support, and guidance each principal and school receives. The realignment also facilitated the vertical articulation of instruction within pyramids.

A second objective was to re-focus divisionwide effort on the mission of instruction and the operational needs of schools. Cluster assistant superintendents, by being in more frequent contact with principals, would be in a better position to know day-to-day school support needs and to marshal divisionwide resources to meet them.

The third objective was to flatten the organization and to reduce the number of high-level positions, together with personnel costs. Each Area Office was, in effect, a mini-school division. Most central office functions (such as student services, special services, transportation) were represented in each Area Office and typically totaled 60 to 70 positions.

Cluster Offices, in contrast, would each have three staff, yielding a total of 24 positions. Of course, a number of Area Office positions and personnel needed to be reassigned to the corresponding central offices in order to maintain required levels of school support. The net result was an overall reduction of eight positions, with the remaining positions at lower levels and lower per-position costs.

FCPS explored reducing the number of cluster offices during late summer 2008. At that time, the organizational structures of nine metropolitan school districts similar in size and demographics to FCPS were examined and FCPS had 24 to 32 schools and 18,000 to 23,000 students per cluster, placing FCPS in the mid-range when compared to the nine metropolitan school districts studied.

In FY 2011, as part of the reductions implemented across FCPS, the number of administrative assistants in the cluster offices was reduced by 50 percent. As a result, each FCPS cluster office currently consists of 2.5 positions: 1.0 assistant superintendent, 1.0 director, and a 0.5 executive administrative assistant.

The organization and staffing of and the responsibilities executed by the eight cluster offices is cost effective. CAS have four primary responsibilities, including: providing leadership, direction, and accountability for principals by monitoring school effectiveness through formative and summative data, staff and parent input and surveys, and feedback

from the school communities; reviewing academic performance of students and using the data to work collaboratively with principals and school leaders in implementing and monitoring continuous school improvement through the School Improvement Planning process; recommending, supervising, and evaluating principals; and serving as a liaison to the parents and school communities as they interface with the school system. By all measures, the academic achievement of our students is continually improving. Annually increasing Annual Measurable Objectives in SOL reading and math tests Adequate Yearly Progress requirements and increasing numbers of students with complex needs have required the cluster staffs to intensify our work with school staffs, and to encourage the continued development of high-performing professional learning communities in our schools.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: Does Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) subsidize the cost of FCPS summer camps or does the tuition charged fully cover the costs of the programs?

Response: The following response was prepared by Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS):

FCPS does not subsidize the cost of summer camps. The student tuition for the FCPS summer camps for Institute for the Arts (IFTA), eIFTA, STEM, Tech Adventure, and Adult and Community Education (ACE) fully funds all camp related expenses. At the end of each year's programs, any remaining funding is used to purchase equipment, supplies, and other program related needs.

In addition to covering the operating expenditures, the IFTA and eIFTA camp programs fund the salary and benefits of a specialist position in Fine Arts office in the Department of Instructional Services. Support in terms of program planning and management for STEM and Tech Adventure camps is provided by staff from the Career and Technical Education office. This support represents a small portion of the employees' job responsibilities