



County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 11, 2015
TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Susan W. Datta, Chief Financial Officer 
SUBJECT: Responses to FY 2016 BOS Budget Questions – Package 1

Attached for your review is Package 1 of responses to Board questions on the FY 2016 budget. Additional 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>County Responses</i>		
1	Please provide a breakdown of pension expenditures between active employees and retirees.	Herrity	1
2	What is the fiscal impact if the Board wants to expand the number of acres allowed under the tax relief program up to a maximum of 5 acres?	Foust	2
3	What is the impact if the Board chooses to reinstate a tax deferral program for the elderly and disabled?	Foust	3
4	Please provide an update on recent changes to pension funding.	Cook	4-6
5	Are there other Northern Virginia jurisdictions with a grass code similar to Fairfax County? What is that code and what is the property owner charged if the jurisdiction cuts the grass? The Washington Post stated Arlington County charges a non-compliant property owner \$600. Is there a state ceiling on what the County can charge and if so, what is it?	McKay	7
6	Please provide background on the fuel prices recommended in the <u>FY 2016 Advertised Budget Plan</u> . Are there any surpluses available in the County's fuel budget?	Foust	8
7	Please summarize the County's funding for IT Projects, including why funding for the selected projects was provided.	Foust	9-12
8	Please explain the discrepancy between the 2.87% revenue growth and the 2.61% expenditure growth as shown on slides 7 and 8 of the County Executive's budget presentation.	Bulova	13
9	Please provide additional information on the proposed closing of the Annandale Adult Day Health Care Program site.	Gross	14
10	What is the possibility of a one-time increase of the \$155 million yearly cap on school bond sales for capital improvement projects by \$13.1 million?	Bulova	15



County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

	<i>FCPS Responses</i>		
11	What are the specific reasons that there are higher per pupil costs for special education/ESOL students?	Hudgins	16
12	Please provide the average class size by jurisdiction as well as the average class size by Fairfax County school.	Herrity	17-22
13	For the last 5 years, please provide a spreadsheet that shows projected versus actual FRM, ESOL and total student enrollment for each elementary, middle, secondary and high school. For this purpose, please show separately the projected numbers used to prepare both the Proposed Budget and the projected numbers used to prepare the detailed approved budgets for each school as well as the actual numbers.	Herrity	23-34
14	Can FCPS reduce school bus fuel consumption by: 1. Reducing the number of school bus stops. 2. Increasing bus capacity and require new bus riders to register for bus service well ahead of the school year to allow for planners to sufficiently forecast how many "full" buses are needed. 3. Eliminating unnecessary bus idling. 4. Expanding pedestrian and bicycle routes to schools where feasible.	BOS	35
15	SACC, Recreation, and the school system offer summer programs for children. A coordinated effort might be more efficient.	BOS	36

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 2016 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Please provide a breakdown of pension expenditures between active employees and retirees.

Response: The funding of liabilities for the retirement systems is performed in a pooled fashion, and assets are not specifically designated to cover retiree liability versus active liability. Contribution dollars are also not characterized as being attributable to retirees or active employees. However, in response to this question, the actuary for the retirement systems developed the following methodology to provide a representation of the breakdown of County contributions to the systems between active employees and retirees:

1. The current County contribution rate was separated into normal cost (which is wholly attributable to actives), Unfunded Actuarial Liability (UAL) amortization, and administrative expenses.
2. The UAL amortization component was allocated between active employees and retirees on the basis of the total liability for each group.
3. For active employees, the UAL component was added to the normal cost component as an approximation of the proportion of the total contribution that is being paid toward actives.

Based on this methodology, the actuary for the retirement systems has estimated that 68 percent of the total County contribution to the systems is for active employees, 31 percent is for retirees, and 1 percent is for administrative expenses. As the UAL is paid off, the percentage going towards funding benefits for current active employees will increase.

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Foust

Question: What is the fiscal impact if the Board wants to expand the number of acres allowed under the tax relief program up to a maximum of 5 acres?

Response: The Board is legally empowered to make a change of this nature by adopting an ordinance amendment. The current program allows relief on the home and up to one acre of land. There are approximately 8,000 participants currently in the program and the average land size is about ¼ acre.

There are 9,713 residentially improved, owner occupied, real estate parcels in the County that are between 1 and 5 acres. These parcels generate approximately \$117 million in General Fund revenue.

Staff has no way to discern the income and fixed asset levels of these homeowners. However, the current tax relief program exempts around 2% of all residentially improved, owner occupied, real estate. The assumption is that the remaining 98% do not qualify based on some combination of age, income and net assets.

If you assume the same percentage would apply to the parcels between 1 and 5 acres, then the fiscal impact of expanding the allowable acreage in tax relief is shown in the table below. In other words, it is estimated that allowing up to 2 acres in tax relief would result in the additional loss of \$1.5 million in General Fund revenue, and another \$35,000 in Special Tax District revenue. Likewise, increasing this to a full 5 acres would result in the additional loss of \$2.3 million in General Fund revenue and just over \$52,000 in Special Tax District revenue. Unfortunately there is no way in advance to validate that the 2% participation rate will remain constant, although this appears to be a reasonable assumption.

Parcel Size	# of Pcl's	Gen. Fund Levy	Spec. Tax Districts	Total Revenue	General Fund at 2%	Special Dist. At 2%	Total Est. Fiscal Impact
>1 acres And </= 2 acres	6,416	\$75,591,664	\$1,747,160	\$77,338,824	\$1,500,000	\$35,000	\$1,535,000
>2 acres And </= 3 acres	1,885	\$24,007,331	\$487,535	\$24,494,867	\$480,000	\$9,800	\$489,800
>3 acres And </= 4 acres	390	\$5,129,346	\$113,036	\$5,242,382	\$103,000	\$2,300	\$105,300
>4 acres And </= 5 acres	1,022	\$12,231,134	\$248,010	\$12,479,144	\$245,000	\$5,000	\$250,000
	9,713	\$116,959,475	\$2,595,742	\$119,555,217	\$2,328,000	\$52,100	\$2,380,100

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Foust

Question: What is the impact if the Board chooses to reinstate a tax deferral program for the elderly and disabled?

Response: The County used to have a tax deferral program, authorized by Va. Code Section 58.1-3210. This program was abolished by the Board in 1990 because of low participation. At its height in 1986 the program only had 38 participants. The disincentive appeared to be that citizens did not want to leave accumulated debt with their estate. Although unpopular in the past, the program would provide a safety valve in the event an elderly or disabled person's cash flow was unable to accommodate taxes.

The Board of Supervisors could reinstate this program simply by adopting a local ordinance amendment. A tax deferral program for the elderly and disabled can be tied to the same income/asset limits, or can provide for deferrals beyond current limits.

For example, 78% of current applicants already receive 100% relief. However, 13% receive 50% and 9% receive 25%. A program could be adopted to allow the deferral of the amounts not relieved for these latter two categories. If all of the tax relief participants in the 25% and 50% categories availed themselves of this opportunity, General Fund revenue would be decreased by approximately \$4.3 million. This would be the worst case loss however. Given past participation rates it seems unlikely that more than a small percentage would actually take advantage of the program. If only 10% participate, the loss would only be \$430,000.

This would establish the annual baseline revenue loss but this would fluctuate somewhat each year as additional deferrals occur, offset by payments made as properties come out of deferral. Any deferred taxes must be repaid upon the applicant's death or upon the sale of the property. The law allows the County to charge interest up to 8% per year. While the eventual payment is generally secure, Va. Code Section 58.1-3216 does state that "any such lien shall, to the extent that it exceeds in the aggregate ten percent of the price for which such real estate may be sold, be inferior to all other liens of record." This is a less favorable position; taxes today represent a priority lien.

Another alternative would be to offer deferral to applicants who otherwise exceed the income/asset limits for the current tax relief program. The maximum allowable income under today's program is \$72,000, and the maximum allowable net asset limit is \$340,000. Under this alternative, for example, the Board could allow elderly and disabled taxpayers to enroll in a deferral program if their income met the existing program limits but their net assets exceeded the existing cap. In other words, an elderly or disabled person with \$72,000 income and \$500,000 in net assets, such as an IRA account, would not qualify for tax relief, but the Board could permit them to participate in a deferral program. This type of program would unquestionably create a much larger pool of potential applicants who could participate in deferral, but would likewise increase the amount of General Fund revenue lost (deferred) in any given year. Unfortunately, staff has no income or asset data from which to project the potential fiscal impact at these higher levels. It also remains unknown what the actual participation rate might be.

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Cook

Question: Please provide an update on recent changes to pension funding.

Response: The County currently uses a corridor approach to employer contributions for the three pension systems, the Employees' Retirement System (ERS), the Uniformed Retirement System (URS), and the Police Officers Retirement System (PORS). The corridor approach was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in FY 2002 at a time when the funding ratios for the three retirement systems ranged from 97 to 102 percent. It was designed by the County's actuaries to set annual contributions at the level necessary to maintain strong funding ratios in each of the plans while reducing the volatility in the employer contribution rates that is typical for plans that are near fully-funded. In the corridor method of funding, a fixed contribution rate is assigned to each system and the County contributes at the fixed rate unless the system's funding ratio falls outside the pre-selected corridor of 90-120 percent or if benefit enhancements are approved. If the funding ratio falls below 90 percent, the unfunded actuarial accrued liability below 90 percent is amortized over a conservative 15-year period, and this amount is included in the annual employer contribution for each fund.

The corridor approach cushioned the County from dramatic rate increases while maintaining strong funding ratios for several years. However, the global financial crisis during FY 2009 resulted in significant losses in the value of the invested assets of all three retirement systems. By the end of FY 2010, funding ratios had fallen to between 72 and 82 percent. Because only 90 percent of the unfunded liability is amortized and included in the employer contribution under the corridor approach, the funding ratios have improved since then, but at a slower pace than desired. As a result, the County has taken multiple steps to improve the financial position of the retirement systems. These steps include increasing contribution levels and limiting increases in liabilities:

- In FY 2010, the requirements regarding the award of ad-hoc Cost-of-Living Adjustments (COLAs) were tightened, requiring that the retirement system must have an actuarial surplus, demonstrated by having a funding ratio exceeding 100 percent, before an ad-hoc COLA can be considered.
- In FY 2011, the employer contribution rates were increased by adjusting the amortization level of the unfunded liability from 90 percent to 91 percent.
- In FY 2012, the Department of Human Resources, as directed by the Board of Supervisors, contracted with a benefits consultant to conduct a comprehensive review of the retirement plans. Based on the results of this study, the Board of Supervisors adopted several modifications to the retirement systems, which apply only to new employees who are hired on or after January 1, 2013. These changes include increasing the minimum retirement age for normal service retirement from 50 to 55 in the Employees' system; increasing the rule of 80 (age plus years of service) to the rule of 85 in the Employees' system; placing a cap on the use of sick leave for purposes of determining retirement eligibility and benefits at 2,080 hours for all three retirement systems; and, for the Deferred Retirement Option

Plan (DROP), removing the pre-Social Security supplement from balances accumulated during the DROP period in the Employees' and Uniformed systems.

- In FY 2015, the employer contribution rates were increased by adjusting the amortization level of the unfunded liability from 91 percent to 93 percent.

These actions, combined with recent strong investment returns, have improved the funding ratios of the systems to between 78 and 87 percent, and the funding ratios would continue to improve under the current funding policy provided that investment returns continue to meet or exceed the long-term target of 7.5 percent. However, the County is now under pressure to significantly increase its pension funding policies as a result of feedback from the bond rating agencies as well as changes in Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) policies.

The bond rating agencies, with Moody's in particular, have recently expressed concern that the County's pension systems are not adequately funded. As a result of this and other factors, the County's AAA bond rating is currently being reviewed. The AAA rating is critical for debt service affordability and access to funds in support of critical capital projects. The County has maintained the AAA rating since 1978, and it has saved the County \$662 million since that time.

A second factor necessitating an increase in pension funding is changes to pension reporting mandated under GASB Statements 67 and 68, which require that the full amount of the County's unfunded pension liability be reported on the balance sheet in the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). The unfunded liability is currently calculated using a discount rate of 7.5 percent based on the long-term expectation of the systems' investment earnings. However, under GASB 67 and 68, a lower discount rate must be used unless the systems each pass an asset depletion test. Funding to the pension systems must be increased in order to pass this asset depletion test. If funding is not increased, the unfunded pension liability reported on the County's balance sheet will be significantly higher – by over \$1 billion under initial projections – as a result of the requirement to use a lower discount rate.

In order to alleviate the concerns of the rating agencies while also meeting the requirements under GASB 67 and 68 to continue to use a discount rate of 7.5 percent, the Board expressed the County's commitment to increasing its pension funding in a letter to Moody's dated January 14, 2015. This commitment includes increasing the amortization level of the unfunded liability from 93 percent to 100 percent by the end of the decade, resulting in 100 percent funding of the Annual Required Contribution (ARC), as well as a goal of reaching a 90 percent funded status for all plans by 2025. In order to fulfill this commitment, the FY 2016 Advertised Budget Plan includes the following multi-year strategy:

- In FY 2016, the employer contribution rates will be increased to adjust the amortization level of the unfunded liability from 93 percent to 95 percent.
- Increases in the employer contribution rates will continue so that the County will amortize 100 percent of the unfunded liability by FY 2020 at the latest, fully funding the Annual Required Contribution for all systems. The County will continue to use a conservative 15-year amortization period.

- Until each system reaches 100 percent funded status, employer contributions to that system will not be reduced. Various factors, such as the historical trend of the County's investment returns exceeding the assumed rate of 7.5 percent, could allow employer contribution rates to be reduced from current levels. However, the County is committed to maintaining the rates and redirecting any potential savings into further improvement in the systems' funded positions.
- Any additional unfunded liability created as a result of approved benefit enhancements, such as ad-hoc COLAs, will be fully funded. It is the intent that no adjustments to benefit levels will reduce the funded status of any of the systems.

The first bullet under this strategy, adjusting the amortization level of the unfunded liability from 93 percent to 95 percent, has been included in the FY 2016 Advertised Budget Plan. This action results in an increase of \$10.2 million in General Fund employer contributions to the three retirement systems over the FY 2015 level. It should be noted that the net General Fund impact of changes to the employer contribution rates to the pension systems, including this change in the amortization level as well as changes resulting from the annual actuarial valuation of the systems, is \$8.6 million. This lower net impact reflects the strong investment earnings that have been realized in the retirement systems.

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: Are there other Northern Virginia jurisdictions with a grass code similar to Fairfax County? What is that code and what is the property owner charged if the jurisdiction cuts the grass? The Washington Post stated Arlington County charges a non-compliant property owner \$600. Is there a state ceiling on what the County can charge and if so, what is it?

Response: Arlington County, Prince William County, and Loudoun County have enacted grass ordinances restricting grass height to twelve inches on certain property within their respective jurisdictions. These jurisdictions charge the property owner the cost of abatement should the County cut the grass after providing notice to the property owner. Prince William County and Loudoun County have also enacted ordinances permitting the assessment of civil penalties in the amount of \$50 for the first violation of the ordinance, and \$200 for each successive violation of the ordinance, with total penalties not to exceed \$3,000 in a twelve month period.

The General Assembly has authorized the County to charge the costs and expenses associated with cutting grass after providing reasonable notice to the property owner. Additionally, civil penalties of \$100 may be assessed against the owners of occupied residential real property of less than one-half acre for each violation of the ordinance. *See* Va. Code Ann. § 15.2-1215(A) (Supp. 2014). Civil penalties of \$50 for the first violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation, with total penalties not to exceed \$3,000 in a twelve-month period may be assessed for any violation of the ordinance, regardless of the size, use, or occupancy of the property. *See* Va. Code Ann. § 15.2-901 (Supp. 2014).

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Foust

Question: Please provide background on the fuel prices recommended in the FY 2016 Advertised Budget Plan. Are there any surpluses available in the County's fuel budget?

Response: The FY 2016 recommended budget assumes an average agency price of \$2.77 per gallon, a decrease of \$0.25 cents (or 8.3 percent) from the FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan level. The \$2.77 price per gallon reflects a "blended" rate based on roughly three-quarters of the County's fuel purchased being diesel, and one-fourth unleaded with a small markup to cover overhead costs and fuel-related capital equipment expenditures. It is important to note that the recommended fuel price results in General Fund savings of \$1.0 million in the FY 2016 Advertised Budget Plan.

While the price of fuel has declined significantly in recent months, the year-to-date average "blended" rate of \$2.58 is only 19 cents below the FY 2016 recommended price. In addition, it appears that fuel prices hit a low point in mid-January and have begun to rebound. Since January 19th, the "blended" rate has increased by approximately 31 cents. This trend is likely to continue as prices generally increase in the spring and summer months. As a result, prices are anticipated to be in line with the FY 2016 recommended budget by the end of FY 2015 and it is assumed that prices will not drop as far in winter 2016 as this winter's prices have not been seen since late FY 2009.

In addition, it should be noted that a \$4.0 million Fuel Price Stabilization Reserve exists in Fund 60010, Department of Vehicle Services. First created as part of the *FY 2009 Third Quarter Review*, this reserve is designed to provide flexibility in the case of an unanticipated increase in fuel prices. These funds have not been required since they were earmarked for this purpose; however, the balance in the reserve is included in the totals reported to the rating agencies.

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Foust

Question: Please summarize the County’s funding for IT Projects, including why funding for the selected projects was provided.

Response: The following chart summarizes the FY 2016 Advertised Budget Plan funding for Fund 10040, IT Projects:

Project Number	Project	FY 2016 Advertised Budget Plan
2G70-003-000	GIS-Oblique Imagery	\$136,000
2G70-004-000	GIS-Plainimetric Data	\$90,000
2G70-006-000	Information Technology Training	\$100,000
2G70-018-000	Enterprise Architecture and Support	\$1,800,000
2G70-020-000	Public Access to Information	\$528,000
2G70-036-000	Remote Access	\$100,000
2G70-041-000	Customer Relationship Management	\$400,000
2G70-069-000	Tax System Modernization Project	\$450,000
IT-000017	Enterprise Document Management	\$450,000
IT-000018	Enterprise Identity Management	\$800,000
IT-000019	FIDO-LDS Replacement	\$1,000,000
IT-000020	Tele-Psychiatry Project	\$300,000
IT-000021	Fire and Police Depts. Telephone Replacement	\$270,000
TOTAL		\$6,424,000

It is important to note that the above total reflects funding of \$2.7 million in General Fund support and \$3.7 million in funds redirected from Fund 40030, Cable Communications, to support IT projects. The \$2.7 million General Fund figure is the lowest annual amount of General Fund support since the IT Projects fund was created in FY 1995. The following chart shows the level of General Fund support over the past ten years. Due to significant funding restraints, only the most critical projects have been funded.

<i>General Fund Commitment to IT Projects (Fund 10040) FY06 - FY16 (\$ in millions)</i>			
	<i>General Fund</i>	<i>Cable (Fund 40030) Funds</i>	<i>Total</i>
FY 2006	\$13.4	\$0	\$13.4
FY 2007	\$12.5	\$0	\$12.5
FY 2008	\$12.4	\$0	\$12.4
FY 2009	\$7.4	\$2.5	\$9.9
FY 2010	\$7.4	\$1.0	\$8.4
FY 2011	\$3.2	\$1.8	\$5.0
FY 2012	\$5.3	\$3.7	\$9.0
FY 2013	\$5.3	\$3.3	\$8.6
FY 2014	\$2.9	\$2.9	\$5.8
FY 2015	\$3.7	\$2.9	\$6.6
FY 2016 (Adv.)	\$2.7	\$3.7	\$6.4

As the table shows, Cable Funds have supplemented General Fund support for many years but it should be noted that their availability in future years is not guaranteed as Cable Fund balances are at their lowest point in recent history.

For this reason, the County Executive noted in his presentation that IT Projects are likely to require additional funding in future years and multi-year budget requirements are being evaluated for projects such as the FIDO-LDS Replacement as well as other projects that did not receive funding in FY 2016 such as the Sheriff Jail Management System replacement and several Human Services-related projects. It should be noted that in the FY 2015 through FY 2016 time period, only 50 percent of agency requests for IT project support was able to be funded due to limited available resources.

Detailed summaries of all FY 2016 projects recommended for funding are included at <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dmb/fy2016/advertised/volume2/10040.pdf>.

The Selection Process – Background:

A rigorous review process is required to judge which projects receive funding as all County agencies business processes are automated and rely heavily on the Department of Information Technology (DIT) to meet their missions and operational requirements. In order to direct this process, the Senior Information Technology Steering Committee has adopted five IT priorities which guide the direction of Fund 10040. Each of the selected projects must meet at least one of the following criteria; however, the majority of the selected projects fit many of these criteria:

Mandated Requirements: Provide support for requirements enacted by the federal government, Commonwealth of Virginia, Board of Supervisors, or those that are Court ordered or resulting from changes to County regulations.

Completion of Prior Investments: Provide support for multi-year lease purchases and to implement a project phase or to complete a planned project.

Enhanced County Security: Provide support for homeland security, physical security, information security and privacy requirements.

Improved Service and Efficiency: Promote consolidated business practices; support more efficient government; optimize management and use of County assets and data; enhance systems to meet the expectations and needs of citizens; and promote service that can be provided through the Internet/e-government. This includes corporate and strategic initiatives that add demonstrable value to a broad sector of government or to the County as a whole, which also provide productivity benefits and/or effectively manages the County's information and knowledge assets.

Maintaining a Current and Supportable Technology Infrastructure: Focus on technology infrastructure modernizations which upgrade, extend or enhance the overall architecture or major County infrastructure components, including hardware and software and its environment. Ensure that citizens, businesses and County employees have appropriate access to information and services.

By these criteria, funding in the FY 2016 Advertised Budget Plan was divided as follows:

<i>Category</i>	<i>Funding</i>
Completion of Prior Investments	\$1.07 million
Enhanced County Security	\$0.80 million
Improved Services and Efficiency	\$1.28 million
Technology Infrastructure	\$3.27 million
Total	\$6.42 million

The Selection Process- FY 2016:

In order to be considered for funding in FY 2016, agencies submitted project funding requests that met one or more of the five above Senior IT strategic priorities, and were also required to provide additional supplemental information, including:

- Specific tangible project outcomes;
- Clear project start and completion dates;
- Anticipated implementation timeline and budget plans over the next five years (including subsequent fiscal year(s) impact on enterprise-wide infrastructure, maintenance and support);
- Clear linkage to agency strategic and business goals; and
- An indication that the project would be completed and maintained without additional staff.

FY 2016 funding requests for existing projects were restricted to projects requiring additional support to meet existing contractual obligations, to complete a planned phase of the project and where appropriate progress against existing project plans had occurred.

The process was designed to facilitate the development of a solid business and technical case for IT project requests and to update the business and technical status for continuing projects.

A Project Review Team consisting of business and technical staff from DIT and the Department of Management and Budget reviewed all submissions. The project review included identification of projects that provide opportunities for improvement; those that help sustain the performance and reliability of the County technology infrastructure; and those poised to take advantage of technological advancements. In addition, the Project Review Team identified projects that would address Board of Supervisors' (BOS) strategic initiatives such as FIDO-LDS Replacement which is consistent with the BOS strategic initiative to improve the permit review process within the County.

Projects were reviewed from both a business and technical perspective. On the business side, consideration included whether project implementation would benefit citizens, the County or both. Benefits of the projects were weighed against the cost and several risk factors including potential related expenses with an unknown cost, changes in scope necessitated by new business drivers, technological relevance, operational transformation needs, project schedule viability and the impact of not funding or otherwise delaying the project. This review was conducted with a multi-year planning horizon in order to plan for both current and future technology needs.

On the technical side, factors examined included identifying infrastructure modernizations which upgrade, extend or enhance the overall architecture or major County infrastructure components, including hardware and software, with consideration given to the organizational experience with the proposed hardware, software and resource support. Special consideration was given to a projects timeframe as replacement solutions are timed to incorporate important technology capabilities that are flexible and can support new mandates, boost worker productivity and data. Staff also ensured that all technology systems were scrutinized against industry norms and technology obsolescence factors to include the cost when technology solutions no longer meet changing business needs. Finally, consideration was given to the availability of human resources both in DIT and the sponsoring agency to manage the business requirements, scope and schedule commitments.

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Chairman Bulova

Question: Please explain the discrepancy between the 2.87% revenue growth and the 2.61% expenditure growth as shown on slides 7 and 8 of the County Executive’s budget presentation.

Response: As shown in the table below, the 2.87% revenue growth shown on slide 7 of the County Executive’s budget presentation is based on a comparison of the FY 2016 Advertised Budget Plan to the *FY 2015 Revised Budget Plan*. This comparison is used because the *FY 2015 Revised Budget Plan* includes the most recent projection of total revenue to be received in FY 2015.

The growth in disbursements of 2.61% shown on page 8 of the County Executive’s budget presentation compares the FY 2016 Advertised Budget Plan to the FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan. The *FY 2015 Revised Budget Plan* is not used as the base for the disbursement growth calculation as it includes expenditure authority for encumbrances carried forward from the prior year and funding for one-time requirements identified as part of the *FY 2014 Carryover Review*.

It should be noted that the table below only shows General Fund revenue and disbursements. In addition to revenue, the disbursement levels shown are supported by transfers in from other funds and, in the case of the *FY 2015 Revised Budget Plan*, the carryover of unexpended balances from FY 2014.

	FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan	FY 2015 Revised Budget Plan	FY 2016 Advertised Budget Plan	Inc/(Dec) Over Adopted	% Inc/(Dec) Over Adopted	Inc/(Dec) Over Revised	% Inc/(Dec) Over Revised
Total Revenue	3,708,563,492	3,701,038,589	3,807,380,285	98,816,793	2.66%	106,341,696	2.87%
Total Disbursements	3,716,363,975	3,780,165,625	3,813,478,453	97,114,478	2.61%	33,312,828	0.88%

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Gross

Question: Please provide additional information on the proposed closing of the Annandale Adult Day Health Care Program site.

Response: Over the last four years in spite of demographic increases in the aging population and concerted efforts to market the Adult Day Health Care (ADHC) Program, the Health Department has experienced a decline in the average daily attendance from 138 in FY 2010 to 96 in FY 2014. The steady decrease in enrollment has also resulted in a decrease in revenue. It is believed that, in part, this is due to the proliferation of Long Term Care options available to residents in the County (e.g., Program for All Inclusive Care of the Elderly [PACE], Assisted Living Facilities with Memory Units, Home Care Agencies and new ADHC Centers). While the increase in options has created more opportunities for some County residents, those with limited resources still rely heavily on the County ADHC services because they are provided on a sliding fee scale.

The Annandale ADHC site has an average daily attendance of 24 participants. If the Annandale ADHC site is closed, the Health Department has the capacity to provide services at the remaining four ADHC sites. It is anticipated that many of the participants will move to the Lincolnia ADHC site as it is only five miles away and will be newly renovated. The Lincolnia ADHC site currently has the capacity to serve an additional 16 participants per day; therefore, 16 (or two-thirds) of the participants at the Annandale ADHC site can be served at the Lincolnia ADHC site. If more than 16 participants from the Annandale ADHC site wish to attend the Lincolnia ADHC site, staff is looking to implement a waitlist and will move participants off the wait list once a slot is available. This will not preclude a participant from attending another ADHC site while he/she waits for a slot at the Lincolnia ADHC site. If the Board wishes to accommodate all 24 participants currently attending the Annandale ADHC site at the Lincolnia ADHC site, 1/1.0 FTE position and \$66,805 could be restored from the ADHC Annandale reduction. This position would be redeployed to the Lincolnia ADHC site and will increase capacity so that all to Annandale ADHC participants can be accommodated at the Lincolnia ADHC site.

Additionally, the Health Department is working with the Department of Neighborhood and Community Services to conduct a comprehensive transportation review of all ADHC participants. Based on this review a plan will be developed to maximize the County's transportation resources while maintaining an acceptable program site for all participants and their families.

The Lincolnia senior site is undergoing a renovation which will require relocation of the ADHC program to another space until July 15, 2015. This will temporarily limit the number of participants who can be served at the Lincolnia ADHC site; however, since this reduction will not be implemented until July 1, 2015, it is not anticipated that this should significantly impact service delivery. There will be capacity within the remaining four ADHC sites to serve the Annandale ADHC participants and/or the Annandale ADHC site could remain open until July 15, 2015.

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Chairman Bulova

Question: What is the possibility of a one-time increase of the \$155 million yearly cap on school bond sales for capital improvement projects by \$13.1 million?

Response: If the County were to provide a one-time amount of \$13.1 million of General Obligation Bond Sales for the Schools this would increase the County's debt ratio by 0.03% and would require approximately \$1.2 million in additional debt service annually beginning in FY 2016.

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Hudgins

Question: What are the specific reasons that there are higher per pupil costs for special education/ESOL students?

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

Additional staffing, itinerant and central support, and specialized equipment are the primary drivers of higher per-pupil costs for students receiving services beyond the general curriculum. Examples include:

- 1) Additional teacher positions for reduced class sizes (often required by state law) or to provide pull-out / push-in services
- 2) Instructional assistants, public health training assistants, or public health attendants to provide students with additional instructional help or personal care
- 3) Itinerant assistive technology teachers and specialized equipment for students needing support to access the curriculum

On average, the cost per pupil for a special education student is approximately double the general education cost per pupil. In 1975, the federal government made a commitment to fund 40.0 percent of the excess special education costs. However, federal funding currently covers only 11.5 percent of FCPS' costs, a shortfall of more than \$71.6 million in FY 2015. The cost of providing English for Speakers of Other Languages services adds approximately 30 percent.

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Please provide the average class size by jurisdiction as well as the average class size by Fairfax County school.

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

The number of students per classroom position and number of students per teacher-scale position are included in the Washington Area Boards of Education (WABE) Guide. Here is the chart from the FY 2015 WABE Guide.

School Division	Students per Classroom Teacher ¹			Students per Teacher-Scale Position ²		
	Elementary	Middle / Intermediate	Secondary / High	Elementary	Middle / Intermediate	Secondary / High
Alexandria City	19.8	18.4	24.2	8.8	11.2	15.8
Arlington County	21.0	20.1	19.6	10.2	15.7	16.5
Fairfax County	22.4	24.6	25.6	14.8	20.5	21.4
Falls Church City	21.9	24.3	19.5	13.0	16.9	13.6
Loudoun County	22.2	25.3	29.7	15.1	21.7	26.0
Manassas City	21.7	26.1	26.7	11.9	15.7	16.5
Manassas Park City	20.3	26.2	25.5	12.9	18.8	19.9
Montgomery County	18.9	25.6	26.8	13.6	21.7	23.6
Prince George's County	18.2	18.4	23.8	13.5	14.8	20.9
Prince William County	23.2	31.5	30.1	15.2	22.1	22.4

Note: Chart excludes teachers and students in pre-K, kindergarten, alternative schools, and self-contained special education.

¹ Classroom teachers are positions used to determine class size.

² Students per teacher-scale positions include classroom teachers and other teachers such as ESOL/ESL, librarians, reading, coaches, mentors, music, art, physical education, etc.

Actual elementary general education class sizes by school for FCPS reported to VDOE as of October 31 each year are available at the link below and FY 2015 has been attached for your convenience.

<http://www.fcps.edu/it/studentreporting/escsa.shtml>

Fairfax County Public Schools
Elementary Class Size Averages
As of October 31, 2014

School	K-3 Initiative	Kindergarten Average	Grades 1-3 Average	Grades 4-6 Average	Combination Classes Average	School Average
Aldrin Elem		22.8	23.5	27.1		24.7
Annandale Terrace Elem	*	18.2	17.8	22.4		19.2
Archer Elem		27.5	23.1	24.9		24.4
Armstrong Elem		19.3	18.9	19.0		19.0
Baileys Elem	*	18.4	18.5			18.5
Bailey's Upper Elem	*		15.4	16.8		16.2
Beech Tree Elem	*	22.7	18.8	21.6		20.3
Belle View Elem		22.5	21.7	20.1		21.2
Belvedere Elem	*	17.8	19.0	21.9	16.5	19.7
Bonnie Brae Elem		23.8	23.1	27.9		25.0
Braddock Elem	*	20.6	19.3	22.5		20.4
Bren Mar Park Elem	*	22.3	19.3	23.0		20.8
Brookfield Elem	*	23.0	20.1	18.5		19.9
Bucknell Elem	*	19.0	15.6	14.0		15.4
Bull Run Elem		21.8	23.8	23.6		23.4
Bush Hill Elem		24.7	22.0	22.1		22.5
Camelot Elem		25.0	21.3	20.0		21.2
Cameron Elem	*	19.0	19.6	17.4	26.0	19.1
Canterbury Woods Elem		21.0	23.5	24.4		23.7
Cardinal Forest Elem		23.8	21.5	24.1		22.8
Centre Ridge Elem		19.8	21.9	22.3	23.5	21.8
Centreville Elem		22.8	22.8	26.4		24.1
Cherry Run Elem		21.3	22.3	23.8		22.8
Chesterbrook Elem		25.7	22.7	24.7		23.9
Churchill Road Elem		26.3	25.7	25.8		25.8
Clearview Elem	*	23.3	20.8	23.1		22.1
Clermont Elem		19.8	24.6	25.7		24.1
Coates Elem	*	22.2	20.4	19.2		20.3
Columbia Elem	*	18.8	18.5	24.6	26.5	20.7

* Schools participating in the K-3 Class Size Reduction Program

Fairfax County Public Schools
Elementary Class Size Averages
As of October 31, 2014

School	K-3 Initiative	Kindergarten Average	Grades 1-3 Average	Grades 4-6 Average	Combination Classes Average	School Average
Colvin Run Elem		25.0	24.2	25.0		24.7
Crestwood Elem	*	17.8	19.5	18.7		18.9
Crossfield Elem		20.0	24.2	24.9		24.0
Cub Run Elem		21.8	23.6	23.6		23.3
Cunningham Park Elem		21.3	22.3	20.6		21.5
Daniels Run Elem		23.8	22.5	23.2		22.9
Deer Park Elem		26.7	22.3	21.1		22.2
Dogwood Elem	*	18.7	17.1	18.0		17.6
Dranesville Elem		21.2	21.0	21.5		21.2
Eagle View Elem		24.8	25.7	26.1		25.7
Fairfax Villa Elem		21.8	23.6	21.6		22.5
Fairhill Elem		20.3	22.2	24.6	24.0	22.8
Fairview Elem		22.5	24.1	25.3		24.3
Flint Hill Elem		22.3	26.2	25.5		25.3
Floris Elem		23.3	24.2	26.7		25.2
Forest Edge Elem		27.0	20.7	22.6		22.2
Forestdale Elem	*	16.3	17.8	18.7		18.0
Forestville Elem		19.0	21.6	24.6		22.6
Fort Belvoir Elem		22.1	21.6	22.4		22.0
Fort Hunt Elem		22.7	21.8	21.0		21.6
Fox Mill Elem		24.0	24.2	23.3		23.8
Franconia Elem		22.3	24.0	24.8	24.0	24.0
Freedom Hill Elem		24.5	23.2	21.1		22.6
Garfield Elem	*	19.7	19.0	18.5	20.0	19.0
Glen Forest Elem	*	18.3	18.2	21.8		19.1
Graham Road Elem	*	21.0	19.2	18.4		19.2
Great Falls Elem		17.7	21.3	23.1	35.0	22.1
Greenbriar East Elem		25.8	25.3	24.8		25.2
Greenbriar West Elem		21.8	25.6	26.8	27.0	26.0

* Schools participating in the K-3 Class Size Reduction Program

Fairfax County Public Schools
Elementary Class Size Averages
As of October 31, 2014

School	K-3 Initiative	Kindergarten Average	Grades 1-3 Average	Grades 4-6 Average	Combination Classes Average	School Average
Groveton Elem	*	16.8	19.1	19.8		19.0
Gunston Elem		19.3	20.8	22.0		21.1
Halley Elem		20.5	22.6	20.5		21.4
Haycock Elem		21.0	23.7	23.8		23.5
Hayfield Elem		26.2	24.4	24.7		24.8
Herndon Elem	*	19.7	19.7	24.6		21.1
Hollin Meadows Elem	*	22.4	19.4	20.5		20.3
Hunt Valley Elem		23.5	24.8	24.5		24.5
Hunters Woods Elem		23.3	24.8	26.4		25.5
Hutchison Elem	*	20.3	20.3	21.0		20.6
Hybla Valley Elem	*	18.8	17.5	18.1		17.9
Island Creek Elem		24.8	22.1	24.6		23.5
Keene Mill Elem		22.0	24.5	25.9		25.0
Kent Gardens Elem		25.0	23.9	27.2		25.3
Kings Glen Elem				23.1		23.1
Kings Park Elem		24.1	22.4			22.9
Lake Anne Elem	*	21.0	20.2	21.3		20.8
Lane Elem		27.6	24.5	24.2	24.5	24.9
Laurel Hill Elem		23.5	25.2	23.5	24.7	24.2
Laurel Ridge Elem		23.0	23.1	25.7		24.1
Lees Corner Elem		23.8	24.8	23.3		24.0
Lemon Road Elem		19.0	24.4	21.0	24.0	22.1
Little Run Elem		20.0	19.0	19.8		19.5
London Towne Elem	*	19.8	20.3	19.6		20.0
Lorton Station Elem	*	19.7	21.5	25.2		22.9
Lynbrook Elem	*	17.0	16.2	18.9		17.1
Mantua Elem		27.0	25.7	24.7	22.7	25.1
Marshall Road Elem		26.8	21.6	24.2		23.3
Mason Crest Elem	*	22.0	21.8	18.9		20.9

* Schools participating in the K-3 Class Size Reduction Program

Fairfax County Public Schools
Elementary Class Size Averages
As of October 31, 2014

School	K-3 Initiative	Kindergarten Average	Grades 1-3 Average	Grades 4-6 Average	Combination Classes Average	School Average
McNair Elem		27.1	27.0	24.9	30.0	26.4
Mosby Woods Elem		28.0	24.3	24.9		25.0
Mount Eagle Elem	*	17.0	16.5	22.0	20.8	18.0
Mount Vernon Woods Elem	*	19.2	19.1	21.4		19.8
Navy Elem		24.8	25.1	23.4		24.3
Newington Forest Elem		24.0	20.9	24.3		22.6
North Springfield Elem	*	20.3	19.7	21.3		20.3
Oak Hill Elem		22.0	24.6	26.6		25.3
Oak View Elem		27.5	24.9	25.2		25.4
Oakton Elem		27.3	24.8	25.6		25.4
Olde Creek Elem		25.5	22.1	22.9		22.9
Orange Hunt Elem		27.3	23.9	24.4	25.0	24.5
Parklawn Elem	*	18.4	18.2	22.4	21.7	19.6
Pine Spring Elem	*	22.8	19.2	20.7		20.2
Poplar Tree Elem		25.5	24.3	22.7		23.7
Powell Elem		25.6	25.2	25.9		25.5
Providence Elem		21.2	22.3	22.4		22.2
Ravensworth Elem		22.3	21.8	22.3		22.1
Riverside Elem	*	22.2	18.1	20.3		19.6
Rolling Valley Elem		27.3	25.4	21.0		23.7
Rose Hill Elem	*	19.4	20.7	19.5		20.0
Sangster Elem		25.7	23.6	24.9		24.5
Saratoga Elem	*	21.2	20.1	19.9		20.2
Sherman Elem		26.0	24.0	24.5	26.0	24.6
Shrevewood Elem		26.5	23.5	23.7	26.0	24.1
Silverbrook Elem		23.5	26.0	23.9		24.7
Sleepy Hollow Elem	*	18.5	19.4	22.0		19.9
Spring Hill Elem		25.0	25.4	26.5		25.8
Springfield Estates Elem		27.5	23.6	24.1	30.0	24.3

* Schools participating in the K-3 Class Size Reduction Program

Fairfax County Public Schools
Elementary Class Size Averages
As of October 31, 2014

School	K-3 Initiative	Kindergarten Average	Grades 1-3 Average	Grades 4-6 Average	Combination Classes Average	School Average
Stenwood Elem		27.0	24.8	23.3		24.5
Stratford Landing Elem		22.3	24.3	25.6	23.0	24.8
Sunrise Valley Elem		20.3	21.6	24.0	22.0	22.5
Terra-Centre Elem		23.0	21.9	24.6		23.1
Terraset Elem		20.4	18.2	23.6	21.0	20.6
Timber Lane Elem	*	17.8	19.2	20.4		19.4
Union Mill Elem		24.4	25.8	24.4		25.0
Vienna Elem		22.7	21.8	23.5		22.5
Virginia Run Elem		21.3	21.1	21.8		21.4
Wakefield Forest Elem		25.0	25.4	23.8		24.7
Waples Mill Elem		25.5	24.7	26.9		25.6
Washington Mill Elem	*	20.8	19.6	20.3		20.0
Waynewood Elem		22.2	23.5	26.5		24.4
West Springfield Elem		25.0	21.9	25.6		23.7
Westbriar Elem		27.3	23.4	25.9		24.8
Westgate Elem		24.5	20.3	21.6		21.4
Westlawn Elem	*	18.3	19.2	21.8		19.9
Weyanoke Elem	*	15.4	18.9	15.6		17.3
White Oaks Elem		21.0	25.3	25.6		24.9
Willow Springs Elem		22.5	23.1	25.1		24.1
Wolftrap Elem		24.7	25.3	24.5	25.0	24.9
Woodburn Elem	*	20.0	18.6	18.7		18.8
Woodlawn Elem	*	20.0	17.6	21.5		19.4
Woodley Hills Elem	*	20.0	20.6	21.6		20.9
FCPS		22.0	21.8	23.1	23.9	22.3

* Schools participating in the K-3 Class Size Reduction Program

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: For the last 5 years, please provide a spreadsheet that shows projected versus actual FRM, ESOL and total student enrollment for each elementary, middle, secondary and high school. For this purpose, please show separately the projected numbers used to prepare both the Proposed Budget and the projected numbers used to prepare the detailed approved budgets for each school as well as the actual numbers.

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

Please see attachments for projected and actual English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and total student enrollment. Actual FY 2015 figures for total student enrollment are not yet available as FCPS does not report official ESOL enrollment until after January 31, official alternative enrollment until after January 31, and official Family and Early Childhood Education Program (FECEP) enrollment until after March 31. FCPS does not project for Free and Reduced-Price Meals (FRM). FRM percentages used for staffing calculations are based on the prior year actuals and are available at

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/nutrition/statistics/index.shtml>

FY11 to FY15
FCPS ESOL Enrollment

Lvl	Num	School	FY11 Prop*	FY11 App*	FY11 Act*	FY12 Prop*	FY12 App*	FY12 Act*	FY13 Prop	FY13 App	FY13 Act	FY14 Prop	FY14 App	FY14 Act	FY15 Prop	FY15 App**
E	305	Aldrin	40	43	72	72	81	104	131	125	80	87	84	87	89	101
E	144	Annandale Terrace	268	268	370	383	389	443	532	529	334	349	334	327	331	396
E	304	Armstrong	39	39	31	36	31	36	40	43	43	45	46	46	48	53
E	103	Bailey's	387	387	445	462	471	558	666	664	626	658	677	664	700	848
E	096	Beech Tree	162	162	169	185	174	141	233	141	159	167	159	159	166	198
E	202	Belle View	53	53	75	79	83	99	120	120	103	110	111	102	101	113
E	456	Belvedere	157	157	169	176	178	155	211	155	203	209	219	202	212	247
E	395	Bonnie Brae	83	83	100	112	107	107	135	113	106	108	109	88	88	102
E	147	Braddock	233	233	281	284	304	320	390	362	375	376	404	384	396	480
E	114	Bren Mar Park	130	130	176	187	195	233	273	279	222	239	240	193	204	228
E	263	Brookfield	138	138	179	184	195	205	243	233	231	229	250	239	248	298
E	207	Bucknell	97	97	85	87	85	97	125	110	97	99	104	101	109	113
E	437	Bull Run	130	130	131	127	131	146	177	163	135	149	138	137	138	164
E	123	Bush Hill	83	83	84	92	84	94	110	104	98	103	106	92	92	108
E	086	Camelot	81	81	116	114	134	155	185	185	150	156	162	148	146	169
E	192	Cameron	128	128	120	122	120	156	190	188	156	160	169	154	155	195
E	402	Canterbury Woods	32	32	54	55	56	53	62	53	49	54	49	57	58	67
E	154	Cardinal Forest	84	84	79	85	79	114	141	136	107	109	113	116	120	141
E	436	Centre Ridge	151	151	148	158	148	176	219	208	230	230	249	221	225	282
E	433	Centreville	137	137	136	149	136	168	200	198	168	176	182	152	157	178
E	372	Cherry Run	23	23	34	37	39	34	39	34	25	26	25	22	21	24
E	035	Chesterbrook	12	12	31	32	37	33	40	34	35	35	37	19	21	23
E	026	Churchill Road	23	29	69	76	80	54	60	54	53	50	53	45	48	51
E	282	Clearview	118	118	142	147	164	159	199	178	167	175	179	156	163	186
E	193	Clermont	67	67	59	59	59	61	74	63	79	81	82	67	76	81
E	416	Clifton	7	7		7										
E	285	Coates	117	117	168	168	194	232	268	278	231	247	250	223	245	271
E	455	Columbia	82	82	96	106	102	128	159	153	162	162	174	150	164	177
E	017	Colvin Run	19	19	28	31	31	42	52	51	38	41	42	24	25	32
E	166	Crestwood	265	265	289	304	305	296	373	301	278	295	278	296	306	354
E	337	Crossfield	24	24	31	28	36	42	47	50	31	36	32	33	35	38
E	244	Cub Run	44	44	42	42	47	60	77	72	67	68	72	62	59	70
E	066	Cunningham Park	85	85	103	115	113	114	145	125	108	118	111	116	121	134

FY11 to FY15
FCPS ESOL Enrollment

Lvl	Num	School	FY11 Prop*	FY11 App*	FY11 Act*	FY12 Prop*	FY12 App*	FY12 Act*	FY13 Prop	FY13 App	FY13 Act	FY14 Prop	FY14 App	FY14 Act	FY15 Prop	FY15 App**
E	397	Daniels Run	133	133	124	131	126	168	210	197	170	182	183	158	165	192
E	242	Deer Park	68	68	75	76	83	105	130	126	103	104	112	102	106	118
E	336	Dogwood	248	254	272	289	291	338	412	405	324	346	350	342	365	408
E	273	Dranesville	86	86	109	110	125	131	158	157	140	150	151	167	169	203
E	136	Eagle View	167	167	152	154	152	167	206	183	170	178	181	123	129	145
E	173	Fairfax Villa	47	47	45	48	45	80	92	97	84	94	91	108	109	134
E	087	Fairhill	84	84	137	145	140	141	184	145	146	146	151	122	127	143
E	362	Fairview	24	24	45	48	48	53	68	63	40	43	40	28	26	32
E	063	Flint Hill	20	20	29	30	33	29	34	29	32	31	33	33	38	34
E	286	Floris	42	42	40	46	46	60	71	73	63	66	69	58	59	67
E	302	Forest Edge	94	94	122	126	136	123	156	123	124	130	124	127	135	148
E	165	Forestdale	134	134	152	145	153	203	258	244	183	193	198	175	177	205
E	295	Forestville	27	32	36	35	38	46	61	55	31	33	31	22	29	24
E	197	Fort Belvoir	21	21	34	34	40	44	51	53	33	40	33	27	24	33
E	217	Fort Hunt	21	21	49	52	55	57	76	64	67	70	73	64	69	72
25 E	334	Fox Mill	37	37	48	49	48	57	73	68	53	55	55	44	46	49
E	122	Franconia	99	99	110	117	115	123	152	136	125	129	132	116	123	131
E	025	Franklin Sherman	34	34	47	50	52	42	55	42	45	48	45	47	50	54
E	077	Freedom Hill	146	146	167	165	187	185	218	205	165	164	165	152	148	178
E	162	Garfield	91	91	95	101	98	119	145	140	142	146	154	143	147	173
E	104	Glen Forest	325	325	401	403	418	465	565	539	442	464	464	451	465	563
E	093	Graham Road	148	148	173	183	192	195	245	217	192	201	202	213	223	259
E	297	Great Falls	19	20	24	24	24	24	35	24	17	21	17	19	19	23
E	254	Greenbriar East	91	91	125	134	132	149	185	169	148	152	160	164	174	191
E	255	Greenbriar West	40	40	71	76	81	87	105	105	88	88	95	76	81	82
E	205	Groveton	198	198	255	259	277	281	371	307	330	329	356	324	335	385
E	348	Gunston	135	135	125	126	125	137	163	149	142	145	152	127	135	149
E	356	Halley	66	66	85	88	90	106	130	127	100	101	108	114	123	138
E	033	Haycock	17	20	32	35	37	44	44	52	51	52	56	46	50	62
E	184	Hayfield	39	39	45	44	45	64	77	77	63	68	68	57	64	61
E	276	Herndon	147	147	198	215	222	223	274	249	263	282	284	309	323	375
E	214	Hollin Meadows	102	123	160	167	184	168	200	174	166	173	170	175	180	205
E	378	Hunt Valley	40	40	40	38	40	51	61	56	53	53	56	46	56	60

FY11 to FY15
FCPS ESOL Enrollment

Lvl	Num	School	FY11 Prop*	FY11 App*	FY11 Act*	FY12 Prop*	FY12 App*	FY12 Act*	FY13 Prop	FY13 App	FY13 Act	FY14 Prop	FY14 App	FY14 Act	FY15 Prop	FY15 App**
E	327	Hunters Woods	65	65	73	81	77	79	94	84	90	93	97	78	84	86
E	287	Hutchison	235	252	317	324	334	374	454	440	433	442	468	477	497	575
E	206	Hybla Valley	321	321	373	385	388	439	543	518	442	473	478	460	478	558
E	429	Island Creek	81	81	89	92	99	95	115	101	79	87	79	77	81	80
E	157	Keene Mill	86	86	75	81	75	90	112	107	99	105	106	87	96	95
E	036	Kent Gardens	89	89	94	100	101	112	129	132	85	87	85	80	84	84
E	406	Kings Glen	102	102	67	74	67	69	83	71	50	52	50	60	63	60
E	407	Kings Park	129	129	133	134	149	160	203	190	145	150	151	160	168	212
E	307	Lake Anne	72	72	108	119	111	126	151	141	109	114	109	107	107	139
E	127	Lane	142	144	155	144	166	170	197	184	143	149	143	119	134	136
E	403	Laurel Hill	85	87	112	119	129	152	179	183	138	143	149	137	146	153
E	394	Laurel Ridge	50	50	65	67	65	75	92	84	69	69	70	59	64	63
E	252	Lees Corner	59	59	87	97	87	119	141	140	99	104	107	101	105	137
E	074	Lemon Road	53	53	52	49	52	47	59	47	65	63	71	76	77	103
E	133	Little Run	67	67	63	66	63	80	95	95	81	81	87	68	71	71
E	245	London Towne	183	183	196	202	206	234	295	279	259	273	279	264	277	321
E	343	Lorton Station	176	176	193	204	193	239	293	283	207	223	217	192	198	227
E	067	Louise Archer	25	25	56	51	64	49	67	49	56	53	56	77	84	87
E	164	Lynbrook	258	284	247	264	252	295	365	352	346	367	373	366	381	462
E	138	Mantua	59	59	80	79	80	85	103	91	68	67	68	71	63	86
E	054	Marshall Road	80	80	117	115	135	137	148	159	120	124	123	132	135	151
E	453	Mason Crest						116		139	160	166	173	192	201	230
E	335	McNair	82	82	109	111	109	159	198	190	189	205	204	205	217	249
E	053	Mosby Woods	117	117	161	171	165	212	249	251	219	223	237	190	197	214
E	203	Mount Eagle	118	118	105	108	105	140	170	168	148	153	161	156	164	200
E	223	Mount Vernon Woo	175	175	180	191	198	254	311	305	295	294	318	271	301	336
E	332	Navy	66	68	63	64	63	69	78	76	68	70	70	68	69	88
E	352	Newington Forest	105	105	107	118	112	124	158	141	123	129	132	97	101	111
E	142	North Springfield	126	126	157	166	167	177	217	196	157	163	158	148	156	173
E	333	Oak Hill	37	37	40	41	46	58	69	70	49	48	52	42	44	50
E	392	Oak View	42	42	47	50	53	58	75	70	66	65	72	54	57	61
E	052	Oakton	57	57	74	81	81	89	106	107	70	76	70	59	55	79
E	135	Olde Creek	32	32	53	44	59	61	65	68	55	53	55	51	56	61

FY11 to FY15
FCPS ESOL Enrollment

Lvl	Num	School	FY11 Prop*	FY11 App*	FY11 Act*	FY12 Prop*	FY12 App*	FY12 Act*	FY13 Prop	FY13 App	FY13 Act	FY14 Prop	FY14 App	FY14 Act	FY15 Prop	FY15 App**	
E	374	Orange Hunt	46	46	52	59	53	71	93	85	64	66	69	47	49	58	
E	102	Parklawn	243	243	296	289	308	316	405	337	308	325	314	323	333	391	
E	084	Pine Spring	148	150	195	214	221	219	281	245	204	217	208	202	209	237	
E	264	Poplar Tree	57	60	84	86	97	48	48	48	44	46	44	42	43	48	
E	431	Powell	96	96	177	180	192	228	278	273	206	227	222	154	167	180	
E	396	Providence	193	193	206	204	218	258	296	309	242	252	261	273	277	333	
E	143	Ravensworth	62	62	83	91	96	90	106	96	78	81	78	88	87	103	
E	226	Riverside	142	142	153	156	153	179	230	209	196	202	212	214	231	280	
E	156	Rolling Valley	58	58	77	80	81	91	107	104	92	96	99	86	87	93	
E	194	Rose Hill	136	136	152	163	152	188	235	225	199	209	215	192	200	230	
E	377	Sangster	26	26	38	41	43	35	43	39	41	42	42	22	21	24	
E	354	Saratoga	161	161	134	147	134	151	187	169	154	159	166	161	177	190	
E	083	Shreveewood	69	69	129	128	137	151	185	167	145	149	154	153	155	207	
E	375	Silverbrook	86	70	36	37	36	57	72	68	54	58	56	45	44	47	
E	106	Sleepy Hollow	113	113	146	145	167	160	204	166	151	167	155	152	162	196	
27	E	018	Spring Hill	65	67	85	80	94	106	133	127	94	103	101	114	114	130
E	163	Springfield Estates	95	95	106	110	112	132	155	158	131	136	140	125	135	146	
E	065	Stenwood	40	40	47	50	47	57	70	68	53	54	55	59	59	68	
E	212	Stratford Landing	30	30	29	28	29	45	58	55	45	45	48	39	42	44	
E	325	Sunrise Valley	21	21	24	23	27	34	39	40	25	28	27	31	32	36	
E	383	Terra Centre	69	69	42	45	42	46	57	48	54	58	56	47	48	65	
E	323	Terraset	61	61	58	65	62	82	99	98	82	84	88	84	89	95	
E	082	Timber Lane	132	132	148	147	148	169	216	194	179	183	194	195	203	243	
E	415	Union Mill	27	27	32	36	35	46	55	55	28	30	28	73	72	83	
E	062	Vienna	28	28	28	29	30	33	38	38	29	31	29	28	27	33	
E	232	Virginia Run	30	30	25	25	25	112	123	135	135	139	145	139	143	170	
E	132	Wakefield Forest	28	28	29	33	31	51	61	61	50	53	54	44	44	46	
E	445	Waples Mill	62	62	66	64	66	90	109	108	77	85	83	72	76	81	
E	222	Washington Mill	94	96	128	132	148	196	223	226	176	194	189	180	186	197	
E	213	Waynewood	6	6	7	7	7	12	14	14	21	17	21	25	22	27	
E	152	West Springfield	24	24	32	36	34	36	53	38	24	27	24	13	13	15	
E	048	Westbriar	45	51	68	75	78	82	96	98	91	94	98	87	92	104	
E	075	Westgate	43	49	99	98	114	167	193	197	184	198	197	178	184	215	

FY11 to FY15
FCPS ESOL Enrollment

Lvl	Num	School	FY11 Prop*	FY11 App*	FY11 Act*	FY12 Prop*	FY12 App*	FY12 Act*	FY13 Prop	FY13 App	FY13 Act	FY14 Prop	FY14 App	FY14 Act	FY15 Prop	FY15 App**
E	095	Westlawn	243	243	301	300	308	335	406	366	327	333	341	317	336	378
E	112	Weyanoke	234	234	218	229	228	277	332	332	267	280	288	278	308	351
E	387	White Oaks	67	67	88	87	99	103	133	112	110	114	119	85	91	99
E	424	Willow Springs	38	38	46	47	50	82	94	98	77	79	83	73	78	95
E	042	Wolftrap	2	2	7	5	7	16	18	19	11	12	12	10	8	12
E	452	Woodburn	121	122	150	160	168	153	249	156	188	194	203	200	215	235
E	227	Woodlawn	83	83	81	80	81	127	157	153	149	160	160	132	150	163
E	229	Woodley Hills	189	189	235	249	252	274	327	320	267	278	287	299	309	356
M	171	Carson	24	26	48	48	52	67	69	74	58	64	63	50	52	50
M	021	Cooper	18	18	28	27	31	27	30	27	19	20	19	28	30	28
M	331	Franklin	44	44	44	44	44	80	76	88	79	82	86	56	59	56
M	131	Frost	35	35	26	25	26	48	44	53	68	71	73	45	44	45
M	101	Glasgow	356	356	364	377	375	465	527	511	475	493	509	433	447	433
M	181	Hayfield	111	111	100	109	103	153	173	177	117	127	125	89	92	89
M	281	Herndon	141	141	135	134	135	187	195	206	199	209	215	185	185	187
M	111	Holmes	194	194	133	138	133	174	183	192	177	183	186	191	207	191
M	321	Hughes	113	113	91	102	91	123	130	135	130	137	140	133	136	135
M	151	Irving	49	49	55	59	55	61	67	61	48	43	48	35	36	35
M	081	Jackson	185	185	171	181	172	219	246	241	236	249	253	233	236	243
M	161	Key	153	153	159	169	159	183	201	201	202	204	218	211	221	219
M	071	Kilmer	73	73	67	67	67	90	102	99	106	110	114	106	104	106
M	401	Lake Braddock	84	84	52	56	52	97	107	107	102	111	110	81	91	81
M	501	Lanier	158	158	137	146	137	176	176	194	153	162	155	121	115	121
M	411	Liberty	75	75	88	91	88	126	119	139	119	130	129	125	121	129
M	031	Longfellow	47	47	89	96	99	100	111	101	76	82	76	93	95	95
M	141	Poe	269	269	251	271	251	355	365	390	273	290	273	233	234	233
M	391	Robinson	63	63	43	42	43	54	62	54	51	53	51	51	52	51
M	251	Rocky Run	36	36	31	34	31	40	42	40	40	40	41	38	42	39
M	231	Sandburg	135	135	165	181	185	221	238	253	198	215	214	203	211	203
M	422	South County	45	45	55	55	62	75	76	82	65	65	66	54	55	54
M	241	Stone	71	71	50	52	50	71	71	78	69	70	74	78	81	80
M	061	Thoreau	52	52	35	37	37	52	52	57	60	60	65	57	59	59
M	191	Twain	119	119	113	120	113	125	131	138	107	118	108	87	87	87

FY11 to FY15
FCPS ESOL Enrollment

Lvl	Num	School	FY11 Prop*	FY11 App*	FY11 Act*	FY12 Prop*	FY12 App*	FY12 Act*	FY13 Prop	FY13 App	FY13 Act	FY14 Prop	FY14 App	FY14 Act	FY15 Prop	FY15 App**
M	221	Whitman	140	140	146	159	163	200	211	220	200	221	216	177	192	177
H	140	Annandale	316	316	389	405	396	432	432	437	399	433	399	371	381	371
H	410	Centreville	124	124	85	102	85	133	131	146	149	149	160	130	132	131
H	250	Chantilly	99	99	115	115	124	149	142	158	164	173	177	148	147	153
H	120	Edison	152	152	150	152	152	180	189	194	201	215	218	199	194	208
H	500	Fairfax	154	154	159	161	167	237	240	261	234	259	252	228	231	228
H	090	Falls Church	244	244	215	224	230	319	293	351	362	372	391	353	376	367
H	180	Hayfield	112	115	107	107	119	176	167	194	154	167	162	140	137	140
H	270	Herndon	170	170	160	195	172	281	258	309	296	333	320	323	318	336
H	400	Lake Braddock	110	110	82	88	82	116	91	128	109	122	113	88	97	88
H	020	Langley	18	18	24	20	25	30	29	31	16	24	16	19	17	19
H	160	Lee	201	201	188	209	193	268	265	294	296	317	320	293	298	305
H	060	Madison	42	42	51	52	51	71	69	75	61	63	61	82	78	85
H	070	Marshall	94	94	102	109	102	142	119	157	120	128	126	131	132	131
H	030	McLean	82	82	84	90	86	102	99	113	90	96	90	84	83	84
29 H	220	Mount Vernon	166	166	140	136	147	229	218	252	239	249	258	266	273	276
H	050	Oakton	76	76	74	71	74	101	100	110	104	106	113	110	104	115
H	390	Robinson	89	89	72	73	72	94	93	104	71	61	71	57	57	57
H	420	South County	62	62	39	43	39	106	78	117	106	116	114	78	78	78
H	320	South Lakes	114	114	97	107	97	158	156	174	178	196	192	171	169	178
H	100	Stuart	287	287	350	374	350	443	476	489	422	463	427	489	514	509
H	300	Thomas Jefferson HSST						1								
H	200	West Potomac	119	119	189	193	201	250	261	275	282	321	302	289	298	291
H	150	West Springfield	66	66	66	65	71	102	95	113	76	88	76	67	66	67
H	240	Westfield	117	119	137	139	142	190	178	209	173	194	174	179	176	179
H	130	Woodson	54	54	59	61	59	68	58	75	69	72	72	59	60	59
N/A	N/A	Trans/Alt/Itinerant	1,134	1,121	1,121	1,136	1,111	1,069	1,141	1,079	1,217	1,226	1,260	1,174	1,305	1,562
Total			20,368	20,462	22,650	23,543	23,828	27,944	32,255	31,480	28,090	29,445	29,723	27,744	28,870	32,103

*Period of transition to WIDA method of ESOL evaluation

**Beginning with FY15 App, kindergarten students receiving ESOL are included

FY11 to FY15
FCPS Total Enrollment

REG	LVL	SCHOOL	FY11 PROP	FY11 APP	FY11 ACT	FY12 PROP	FY12 APP	FY12 ACT	FY13 PROP	FY13 APP	FY13 ACT	FY14 PROP	FY14 APP	FY14 ACT	FY15 PROP	FY15 APP
1	E	ALDRIN	636	617	683	659	766	678	778	714	709	759	751	708	803	707
1	E	ARCHER	741	753	788	734	791	792	771	769	827	756	768	759	701	728
1	E	ARMSTRONG	489	506	495	509	499	471	543	524	516	530	531	500	514	485
1	E	CHURCHILL ROAD	811	812	851	821	842	823	832	812	826	782	802	873	817	869
1	E	CLEARVIEW	641	675	641	704	642	670	662	679	681	660	688	685	704	696
1	E	COLVIN RUN	846	862	883	848	831	860	832	857	875	812	862	894	857	886
1	E	CROSSFIELD	763	777	754	791	758	776	758	773	743	740	702	700	632	647
1	E	CUNNINGHAM PARK	450	454	472	492	483	485	482	489	480	495	481	484	490	497
1	E	DOGWOOD	679	700	705	715	727	779	766	809	839	843	838	844	874	882
1	E	DRANESVILLE	612	635	633	651	663	681	703	697	682	722	729	764	759	785
1	E	FLINT HILL	678	675	699	680	739	690	690	666	682	663	696	707	690	695
1	E	FOREST EDGE	865	849	809	845	816	819	809	786	791	775	752	789	758	788
1	E	FORESTVILLE	736	726	727	705	701	694	648	636	671	586	655	618	639	591
1	E	FOX MILL	636	650	641	630	642	628	605	590	618	557	603	631	586	639
1	E	GREAT FALLS	569	577	547	579	519	570	539	556	580	504	545	577	535	581
1	E	HERNDON	864	855	808	876	820	827	862	856	864	868	892	918	958	961
1	E	HUNTERS WOODS	1,018	1,015	1,040	983	1,017	1,047	1,001	1,051	1,127	1,058	1,085	1,115	1,020	1,061
1	E	HUTCHISON	736	746	759	773	821	809	919	854	912	914	926	960	961	1,019
1	E	LAKE ANNE	637	659	674	691	698	668	741	703	692	745	734	653	769	660
1	E	MARSHALL ROAD	646	639	606	684	667	627	688	683	639	724	660	679	673	695
1	E	MOSBY WOODS	776	784	835	795	859	836	858	884	925	941	996	968	1,047	1,014
1	E	NAVY	824	845	811	853	817	799	792	773	815	750	894	856	951	875
1	E	OAKTON	732	731	695	773	731	745	780	793	805	801	805	846	808	867
1	E	SPRING HILL	983	990	955	990	958	974	1,005	1,003	954	1,003	963	949	990	981
1	E	SUNRISE VALLEY	638	638	646	637	627	623	611	607	621	591	626	582	652	594
1	E	TERRASET	427	433	420	443	434	471	451	471	482	499	515	511	556	554
1	E	VIENNA	415	411	390	414	381	391	370	385	390	388	393	397	408	429
1	E	WAPLES MILL	851	858	855	860	867	885	933	905	859	906	845	862	840	880
1	E	WOLFTRAP	586	585	590	579	563	567	537	565	565	528	553	576	525	549
1	M	CARSON	1,263	1,257	1,283	1,271	1,339	1,352	1,365	1,406	1,356	1,409	1,330	1,343	1,365	1,377
1	M	COOPER	856	847	840	817	821	827	812	788	801	749	761	751	727	709
1	M	HERNDON	920	938	962	949	973	937	985	946	944	958	939	970	1,029	991
1	M	HUGHES	922	940	901	941	859	923	898	1,025	961	1,107	1,042	1,002	1,146	1,023
1	M	THOREAU	749	736	782	704	752	779	774	865	827	914	868	843	874	832
1	H	CEDAR LANE	67	70	76	71	80	73	85	85	96	97	98	87	88	88
1	H	HERNDON	2,220	2,180	2,232	2,163	2,223	2,208	2,246	2,159	2,143	2,084	2,174	2,176	2,145	2,214
1	H	LANGLEY	2,013	2,036	2,009	2,056	2,021	2,010	1,988	1,979	1,948	1,964	1,952	1,987	1,941	2,005
1	H	MADISON	1,987	1,969	1,986	1,946	1,986	1,969	1,975	1,974	1,970	1,969	2,039	1,974	2,094	2,035
1	H	OAKTON	2,301	2,323	2,248	2,323	2,251	2,212	2,235	2,220	2,165	2,283	2,180	2,192	2,158	2,264
1	H	SOUTH LAKES	2,087	2,073	2,080	2,199	2,230	2,274	2,308	2,393	2,321	2,412	2,301	2,346	2,253	2,383

FY11 to FY15
FCPS Total Enrollment

REG	LVL	SCHOOL	FY11 PROP	FY11 APP	FY11 ACT	FY12 PROP	FY12 APP	FY12 ACT	FY13 PROP	FY13 APP	FY13 ACT	FY14 PROP	FY14 APP	FY14 ACT	FY15 PROP	FY15 APP
2	E	ANNANDALE TERRACE	878	865	868	899	911	917	973	789	730	774	739	715	746	733
2	E	BAILEYS	1,004	999	1,149	1,049	1,295	1,228	1,417	1,330	1,332	1,427	1,389	1,386	1,433	1,463
2	E	BEECH TREE	532	495	476	507	474	480	472	396	397	380	401	390	383	401
2	E	BELVEDERE	595	567	592	558	609	624	666	566	662	553	706	681	764	696
2	E	BRADDOCK	678	698	713	722	768	711	809	749	728	802	771	814	822	869
2	E	BREN MAR PARK	455	458	495	462	525	486	565	536	506	627	539	500	570	515
2	E	CAMELOT	567	562	553	557	613	600	634	612	557	618	590	604	581	589
2	E	CHESTERBROOK	639	659	631	699	638	656	668	688	686	700	726	687	765	707
2	E	COLUMBIA	402	400	412	418	423	452	448	475	448	521	499	478	544	510
2	E	FAIRHILL	647	641	610	696	647	627	679	663	623	693	652	588	688	615
2	E	FREEDOM HILL	612	637	660	691	724	715	736	732	633	755	674	630	717	651
2	E	GLEN FOREST	898	926	935	961	974	982	1,048	1,016	1,005	1,063	1,065	1,047	1,125	1,105
2	E	GRAHAM ROAD	423	428	457	447	473	436	476	452	481	487	504	488	536	503
2	E	HAYCOCK	750	767	773	766	778	837	805	919	958	950	843	907	839	944
2	E	KENT GARDENS	893	913	882	939	874	895	931	916	905	882	896	920	876	912
2	E	LEMON ROAD	287	293	270	294	258	251	243	225	323	229	484	483	507	525
2	E	MASON CREST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523	472	593	546	576	565	608
2	E	NORTH SPRINGFIELD	579	575	570	581	575	580	570	575	544	581	539	544	555	544
2	E	PARKLAWN	708	715	762	713	786	772	853	793	759	857	807	778	836	782
2	E	PINE SPRING	582	586	581	602	579	576	579	558	596	571	617	585	640	596
2	E	SHERMAN	358	375	379	387	376	391	385	368	421	365	431	412	447	418
2	E	SHREVEWOOD	553	552	609	578	649	608	689	678	640	714	688	686	729	743
2	E	SLEEPY HOLLOW	456	456	450	475	466	471	487	472	438	461	442	455	446	459
2	E	STENWOOD	485	490	496	508	509	513	528	523	518	530	517	537	531	561
2	E	TIMBER LANE	516	507	510	522	551	562	537	560	577	597	609	602	635	642
2	E	WESTBRIAR	516	521	525	545	529	533	565	551	547	552	615	623	696	707
2	E	WESTGATE	469	471	506	501	566	563	634	624	610	676	645	607	681	639
2	E	WESTLAWN	775	766	703	779	731	741	777	776	743	846	803	766	827	790
2	E	WEYANOKE	559	547	547	561	563	579	579	579	571	596	552	591	580	618
2	E	WOODBURN	582	587	551	631	577	557	590	482	498	487	529	501	556	524
2	M	GLASGOW	1,182	1,210	1,221	1,318	1,303	1,385	1,381	1,485	1,443	1,599	1,545	1,521	1,626	1,518
2	M	HOLMES	741	726	741	711	759	776	772	833	849	953	910	956	966	977
2	M	JACKSON	1,154	1,170	1,149	1,207	1,144	1,149	1,152	1,161	1,165	1,132	1,276	1,253	1,376	1,243
2	M	KILMER	1,095	1,118	1,113	1,158	1,158	1,185	1,171	1,292	1,274	1,322	1,307	1,366	1,362	1,348
2	M	LONGFELLOW	1,225	1,236	1,269	1,239	1,305	1,337	1,238	1,297	1,275	1,347	1,308	1,331	1,391	1,376
2	M	POE	1,285	1,224	1,170	1,259	1,164	1,089	1,137	994	935	994	911	900	926	932
2	H	ANNANDALE	2,583	2,670	2,579	2,619	2,529	2,475	2,632	2,421	2,393	2,291	2,197	2,238	2,118	2,144
2	H	DAVIS CENTER	122	119	107	121	115	98	110	110	96	105	105	105	106	106
2	H	FALLS CHURCH	1,598	1,565	1,518	1,586	1,620	1,568	1,726	1,681	1,659	1,711	1,678	1,667	1,649	1,711
2	H	JEFFERSON SCI/TECH	1,795	1,801	1,811	1,856	1,833	1,854	1,838	1,872	1,846	1,895	1,853	1,843	1,863	1,841
2	H	MARSHALL	1,506	1,483	1,563	1,567	1,650	1,625	1,713	1,683	1,641	1,737	1,735	1,814	1,777	1,878
2	H	MCLEAN	1,955	1,942	1,921	1,975	1,941	1,963	2,003	2,068	2,076	2,035	2,117	2,072	2,144	2,064
2	H	PIMMIT	262	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	H	STUART	1,680	1,642	1,707	1,651	1,719	1,719	1,720	1,766	1,743	1,946	1,848	1,821	1,979	1,918

FY11 to FY15
FCPS Total Enrollment

REG	LVL	SCHOOL	FY11 PROP	FY11 APP	FY11 ACT	FY12 PROP	FY12 APP	FY12 ACT	FY13 PROP	FY13 APP	FY13 ACT	FY14 PROP	FY14 APP	FY14 ACT	FY15 PROP	FY15 APP
3	E	BELLE VIEW	494	483	508	491	503	531	546	571	546	582	553	542	564	568
3	E	BUCKNELL	302	292	291	293	313	259	279	217	276	208	281	265	303	281
3	E	BUSH HILL	458	431	452	423	464	446	488	469	483	482	508	496	527	505
3	E	CAMERON	526	525	548	507	560	566	609	594	567	625	602	544	629	554
3	E	CLERMONT	488	476	472	501	480	468	502	498	478	531	497	531	513	546
3	E	CRESTWOOD	610	588	563	598	598	606	633	618	638	628	649	652	673	687
3	E	FORESTDALE	575	543	583	532	607	629	693	639	612	668	616	602	632	634
3	E	FORT BELVOIR	1,267	1,254	1,140	1,293	1,153	1,175	1,262	1,243	1,153	1,301	1,161	1,116	1,190	1,096
3	E	FORT HUNT	543	559	562	570	572	582	576	583	607	599	622	605	636	602
3	E	FRANCONIA	531	546	532	559	539	545	574	574	548	592	569	567	587	556
3	E	GARFIELD	327	339	334	347	363	361	384	372	363	379	364	368	375	365
3	E	GROVETON	772	714	698	726	757	719	806	753	739	791	797	781	829	842
3	E	GUNSTON	571	601	566	630	582	544	584	570	525	610	557	550	549	549
3	E	HAYFIELD	684	667	644	703	686	662	730	680	660	712	680	676	699	712
3	E	HOLLIN MEADOWS	658	647	663	659	688	646	686	651	655	678	666	645	700	646
3	E	HYBLA VALLEY	827	816	857	834	919	856	951	891	861	963	904	924	917	953
3	E	ISLAND CREEK	801	802	817	798	818	793	851	853	799	874	818	747	854	801
3	E	LANE	710	737	738	748	796	836	866	874	807	922	851	794	902	827
3	E	LORTON STATION	892	892	900	905	905	935	904	952	1,012	944	1,047	1,029	1,065	1,048
3	E	LYNBROOK	517	510	484	520	491	519	543	568	615	633	664	637	693	674
3	E	MOUNT EAGLE	277	264	302	258	317	340	342	356	369	407	415	381	491	430
3	E	MOUNT VERNON WOODS	511	523	559	507	557	579	614	622	672	611	720	685	725	687
3	E	RIVERSIDE	616	631	611	644	656	682	720	752	716	811	775	742	808	769
3	E	ROSE HILL	793	776	704	773	700	717	729	722	746	750	771	760	799	768
3	E	SARATOGA	754	745	740	754	763	782	772	803	786	784	766	759	766	767
3	E	SPRINGFIELD ESTATES	670	655	648	655	650	692	663	709	746	723	775	746	796	730
3	E	STRATFORD LANDING	724	736	779	732	774	821	786	849	868	861	921	899	932	921
3	E	WASHINGTON MILL	615	610	608	637	610	619	641	639	662	648	647	664	649	686
3	E	WAYNEWOOD	712	701	716	703	715	702	727	715	724	706	715	733	675	702
3	E	WOODLAWN	562	605	541	588	527	676	587	651	738	663	766	767	749	736
3	E	WOODLEY HILLS	685	678	706	681	714	693	756	717	708	749	740	738	765	759
3	M	HAYFIELD	934	947	988	958	1,027	995	1,026	940	875	887	881	885	894	861
3	M	KEY	969	976	932	979	908	895	934	846	880	897	878	939	942	952
3	M	SANDBURG	1,222	1,215	1,196	1,224	1,223	1,216	1,354	1,279	1,273	1,258	1,168	1,312	1,238	1,385
3	M	TWAIN	810	808	814	833	869	863	879	878	885	881	888	886	933	894
3	M	WHITMAN	984	978	983	1,022	1,001	1,010	1,014	969	973	1,020	998	969	1,084	1,013
3	H	BRYANT	361	408	304	423	380	302	375	339	431	338	428	354	438	378
3	H	EDISON	1,696	1,660	1,653	1,659	1,574	1,638	1,508	1,699	1,686	1,784	1,698	1,776	1,717	1,848
3	H	HAYFIELD	1,928	1,941	1,954	1,960	1,968	1,930	2,040	1,967	1,949	2,006	1,914	1,887	1,920	1,912
3	H	LEE	1,795	1,794	1,806	1,815	1,773	1,788	1,782	1,782	1,808	1,711	1,750	1,747	1,739	1,778
3	H	MOUNT VERNON	1,790	1,774	1,708	1,835	1,755	1,828	1,733	1,889	1,876	1,976	1,935	1,978	2,017	1,994
3	H	PULLEY CENTER	111	106	95	111	103	91	103	103	89	100	100	94	98	97
3	H	QUANDER ROAD	94	94	69	101	73	80	78	78	83	84	84	76	75	75
3	H	WEST POTOMAC	2,221	2,158	2,222	2,223	2,267	2,308	2,217	2,295	2,277	2,359	2,402	2,335	2,434	2,416

FY11 to FY15
FCPS Total Enrollment

REG	LVL	SCHOOL	FY11 PROP	FY11 APP	FY11 ACT	FY12 PROP	FY12 APP	FY12 ACT	FY13 PROP	FY13 APP	FY13 ACT	FY14 PROP	FY14 APP	FY14 ACT	FY15 PROP	FY15 APP
4	E	BONNIE BRAE	743	725	734	729	770	754	802	746	723	735	715	709	712	704
4	E	BULL RUN	935	931	915	947	857	874	850	844	881	826	915	853	967	882
4	E	CARDINAL FOREST	574	574	598	561	585	596	602	599	593	635	622	618	664	657
4	E	CENTRE RIDGE	815	822	801	809	777	829	828	845	835	847	820	814	815	827
4	E	CENTREVILLE	945	955	941	967	928	962	1,031	1,007	960	961	928	910	945	940
4	E	CHERRY RUN	523	531	507	550	505	495	497	480	484	461	466	501	465	504
4	E	CLIFTON	355	348	366	334	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	E	FAIRVIEW	575	586	581	591	730	726	700	683	663	688	677	661	660	654
4	E	HALLEY	747	739	713	755	747	738	795	762	747	792	772	734	792	742
4	E	HUNT VALLEY	631	631	604	641	610	602	627	623	625	625	619	622	646	646
4	E	KEENE MILL	591	580	580	578	542	628	565	643	685	701	727	726	765	748
4	E	KINGS GLEN	486	469	466	467	477	472	503	461	464	453	456	479	433	480
4	E	KINGS PARK	679	666	692	658	657	659	663	644	676	629	689	678	717	703
4	E	LAUREL HILL	863	848	832	874	849	872	906	924	894	945	916	941	935	953
4	E	LAUREL RIDGE	863	873	840	885	862	813	878	828	800	816	795	815	775	791
4	E	NEWINGTON FOREST	647	641	630	625	594	640	606	663	637	662	644	619	640	608
4	E	OAK VIEW	698	700	710	700	758	743	760	739	759	746	773	757	754	727
4	E	ORANGE HUNT	783	770	791	762	790	794	798	777	785	770	803	824	839	855
4	E	POWELL	1,081	1,115	1,121	1,148	1,131	1,160	1,298	1,267	1,163	1,181	1,009	1,000	993	958
4	E	RAVENSWORTH	558	562	538	573	524	544	521	532	520	547	532	541	535	546
4	E	ROLLING VALLEY	570	587	539	603	548	575	589	598	558	590	543	561	552	569
4	E	SANGSTER	809	798	858	783	859	852	818	835	905	816	933	930	941	930
4	E	SILVERBROOK	715	791	710	802	677	733	704	720	750	725	766	785	764	758
4	E	TERRA-CENTRE	555	562	543	561	565	539	536	537	549	520	529	552	500	532
4	E	UNION MILL	742	742	747	727	862	812	776	775	789	960	980	983	983	994
4	E	WEST SPRINGFIELD	473	484	461	485	449	476	481	467	478	468	490	462	499	469
4	E	WHITE OAKS	717	722	710	696	711	733	722	740	800	742	828	827	859	844
4	M	BURKE	65	77	67	73	70	93	88	100	80	89	89	82	81	96
4	M	IRVING	1,145	1,174	1,088	1,127	1,010	987	1,007	962	1,006	949	975	969	912	897
4	M	LAKE BRADDOCK	1,294	1,282	1,351	1,246	1,383	1,451	1,384	1,507	1,412	1,541	1,439	1,387	1,510	1,423
4	M	LIBERTY	1,134	1,145	1,141	1,122	1,113	1,112	1,134	1,125	1,115	1,130	1,085	1,110	1,018	1,072
4	M	ROBINSON	1,206	1,242	1,200	1,174	1,060	1,145	1,039	1,144	1,202	1,133	1,205	1,218	1,171	1,138
4	M	SOUTH COUNTY	904	905	868	986	898	901	898	923	1,046	892	1,065	1,096	1,034	1,131
4	H	CENTREVILLE	2,243	2,256	2,275	2,273	2,331	2,324	2,379	2,385	2,381	2,457	2,395	2,392	2,368	2,431
4	H	LAKE BRADDOCK	2,476	2,466	2,575	2,419	2,569	2,558	2,619	2,580	2,583	2,612	2,615	2,644	2,639	2,670
4	H	MOUNTAIN VIEW	302	301	326	306	336	289	336	305	300	303	308	281	317	317
4	H	ROBINSON	2,830	2,764	2,695	2,780	2,706	2,721	2,611	2,681	2,692	2,615	2,678	2,717	2,756	2,820
4	H	SOUTH COUNTY	1,933	1,934	1,945	1,929	1,965	1,981	1,966	2,076	2,013	2,153	2,150	2,078	2,193	2,105
4	H	WEST SPRINGFIELD	2,281	2,279	2,241	2,357	2,283	2,289	2,277	2,272	2,267	2,228	2,247	2,255	2,258	2,253

FY11 to FY15
FCPS Total Enrollment

REG LVL SCHOOL	FY11 PROP	FY11 APP	FY11 ACT	FY12 PROP	FY12 APP	FY12 ACT	FY13 PROP	FY13 APP	FY13 ACT	FY14 PROP	FY14 APP	FY14 ACT	FY15 PROP	FY15 APP
5 E BROOKFIELD	781	792	805	778	823	813	844	840	839	900	855	809	847	805
5 E CANTERBURY WOODS	625	619	653	571	632	664	593	596	682	606	725	737	685	753
5 E COATES	661	650	651	712	752	717	859	791	780	878	846	810	954	869
5 E CUB RUN	459	450	480	433	620	625	655	648	666	648	674	610	669	588
5 E DANIELS RUN	797	799	789	798	770	765	797	747	748	769	780	773	776	760
5 E DEER PARK	718	710	722	696	735	712	768	729	674	709	645	677	640	707
5 E EAGLE VIEW	964	966	930	1,023	873	862	946	940	928	826	782	710	850	743
5 E FAIRFAX VILLA	381	394	378	389	435	433	433	430	456	563	611	598	628	636
5 E FLORIS	757	733	717	770	718	720	722	729	703	692	721	703	715	673
5 E GREENBRIAR EAST	744	784	785	835	774	803	856	867	868	992	965	1,007	1,003	1,072
5 E GREENBRIAR WEST	891	894	943	888	896	931	894	921	993	930	1,027	1,063	1,066	1,068
5 E LEES CORNER	708	699	712	718	740	731	762	749	741	750	742	742	721	750
5 E LITTLE RUN	351	358	339	348	332	345	340	373	350	372	362	359	370	338
5 E LONDON TOWNE	895	900	895	933	852	901	887	923	911	950	891	910	906	941
5 E MANTUA	882	875	863	872	869	923	904	936	955	957	949	975	945	972
5 E MCNAIR	695	702	683	753	731	835	894	927	974	984	1,106	1,090	1,237	1,205
5 E OAK HILL	822	815	851	796	845	831	812	835	858	821	861	882	836	881
5 E OLDE CREEK	423	408	416	421	448	439	486	500	445	488	430	439	463	484
5 E POPLAR TREE	746	767	773	794	723	672	674	657	630	584	573	630	528	613
5 E PROVIDENCE	908	896	927	916	963	932	954	947	931	977	945	937	927	946
5 E VIRGINIA RUN	706	714	679	689	731	762	752	753	780	732	803	782	836	778
5 E WAKEFIELD FOREST	460	456	459	455	478	480	458	455	480	445	483	517	473	511
5 E WILLOW SPRINGS	675	666	698	655	810	873	814	913	979	923	1,007	997	1,065	1,033
5 M FRANKLIN	929	929	893	925	870	848	847	830	839	835	789	853	749	855
5 M FROST	1,008	1,012	1,042	977	1,031	1,024	1,017	1,019	1,078	1,068	1,106	1,104	1,063	1,143
5 M LANIER	1,178	1,211	1,235	1,175	1,219	1,161	1,273	1,241	1,238	1,199	1,246	1,162	1,227	1,058
5 M ROCKY RUN	957	963	966	939	981	998	943	1,009	1,017	1,060	1,093	1,098	1,155	1,118
5 M STONE	926	936	899	913	858	853	860	827	815	835	779	817	838	844
5 H CHANTILLY	2,569	2,613	2,627	2,560	2,605	2,640	2,542	2,653	2,636	2,686	2,621	2,693	2,553	2,645
5 H FAIRFAX	2,369	2,366	2,367	2,580	2,597	2,634	2,721	2,717	2,655	2,767	2,728	2,609	2,849	2,552
5 H WESTFIELD	2,809	2,855	2,862	2,838	2,855	2,787	2,863	2,730	2,764	2,693	2,788	2,729	2,687	2,617
5 H WOODSON	2,098	2,127	2,108	2,161	2,150	2,098	2,184	2,149	2,207	2,143	2,236	2,222	2,275	2,305
N/A N/A TRANS/ALT/PS RESOURCE	2,317	2,267	2,151	2,321	2,232	1,894	2,240	2,068	2,050	2,132	2,135	1,993	2,290	2,183
TOTAL	175,333	175,296	174,933	177,416	177,629	177,918	181,608	181,536	181,259	184,393	184,625	183,895	187,994	186,785

34

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Board of Supervisors

Question: Can FCPS reduce school bus fuel consumption by:

1. Reducing the number of school bus stops.
2. Increasing bus capacity and require new bus riders to register for bus service well ahead of the school year to allow for planners to sufficiently forecast how many “full” buses are needed.
3. Eliminating unnecessary bus idling.
4. Expanding pedestrian and bicycle routes to schools where feasible.

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

Over time, FCPS has continued to reduce bus fuel consumption through a reduction and consolidation of bus stops, especially for Advanced Academic Program (AAP) programs. Each year, potential riders vs. bus stops are carefully examined in the division’s on-going efforts to maximize efficiency.

In addition to the efficient placement of bus stops, FCPS also strives to maximize bus capacity. With this in mind, bus routers have several parameters and contributors when considering routes which reduce capacity. The parameters include: respecting “civil twilight” and 45-minute maximum ride length for elementary school runs; 60-minute maximum ride length for middle and high school runs; maintaining a 5 to 15 minute arrival/drop off window for elementary students; and maintaining 10 to 20 minute arrival/drop off window for middle and high school students. Transporting the AAP population can contribute to the reduction in capacity when maintaining an acceptable length of ride for students.

FCPS trains our drivers to minimize bus idle time. Dispatch locations also receive notifications through our Automated Vehicle Locator (AVL) system when idling is excessive. The Office Transportation Services works with our bus drivers to reduce idling and often issues reminders over the radio, in safety messages, or in our monthly publication. We continually monitor driver idling practices.

Many of the FCPS regulations have been updated to include new information about walking and bicycling to school. We are working with the Office of Safety and Security and the Safe Routes to School coordinator to promote healthy alternatives.

Response to Questions on the FY 2016 Budget

Request By: Board of Supervisors

Question: SACC, Recreation, and the school system offer summer programs for children. A coordinated effort might be more efficient.

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

Currently, FCPS works with the Fairfax County SACC and RecPac on building use during the summer and holidays.

During the summer, FCPS offers several summer programs including opportunities for students to take new and repeat courses, credit recovery, and SOL remediation. In addition, FCPS offers four academic focused camps – Institute for the Arts (IFTA), Tech Adventure Camp, Elementary Institute for the Arts (eIFTA), and STEM Camp. Students completing the IFTA program receive academic credit. In a few central academic summer locations, the academic program is supplemented by classes offered by Adult and Community Education to provide before and after summer school programming at limited sites. A copy of the FY 2014 summer programs can be found online <http://www.fcps.edu/is/summer/documents/2014/Encore.pdf>.

FCPS offers extended school year (ESY) services to any student with disabilities whose individualized education program (IEP) team has determined that a student requires services during the summer break. Each summer, ESY secondary sites share a school building with Therapeutic Recreation. In summer 2014 ESY had three secondary sites. The co-location of programs allows for the sharing of FCPS buses between Therapeutic Recreation participants and ESY students as well as provides opportunities for individuals to have access to ESY classes and Therapeutic Recreation programs in the same day.

In addition to the academic summer school and specialized camps, the FCPS School Board authorized funding for school-based summer learning opportunities. For the last several years, each elementary and middle school have offered summer learning opportunities for at risk students to prevent learning loss over the summer.

Information about the various FCPS summer programs will be posted on January 5, 2015 on the following website <http://www.fcps.edu/is/summer/index.shtml>.

FCPS does not provide a similar program to SACC or Parks and Recreation and therefore there would be no efficiencies found by combining these programs with the FCPS academic focused summer programs.