County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 12, 2012

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Susan W. Datta, Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: FY 2013 – Responses to BOS Questions – Package 3

Attached for your information is FY 2013 Budget Q&A Package 3 containing responses to budget questions from the Board Budget Subcommittee meetings and questions received via email. Responses to questions 1-35 were included in previous packages and additional responses will be included in subsequent packages. If you have any questions, please let me know.

The following responses are included in this package:

	Pkg. 3 – County Responses to Questions from 3/5/12 – 3/28/12	Supervisor	Pages
36	For the SACC program, how much is currently spent on subsidizing the fees and what are the criteria for eligibility for the subsidized fee? What is the monthly charge for participation in SACC? How does that charge compare to the market rate cost for similar after school care? Assuming SACC fees are lower, how much additional funding would be raised if SACC fees were increased to that market rate?	Cook	63-64
37	Why are the non-general fund rates for refuse collection, refuse disposal and leaf collection flat and not rising for 2011-2013?	Hudgins	65
38	In order to take advantage of low current construction costs, what would happen if an additional one-time amount of $25 million of GO Bond Sales were programmed for FCPS? How would this impact debt ratios? What would the impact on debt ratios be if the increase were recurring?	Bulova	66
39	Please provide an assessment of the condition of County Libraries as it relates to the timing of rehabilitation in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).	Cook	67
40	Please provide benchmark data comparing Fairfax County's construction costs against those being experienced by neighboring jurisdictions. Could design costs be reduced significantly by using previous design models for similar types of facilities? *(Note: A response to this question is being prepared by both the County and FCPS. This is the County response. The FCPS response is included as question #58 on page 93 of this Q&A package.*	Herrity	68-70
41	Should the County pursue the formation of a VEBA as a vehicle for employees to fund retiree health insurance premiums through unused, accrued sick leave balances over 2,080 hours at the time of retirement?	Gross	71-72
42	How does the proposed change to retirement eligibility for the Employees' Retirement System differ from retirement eligibility among our comparator jurisdictions?	McKay	73
43	Is the County charging the maximum allowed for parking tickets?	McKay	74

Department of Management and Budget
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 561
Fairfax, Virginia 22035-0074
Telephone: (703) 324-2391 Fax: (703) 324-3940 TTY: 711
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dmb

County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

44	Is the County charging the maximum allowed for zoning violations?	McKay	75
45	When did the County start charging $10 for police incident reports and was it in response to budget pressures?	McKay	76
46	How does sales tax paid in Fairfax County come back to the County?	McKay	77
47	How is sales tax paid on internet purchases allocated (from where the store is physically located or from where the merchandise is delivered?)	McKay	78
48	How much did the County cut from Police in overtime and how much in actual savings has the County realized?	Hudgins	79
49	How many electric vehicles are registered in Fairfax County and what would be the revenue loss if the County were to exempt these vehicles from the Personal Property Tax?	McKay	80
50	Please summarize the Human Services Council recommendations, identifying restorations and new or supplemental funding to existing programs.	Bulova	81
51	Please expand the Human Services Council recommendation chart to include the reductions taken in of each program on the chart over the last three years.	McKay	82-83
52	Please summarize the $0.6 million in "Other" Third Quarter adjustments referenced in the Third Quarter presentation to the Board on March 27, 2012.	Bulova	84-85
53	Please provide a summary of the source of funds being used to support the FOCUS project. Include any non-IT related funds. Are any funds being supplied by Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS?)	McKay	86
54	Is the County still providing funding to the Reston Chamber of Commerce to provide a Visitors Center in the Chamber headquarters?	Herrity	87
	FCPS Responses to Questions from 3/13/12		
55	Please provide a breakdown of the school population by major categories similar to that shown on Slide 9 of the School Board's Advertised Budget presentation.	Foust	88
56	Please provide a list of sites where adult and continuing education (ACE) programs will be offered in the future as well as a list where these programs used to be offered but no longer will. Also, provide information on ACE programs being consolidated with County programs, specifically focusing on ensuring that they are being offered across the County.	Foust/ McKay/ Hudgins	89-90
57	Please compare the percent of retirement paid by local Maryland school districts to that paid by FCPS.	Foust	91-92
58	Please provide benchmark data comparing Fairfax County's construction costs against those being experienced by neighboring jurisdictions. Could design costs be reduced significantly by using previous design models for similar types of facilities such as schools? *(Note: A response to this question is being prepared by both the County and FCPS. This is the FCPS response. The County response is included as question #40 on pages 68-70 of this Q&A package.)*	Herrity	93
59	Please provide a copy of the previous research done by FCPS showing what an additional $25 million per year in GO Bond Sales for FCPS would be able to accommodate.	Bulova	94-95

Attachment

Department of Management and Budget
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 561
Fairfax, Virginia 22035-0074
Telephone: (703) 324-2391 Fax: (703) 324-3940 TTY: 711
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dmb

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Cook

Question: For the SACC program, how much is currently spent on subsidizing the fees and what are the criteria for eligibility for the subsidized fee? What is the monthly charge for participation in SACC? How does that charge compare to the market rate cost for similar after school care? Assuming SACC fees are lower, how much additional funding would be raised if SACC fees were increased to that market rate?

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 SACC centers located in 136 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.

For FY 2013, parent fees are currently estimated to cover approximately 79 percent of SACC program costs, with a net cost to the County of less than $10.0 million. This subsidy provides much needed child care services for working families on the sliding fee scale and addresses the higher costs associated with serving children with special needs.

The FY 2012 monthly fee (September through June) for the after school program is $309. Families with an adjusted household income of more than $51,000 pay the full fee (i.e. a full paying parent will pay the full $309). Families with adjusted household incomes of less than $51,000 are eligible for reduced fees. Approximately 18 percent of SACC families are eligible for reduced fees on the sliding fee scale. Historically, SACC parent fees have been adjusted based on increased program costs (primarily driven by annual compensation increases to employees); however, in recent years, in an effort to address the budget shortfall, fees have been increased based on a flat percentage. Over the past few fiscal years, fees have increased nearly 17 percent. The most recent annual fee increases are as follows:

- FY 2010: 5 percent
- FY 2011: 3 percent
- FY 2012: 3 percent
- FY 2013: 5 percent (proposed)

It should be noted that a 3 percent SACC fee increase generates approximately $1 million in revenues.

Monthly After-School Fees Across the Region

Staff is currently undertaking a comprehensive review of SACC fees and the sliding fee scale as well as reviewing the program designs of other after school child care programs within the surrounding jurisdictions and in the community. Since many variables may be included when setting a rate, most notably personnel and overhead costs, the use of a sliding fee scale, serving special needs children, geographic location, hours of operation, and profit status, it may be difficult to compare the County's program to other jurisdictions and community programs. The table below represents a strict rate comparison (i.e., it does not account for the variables discussed above that may or may not be included in the rates) of the current after-school monthly fees for the municipal programs in the region:

Jurisdictions	**Fairfax County SACC**	Prince William County	Arlington[1] County	Falls Church City	Loudoun County	Alexandria[2] City
After School Monthly Fee	**$309**	$280	$248- $332	$306	$321	$386

[1] Fees vary per site. Full fee at income above $100,000
[2] Full fee at income above $165,000

Upon completion, the comprehensive review of SACC fees and the sliding fee scale as well as the review of program designs of other after school child care programs within the surrounding jurisdictions and in the community will be shared with the Board of Supervisors. In addition, updated SACC fee recommendations are anticipated to be made as part of the FY 2014 budget process.

Response to Questions on the FY 2011 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Hudgins

Question: Why are the non-general fund rates for refuse collection, refuse disposal and leaf collection flat and not rising for 2011-2013?

Response: The fees for refuse collection, refuse disposal and leaf collection are established based on past experience and future projections. Fee recommendations are based on a five-year forecast, to maintain rates that are fairly stable and avoid dramatic increases or decreases in the fees charged. Rate stabilization reserves are established in each fund to provide this buffer. The refuse disposal fee is not increasing due to a reduction in the cost of disposal, allowing the rate to be maintained at a stable level. The flat disposal fees, cost control activities and the rate stabilization reserve result in the recommendation for the FY 2013 refuse collection rate to be maintained at the <u>FY 2012 Adopted Budget Plan</u> level. The leaf collection fee and leaf collection operating costs are dependent on many things, most notably the assessed value of the property, weather conditions, and the cost of leaf processing. Projections of each of these, in conjunction with use of the rate stabilization reserve, allow the rate to remain at its current level.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Chairman Bulova

Question: In order to take advantage of low current construction costs, what would happen if an additional one-time amount of $25 million of General Obligation Bond Sales were programmed for FCPS? How would this impact debt ratios? What would the impact on debt ratios be if the increase were recurring?

Response: If the County were to provide a <u>one-time</u> amount of $25 million of General Obligation Bond Sales for the Schools this would increase the County's debt ratio by 0.06% and require approximately $2.5 million in additional debt service annually.

A decision to increase bond sales <u>annually</u> by $25 million from $155 million to $180 million would have a significant impact on both the debt ratio and annual debt service payments due to the compounding impact. The debt ratios would then increase by the same 0.06% annually and would peak at 9.6% in FY 2017 with a gradual decline in the following years. In addition, the associated debt service costs on the $25 million for the first year would be approximately $2.5 million annually, but within five years increases to approximately $10.8 million annually. This decision would further push the debt ratios closer to the ten percent limit and increases debt service costs with no identified funding source.

As noted at the March 14th Budget Committee meeting, the County is expected to continue with annual General Obligation bond sales averaging $233 million, and the Schools figure is projected to remain at $155 million or 67 percent of the total. It should be noted that the Board of Supervisors approved an increase in School Bond Sales from the $130 million planned for FY 2013 to $155 million. In addition, the County anticipates financing other pressing infrastructure needs such as a replacement of the Massey building (Public Safety Headquarters), Dulles Rail requirement, Tysons redevelopment, transportation needs, and devolution uncertainties from the General Assembly. Based on these current capital requirements, the County will move even closer to the ten percent debt limit ratio.

While there is no statutory limit on the amount of debt the voters can approve, and therefore the debt service that is paid, it is important to note that the County's debt ratios are consistent with best practices for highly rated issuers of municipal debt. One of the County's Debt Ratio policies is that debt service expenditures as a percentage of General Fund disbursements shall not exceed ten percent.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Cook

Question: Please provide an assessment of the condition of County Libraries as it relates to the timing of rehabilitation in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

Response: The four existing libraries that are included in the five year window of the Advertised CIP, and on the proposed fall 2012 Library Bond Referendum are the John Marshall, Tysons-Pimmit, Pohick, and Reston libraries. These are the next highest priority projects identified by Library Administration and the Library Board for capital renewal and alteration. John Marshall Library is 16,500 square feet (SF) and was built in 1974. Tysons-Pimmit Library is 25,000 SF and was built in 1986. Pohick Library is 25,000 SF and was built in 1986. Reston Library is 30,000 SF and was built in 1985.

The proposed fall 2012 library bond referendum in the amount of $25 million is intended to provide $10 million for a possible replacement of the Reston Library as part of the County's Reston/ North County land-use master plan, and to provide $5 million for the renewal of each of the other three libraries. The Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES) has not yet conducted detailed feasibility studies and project scoping for these projects. Feasibility studies and scoping will be initiated in summer 2012. The proposed capital funding levels for these four libraries is less than the funding that was provided for the previous library expansion/renewal projects on the 2004 Library Bond Referendum. The 2004 referendum was $29.5 million for four, smaller community libraries and provided not only capital renewal of building subsystems, but a complete renovation and expansion. The proposed fall 2012 library referendum includes funding for renewal only and no expansion funding. Based on the proposed bond funding amount, DPWES will work with the Library Administration and the Facilities Management Department to identify the prioritized list of renovation, capital renewal, and strategic expansion items to be addressed at each of the libraries.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Please provide benchmark data comparing Fairfax County's construction costs against those being experienced by neighboring jurisdictions. Could design costs be reduced significantly by using previous design models for similar types of facilities?

Response: *(Note: A response to this question is being prepared by both the County and FCPS. This is the County response. The FCPS response is included as question #58 on page 93 of this Q&A package.*

Benchmark Construction Costs

Benchmark cost information comparing Fairfax County DPWES' construction only costs for building projects to comparable costs for other jurisdictions in the region is reflected in the following table of average construction costs. The local jurisdiction benchmark costs are for years 2008 to current. The Fairfax County averages were for years 2008 or later to be comparable with the local jurisdiction benchmark.

Facility Type ($/SF)	Benchmark Average ($/SF)	Fairfax County Average ($/SF)
Library	$384	$253
Fire Station	$316	$335 *
Police Station	$200	$180
Parking Garage	$ 55	$ 51

*Fire station costs vary depending on the fire and rescue requirements for each jurisdiction.

DPWES staff worked with independent construction cost estimators to obtain the benchmarking information for recent, similar projects in other jurisdictions. Jurisdiction included Silver Spring MD, Montgomery County MD, Prince Georges County MD, Culpepper VA, Leesburg VA, Arlington VA, Howard County MD, Charlottesville, VA, Henrico County VA, Falls Church VA, and Warrenton, VA. These jurisdictions were selected based on the number of similar projects constructed since 2008. The data was compiled from the construction bids provided by two independent cost estimators. The cost benchmarking information indicates that DPWES' construction costs per SF are in line with, or lower than, costs for other jurisdictions in the region for comparable facility types.

There a wide variety of factors that influence the actual construction cost to Fairfax County for building projects. Such factors include: 1) Economic conditions at the time of bid, 2) Level of quality specified for the facility in the construction documents, 3) Cost savings achieved from Value Engineering, 4) Complexity of the work and whether it is all new work, renovation, or capital renewal work, and 5) Required site development costs to meet regulatory requirements. A brief discussion of these factors is, as follows:

Economic Conditions: The construction cost is heavily influenced by the prevailing economic conditions that exist in the regional construction market at the time of bidding. In the past 3-4 years Fairfax County and other localities in the region have benefitted from very competitive construction bidding, with a large supply of contractors bidding for a limited volume of construction work. The cost of materials, supplies and equipment also has a direct impact on the construction cost, and those costs have generally been depressed in recent years.

Level of Quality Specified in Construction Documents: The level of quality that is required for our construction projects directly impacts the cost, with higher quality project specifications generally costing more. The level of quality specified in County projects is driven by: 1) Aesthetic and operational expectations of the communities and County's regulatory planning and zoning agencies, 2) Operational requirements of the customer agencies such as police, fire and rescue, library and transportation, and 3) Life cycle operations and maintenance cost considerations as represented by Facilities Management Department.

Value Engineering (VE): In accordance with the Board of Supervisors' Policy, a formal VE process is conducted for all building projects with a construction value of over $5 million. VE is also typically administered by DPWES for building projects valued below $5 million. The intent of VE is to retain the same scope, quality, and functionality for the project, but to do so in a more cost effective manner. VE is conducted at the 35% design stage in an effort to assure the best value for the project, and the historic results of VE studies reflects an average return on investment of approximately 45:1.

Complexity of Work: The construction cost per square foot of building area is significantly impacted by the nature of the construction work being performed, including such factors as: 1) New work versus renovation work, 2) Occupied versus unoccupied renovation work, 3) Requirements for phased construction work, 4) Environmental remediation, and 5) Extent of IT and security systems and equipment. Many County CIP building projects deal with the replacement or capital renewal of existing facilities that are in excess of thirty years old. In some cases the projects entail full demolition and rebuild; other cases entail expansion and varying amounts of capital renewal work. Most of these projects require some type of phased construction, environmental abatement, and upgrades to building systems, equipment and technology to accommodate current building systems and IT into the facilities.

Site Development Costs: The majority of current CIP building projects that are managed by DPWES involve building replacement or capital renewal of older facilities that were originally developed in the mid-1980's or earlier. These sites are typically very small and do not meet the environmental site regulations required for current facilities. The costs to retrofit older facility sites for stormwater detention, water quality, adequate outfall, parking requirements, tree cover and other issues is often substantial. Innovative site work provisions such as underground detention, porous pavement/asphalt, rain gardens and sand filters are often used to bring older sites up to standards. As part of DPWES's commitment to the Board of Supervisors Environmental Agenda and to being a good steward of the environment, DPWES strives to meet all regulatory site requirements and avoid requests for waivers.

Use of Previous Design Models

For projects managed by DPWES, staff continuously utilizes successful design standards from previous projects in an effort to reduce cost, and improve quality and efficiency. DPWES staff routinely utilizes the NACO award winning Guidelines for Architects and Engineers that reflects building system and equipment requirements identified by Facilities Management Department (FMD) and lessons learned from previous projects. DPWES also utilizes the NACO award winning Fire Station Design Manual and a Police Station Design Guideline that have been developed and updated over time to reflect standard approaches for these facility types. DPWES is working with Library Administration to formalize a Library Design Guideline, and also implements design guidelines for structured parking facilities. DPWES also utilizes standard space programs as the basis for the scoping for libraries, fire stations, police stations, and district supervisor's offices. Although a standard building floor plan is not used, the spaces within the floor plan are generally consistent and adapted to the site and any specific requirements of the particular facility. The design standards are dynamic documents that are regularly updated to reflect evolving requirements of the customer agencies; FMD's changing requirements for maintenance, durability, and consistency; industry changes in systems and equipment; the evolution of sustainable design; and the recurring changes to regulatory requirements and approaches.

DPWES previously adapted a single fire station building plan for use on two different sites. This was done over twenty years ago, on two green field sites, with mixed results. Due to the differences in the site configurations, the building and site plans for the fire stations had to be significantly altered to work within the specific constraints associated with each site. Any savings realized on these projects were minimal due to the specific design modifications required for each site.

In the current County environment, green field sites are virtually non-existent. A significant portion of the current CIP projects are renovation and expansion projects for older County facilities. These renovation and expansion projects are intended to address the capital renewal of older County facilities that were originally built over twenty five years ago. The majority of County building projects are also prominent facilities in the community and the appearance and operations of the facilities are the subject of significant community input. Building sites and community expectations vary significantly, so it is extremely difficult to site adapt a standard design in different locations in the County. Individual building designs often reflect the character of the surrounding communities and neighborhoods. The sites associated with building renovation and expansion projects, and capital renewal projects, in the current County CIP tend to be extremely tight. Due to the tight sites and the current regulatory site requirements, the proposed building work usually has to be designed specifically to work with the individual site constraints. However, projects are generally based on a standard program for each facility and the standard program is adapted to include the unique program requirements of the customer agency based on the specific geographic and demographic locations. Examples of unique program elements to be reflected in the facility design include joint professional and volunteer fire stations; and fire stations with special operational units such as HazMat, Swift Water Rescue, and Technical Rescue Operations Team. Police station and libraries frequently have special program requirements to respond to the unique demographics of their specific location.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Gross

Question: Should the County pursue the formation of a VEBA as a vehicle for employees to fund retiree health insurance premiums through unused, accrued sick leave balances over 2,080 hours at the time of retirement?

Response: ***Background.*** Certain changes are recommended to the County's defined benefit retirement plans to bring those programs more in line with the competitive marketplace in response to the Post-Employment Benefits study conducted by AON-Hewitt. One recommendation would place a 2,080 hour cap on the amount of unused, accrued sick that can be used for determining eligibility and level of benefits under the County's pension plans.

Such a cap would be applied on a prospective basis to employees hired after a future date that has yet to be determined. The changes proposed are designed to bring the County more in line with the marketplace, but not to erode a competitive edge necessary to successfully attract and retain employees.

During the discussion of the County Executive's recommendations at the March 13th meeting of the Personnel and Reorganization Committee, representatives of the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) Local 2068 requested exploration of the potential for a "VEBA" to be used as a repository for employees with unused sick leave balances in excess of the 2,080 hour cap. Dollars associated with these unused balances would be used to fund retiree health insurance premiums. The Board directed staff to provide further information on VEBAs as part of the FY 2013 Budget Q and A process.

Discussion of VEBAs. A Voluntary Employee Benefit Arrangement (VEBA) is a type of tax-exempt trust that is governed by section 501(c)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code (the "Code") and provides for the payment of certain types of benefits (such as health, life or accident insurance) for its members. Due to its tax-favored status, a VEBA must meet a stringent set of requirements set forth in the Code.

VEBAs may be funded by employers and/or employees and have been in use since the late 1920s. They have gained recent attention as the mechanism that U.S. auto makers used to transfer liabilities for retiree medical plans to a fund created through negotiations with the United Auto Workers union. This type of VEBA is referred to as a "defeasance VEBA." The fund, which is overseen by the union, uses the pool of assets to provide retiree benefit programs that are actually designed by and offered through the VEBA. In the public sector, VEBAs have been historically used by state and local governments to set aside funds to cover employer costs for future Other Post-Employment Benefit (OPEB) obligations. (Note: The Virginia OPEB Trust, of which Fairfax was a founding member, considered the use of a VEBA, but elected instead to organize as a Trust under section 115 of the Code.) Other public sector employers have made VEBAs available for employee contributions to fund future health insurance premiums, including contributions arising out of unused sick leave balances.

VEBAs for Fairfax County. As part of its evaluation of the County's retiree medical offerings, staff reviews all options to provide a competitive, comprehensive and cost-effective benefits program for retirees While a VEBA offering is one option under consideration, staff is also examining other options to help retirees pay health coverage expenses, including both health reimbursement arrangements (HRAs) and health savings accounts (HSAs). The pros and cons of all three of these tools must be weighed in the overall context of plan design and a rapidly changing regulatory environment, as well as in the context of the "total" retirement package offered by the County.

A VEBA whose primary source of funding is unused sick leave balances over the 2,080 hour cap proposed by the County Executive is not practicable at this time for the following reasons:

- Currently, only 4.37% of County employees have sick leave balances over the proposed 2,080 hour cap. The average sick leave balance for ***all*** County employees currently eligible for retirement is 469 hours. Given that the County Executive's proposal applies only to future new hires, a VEBA that is funded only with unused sick leave balances in excess of 2,080 hours at retirement would probably not receive its first contributions for decades. It is difficult to predict the trends in medical plan design or regulatory environment that far into the future, making it impractical to design an optimal funding mechanism for health insurance programs.

- Under the Code, VEBAs must satisfy "nondiscrimination" requirements that ensure that both benefits and eligibility are provided fairly and proportionally across segments of the employer's population. Given the small size of the population that would have sick leave hours above the 2,080 hour cap to contribute to the VEBA, there is the potential that the program would have nondiscrimination testing issues.

- The conversion of hours above the 2,080 hour cap to dollar values in the form of a VEBA contribution will carry a cost to the County that is not currently part of its compensation or benefits budget. In addition to this expense, a VEBA would require the formation of a separate oversight body as required by the Code. Such an administrative entity would require funding in its own right to properly manage the VEBA both from an investment and operational perspective.

- HRAs and HSAs might have potentially more benefits for both retirees and active employees.

Staff is currently evaluating the County's retiree health programs in the larger context of its role in an overall "total retirement" portfolio of benefits. Over the next several months, it is expected that more information, as well as recommendations for future modifications to the program, will be presented to the Board in an effort to enhance and contemporize offerings.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: How does the proposed change to retirement eligibility for the Employees' Retirement System differ from retirement eligibility among our comparable jurisdictions?

Response: The following table provides a summary of the retirement eligibility criteria for employers used in the AON-Hewitt Post-Retirement Benefits Study. Please note that retirement age is just one component in the valuation of potential retirement benefits. The other factors that determine the final retirement benefits offered by the plans under examination vary widely.

Plan	Retirement Eligibility
Proposed Fairfax Employees' Retirement System	Age + Service = 85 (with minimum age of 55) ***or*** Age = 65 with 5 years of service
Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) Educational Employees' Supplementary Retirement System	30 years of service ***or*** Age = 60 with 5 years of service
Virginia Retirement System (VRS) - Pre 7/10	30 years of service (minimum age of 50) ***or*** Age = 65 with 5 years of service
Virginia Retirement System (VRS) - Post 7/10	Age + Service = 90 ***or*** Social Security Normal Retirement Age with 5 years of service
Alexandria (Supplement to VRS only)	65 ***or*** Age 50 with 30 years of service
Arlington	Age 62 ***or*** Age + Service = 80 ***or*** Years of Service = 30
Loudoun	See VRS
Montgomery County	N/A – Defined Contribution plan
Prince George's	30 years of service ***or*** Age + Service = 67 (for employees aged 62-65)
Prince William	See VRS
Federal Government (Defined Benefit Program)	Age 62 (with 5 years of service) ***or*** Age 60 (with 20 years of service) ***or*** 30 years of service

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: Is the County charging the maximum allowed for parking tickets?

Response: With three exceptions, the County Code currently imposes a fine of $50 for parking violations. Handicapped accessible parking violations are at the maximum allowed at $500 for each violation, the fine for parking a commercial vehicle in a residential area is $100 and the fine for parking in a residential parking district without the required decal is $75.

All parking offenses are classified by state law as traffic infractions and the maximum penalty is set by Virginia Code §§46.0-100 and 46.2-113. That maximum penalty for traffic infractions is $250 per violation. However, while in theory the County could impose fines of up to $250 per parking violations there is a lower practical limit, because Virginia law gives persons the option of going to court to contest a parking offense. The court is allowed to follow a payment schedule of fines established by the Virginia Supreme Court that could lower the parking violation fee to $20 with a court processing fee of $61 for a total amount of $81. Any proposed increase in the fine should remain low enough to encourage most violators to prepay parking tickets in lieu of pursuing a court appeal that would consume additional staff time and potentially result in a lower fine. In addition to the parking violation fee, the Department of Tax Administration charges other legally permissible fees, when applicable, in the collection of parking tickets which may include a $25 penalty if the violation is not paid within 21 days; a $30 administrative collection fee; $20 DMV Registration Hold fee; plus private collection agent fees of 20 percent. As shown in the table below, Fairfax County's current rates are at or above the rates of surrounding jurisdictions.

Parking Violation Fines

Jurisdiction	Parking in Handicapped Reserved Space	Meter Violations	Fire Code Violations*	Residential Area Violations	Wrong Way	Stopping of the Highway	Late Fee
Fairfax County	$500	$50	$50	$75 ($100 for commercial vehicles)	$50	$50	$25
Alexandria	$201	$35	$48	$40	$40	$40	$25
Arlington	$500	$35	$50	$50	$50	$50	$25
Loudoun	$100	none	$40	$50	$50	$50	$25

*For example, parking too close to a fire hydrant.

The County currently imposes the maximum tax of $100 on certain vehicles that do no display current Virginia license plates. The House and the Senate have approved an increase in this tax to $250. If signed by the Governor, the maximum tax of $250 would be effective July 1, 2012. At the $250 maximum, an additional $0.3 million in revenue is projected.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: Is the County charging the maximum allowed for zoning violations?

Yes, the County charges the maximum rates allowed by the *Code of Virginia* for civil penalties for Zoning Ordinance violations.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: When did the County start charging $10 for police incident reports and was it in response to budget pressures?

Response: The fee for police incident reports (burglary, larceny, etc.) was raised from $3 to $10 effective July 1, 2009. This fee was included in a review of user fees and other charges conducted as part of the Lines of Business Review during the development of the FY 2010 budget. Prior to this increase, the incident report fee had not been adjusted since 1991.

It should be noted that the County does not charge persons involved in motor vehicle accidents for an accident report. Insurance companies and attorneys are charged $5 for such reports.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: How does sales tax paid in Fairfax County come back to the County?

Response: Fairfax County's 1.0 percent local option Sales Tax is collected by the State with the 4.0 percent State Sales Tax and is distributed to the County based on point-of-sale. Fairfax County Public Schools also receives a rate of 1.125 percent from the State's Sales Tax which is distributed based on the County's share of statewide school-age population. The remaining State Sales Tax is distributed as follows: a rate of 0.125 percent is earmarked for education and is directed to a special fund used toward the Commonwealth's responsibility for the Standards of Quality; a rate of 0.5 percent is designated for the Transportation Trust Fund and 2.25 percent goes to the State's general fund.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: How is sales tax paid on internet purchases allocated (from where the store is physically located or from where the merchandise is delivered?)

Response: The sales tax paid on Internet purchases is distributed to the locality to which the merchandise was delivered. All sales taxes go to the Commonwealth of Virginia prior to distribution to localities. Sales tax on Internet purchases is not distinguishable from other sales taxes.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Hudgins

Question: How much did the County cut from Police in overtime and how much in actual savings has the County realized?

Response: As part of the FY 2010, FY 2011, and FY 2012 Adopted budgets, the Fairfax County Police Department (FCPD) reduced the overtime budget by $7.4 million, or just over 30 percent. This is the equivalent of approximately 135,500 hours. It is important to note that providing 24/7 coverage for police operations requires a combination of scheduled regular hours, scheduled overtime, and unscheduled overtime to meet minimum staffing requirements for calls for service. At the time these reductions were taken, it was noted that a reduced overtime budget could negatively impact response times, delay investigations, reduce proactive initiatives, and reduce the Department's flexibility to respond to unforeseen major incidents.

Since FY 2008, significant reductions in Personnel Services have been realized to meet projected budget shortfalls. From a peak in FY 2007 to the end of FY 2011, actual overtime expenditures decreased by $5.4 million, which while significant, was not as much as cut from the budget. In addition, savings were achieved through the targeted elimination of 52 positions, civilianization of appropriate uniformed positions, and management of vacancies. However, recognizing the County's significant investment in training police officers and to minimize the direct impact on critical public safety services, elimination of uniformed positions was achieved entirely through employee attrition, with no Reductions in Force. As a result, the full value of projected savings did not materialize as anticipated. Based on review of current staffing, overtime, and programmatic requirements consistent with Board of Supervisors' direction that staff monitor the impact of reductions to public safety, an increase of $2.0 million in recurring funding is necessary at this time for the Department to maintain sufficient flexibility to meet 24/7 minimum staffing requirements.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: How many electric vehicles are registered in Fairfax County and what would be the revenue loss if the County were to exempt these vehicles from the Personal Property Tax?

Response: At present, Fairfax County has 87 electric vehicles registered for personal property taxes. If the Board were to propose a one cent tax rate in FY 2013 for this class of vehicle, the estimated revenue loss would be approximately $100,000.

According to County records, the following electric vehicle types are currently registered in Fairfax County:

5 Nissan LEAF
13 TESLA
69 Chevrolet Volt (the Volt is electric with gas engine backup - an electric hybrid - and would likely qualify.)

Currently, purchasers of these vehicles are eligible for a federal income tax credit of up to $7,500. Electric vehicles are expected to be a growing sector of the marketplace, as additional models, such as the Mitsubishi MiEV; Ford Transit Connect; Toyota RAV4-EV; Honda FitEV; Smart Car Fortwo EV; and Prius V become available. Therefore, the revenue loss from an exemption would be expected to increase over time.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Chairman Bulova

Question: Please summarize the Human Services Council recommendations, identifying adjustments to the County Executive's recommendations and new or supplemental funding to existing programs.

Response: The Human Services Council recommendations have been categorized as follows:

New Funding	Amount
Replenishing the Partners in Prevention Fund	$400,000
Providing additional funding for the Consolidated Community Funding Pool[1]	$448,534
Providing full-time support for the Domestic Violence Action Center	$110,997
Providing additional funding for the Adult Dental Program	$ 50,000
Expressing concern for the Infant and Toddler Connection Program	$ 0
Providing funding for Residential Services for Young Adults with both Autism and Mental Illness	$663,721
Subtotal	**$1,673,252**
Adjustments to the County Executive's Recommendations	**Amount**
Eliminating implementation of a transportation fee and expanding the sliding scale within Therapeutic Recreation Summer Programs and Adult Social Club Program	$ 35,000
Restoring funding for Access Fairfax	$ 75,000
Restoring funding for two Computer Learning Centers	$ 90,000
Restoring funding for the Dept. of Family Services' Rent Relief program	$275,000
Restoring funding for seven School Health Aide (SHA) Substitutes	$100,000
Restoring funding for one contracted Nurse Practitioner with the Community Health Care Network at the highest-volume center	$130,000
Restoring funding additional funding for the Adult Dental Program	$50,000
Restoring funding for the Home Based Care program	$300,000
Restoring funding for Prevention and Student Assistance Services	$100,000
Subtotal	**$1,155,000**
Overall Total	**$2,828,252**

[1] New County funding is being requested as a result of anticipated reductions in federal funds that the County uses to support the funding pool.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: Please expand the Human Services Council recommendation chart to include the reductions taken in of each program on the chart over the last three years.

Response: The Human Services Council recommendations have been expanded to reflect reductions taken in prior years as follows:

Program	FY 2013 Amount	Prior Year Reductions
Replenishing the Partners in Prevention Fund	$400,000	NA
Providing additional funding for the Consolidated Community Funding Pool	$448,534	NA
Eliminating implementation of a transportation fee and expanding the sliding scale within Therapeutic Recreation Summer Programs and Adult Social Club Program	$35,000	NA
Restoring funding for Access Fairfax	$75,000	NA
Restoring funding for two Computer Learning Centers	$90,000	FY 2012 - $0 FY 2011 - $0 FY 2010 - $130,000 Note: In FY 2010, with structural changes realizing program efficiencies and alternative resource development, 2 centers slated for closure remained open. If CLC reductions taken in FY 2013, similar options are not readily apparent and DNCS would have to close the centers.
Restoring funding for the Dept. of Family Services' Rent Relief program	$275,000	FY 2012 - $0 FY 2011 - $0 Note: this request moves funding to the Department of Neighborhood and Community Services and service delivery will be redesigned to support emergency financial assistance
Providing full-time support for the Domestic Violence Action Center	$110,997	NA – new request
Restoring funding for seven School Health Aide (SHA) Substitutes	$100,000	FY 2012 - $0 FY 2011 - $0

Program	**FY 2013 Amount**	**Prior Year Reductions**
Restoring funding for one contracted Nurse Practitioner with the Community Health Care Network at the highest-volume center	$130,000	FY 2012 - $0 FY 2011 - $0
Restore funding and providing additional funding for the Adult Dental Program	$100,000	FY 2012 - $0 FY 2011 - $0 Note: this request restores the Advertised budget reduction of $50,000 and adds $50,000 in funding to the program
Restoring funding for the Home Based Care program	$300,000	FY 2012 - $0 FY 2011 - $496,125
Restoring funding for Prevention and Student Assistance Services	$100,000	FY 2012 - $0 FY 2011 - $0 Note: FCPS terminated its $99,500 in funding for this program and CSB was able to absorb the cut in FY 11 and 12. FY 2010 - $0 Note: this request restores the Advertised budget reduction of $99,500 and adds $500 in funding to the program
Expressing concern for the Infant and Toddler Connection Program	$0	FY 2012 - $0 FY 2011 - $49,256 FY 2010 - $0
Providing funding for Residential Services for Young Adults with both Autism and Mental Illness	$663,721	NA
Total	**$2,828,252**	

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Chairman Bulova

Question: Please summarize the $0.6 million in "Other" Third Quarter adjustments referenced in the Third Quarter presentation to the Board on March 27, 2012.

Response: The total of $648,000 reflects increases totaling $1,648,000 partially offset by a reduction of $1,000,000 for Foster Care and Adoption Services. The required adjustments are for:

Adjustment	Funding	Explanation
Storm Related Costs	$600,000	A total of $1,100,000 is required for storm-related costs caused by Tropical Storm Lee in September 2011. A portion of this requirement will be supported by existing fund contingency of $500,000 within Fund 303, County Construction. The remaining $600,000 will be supported by an increased General Fund transfer to Fund 303. Damage to County infrastructure from the storm has been estimated to be over $3.3 million, with the majority of damage impacting wastewater management infrastructure and the park system. The County expects to recover much of these costs from its insurance carrier. However, the County's insurance policy includes a deductible of $100,000 for property not located in a FEMA flood plain and a separate deductible of $1,000,000 for property located in a FEMA flood plain. The Wastewater Management Program has been able to absorb the costs of repairs to the sewer system within its existing appropriation. However, damage to the park system requires repairs which are greater than the Park Authority is able to absorb. Total funding of $1,100,000 is required for the Park Authority to address high priority repairs, an amount which will satisfy the County's deductible under its insurance policy. The County will continue to pursue insurance recoveries and, where possible and appropriate, will seek federal reimbursement for storm-related costs. However, it is anticipated that if any recovery is accomplished, funds will not be received until FY 2013 or later and therefore are not reflected at this time.
Finance Audit and Implementation Requirements	$588,000	Funding of $588,000 is required for additional audit and implementation requirements related to the new financial system. More robust audit requirements have been defined by the County's external auditor to meet mandated reporting requirements for County-wide financial statements. In addition, funding is provided to support staff costs associated with ensuring the accuracy of the new financial system and transitioning to centralized Accounts Payable processing which has been developed as part of the best practice implementation of the system.

Adjustment	Funding	Explanation
Child Care Assistance and Referral Program	$400,000	Funding of $400,000 is required to appropriate additional federal and state revenue for the Child Care Assistance and Referral (CCAR) program to provide child care services to the mandated population (i.e., those receiving services through TANF/VIEW/Head Start). The expenditure increase is fully offset by an increase in federal and state revenues for no net impact to the County.
Government Center Landscaping	$60,000	Funding of $60,000 is included for costs associated with landscaping at the Government Center facility, including: weeding, mulching, mowing and maintenance of shrubbery. This funding will enable the Facilities Management Department to increase basic landscaping activities which had been reduced due to budget constraints the past several years. This adjustment is completely offset by General Fund revenues received from Wegmans for the use of certain Government Center parking spaces during weekends and holidays.
Foster Care and Adoption Services	($1,000,000)	A decrease of $1,000,000 to both revenues and expenditures for the Adoption Subsidy Program is included to more accurately align the program's budget with actual spending. Program spending has declined significantly due to the maximization of Medicaid as an alternative funding source for these subsidies. The expenditure decrease is fully offset by a decrease in federal and state revenues for no net impact to the County.
Total	**$648,000**	

In addition, funding adjustments within Fund 104, IT Project Fund which have no General Fund impact were noted by the County Executive in the Third Quarter letter to make the Board aware of the changes. A total of $2.2 million is recommended for redirection and reprioritization for critical hardware and system infrastructure requirements as well as specialized technical staff augmentation for major County computer systems, including the FOCUS project. The specialized staff resources are required to provide technical system work that is not typically performed as a part of ERP functional implementation consultant contracts. The contracted consultants have specific expert skill in the underlying SAP solution and its architecture, and perform tasks that span business day work with SAP and work that can only be performed evenings and weekends to meet the project schedule. The project has reached the peak period with significant overlapping work for Phases 1B (finance and procurement development and testing), Phase 2 (County human resources and payroll development and testing), and Phase 3 (schools core human resources and payroll design, and County and schools non-core human resources and budget modules). It should be noted that these staff resources are also supporting Phase1A system production and on-going stabilization.

The Department of Information Technology (DIT) evaluated all available balances in Fund 104, and have identified areas where funds can be reallocated from projects recently completed, identified any projects where flexibility existed, and reprioritized other projects where work can be deferred until later. Included in this total is $1.7 million of the $2.0 million previously approved to support secure access of new web-based social media functionalities. This project was intended to implement a protected web security gateway infrastructure to expand web and social media access to County agencies for business needs. The project has only incurred minimal expenses to date, and staff has determined that, given current priorities, reallocating these funds is necessary at this time. However, given the evolving technology in this field, adjusting deployment of these capabilities is prudent. It will be necessary to fund the revised implementation schedule in future years. Specific details on the reallocations recommended at this time can be found in Attachment III, Other Funds Detail in the FY 2012 Third Quarter package.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: Please provide a summary of the source of funds being used to support the FOCUS project. Include any non-IT related funds. Are any funds being supplied by FCPS?

Response: The source of funds being used to support the Fairfax County Unified System (FOCUS) project is a transfer from the General Fund to Fund 104, Information Technology. There has been funding provided to Project IT0079 ERP for software, software maintenance, training, consulting services and third party products; Project IT0022 Enterprise Architecture and Support for servers, storage, hardware, middleware, security, and document management; and Project IT0088 Retirement of Legacy Systems for the assessment, conversion and migration of legacy mainframe systems.

FOCUS related agencies such as the Department of Finance and the Department of Human Resources have been and will continue to use their operational funding to support the ongoing operational needs of their agencies, much of which is directly related to the financial, procurement and human resources needs of the County.

The Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) is not providing direct financial support of the FOCUS project. Annually, the Fairfax County Government provides a multi-million dollar transfer to the Public Schools to support educational needs. However it is standard practice to not include funding in the annual transfer for joint initiatives and then have the Public Schools transfer the funds back to the Government. FCPS has provided significant staff resources in project management, finance, procurement, human capital management (human resources/payroll), training, and organizational change management. FCPS will also provide training facilities for school employee training.

The following table was provided to the Board's auditor in November 2011 and is updated to include recent funding adjustments recommended as part of the *FY 2012 Third Quarter Review*.

	Fund 104 Project IT0079 Legacy System Replacement	Fund 104 Project IT0022 Tactical Initiatives	Fund 104 Project IT0088 Retirement of Legacy Systems	**TOTAL**
FY08 Adopted Budget Plan	$800,000			
FY09 Adopted Budget Plan	$7,000,000			
FY08 Carryover	$4,300,000			
FY09 Third Quarter	$3,500,000			
FY09 Carryover	$6,050,000			
FY10 Carryover	$10,000,000			
FY11 Third Quarter		$3,800,000		
FY11 Carryover	$10,000,000			
FY12 Adopted Budget Plan		$2,163,200	$500,000	
FY12 Third Quarter		$2,022,059		
FY12 Carryover (Planned)	$10,000,000			
TOTAL	**$51,650,000**	**$7,985,259**	**$500,000**	**$60,135,259**

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Is the County still providing funding to the Reston Chamber of Commerce to provide a Visitors Center in the Chamber headquarters?

Response: Starting in FY 2012, funding in the amount of $25,000, which in the past had been provided by the Fairfax County Convention and Visitors Corporation (FCCVC) to the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce Visitor Center, is no longer being provided. In June 2011, FCCVC notified the Chamber about this funding adjustment, which was necessitated by the significant reduction in funding due to the economic downturn over the past three years.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Foust

Question: Please provide a breakdown of the school population by major categories similar to that shown on Slide 9 of the School Board's Advertised Budget presentation.

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

Below is a chart detailing the breakdown of school enrollment for FY 2008 – FY 2013 by major categories as highlighted on Slide 9 of the School Board's Advertised Budget presentation. This data is provided in the FY 2013 Proposed Budget in the Benchmarks chart on page 74.

FY 2008 - FY 2013						
	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Estimate	FY 2013 Proposed
Membership						
General	152,808	155,467	158,234	160,333	162,937	166,244
Special Ed Level 2 and Preschool	13,499	14,071	14,157	14,600	14,778	15,364
Total	**166,307**	**169,538**	**172,391**	**174,933**	**177,715**	**181,608**
ESOL Membership [1]	21,751	20,689	19,078	22,650	26,749	32,255
Percent of Total Membership	13.1%	12.2%	11.1%	12.9%	15.1%	17.8%
Special Ed Unduplicated Count	23,815	24,017	24,173	24,489	24,807	24,931
Percent of Total Membership	14.3%	14.2%	14.0%	14.0%	14.0%	13.7%
Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Meals	34,048	37,161	42,204	44,018	45,224	46,096
Percent of Total Membership	20.5%	21.9%	24.5%	25.2%	25.4%	25.4%

[1] Does not include students in kindergarten.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisors Foust, McKay and Hudgins

Question: Please provide a list of sites where adult and continuing education (ACE) programs will be offered in the future as well as a list where these programs used to be offered but no longer will. Also, provide information on ACE programs being consolidated with County programs, specifically focusing on ensuring that they are being offered across the County.

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

The Adult and Community Education (ACE) program will focus on Adult ESOL and career and workforce readiness. Classes for adult enrichment such as art, fine crafts, travel, and personal fitness will not be offered by ACE but will be offered by the Fairfax County Park Authority. ACE will continue to offer enrichment classes in key program areas including business, technology, foreign language, and personal improvement but will limit the offerings to classes that meet enrollment targets. Program adjustments will be made as necessary to meet the needs of the community.

The following chart shows ACE locations for FY 2012 and FY 2013:

FY 2012 ACE Locations	FY 2013 ACE Locations
ACE Herndon Learning Center	x
Annandale High School	x
Bryant Center	x
Centreville Center	
Centreville High School	
Chantilly High School	x
Chantilly Regional Library	
Edison High School	
City of Fairfax Regional Library	
Fairfax High School	
Falls Church High School	
Greenspring Village - Hunters Crossing	
Gunston Hall Plantation (Culinary Arts - Open Hearth Cooking - fall only)	TBD
Hayfield Secondary School	
Herndon High School	
Herndon Neighborhood Resource Center	
Hollin Hall Senior Center	

FY 2012 ACE Locations	FY 2013 ACE Locations
Inova Fair Oaks Hospital – Clinical only	x
Lake Braddock Secondary School	x
Lee High School	x
Lincolnia Senior Center	
Little River Glen Senior Center	
McLean High School	x
Mott Community Center – Adult ESOL	x
Pimmit Hills Center	x
Plum Center	x
Poe Middle School	
Pohick Regional Library	
R Byrd Library	
Sherwood Regional Library	
South Lakes High School	
Thoreau Middle School	
Willston Multicultural Center – Adult ESOL	x
Woodson High School	x
Fairfax County YWCA (Vienna)	

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Foust

Question: Please compare the percent of retirement paid by local Maryland school districts to that paid by FCPS.

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

The FCPS provides pension support through three systems. Participation in the varied systems is dependent on the type of position the employee holds and whether or not they are full or part-time. Currently, FCPS contributes both the employer and employee share into the VRS (Virginia Retirement System). In the early seventies, ERFC (Educational Employees' Supplementary Retirement System of Fairfax County) was created as a supplement to the VRS. FCPS currently provides an employer contribution to ERFC and employees also contribute. The combination of VRS and ERFC are meant to be comparable to FCERS (Fairfax County Employees' Retirement System). Select FCPS employees participate in FCERS in lieu of VRS/ERFC. FCPS provides an employer contribution and employees pay one of two rates, depending on their choice of the plan A or plan B benefit level.

Maryland's funding approach is different in that the localities do not pay directly into the state pension programs. For FY 2013, the actuarially determined, defined benefit pension employer cost for the Maryland state plan is 17.76 percent of salary; however, the budgeted state cost, excluding the impact of reinvestment savings, is 13.29 percent. Employee contributions are also required. Montgomery County is the only Maryland jurisdiction with a supplemental plan and MCPS (Montgomery County Public Schools) provides an employer contribution. MCPS employees contribute a number of differing amounts, depending on their plan participation alternative.

Costs for pension programs are generally shown as a percentage of salary and vary annually. The attached chart provides a pension cost comparison for Montgomery and Fairfax Counties teachers for the current and upcoming fiscal years. The chart reflects costs for both the state programs and local supplemental cost.

County	Retirement Plan(s)	FY 2012 State/ Employer Rate	FY 2012 Employee Rate	Proposed FY 2013 State/ Employer Rate	Proposed FY 2013 Employee Rate
Montgomery teachers	MD Teacher Pension	15.45%[1]	7.00%	13.29%[2]	7.00%
	Local Plan	1.50%	0.50%	1.50%	0.50%
	Total	**16.95%**	**7.50%**	**14.79%**	**7.50%**
Fairfax teachers	VRS	6.33%	5.00%[3]	11.66%	5.00%[4]
	Local Plan -- ERFC	4.34%	4.00%	4.34%	4.00%
	Total	**10.67%**	**9.00%**	**16.00%**	**9.00%**
Fairfax County (Includes FCPS Participants)	FCERS (Plan A)[5]	17.20%	4.00%	19.05%	4.00%
	FCERS (Plan A, above Social Security Wage Base and Plan B)[5]	17.20%	5.33%	19.05%	5.33%

[1] The State of Maryland makes this contribution rather than Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS).

[2] Under discussion whether MCPS will make this contribution or the State of Maryland will continue to pay.

[3] Paid by Fairfax County Public Schools.

[4] Legislation passed by the Virginia Senate and House will require employees to pay the 5.00% employee contribution rate.

[5] Employees make either a 4.00% or 5.33% contribution depending on their choice of the FCERS plan A or plan B benefit level and wages above the Social Security wage base.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Please provide benchmark data comparing Fairfax County's construction costs against those being experienced by neighboring jurisdictions. Could design costs be reduced significantly by using previous design models for similar types of facilities such as schools?

Response: *(Note: A response to this question is being prepared by both the County and FCPS. This is the FCPS response. The County response is included as question #40 on pages 68-70 of this Q&A package.)*

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

FCPS utilizes existing design models when appropriate and when possible. The Department of Facilities and Transportation Services has obtained construction cost data from four surrounding school systems. We have been aware that our construction costs are substantially lower than these systems, but this is the first time they agreed to provide their actual costs. They did so, however, with a caveat. They have requested that we not name the school systems explicitly. Therefore, we are showing these systems as Virginia Public School Systems A, B, and C, and Maryland Public School System D.

Because none of these surrounding school systems conduct phased-occupied renovation projects as we do in FCPS, it is not possible to compare renovation costs. Thus, what we are providing is a comparison of new construction costs only.

The following chart displays the cost data that we received from the other local jurisdictions for the construction of a new elementary school.

Response to Questions on the FY 2013 Budget

Request By: Chairman Bulova

Question: Please provide a copy of the previous research done by FCPS showing what an additional $25 million per year in GO Bond Sales for FCPS would be able to accommodate.

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

The School Board has requested that the Board of Supervisors increase its annual bond funding limit from $155 million to $180 million beginning in FY 2014. The attached spreadsheet shows the impact that this additional funding would have on the timing of school renovations. Construction start dates for schools in queue positions 1 through 26 would not be impacted by the additional funds. However, schools in queue positions 27 through 45 would be positively impacted and their estimated construction start dates would be advanced by either 18 or 24 months. The attached spreadsheet reflects the updated estimated construction start dates by fiscal year for these projects. As can be noted, schools such as Falls Church High School would have their renovations accelerated by about two years should this additional funding be provided.

Renovation Queue and Updated Timeline With Additional Funding Provided in 2014			
	Queue Position	Revised Estimated Construction Start by Fiscal Year	# of Months Advanced from Original Start Date with Additional Funding
CLERMONT ES	1	2013	No Change
TERRASET ES	2	2014	No Change
SUNRISE VALLEY ES	3	2013	No Change
GARFIELD ES	4	2013	No Change
TERRA CENTRE ES	5	2013	No Change
THOREAU MS	6	2013	No Change
WESTGATE ES	7	2014	No Change
HAYCOCK ES	8	2014	No Change
LANGLEY HS	9	2015	No Change
RAVENSWORTH ES	10	2014	No Change
WOODLAWN ES	11	2014	No Change
FORESTVILLE ES	12	2014	No Change
NORTH SPRINGFIELD ES	13	2014	No Change
SPRINGFIELD ESTATES ES	14	2014	No Change
KEENE MILL ES	15	2015	No Change
BUCKNELL ES	16	2015	No Change
CHERRY RUN ES	17	2016	No Change
WAYNEWOOD ES	18	2016	No Change
STRATFORD LANDING ES	19	2016	No Change
NEWINGTON FOREST ES	20	2016	No Change
HOLLIN MEADOWS ES	21	2016	No Change
WHITE OAKS ES	22	2016	No Change
WEST SPRINGFIELD HS	23	2016	No Change
MOUNT VERNON WOODS ES	24	2016	No Change
HERNDON HS	25	2017	No Change
ROCKY RUN MS	26	2017	No Change
BELLE VIEW ES	27	2016	+ 24 Months
ANNANDALE TERRACE ES	28	2016	+ 24 Months
CLEARVIEW ES	29	2016	+ 24 Months
OAKTON HS	30	2018	+ 18 Months
HUGHES MS	31	2018	+ 18 Months
SILVERBROOK ES	32	2018	+ 24 Months
HYBLA VALLEY ES	33	2018	+ 24 Months
COOPER MS	34	2019	+ 24 Months
FROST MS	35	2019	+ 24 Months
WASHINGTON MILL ES	36	2020	+ 24 Months
BRADDOCK ES	37	2020	+ 24 Months
FOX MILL ES	38	2020	+ 24 Months
OAK HILL ES	39	2020	+ 24 Months
WAKEFIELD FOREST ES	40	2020	+ 24 Months
LOUISE ARCHER ES	41	2020	+ 24 Months
CROSSFIELD ES	42	2020	+ 24 Months
MOSBY WOODS ES	43	2020	+ 24 Months
BONNIE BRAE ES	44	2020	+ 24 Months
FALLS CHURCH HS	45	2020	+ 24 Months