



County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2014
TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Susan W. Datta, Chief Financial Officer 
SUBJECT: Responses to FY 2015 BOS Budget Questions – Package 4

Attached for your review is Package 4 of responses to Board questions on the FY 2015 budget. Additional questions and responses will be included in subsequent packages. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me.

The following responses are included in this package:

Question Number	Question	Supervisor	Pages
	<i>Questions 1-11 answered in Package 1 dated March 11, 2014</i>		1-24
	<i>Questions 12-35 answered in Package 2 dated March 31, 2014</i>		25-54
	<i>Questions 36-55 answered in Package 3 dated April 7, 2014</i>		55-81
56	Please provide information on the goals, mission, and objectives of both the Healthy Families program and the Live Healthy Fairfax program as well as information on expenditures and revenues generated by these programs. Please identify sources of funding for these programs.	Herrity	82-83
57	Please review the Parking Reduction program to increase the fees in place of eliminating the positions which is an option in the reduction package.	Smyth	84
58	The Budget Consideration Item reduction “ <i>Reduce positions associated with FOCUS implementation by 25 percent</i> ” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	85
59	The Budget Consideration Item reduction “ <i>Reduce administrative support</i> ” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	86
60	The Budget Consideration Item reduction “ <i>Privatize refuse collection</i> ” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	87
61	The Budget Consideration Item reduction “ <i>Realign the SACC program to attain budget neutrality</i> ” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.	Herrity	88
62	Please provide an update on SACC parent fees, the sliding fee scale and capacity issues.	Multiple Supervisors	89-91
63	Please provide an update on the County’s reserves including the sequestration reserve.	McKay	92
64	Please provide additional information on the School Readiness Program including the staffing plan and operational strategies that the proposed new funding will support.	McKay/Smyth	93-94



County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

65	Please provide additional information on Behavioral Health Services including the staffing plan and operational strategies that the proposed new funding will support.	Smyth	95
66	Please identify by line item each item in the budget which has increased more than 3 percent over the <u>FY 2014 Adopted Budget Plan</u> , and describe the reason for the increase.	Cook	96-99

Attachment

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

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Please provide information on the goals, mission, and objectives of both the Healthy Families program and the Live Healthy Fairfax program as well as information on expenditures and revenues generated by these programs. Please identify sources of funding for these programs.

Response: Healthy Families Fairfax

Healthy Families Fairfax is a collaborative effort between two County agencies, the Department of Family Services and the Health Department as well as three nonprofit agencies, Northern Virginia Family Services, Cornerstones (formerly Reston Interfaith) and United Community Ministries. Healthy Families Fairfax utilizes a nationally recognized evidence-based home visiting program model designed to work with overburdened families whose children are at-risk for adverse childhood experiences, especially child maltreatment. It is the home visiting model best equipped to work with families who may have histories of trauma, intimate partner violence, and mental health and/or substance abuse issues. Adherence to program design is maintained through a comprehensive accreditation process that occurs every four years. The goals and objectives of the program are as follows:

Goal # 1: Achieve positive pregnancy outcomes and maternal and child health outcomes

Objective 1: Families will receive appropriate health care

Objective 2: Pregnancy and Birth Outcomes

Objective 3: Health Outcomes

Objective 4: Mothers Health

Goal # 2: Promote Optimal Child Development

Objective 1: Promote optimal Child Development

Goal # 3: Parents demonstrate positive parent-child interaction and, positive parenting knowledge and behavior

Objective 1: Positive Parent – Child Interaction

Objective 2: Positive Parenting Knowledge and Behavior

Goal # 4: Children will not be abused or neglected

Objective 1: Absence of founded child abuse/neglect reports

In FY 2013, \$2.0 million was spent in the program, offset by state revenue of \$0.3 million for a net cost to the County of \$1.7 million. It is anticipated that FY 2014 expenditures will be consistent with FY 2013. Most of the program's expenditures are contracted out to supply home visiting staff who provide parent education, assessment, education on child development, crisis intervention, outreach, documentation, and goal setting. It should also be noted that Northern Virginia Family Services provides funding of \$0.1 million in addition to the County funding.

Live Healthy Fairfax

Live Healthy Fairfax is an initiative funded primarily by the Community Transformation Grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The initiative seeks to improve community health through policy, systems, programmatic and infrastructure changes that promote health, prevent disease, and reduce disparities in health outcomes. Live Healthy Fairfax activities are guided by the Partnership for a Healthier Fairfax's (PFHF), Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), which was published in October 2013. Developed through a collaborative effort by numerous multi-sector stakeholders, the Community Health Improvement Plan was designed for community ownership and implementation. The success of the plan's implementation depends on the support and commitment of all who play a role in directly or indirectly impacting health outcomes in the Fairfax community. The plan and all seven priority health issues, including goals, objectives and key actions, can be viewed at <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/livehealthy/pdfs/community-health-improvement-plan.pdf>

There are no FY 2014 General Fund dollars supporting the Live Healthy Fairfax implementation activities currently underway. The continued dedication of current and future community partners and the investment of time, energy, and other resources are moving the community forward toward reaching its goals. The CHIP has helped to establish capacity within the Partnership for a Healthier Fairfax, thus positioning the County to receive additional competitive grant awards to support implementation activities. FY 2014 funding includes:

- Community Transformation Grant Award: \$499,559
- Healthy Eating/Active Living Grant Award: \$67,410
- Health Impact Assessment Grant Award: \$14,487

The County was recently informed that the national Community Transformation Grant program award that has supported our Partnership activities since 2011 would be prematurely ended in September 2014. The original 5-year grant award was to end September 2016.

Although it is important to the County that the PFHF not lose momentum, the elimination of the grant funds will significantly limit the County's ability to coordinate implementation activities that support the Partnership's vision and goals. The day-to-day partnership management functions including the coordination of implementation activities, partnership organization and grant writing functions require staff resources. Up until now, Partnership support has been provided solely by grant funds.

The PFHF established a Sustainability Committee in the fall of 2013 to begin discussions regarding the on-going operations of the coalition. Despite efforts to proactively address sustainability, the premature termination of the grant award has threatened to foreshorten an action plan for ensuring independent operations. Although the CHIP has enabled the County and the PFHF to successfully compete for additional grants to further support implementation activities, at this time there are no grant funds available after October 1, 2014.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Smyth

Question: Please review the Parking Reduction program to increase the fees in place of eliminating the positions which is an option in the reduction package.

Response: Land Development Services (LDS) does not recommend an increase in fees for the Parking Reduction program. Fees were increased for the recent cost of living by 2.77% in FY 2014. Current rates are provided below:

Types of Fees for Parking Reduction Program	Fees
Parking tabulation for change in use, per submission	\$817
Parking redesignation plan, per submission	\$817
Administrative parking reduction for churches, chapels, temples, synagogues and other such places of worship with child care center, nursery school or private school of general or special education, per submission	\$817
Parking reduction based on hourly parking accumulation characteristics or hourly parking accumulation characteristics in combination with other factors when the required spaces are:	
Under 225 spaces	\$2,343
225 to 350 spaces	\$4,069
351 to 599 spaces	\$6,505
600 spaces or more	\$13,626
Parking reduction based on proximity to a mass transit station	\$2,343
Parking reduction based on a Transportation Demand Management Program	\$2,343
Recycling study: When the plan or study is submitted to the County for the sole purpose of placing recycling containers on a commercial or industrial site, as required by the Fairfax County Business Implementation Recycling Plan, per submission.	NA

LDS can include the parking study fees in the next review, which will begin in the next few months, and any increase would be effective in FY 2016.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Reduce positions associated with FOCUS implementation by 25 percent*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: The Consideration Item proposes a 25 percent reduction, over a two year period, of FOCUS support positions, resulting in a the elimination of 7 positions and total savings of \$1 million.

A reduction of \$983,565 in salary and mainframe costs and the elimination of 4 positions were included as part of the FY 2014 Adopted Budget Plan. This reduction was taken as part of the organizational adjustments that were made to support FOCUS.

As the first phases of the FOCUS project became operational the County realigned the ongoing support of the system with technical support remaining in the Department of Information Technology and functional support being consolidated in the Department of Management and Budget and coordinated with the “business process owners.” Staff from the business process owners of the system (the Departments of Finance, Human Resources, Purchasing and Supply Management and Management and Budget) was identified to coordinate the functional requirements and a new organizational group, FOCUS Business Support Group (FBSG), was formed in the Department of Management and Budget. This realignment was done entirely with existing staff. As defined, the FBSG will not only support the phases of the system that have been rolled out but also assist with the implementation of subsequent phases.

During the FOCUS project, staff was temporarily deployed to the project. While the regular work performed by these staff was back filled by other staff during the period of the deployment this was only possible on a temporary basis. There is no flexibility to make additional position reductions.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

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

Response: The Consideration Item proposes a reduction, over a three year period, of administrative support positions, defined as Administrative Assistants I – V and Administrative Associates, from 9.5 percent of all county employees to 5 percent of all County employees generating a cumulative savings of \$12 million to better align County staffing with Bureau of Labor Statistics data on typical levels of administrative support in local governments.

The County uses the Administrative job class for many different functions, not all of which fall into the traditional administrative support category. For example, Tax Administration, Circuit Court and Human Services Administration deploy staff in Administrative Assistant job classes for revenue collection functions and for customer service. In other agencies such as the Health Department, Department of Family Services, Neighborhood and Community Services and the Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board Administrative positions are also used to staff front desks at various sites for intake of clients. By just excluding the positions in the administrative job classes in these agencies the ratio drops to 4.6%, based on the methodology employed to calculate the savings. These positions are critical to ensure that the County meets its revenue collection goals, is available to respond to inquiries and processes applications and requests for service.

It should be noted that not only have reductions already occurred throughout the County reducing the number of traditional administrative support positions, the remaining positions serve a number of functions that include traditional administrative support functions supporting agency operations as well as serving as agency payroll contacts, and processing financial and purchasing documents for agencies.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

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

Response: The Solid Waste Management Program (SWMP) currently collects waste and recycling from 218 County General Fund facilities. In FY 2013, the SWMP billed these County agencies a total of \$1,110,555 for refuse and recycling collection. These billings included \$395,783 of refuse disposal charges. These disposal fees are fixed charges that would have been incurred even if a privately contracted refuse collection company had performed collection services for County facilities. These disposal fees have averaged more than \$400,000 per year over the last three years. Given that the charge to County General Funded facilities net of disposal costs was only \$714,772 in FY 2013, it is not possible to achieve \$1,000,000 of savings. Any private contractor would also have to incur costs for salaries, benefits, equipment, fuel, and other operating costs.

SWMP service levels and rates were also compared with the FCPS contract for private disposal services and actual invoices for FCPS’s refuse and recycling collections. These costs appeared comparable to those billed by SWMP to County agencies. While SWMP charges agencies a flat rate for refuse and recycling collections as well as the repair and replacement of containers, the private contractor charges an additional fee for recycling collections and container repair and replacement fees. In addition, SWMP obtained a study conducted by Arlington County in 2011 on container collection service. It was noted that Fairfax County’s current rate is substantially lower than the average rate for the region at that time. As previous evaluations have shown, no appreciable savings are anticipated by utilizing the FCPS contract to collect County routes as SWMP’s charges are quite competitive. It should also be noted that George Mason University and Northern Virginia Community College have examined their best options for refuse and recycling service and have chosen Fairfax County Solid Waste Management Program to provide this service for many years. As a result, there are no anticipated savings resulting from privatization.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: The Budget Consideration Item reduction “*Realign the SACC program to attain budget neutrality*” has been requested. Provide a summary of the reduction including the impact it would have.

Response: Please refer to Q&A number 62 on pages 89 – 91 of this package for a comprehensive discussion of SACC parent fees, the sliding fee scale and capacity issues.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Multiple Supervisors

Question: Please provide an update on SACC parent fees, the sliding fee scale and capacity issues.

Response: In response to the Board of Supervisors discussion of School-Age Child Care (SACC) fees during the March 25, 2014 Board meeting, the following is being provided as an update to the issues raised as part of that discussion. As the Board is aware, SACC supports working families and helps children to thrive by providing out-of-school time programs for children in kindergarten through sixth grade, as well as older children with multiple disabilities. In the fall of 1974, SACC programs opened their doors to children and families in eight FCPS elementary schools, serving 160 children daily. Today, SACC is available throughout the County in 137 schools and one recreation center and serves approximately 10,000 children daily. Hallmarks of SACC include the dedicated and qualified workforce, educational and innovative programming, and a commitment to provide subsidized child care to families with low-incomes and children with special needs.

SACC program staff has worked consistently in recent years to modify the program based on the Board's priorities and community needs while at the same time preserving the integrity of the program. For example, in FY 2010, in an effort to address the waiting list, staff identified efficiencies and were able to add 400 new slots to the after school program. Additionally, beginning in FY 2014, the SACC program began implementing a new staffing model which utilizes a combination of merit and benefits-eligible employees, rather than a traditional merit only model. Based on the questions raised by the Board, staff has been instructed to work with the SACC Parent Advisory Council and the Child Care Advisory Council to develop a formal report with recommendations for setting parent fees and cost recovery and amending the sliding fee scale, as well as addressing capacity issues. Staff routinely coordinates with these advisory groups on policy issues and any changes to the rate structure and/or sliding fee scale should incorporate this step in an effort to include all stakeholders in the process of identifying options and recommendations. Any change to rate structure and/or sliding fee scale needs to correspond to the beginning of the school year. It is not anticipated that a review of this magnitude can be completed prior to the start of the 2014-2015 school year. In an effort to inform and give all participants the opportunity to comment, it is anticipated that recommendations will be implemented in FY 2016, if not sooner. Given the potential significance of the changes, this will allow all stakeholders to participate in the process prior to implementation. Staff will provide regular updates at Human Services Committee meetings and will facilitate Board discussion and decisions on how best to move forward. An outline will be presented at the May 6, 2014 Human Services Committee meeting. The report will specifically address the following issues:

- Rate Structure
SACC fees are collected from parents as payment for child care services. SACC fees are established based on the cost of the program, reviewed annually and are typically adjusted based on increased program costs (primarily driven by annual compensation increases to employees). Families with an adjusted household income of less than

\$52,000 are eligible to pay on a sliding fee scale; therefore, SACC parent fees are estimated to cover approximately 80 percent of SACC program costs.

In recent years, in an effort to address the budget shortfall, fees have been increased based on a flat percentage. Over the past five fiscal years, fees have increased nearly 24 percent. The FY 2015 Advertised Budget Plan includes a proposed fee increase of 1.3 percent which is consistent with the proposed compensation increases for employees. This means a parent paying full fee will be charged \$344 per month for the SACC after-school program in FY 2015. This is nearly a 25 percent increase since FY 2009. Specifically, staff will review the factors that are included when setting the fees; analyze and compare market rates, rate structure, and program design of other jurisdictions as well as private providers; and explore a higher rate of cost recovery.

- Sliding Fee Scale

As mentioned earlier, the SACC program provides a sliding fee scale to support income eligible families' participation in the program. Currently, families with an adjusted household income of less than \$52,000 are eligible to pay on a sliding fee scale. This income eligibility limit is approximately 50 percent of the County median income and approximately 250 percent of the federal poverty level. There are many variations to the sliding fee scale that can be considered. These will be considered as part of the comprehensive review and will be included in the recommendations presented to the Board. However, as a point of reference and assuming no adjustments have been made to the sliding fee scale, should the Board wish to achieve full cost recovery, estimated to be \$9.0 million in FY 2015, and only adjusting fees for the full paying parents, in FY 2015, a parent paying the full fee will be charged \$449 per month for the SACC after-school program. This would be a 32 percent increase over the FY 2014 rate and a 63 percent increase since FY 2009. Please note, this recovery rate is predicated upon the current number of families paying full fee.

- Capacity

SACC was designed to be one component of child care in the community and to complement center- and home-based child care options. The network of child care around the County is different from neighborhood to neighborhood. Similarly, the waiting list for SACC fluctuates across the County. Nearly 75 percent of SACC centers have fewer than 30 children on the waiting list for services; 5 SACC centers have very large waiting lists with 91 to 135 families requesting care. Though demand remains consistent, anecdotal information indicates that families on the SACC waiting list often have alternate arrangements in place and choose to remain on the waitlist for future placements.

SACC Waiting List (as of February 2014)

Number of Children on Waitlist	Number of Centers	Percentage
0	47	34.1%
1-30	56	40.6%
31-60	20	14.5%
61-90	10	7.2%
91-135	5	3.6%

In neighborhoods where the supply of child care options do not meet the full needs of the community, SACC has worked with community groups and child care providers to support their capacity to meet the child care needs of working families. Additionally, SACC continues to explore and identify opportunities to increase the availability of SACC services utilizing the redesigned staffing model incorporating a combination of merit and benefits eligible employees throughout the program, thereby recognizing cost efficiencies.

Staff will provide additional information as it relates to program capacity, where the longest waiting lists are located, what the primary drivers are for those waiting lists, and potential ways the waiting lists can be addressed.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay

Question: Please provide an update on the County's reserves, including the sequestration reserve.

Response: Reserve balances funded utilizing General Fund resources are outlined below. Balances are shown as included in the FY 2015 Advertised Budget Plan, unless otherwise noted.

Sequestration Reserve: This reserve in the General Fund, which was initially created as part of the *FY 2012 Carryover Review*, has a balance of \$7.70 million. Of this amount, \$1.00 million has been earmarked for the Housing Blueprint/Bridging Affordability Program.

Managed Reserve and Revenue Stabilization Reserve: These reserves are maintained at 2 percent and 3 percent, respectively, of General Fund disbursements in accordance with Board policy. The Managed Reserve balance is \$74.09 million and the Revenue Stabilization balance is \$111.13 million. The Managed Reserve is held in the General Fund, while the Revenue Stabilization Reserve is held in a separate fund - Fund 10010.

Litigation Reserve: This reserve was initially established in the General Fund at a level of \$5.0 million at the *FY 2012 Carryover Review* to address the impact of a number of potential refunds resulting from pending tax appeals. The reserve was increased by \$25.0 million based on revised revenue estimates as of the fall of 2013 and revised projections of the timing of the litigation requirements. The \$30.0 million reserve is proposed to be moved to Fund 60000, County Insurance, as part of the *FY 2014 Third Quarter Review*.

Vehicle Replacement Reserve: The FY 2015 projected balance in this reserve, held in Fund 60010, Department of Vehicle Services, is \$2.01 million. This balance fluctuates based on vehicle replacement requirements in a given year; however, it should be noted this balance level is the lowest in recent history.

Fuel Price Stabilization Reserve: The FY 2015 projected balance in this reserve, held in Fund 60010, Department of Vehicle Services, is \$4.00 million. This reserve was established by Board action as part of the *FY 2009 Third Quarter Review* to be used in the event of an unanticipated increase in fuel prices.

PC Replacement Reserve: The FY 2015 projected balance in this reserve, held in Fund 60030, Technology Infrastructure Services, is \$1.49 million. The FY 2015 Advertised Budget Plan included significant adjustments to the PC Replacement Program. It should be noted that a potential reduction of \$708,500 in the PC Replacement program was included in the County Executive's memo dated March 18, 2014 and if that reduction is taken, these reserve funds will be used to offset.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor McKay and Supervisor Smyth

Question: Please provide additional information on the School Readiness Program including the staffing plan and operational strategies that the proposed new funding will support.

Response: School readiness is being expanded as a result of the recommendations presented to the Human Services Committee of the Board of Supervisors on November 26, 2013. These recommendations are the direct result of the work completed by the Successful Children and Youth Policy Team (SCYPT) which is comprised of both County and Fairfax County Public Schools Board members and staff. School readiness describes the capabilities of children, their families, schools and communities that will best promote student success in kindergarten and beyond. Early childhood education programs support the development of children's cognitive, social, emotional and physical development skills which are strong predictors of success in school. In the fall of 2012, 33 percent of kindergartners in FCPS were eligible for free/reduced meals; 16 percent of kindergartners in FCPS did not meet the reading intervention benchmark and were referred for services; and 6 percent of children under the age of 5 were living below the poverty level. The County addresses school readiness through quality community-based programs that are accessible even to those most vulnerable. Additional funding has been included in FY 2015 to expand and support community-based programs. Funding is aimed at creating a network of programs that promote school readiness through the alignment of curricula to the Virginia Foundation Blocks for Early Learning, as well as supporting children living in poverty to reach fall kindergarten benchmarks. Funding of \$714,013 and 3/3.0 FTE Child Care Specialist II positions, as well as benefits-eligible support, specifically supports the following community-based school readiness initiatives:

- **Neighborhood School Readiness Teams (NSRTs):** NSRTs exist to support school readiness in communities where there are large numbers of children at-risk for school failure by fostering collaborative partnerships between schools, County, community and early childhood programs. The teams develop and implement action plans to support school readiness to ensure that children successfully transition to kindergarten. The expansion of the NSRTs included with this funding will make it possible for all Title I elementary schools to participate on a team.
- **Virginia Quality Rating and Improvement System (VQRIS):** This funding enables additional County child care centers/preschools and family child care homes serving children living in poverty to participate in this key program that defines standards for early childhood education and creates a framework for accountability. An additional 30 programs will be rated and receive mentoring as part of VQRIS.
- **Coaching and Professional Development:** Increased coaching and professional development opportunities for early childhood educators in community programs will support quality early care and education. Funding will support 3/3.0 FTE Child Care Specialist II positions and will enable the County to provide on-site

coaching to 360 early childhood professionals in child care centers, preschool settings, and family child care homes.

- Virginia Preschool Initiative: The Virginia Preschool Initiative serves at-risk four-year olds in a comprehensive preschool program in community-based settings (child care centers, preschools and family child care homes) and Fairfax County Public Schools. Additional funding has been included to serve an additional 50 children in community-based settings. This funding will also allow the County to draw additional state revenue totaling \$150,000.

The County has worked closely with FCPS to develop a mixed-delivery system providing community-based as well as school-based options for school readiness. It is hoped that the FCPS School Board will support the expansion of school-based programs; however, expansion of community-based programs is not contingent on additional school funding.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Smyth

Question: Please provide additional information on Behavioral Health Services including the staffing plan and operational strategies that the proposed new funding will support.

Response: Behavioral health services for youth and families are being expanded as a result of the recommendations presented to the Human Services Committee of the Board of Supervisors on October 1, 2013. These recommendations were the direct result of the guidance included by the Board of Supervisors as part of the FY 2014 Adopted Budget Plan directing staff to identify requirements to address youth behavioral human services requirements in schools and the broader community. An Interagency Youth Behavioral Health Services Work Group, with representatives from County human services departments, Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) and the Fairfax Partnership for Youth, was convened to identify the array of youth services currently being provided as well as services that are necessary to address the most pressing needs in the community. It is estimated that between 400 and 500 youth and their families are in need of interventions and services for emerging mental health or substance use issues. FY 2015 funding includes \$1.0 million and 3/3.0 FTE positions (1/1.0 FTE Division Director, 1/1.0 FTE Program Manager and 1/1.0 FTE MH/ID/ADS Senior Clinician) and will create a new program unit which will implement a Systems of Care model by connecting the continuum of supports and services across County agencies, FCPS and community partners. The new unit will develop new policies and procedures on providing care coordination and service delivery, as well as oversight, to the various entities delivering services along the continuum. Additionally, the new unit will be responsible for implementing contractual services for individuals with emerging mental health and substance use issues. The Interagency Youth Behavioral Health Services Work Group will continue its work and make final recommendations by May 2014 focusing on developing protocols to ensure effective cross-system coordination of services. Work will also be done on how to track system performance measures and outcomes. This is year one of a multi-year plan; therefore, once fully implemented, it is anticipated that \$1.2 million will be available for contractual services for individuals with emerging mental health and substance use issues.

Response to Questions on the FY 2015 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Cook

Question: Please identify by line item each item in the budget which has increased more than 3 percent over the FY 2014 Adopted Budget Plan, and describe the reason for the increase.

Response: The following table describes each superior commitment item in each General Fund agency that increased by more than 3 percent over the FY 2014 Adopted Budget Plan.

Agency	Superior Commitment Item	FY 2014 Adopted	FY 2015 Advertised	% Increase
Office of the County Executive	Operating Expenses	\$598,931	\$721,219	20.4%
This increase is primarily attributable to the transfer of a legislative contract from Agency 40, Department of Transportation, to the Office of the Legislative Liaison to better align costs related to the contract.				
Facilities Management Department	Personnel Services	\$12,029,780	\$12,421,809	3.3%
This increase is primarily attributable to funding for 4/4.0 FTE new positions to address maintenance requirements at the new Mid-County Human Services Center, a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015, and employee pay increases for specific job classes identified in the County's benchmark class survey of comparator jurisdictions.				
Facilities Management Department	Operating Expenses	\$47,783,252	\$51,163,955	7.1%
This increase is primarily attributable to the partial or full year opening of new or expanded facilities in FY 2015 and annual rent-based adjustments for the agency's lease contracts.				
Department of Purchasing and Supply Management	Personnel Services	\$3,075,875	\$3,323,865	8.1%
This increase is primarily attributable to funding for 3/3.0 FTE new positions to support additional workload requirements associated with contract rebates and the Surplus and Excess Property program, as well as a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015.				
Office of Elections	Personnel Services	\$2,742,398	\$2,985,140	8.9%
This increase is primarily attributable to funding for 3/3.0 FTE new positions to provide technical support in the agency, support language outreach, and oversee Election Officer recruiting and training efforts, as well as a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015.				
Business Planning and Support	Personnel Services	\$1,095,679	\$1,498,306	36.7%
This increase is primarily attributable to funding to support 4/4.0 FTE positions transferred from Agency 31, Land Development Services. This increase is offset by a corresponding decrease in Land Development Services for a net impact to the General Fund of \$0. Personnel Services also increased due to a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015.				
Office of Capital Facilities	Personnel Services	\$10,513,338	\$11,088,974	5.5%
This increase is primarily attributable to support for the Economic Development Core Team, funding to support a net increase of 4/4.0 FTE new positions, and a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015.				
Office of Capital Facilities	Operating Expenses	\$8,904,905	\$9,212,294	3.5%
This increase is primarily attributable to increases in required utility costs associated with anticipated additional streetlight installations by Virginia Dominion Power and NOVEC in FY 2015.				

Agency	Superior Commitment Item	FY 2014 Adopted	FY 2015 Advertised	% Increase
Land Development Services	Personnel Services	\$17,169,717	\$18,599,102	8.3%
This increase is primarily attributable to an adjustment to respond to increased construction activity throughout the County including the redevelopment occurring in Tysons and Reston, as well as funding to support the Economic Development Core Team and 2/2.0 FTE new positions supporting revitalization efforts. Adjustments are also included for the realignment of positions within the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services and for a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015.				
Land Development Services	Recovered Costs	(\$426,654)	(\$216,868)	49.2%
This increase is attributable to the reorganization of staff within the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services to better align resources.				
Department of Planning and Zoning	Personnel Services	\$9,237,069	\$9,600,235	3.9%
This increase is primarily attributable to support for the Economic Development Core Team and a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015.				
Planning Commission	Personnel Services	\$616,744	\$654,701	6.2%
This increase is primarily attributable to an adjustment in the Personnel Services budget based on actual salary requirements and a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015.				
Office of the Financial and Program Auditor	Operating Expenses	\$32,166	\$33,166	3.1%
This increase is due to an increase in PC replacement charges based on updated inventory counts and revised costs.				
Department of Housing and Community Development	Personnel Services	\$4,389,153	\$4,522,051	3.0%
This increase is primarily attributable to funding to fill 1/1.0 FTE previously vacant position to support the Workforce Housing Program and a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015.				
Fairfax County Public Library	Operating Expenses	\$5,776,831	\$6,088,331	5.4%
This increase is primarily attributable to increased funding to supplement the Library's materials budget and an increase in PC replacement charges based on updated inventory counts and revised costs.				
Department of Family Services	Recovered Costs	(\$1,111,339)	(\$534,749)	51.9%
This increase is due to the alignment of budget to actual program experience associated with the Family Partnership Program. Corresponding expenditure adjustments were made to the Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) program for no net impact to the County.				
Department of Administration for Human Services	Personnel Services	\$10,423,176	\$11,094,735	6.4%
This increase is primarily attributable to the reallocation of funding from various human services agencies to provide funding for FY 2014 position adjustments with a net impact of \$0 to the General Fund, funding to provide after-hours facility maintenance work support at human services sites, and a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015.				
Department of Information Technology	Operating Expenses	\$15,040,431	\$15,774,931	4.9%
This increase is primarily attributable to the multi-year disaster recovery plan and an increase in PC replacement charges based on updated inventory counts and revised costs.				
Office to Prevent and End Homelessness	Operating Expenses	\$10,620,610	\$11,495,161	8.2%
This increase primarily reflects additional funding needed to support Mondloch Place and the Katherine K. Hanley Townhomes, contract rate increases for the providers of contracted homeless services, and the reallocation of funds from the Federal-State Grant Fund due to a reduction in federal grant funding.				

Agency	Superior Commitment Item	FY 2014 Adopted	FY 2015 Advertised	% Increase
Department of Neighborhood and Community Services	Personnel Services	\$15,964,744	\$16,828,432	5.4%
This increase is primarily attributable to funding for 7/7.0 FTE new merit positions and non-merit staff for the new Providence Community Center and a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015.				
Department of Neighborhood and Community Services	Operating Expenses	\$18,700,493	\$20,014,189	7.0%
This increase is primarily attributable to the opening of the new Providence Community Center, the transfer of the Springfield and Culmore Family Resource Centers Operating Expenses from Agency 67, Department of Family Services, contract rate increases for the Neighborhood Initiatives and the Middle School After School programs, expansion of FASTRAN services, an increase in Department of Vehicle Services charges, and an increase in PC replacement charges.				
Department of Neighborhood and Community Services	Capital Equipment	\$0	\$55,000	-
This increase is required for the purchase of a passenger van for the new Providence Community Center.				
Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court	Operating Expenses	\$1,929,903	\$2,169,283	12.4%
This increase is primarily attributable to funding required to support the Intervention Prevention Education Program and the Evening Reporting Center which were previously supported by grant funding.				
Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney	Personnel Services	\$2,611,467	\$3,381,201	29.5%
This increase is primarily attributable to funding for 3/3.0 FTE new Senior Assistant Commonwealth's Attorney positions, additional limited-term support, funding to fill four existing but previously vacant positions based on increased workload requirements, and a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015.				
Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney	Operating Expenses	\$87,684	\$123,884	41.3%
This increase is primarily attributable to increases in Operating Expenses associated with the establishment of 3/3.0 FTE new positions.				
Unclassified Administrative Expenses - Nondepartmental	Operating Expenses	(\$600,000)	\$0	100.0%
No reserves are included in Agency 87, Unclassified Administrative Expenses – Nondepartmental, in FY 2015. This increase is necessary to offset the budget of (\$600,000) that was included in the <u>FY 2014 Adopted Budget Plan</u> .				
Employee Benefits	Fringe Benefits	\$297,561,471	\$312,330,626	5.0%
This increase is primarily attributable to increases in employer contributions to the retirement systems, Social Security contributions, and projected increases in health insurance premiums.				
Employee Benefits	Operating Expenses	\$1,172,850	\$2,087,850	78.0%
This increase is due to an increase in funding for employee development initiatives, funding to support the development of various initiatives to improve the customer experience with County government, and the reinstatement of cash awards for recipients of Outstanding Performance, Team Excellence, and Managerial Excellence awards.				
Office of the Sheriff	Recovered Costs	(\$256,000)	\$0	100.0%
This increase reflects Community Labor Force services supporting dry pond maintenance as direct charges to Stormwater Services in lieu of reflecting them as Recovered Costs.				

Agency	Superior Commitment Item	FY 2014 Adopted	FY 2015 Advertised	% Increase
Fire and Rescue Department	Personnel Services	\$147,194,056	\$155,096,059	5.4%
This increase is primarily attributable to the full-year operation of Wolftrap Fire Station, funding to support 2/2.0 FTE new positions in the Fire Prevention Division, an increase of 3.0 percent for all employees on the public safety pay scale F, a 1.29 percent market rate adjustment for all employees in FY 2015, and employee pay increases for specific job classes identified in the County's benchmark class survey of comparator jurisdictions.				
Fire and Rescue Department	Operating Expenses	\$23,665,545	\$27,270,274	15.2%
This increase is primarily attributable to an increase in the annual contribution to the Large Apparatus Replacement Fund and Ambulance Replacement Fund, funding for an Advanced Life Support (ALS) school and an additional recruit school, and Operating Expenses associated with the full-year operation of Wolftrap Fire Station.				
Fire and Rescue Department	Capital Equipment	\$0	\$69,017	-
This increase is associated with the full-year operation of Wolftrap Fire Station.				
Office of Emergency Management	Operating Expenses	\$569,104	\$639,604	12.4%
This increase is due to an increase in PC replacement charges based on updated inventory counts and revised costs.				
Department of Code Compliance	Operating Expenses	\$527,246	\$556,830	5.6%
This increase is due to increases in Department of Vehicle Services charges and PC replacement charges.				