



Response to Questions on the 2016 LOBs

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Relevant LOB(s): N/A

Question: What metrics drive efficiency in Stormwater?

Response:

Stormwater Services staff currently track efficiency measures relating to the cost of inspecting and maintaining both private and public facilities as outlined in the below table. Staff continues to gather additional data and track trends, as well as research any available benchmark data.

Stormwater Efficiency Measures

Efficiency Indicator	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016 Estimate	FY 2017 Estimate
Annual cost per private stormwater management facility	\$136	\$352	\$416	\$433	\$489
Costs of inspection and maintenance per public stormwater facility	\$955	\$1,356	\$1,600	\$1,791	\$1,876

Costs continue to increase based on the requirements associated with building, operating, inspecting, and maintaining stormwater facilities required as part of the County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit. Two of the biggest drivers to the cost increases are the level of review required and the documentation required to ensure that facilities are being adequately maintained. The amount of time spent preparing for an inspection, performing the inspection, generating and controlling the quality of the inspection report, following-up after the inspection findings (either maintenance of public facilities or enforcement of private facilities), and record keeping are all key requirements of the program. The majority of this work is performed by contractors working for the County. The number of facilities entering the inventory is also increasing. Current Stormwater standards encourage the installation of smaller facilities on individual lots so that each lot may have a stormwater management facility vs. one facility serving an entire community. This leads to a higher number of smaller facilities being constructed versus the larger facilities that were constructed in past years.

In addition, the Chesapeake Bay water quality standards are expressed as Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) and require Fairfax County to significantly reduce the Phosphorous, Nitrogen, and sediment entering the bay from urban stormwater sources. This requirement is also regulated as part of the MS4 Permit. Stormwater technologies associated with tracking water quality are still relatively new and life cycle costs and efficiency measures are still evolving. New studies are continually revising the information in an attempt to provide better data, and staff expects



significant fluctuations in the costs and benefits of the various techniques being utilized to continue over the next few years.

There are many practices that can be implemented to improve water quality and the Stormwater Planning Division is tracking the cost per pound removed for each pollutant for all projects. This information is being utilized to develop the annual work plan and to help determine the most cost-effective manner to comply with regulatory requirements. The following table includes the total facilities completed between FY 2009 and FY 2015, as well as their capital costs.

Completed Facilities FY 2009 - FY 2015

Practices	Cumulative Number Installed	Total Capital Cost per Pound of Nitrogen	Total Capital Cost per Pound of Phosphorus	Total Capital Cost per Pound of Suspended Solids
Stream Restoration	24	\$2,400	\$22,000	\$63
Pond Retrofits	46	\$4,000	\$38,000	\$49
Infiltration Swales and Trenches	7	\$7,600	\$67,200	\$88
Dry Swales	8	\$10,400	\$118,000	\$174
Bioretention (Rain gardens)	37	\$21,500	\$196,400	\$262
Pervious Pavement	12	\$54,300	\$469,000	\$611

Although the Chesapeake Bay TMDL is currently the financial driver, it is anticipated that TMDLs on impaired local streams will likely also become a major driver. Addressing the TMDLs on local streams may require different strategies and techniques, which will likely change the cost benefit relationships of various project types.

The stormwater planning staff offers a briefing to the Board of Supervisors' members each year to discuss the project implementation plan. The staff utilizes available unit cost information in developing the project list and can share this information as it relates to the project selection process. Staff continues to research and develop additional efficiency measures as this program evolves.



Response to Questions on the 2016 LOBs

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Relevant LOB(s): N/A

Question: Explain the drivers behind the increase in children receiving free meals compared to those receiving reduced-price meals in the Free and Reduced-Price Meals Program.

Response:

The Free and Reduced-Price Meals (FRM) program provides nutritious meals to students during the school year whose families are unable to pay the full price of meals according to criteria based on household size and income. Families who earn less than 130 percent of the poverty level are eligible for free meals and those with incomes between 130 and 185 percent of the poverty level qualify for reduced-price meals.

The number of children eligible for the FRM program in Fairfax County has increased over the past decade. According to the Virginia Department of Education, in 2005-06, approximately 20 percent of the Fairfax County Public Schools' population was eligible for the FRM program. In 2014-15, it was 28 percent of the schools' population. Within the population eligible for the FRM program, the number of children eligible for free meals has grown significantly over the past decade. According to the Virginia Department of Education, from 2005 to 2014, there was an 80 percent increase in the number of students eligible for free meals. During this same time period, the number of students eligible for reduced-price meals increased by 23 percent. Increased outreach and streamlining the certification process in recent years for certain members of the community may have increased participation for those that may have been eligible, but did not previously participate. Specific factors driving the increase in the number of students eligible for the FRM program overall as well as the number of students eligible for free meals, include the following:

- The overall poverty rate in the County has increased over the past few years and has not returned to pre-recession levels. In 2014 alone, there were over 23,000 children (18 years of age or younger) living below the federal poverty rate in Fairfax County (\$23,850 for a family of four in 2014). Children living below the federal poverty rate qualify for free meals.
- Participation in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) in Fairfax County provides some insight into



factors that may be driving participation in the FRM program. Those families participating in TANF and/or SNAP also meet the eligibility criteria for the FRM program and are eligible for either reduced-price meals or free meals based on family income. Over the past decade, the number of individuals receiving TANF in Fairfax County has remained fairly stable. However, the number of individuals receiving SNAP benefits, which is also a food assistance program, has increased substantially. From 2005 to 2015, the number of individuals receiving SNAP in the County has increased by 170 percent. It is believed that this significant increase has also led to increases in the FRM program and more children are eligible for free meals rather than reduced-price meals.

- Applications for the FRM program are mailed to all households by FCPS each August. Children eligible to participate in the FRM program may be certified by applying for the program or by a school district identifying and directly certifying students in households that participate in TANF or SNAP, thereby reducing the administrative burden of filling out and processing applications. Since 2012 the USDA and the Commonwealth of Virginia have implemented concerted efforts to increase participation in the FRM program by directly identifying students in households participating in SNAP and/or TANF and providing regularly updated lists to the school districts. Previously school districts received lists of eligible families only once per year each July. This allows schools to have a more dynamic list of children who are eligible to participate in the FRM program and can consequently lead to more eligible children participating and receiving free meals.



Response to Questions on the 2016 LOBs

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Relevant LOB(s): LOBs #44, #45

Question: Provide cost per voter for comparative jurisdictions, normalizing benefit costs.

Response:

The Office of Elections has developed a survey which will be sent to surrounding jurisdictions at the end of FY 2016. FY 2016 will contain two statewide elections with complexities such as a high number of ballot styles for the November election and a higher voter turnout for the March primary. In addition, it will include town and city elections and some jurisdictions will be conducting June primaries. The Office of Elections feels strongly that having this data and the total number of votes cast for all of these elections will allow for a more thorough analysis. The Office anticipates finalizing the response by late summer and will update the Board of Supervisors at that time.



Response to Questions on the 2016 LOBs

Request By: Supervisor Smyth

Relevant LOB(s): N/A

Question: What is the budget impact of the bell schedule change by the Fairfax County Public Schools?

Response:

Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS)

The following chart was provided by the Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) and summarizes FCPS costs:

One-time Cost	Description	(\$ in Millions)
	Bus Driver	\$2.2
	Bus Attendant	\$0.4
	Overtime	\$0.1
	Supervisor	\$0.1
Y	Recruitment Bonus	\$0.0
	Fuel & Vehicle Services	\$0.9
Y	Initial Training	\$0.5
	Buses (Lease Purchase)	\$1.2
	Spare Bus Usage	\$0.0
Total Cost		\$5.4
Net Cost (Reduced by 20 buses already purchased)		\$4.9

Fairfax County Government

While the changes associated with the bell schedule have impacted several County agency's operations, the recurring County fiscal impact is \$0. The Department of Vehicle Services incurs expenditures associated with maintaining additional buses but these costs are fully offset by billing FCPS (and are shown in the "Fuel & Vehicle Services" row in the above chart). A summary of the operational impact on the Department of Family Services, the Health Department and the Department of Vehicle Services has been included on the following page.



Impact on County Agencies

Agency	Total Cost	Explanation
Department of Family Services	\$0	In response to the change in bell schedule implemented by FCPS in the fall of 2014, there was an increase in demand for before-school SACC. Funding was included as part of the <i>FY 2015 Carryover Review</i> to increase capacity at 30 elementary schools to address waiting lists and meet the increased demand. However, the bell schedule change has not resulted in any additional costs to the SACC program, as employee schedules have been adjusted to coincide with the new schedule. Any budget impact was as a result of the decision to expand capacity and serve additional families, not due to changes specific to the revised bell schedule itself.
Health Department	\$0	The change in the FCPS schedule has had no budget impact on School Health Services provided by the Health Department. In anticipation of the schedule change, the department adjusted School Health Aide (SHA) and Public Health Nurse (PHN) hours to mirror the newly posted school schedule. The majority of staff were able to adjust their schedules accordingly, and those that were unable to adjust their schedule requested and were reassigned to schools whose schedule did not conflict with other commitments. There are a number of students on site before the bell at the high school to meet with teachers, work on group projects and use the library. This usually occurs in the half hour or 45 minutes prior to the start of school. The PHN and SHA are not on site prior to the bell so any health services needed by students during that time would fall to FCPS staff to provide.
Department of Vehicle Services	\$0	During FY 2015 and FY 2016, a total of 66 buses were added to the FCPS fleet. To support the FCPS fleet growth, in FY 2016 the Department of Vehicle Services (DVS) received funding of \$165,000 and two additional Automotive Mechanic I positions. In addition, the annual cost associated with maintaining and operating 66 school buses - labor, parts, commercial repair and fuel - is approximately \$715,000 annually. As a result, the total annual impact on DVS is approximately \$880,000; however, this entire amount is recovered by billing FCPS.
Total County Costs	\$0	