County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 11, 2013
TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Susan W. Datta, Chief Financial Officer
SUBJECT: Responses to FY 2014 Budget Q&A Items (Package 4)

Attached for your information is FY 2014 Budget Q&A Package 4 containing completed responses to recent budget questions. Future 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
	Responses to questions 1-8 were included in Package 1 dated March 12, 2013, responses to questions 9-14 were included in Package 2 dated March 18, 2013, and responses to questions 15-43 were included in Package 3 dated April 10, 2013.		
44	Provide information over the last three years on the size and cost of the Health Department budget. Please identify state funding provided to support the Health Department.	Herrity	86
45	Please provide a count of all merit personnel that have been laid off in the last 7 years. Include the salary and agency.	Herrity	87
46	When grant funding expires, what happens to the associated grant positions?	Herrity	88
47	Please provide a list of professional membership fees currently paid by the County.	Herrity	89-90
48	During the *FY 2009 Third Quarter Review*, the County Executive identified over $12 million to be transferred to the General Fund from various capital projects. Many of those projects were completed, deferred, or deemed no longer necessary. Has the County Executive conducted a similar review of capital projects for the FY 2014 budget cycle and what were the results? Could the County Executive conduct a review of capital projects to identify specific projects that are completed, deferred, or no longer necessary, with the goal of transferring those financial resources back to the General Fund?	Foust	91-92
49	With regards to the establishment of a Connector bus replacement reserve, can the increase of $5.7 million to the County Transit Fund (Fund 40000) be deferred or reduced and can this funding be used by the General Fund?	Foust	93
50	Fund 60020, Document Services, receives a General Fund transfer of approximately $2.4 million annually. Can balance be utilized so that the FY 2014 General Fund transfer to the Document Services Fund can be reduced by $1.0 million?	Foust	94

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

51	Fund 60010, Department of Vehicle Services, has returned $9,750,000 to the General Fund since FY 2009. In FY 2014, can Fund 60010 transfer $2 million back to the General Fund?	Foust	95
52	With regards to IT projects with no expenditures to date, what are the planned timelines and total project costs for the Tax Modernization Project and could the $800,000 included in the FY 2014 Advertised Budget for this project be deferred? In addition, what are the planned timelines and total project costs for the Police In-Car Video project? Can a portion of the funding allocated for this project be returned to the General Fund?	Foust	96
53	Please recirculate information previously provided on housing choice vouchers.	Gross	97-99
54	Please provide additional information on the proposed courtroom-related reductions in the Office of the Sheriff.	Hyland	100

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

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 2014 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Provide information over the last three years on the size and cost of the Health Department budget. Please identify state funding provided to support the Health Department.

Response: Total expenditures included in the FY 2014 Advertised Budget Plan for the Health Department is $51.7 million. This level is consistent with the FY 2013 Adopted Budget Plan of $52.5 million and FY 2012 Actuals of $51.3 million. There was a $4.6 million increase in total expenditures between FY 2011 and FY 2012 primarily due to the additional Public Health Nurse positions added in support of school health functions and the 2.0 percent market rate adjustment, effective September 2011.

The Health Department receives revenue from the state based on a formula which partially funds department-wide functions such as environmental health services, dental services, family planning and general medical services, disease investigation, laboratory and pharmacy services, health education services, and emergency preparedness. The Health Department also receives state revenue for school health functions. As the Board may recall, in FY 2011, revenue previously provided to Fairfax County Public Schools was moved to the Health Department. This realignment was done in an effort to recognize that the County incurs the majority of expenses for school health services. In FY 2014 it is anticipated that approximately $13.4 million will be received from the state.

Additionally, revenue is generated from fees charged for services, permits, licenses etc. For example, fees are charged for inspections, building permits, plans for food establishments, onsite sewage disposal, water well systems, and swimming pool facilities. Individuals are also charged a fee for health-related services such as x-rays, pregnancy testing, prenatal care, laboratory tests, pharmacy services, primary care services, adult immunizations, and Adult Day Health Care participation. Eligible health-related services are billed to Medicare, Medicaid, and other third party payers for covered enrollees. In FY 2014 it is anticipated that approximately $5.8 million in revenue will be collected from these other revenue sources.

Total revenue included in the FY 2014 Advertised Budget Plan is $19.2 million. Therefore, the anticipated net cost to the County is $32.5 million or 62.8 percent. This is consistent with the FY 2013 Adopted Budget and FY 2012 Actuals. The table below summarizes Health Department funding:

Category	FY 2014 Advertised	FY 2013 Adopted	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2010 Actual
Total Expenditures	$51,704,161	$52,484,280	$51,278,368	$46,655,718	$46,577,027
State Revenue	$13,454,153	$12,938,609	$13,572,704	$12,989,236	$9,395,489
Other Revenue	$5,764,234	$5,511,183	$5,424,369	$6,752,284	$5,873,696
Total Revenue	$19,218,387	$18,449,792	$18,997,073	$19,741,520	$15,269,185
Net Cost	**$32,485,774**	**$34,034,488**	**$32,281,295**	**$26,914,198**	**$31,307,842**
Percent Net Cost	**62.8%**	**64.8%**	**63.0%**	**57.7%**	**67.2%**

Response to Questions on the FY 2014 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Please provide a count of all merit personnel that have been laid off in the last 7 years. Include the salary and agency.

Response: As the Board is aware more than 500 positions were eliminated as a result of the budget reductions that have occurred between FY 2008 and FY 2013. As a result of agencies anticipating the reductions and therefore holding positions vacant as natural attrition occurred, and the successful placement of employees in other funded positions a small number of merit employees were actually terminated. The following 24 General Fund merit regular employees were laid off since 2007. It is important to note that the termination action in the payroll system applies to both those employees who wished to have placements made as part of the Reduction in Force (RIF) and those that did not. A number of employees who were in DROP or close to retirement opted out of the placement exercise and therefore are included below even though they may have been placed as a result of the RIF process.

Agency	Class Code Title	Pay Rate
DCCP	PRINT SHOP OPERATOR II	$ 24.93
DIT	INFO TECH PROGRAM MANAGER II	$ 50.73
DTA	ADMIN ASST III	$ 16.15
FCPA	MAINTENANCE TRADE HELPER II	$ 14.80
FCPA	AUTOMOTIVE MECHANIC II	$ 26.34
FCPL	LIBRARY AIDE	$ 14.72
FCPL	LIBRARY ASSISTANT I	$ 16.74
FCPL	LIBRARY ASSISTANT I	$ 17.35
FCPL	ASSOC DIR LIBRARY TECH OPNS	$ 55.37
FCPL	LIBRARIAN I	$ 21.44
FCPL	LIBRARY ASSISTANT I	$ 16.04
FCPL	LIBRARY ASSISTANT I	$ 16.12
FCPL	LIBRARIAN II	$ 22.30
FCPL	LIBRARIAN I	$ 20.31
FCPL	LIBRARIAN II	$ 26.92
FCPL	ADMIN ASST I	$ 14.06
FCPL	ADMIN ASST I	$ 13.66
HCD	FACILITY ATTENDANT II	$ 16.44
Police	ADMIN ASST II	$ 19.96
Police	ADMIN ASST II	$ 16.63
Police	ADMIN ASST II	$ 16.52
Police	ADMIN ASST II	$ 17.16
Police	MANAGEMENT ANALYST III	$ 34.14
Police	TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT SUPV	$ 23.98

Response to Questions on the FY 2014 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: When grant funding expires, what happens to the associated grant positions?

Response: The Board of Supervisors approves all grant positions either through a Board item or as part of the Third Quarter or Carryover Review packages. Prior to submitting a grant position to the Board for approval, the Department of Management and Budget (DMB) reviews the position request to confirm the grant funding will cover the anticipated cost of the position. Additionally, DMB reviews the length of the grant award, as well as the agency's ability to place the incumbent in a General Fund merit position should grant funding expire.

Board of Supervisors policy also states that the County is under no obligation to continue funding grant positions when grant funding expires. Therefore, when all grant funding has been expended, the grant is formally closed by the Board of Supervisors as part of the Third Quarter or Carryover Review Packages and any associated grant positions are abolished. However, grant employees are afforded the same protections as all merit employee; therefore, if the grant position is filled at the time grant funding has been expended, the employee is moved into an existing vacant General Fund position, rather than instituting a Reduction in Force.

There have been instances where the Board has decided to continue funding positions previously paid for with grant dollars. In these instances, the grant positions are converted to merit positions in the General Fund. For example, as part of the FY 2009 Adopted Budget Plan, funding was included to support the conversion of 4/4.0 FTE grant positions to merit positions in the Police Department to continue the P'CASO (Protecting Children Against Sex Offenders) program. These positions conduct criminal investigations of Internet-based child exploitation, aggressively monitor Fairfax County sex offenders, enforce Virginia Sex Offender Registry requirements, and provide educational programs to raise community awareness of the risks of child exploitation. Without the General Fund support, this program would have been terminated.

Looking ahead, it is currently anticipated that grant funding received in support of the Northern Virginia Regional Gang Task Force is ending. This funding primarily supports 2/2.0 FTE grant positions in the Police Department. Sufficient grant funding has been identified for these positions through FY 2014; however, it is anticipated that no additional grant funding will be available in FY 2015 and beyond. Therefore, if the Board directed that this work continue, funding would be necessary and 2/2.0 FTE grant positions would need to be converted to General Fund merit positions.

Response to Questions on the FY 2014 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Herrity

Question: Please provide a list of professional membership fees paid by the County.

Response: Through March 2013, FY 2013 expenses to-date for the General Fund on professional memberships total $219,074.22. The following agencies have expenses to-date:

Agency	Amount Spent
Family Services	$ 25,228.04
Sheriff	$ 21,275.25
Information Technology	$ 16,902.92
Police	$ 16,860.64
Facilities Management	$ 14,441.00
County Executive	$ 13,389.00
Economic Development Authority	$ 10,337.20
Park Authority	$ 9,703.20
Transportation	$ 7,926.45
Housing and Community Development	$ 7,735.00
Planning and Zoning	$ 7,020.00
Fire and Rescue	$ 6,996.81
Finance	$ 6,774.33
Tax Administration	$ 6,625.00
Management and Budget	$ 5,550.00
DPWES/Capital Facilities	$ 5,506.75
Circuit Court	$ 4,750.00
Health	$ 4,575.00
DPWES/Business Planning and Support	$ 4,308.00
Emergency Management	$ 4,285.00
Fairfax County Public Libraries	$ 3,907.16
County Attorney	$ 2,586.47
Purchasing and Supply Management	$ 2,165.00
DPWES/Land Development Services	$ 1,821.00
General District Court	$ 1,770.00
Human Resources	$ 1,387.00
Human Rights and Equity Programs	$ 1,000.00
Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court	$ 989.50
OPEH	$ 690.00
Cable and Consumer Protection	$ 530.50
Board of Supervisors	$ 420.00
Planning Commission	$ 408.00

Agency	Amount Spent
Elections	$ 310.00
Neighborhood and Community Services	$ 295.00
Administration for Human Services	$ 280.00
Total	**$ 219,074.22**

The five largest agency expenditures are explained in more detail below:

The expenditures in the Department of Family Services (DFS) are spread among a number of Associations with 80 percent of the agency total funding and memberships for American Public Human Services, the Virginia Head Start Association, the Virginia Community Action Partnership, Prevent Child Abuse America and for the State Domestic Violence Hotline. The payment for the Hotline also provides a service for DFS with access to state hotline services when the County does not have coverage.

The expenditures for the Office of the Sheriff are primarily for membership of deputies in the Virginia Sheriff's Association.

The expenditures for the Department of Information Technology are primarily for Public Technologies Inc. and reflect memberships for DIT, Facilities Management, Vehicle Service and the County Executive.

Police membership fees are distributed among a number of groups including the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Major Cities Chief's Association, American Association of Police Polygraphist, Association of Certified Fraud Examiners and the Helicopter Association.

Facilities Management Department membership fees are paid to the Virginia Energy Purchasing Government Association helping the agency leverage lower utility rates for County facilities.

Response to Questions on the FY 2014 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Foust

Question: During the *FY 2009 Third Quarter Review*, the County Executive identified over $12 million to be transferred to the General Fund from various capital projects. Many of those projects were completed, deferred, or deemed no longer necessary. Has the County Executive conducted a similar review of capital projects for the FY 2014 budget cycle and what were the results? Could the County Executive conduct a review of capital projects to identify specific projects that are completed, deferred, or no longer necessary, with the goal of transferring those financial resources back to the General Fund?

Response: As part of the *FY 2009 Third Quarter Review*, a total of $12.0 million was reduced from a variety of capital projects. Approximately $3.5 million was associated with projects that were complete and balances were returned to the General Fund. In addition, $2.5 million was associated with a favorable construction contract award for the Mount Vernon Mental Health Center, $1.6 million was associated with the elimination of the land acquisition reserve which had been used to provide funding for the preservation of land for future County facilities, $1.4 million was associated with the deferral of the planned expansion of the Mott Community Center, General Fund support of $1.0 million for the construction of six Transitional Housing units at the Hanley Family Shelter was eliminated and supported by Housing Trust Funds and HOME funds and $1.3 million was eliminated from the Dolley Madison Library project when the Dranesville District Supervisor's office was relocated to the McLean Governmental Center and Police Station. The cost of the District Supervisor's office was later funded by reallocating surplus bond funds in the Great Falls Fire Station project based on favorable bids to the McLean Police Station renovation project. Lastly, some projects were reduced necessitating the prioritization of remaining requirements, such as a reduction of $650,000 for safety enhancement and improvements to bus shelters throughout the County and $100,000 for renewable energy projects to support the Environmental agenda.

It is important to note that this reduction equated to over ½ of the entire General Fund Paydown program as funded in FY 2009. At the time, the County Executive directed staff to continue to review all General Fund paydown capital project spending and significantly reduce annual Paydown funding levels to address only the most critical projects and commitments.

Since FY 2009, staff has continued to review General Fund capital projects and return balances to the General Fund, as appropriate. If lower than anticipated contract awards are approved or if projects are determined to be funded in excess of requirements, General Fund funding is returned. For example, between FY 2009 and FY 2012, approximately $7 million in unrequired construction contingency funding associated with the MPSTOC project was returned to the General Fund and in FY 2010, nearly $500,000 was returned to the General Fund from the Gregory Drive Treatment Facility Renovation project, based on the favorable bid environment.

As part of the County's conversion to the FOCUS system, capital project funds were reviewed rigorously. Many projects with small remaining balances were closed out and remaining funds were reallocated to the fund contingency. Prior to the conversion to the FOCUS system, several Capital Project Funds with limited active projects were eliminated, including: Fund 311, County Bonds Construction (all projects moved to Fund 303, County Construction), Fund 314, Neighborhood Improvement Program (all projects were completed), and Fund 318, Stormwater Management Program (all projects moved to Fund 125, Stormwater Services Fund).

At each quarterly review, an analysis is conducted and projects with small remaining balances are reallocated to contingency, or reallocated to offset other critical requirements. For instance, at the *FY 2012 Third Quarter Review*, funding of $2.5 million remaining in the MPSTOC project was reallocated to install sewer grinders at the Adult Detention Center to prevent sewer back-ups caused by debris being put into the sewer lines resulting in repeated back-ups, damaged equipment and a health and safety concern.

The practice of reviewing capital project statuses and remaining balances continues throughout the year and is also considered when making funding decisions for each new fiscal year. For example, as part of the <u>FY 2014 Advertised Budget Plan</u>, an amount of $500,000 within the Laurel Hill development project is proposed to be used to offset FY 2014 Laurel Hill requirements. Since FY 2012, savings associated with additional mowing services at Laurel Hill being performed by the Community Labor Force (CLF) had been realized and this funding allowed for a reduction in the amount of new General Fund funding required for FY 2014. The use of other sources to offset General Fund requirements is considered as well, including the use of $1,085,000 from Fund 80300, Park Capital Improvement Fund, to support Park Authority ADA improvement projects, consistent with the recommendations of the auditor.

Bond funded projects are reviewed similarly and any surplus funding is used to fund additional project work as appropriate. The most recent example is the redirection of Library bond funds from several completed library projects to support the renovation of the Woodrow Wilson Community Library.

Response to Questions on the FY 2014 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Foust

Question: With regards to the establishment of a Connector bus replacement reserve, can the increase of $5.7 million to the County Transit Fund (Fund 40000) be deferred or reduced and can this funding be used by the General Fund?

Response: As the Board is aware, a significant long term issue in transportation concerns the bus replacement needs for the Connector fleet. Starting in FY 2020, approximately 170 buses are scheduled for replacement over the ensuing five years. At this time, no funds are set aside for bus replacement and if the County tried to go on a non-smoothed out pay-as-you-go basis, there would be years where it require as much as $43 million in one year to replace buses (68 buses in FY 2020).

To mitigate this issue, the following chart shows the recommended option for starting and funding a Connector bus replacement reserve. In FY 2014 and FY 2015, amounts of ***$5.7 million, to be fully covered by State Aid,*** are recommended to be set aside to start the process of establishing a reserve. Under this scenario, starting in FY 2016, annual payments to the reserve would need to increase from $5.7M to $7.4M, and then be increased 4.0 percent per year thereafter. It is anticipated that at least initially State Aid will be the main funding source to fund the reserve; however, this will need to be examined in future years as there is currently not enough State Aid projected to be available to cover the entire bus replacement requirement.

Preferred Option B								
Fiscal Year	***FY 2013***	***FY 2014***	***FY 2015***	***FY 2016***	***FY 2017***	***FY 2018***	***FY 2019***	***FY 2020***
Replacement Cost	$9,360,000	$8,640,000	$8,486,400	$0	$0	$0	$0	$13,969,122
Annual Pay In Amount	$9,360,000	$14,340,000	$14,186,400	$7,400,000	$7,696,000	$8,003,840	$8,323,994	$8,656,953
Reserve Balance	$0	$5,700,000	$11,400,000	$18,800,000	$26,496,000	$34,499,840	$42,823,834	$37,511,665

Preferred Option B									
Fiscal Year	***FY 2021***	***FY 2022***	***FY 2023***	***FY 2024***	***FY 2025***	***FY 2026***	***FY 2027***	***FY 2028***	***Total***
Replacement Cost	$14,527,887	$15,109,002	$15,713,362	$16,341,897	$16,995,573	$17,675,396	$7,193,118	$0	$102,147,670
Annual Pay In Amount	$9,003,231	$9,363,361	$9,737,895	$10,127,411	$10,532,507	$10,953,808	$11,391,960	$11,847,638	$116,199,085
Reserve Balance	$31,987,010	$26,241,368	$20,265,901	$14,051,415	$7,588,349	$866,762	$5,065,604	$16,913,242	$14,051,415

Response to Questions on the FY 2014 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Foust

Question: Fund 60020, Document Services, receives a General Fund transfer of approximately $2.4 million annually. Can balance be utilized so that the FY 2014 General Fund transfer to the Document Services Fund can be reduced by $1.0 million?

Response: The General Fund Transfer of $2.4 million to Fund 60020, Document Services is used entirely in support of the County's fleet of large and mid-sized Multi-Functional Devices (MFDs) that are used throughout County government for copying, printing, faxing, and scanning. Program activities include administration of the County's MFD fleet contract; day-to-day management of the service delivery; and integration with the County's technology infrastructure, including network and Microsoft applications. MFDs are installed in buildings across the County and are linked to individual workstations via the County's enterprise network. Fund 60020 also supports the County's Print Shop, which is responsible for providing high-speed digital black and white and color printing, offset printing, and bindery services.

The FY 2014 Advertised Budget Plan projected ending balance in Fund 60020 is $1.1 million which is held in reserve for unanticipated print shop operating and equipment replacement requirements. This is a relatively modest reserve given the relatively high cost of print shop equipment. It is not recommended to utilize this reserve in order to reduce the General Fund transfer in support of the MFD program.

Response to Questions on the FY 2014 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Foust

Question: Fund 60010, Department of Vehicle Services, has returned $9,750,000 to the General Fund since FY 2009. In FY 2014, can Fund 60010 transfer $2 million back to the General Fund?

Response: Over the FY 2009 to FY 2011 timeframe, Transfers Out to the General Fund totaling $9.75 million were made. Of this total, $9.0 million was associated with the deferral of the replacement of the majority of the vehicles in the County fleet for two years. When this decision was made, an analysis and discussion of the risks associated with this decision was conducted. The discussion included the risks of an older fleet, increased maintenance costs etc. It was determined that a two-year deferral was the maximum that could be recommended without taking on an unacceptable level of risk and decline in the County fleet. Without this policy decision, which had the effect of permanently extending the replacement criteria of a majority of light vehicles classes by two years, Fund 60010 would not have been in position to transfer significant funds back to the General Fund.

As part of the FY 2014 budget process, a detailed review of all reserve balances in Fund 60010 was conducted. As a result, staff recommended that an increase of $1.0 million was necessary to support the first year of a multi-year process to gradually increase the annual contributions to the Large Apparatus Replacement Fund and Ambulance Replacement Fund. This funding is in addition to the department dedicating additional grant funds, additional baseline funds and one-time contributions in support of this effort. Additional contributions are required due to increasing cost of vehicles, some fleet growth, and a contribution level that has remained flat since FY 2007. For example, the cost of a ladder/tower truck in FY 2013 is $1.1 million, compared to $0.8 million in FY 2008, an increase of approximately 37.5 percent. Likewise, the cost of a rescue truck in FY 2013 is $750,000 compared to $468,000 in FY08, an increase of $282,000 or approximately 60 percent. Without additional funding, the replacement reserves will be depleted in FY 2016. It should be noted that given the current inventory and replacement cycle, the annual contribution should be in the $5-6 million range for the Large Apparatus Replacement Reserve and approximately $1 million for the Ambulance Replacement Reserve. The current annual contributions are $3.1 million and $0.2 million, respectively.

Other reserves were also analyzed and in some cases utilized to help build the FY 2014 Advertised Budget Plan for Fund 60010. This analysis concluded that balance levels still remaining in Fund 60010 are appropriate and not available to be transferred back to the General Fund.

Response to Questions on the FY 2014 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Foust

Question: With regards to IT projects with no expenditures to date, what are the planned timelines and total project costs for the Tax Modernization Project and could the $800,000 included in the FY 2014 Advertised Budget for this project be deferred? In addition, what are the planned timelines and total project costs for the Police In-Car Video project? Can a portion of the funding allocated for this project be returned to the General Fund?

Response: The goals of the Tax Modernization project are to eliminate the technology risks and functionality gaps of the existing Personal Property and Business Professional and Occupational Licensing (BPOL) legacy mainframe systems. The current systems use dated technology and programming languages, which have reached the end of their viability. The system is one of the last systems that will come off the legacy mainframe which when done will allow DIT to shut off that environment and associated expenses. The outdated technology platform limits integration with other County and state systems, as well as limits citizen interaction and self-service opportunities via web based technologies. DIT is working with the Department of Tax Administration on vendor/system requirements and has been doing extensive research on solutions and best way to replace current legacy system since few realistic commercial options are available for this Virginia-specific need and is subject to changes annually. This is likely to be a built in-house using a services contract, thus spending will happen based on milestone deliverables. Spending is anticipated to commence in FY 2014 and it is anticipated that the entire $1.8 million ($1.0 million included in the FY 2013 Adopted Budget Plan and $800,000 in the FY 2014 Advertised Budget Plan) will be required.

The Police In-Car Video project is designed to install digital surveillance video cameras in all of the Police Department's approximately 800 patrol vehicles. The Police Department has recently concluded an extensive RFP/contract/vendor selection process and spent several months evaluating proposed solutions, ancillary equipment options, and operational requirements and benchmarks. It is a complex project that involves all Police Department vehicles as well as many technical IT-related issues and quality control processes before use. The Police Department just recently assigned a dedicated project manager. The Department of Purchasing and Supply Management (DPSM) is in the process of issuing a letter of intent to award to the selected vendor and will be ready to issue a purchase order in the next 30 -60 days working through the elements of the one-year schedule, with a project start date of July 1. The market review and contract process took longer than anticipated due to the total solutions costing more than originally projected. In the negotiations process, the Department of Information technology (DIT) and the Police Department were able to bring the cost within allocation, with staff performing a key role in the implementation and developing interim options for storing the data.

Police, DIT, and DPSM are satisfied that this is the best available option for the County, and expect to use all $5.53 million in available funds for this project, so there is not anticipated to be any funds available to return to the General Fund. Further, it should be noted that this program will require ongoing funding requirements for maintenance service contracts and replacement cycle beyond the initial funding totals.

Response to Questions on the FY 2014 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Gross

Question: Please recirculate information previously provided on housing choice vouchers.

Response: Please see the following memorandum to the Board of Supervisors dated March 26, 2013 with the requested information.

County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 26, 2013

TO: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

FROM: Paula C. Sampson, Director
Department of Housing and Community Development

SUBJECT: Initial Actions to Implement Federal Budget Sequestration in the Housing Choice Voucher Program

The Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority (FCRHA) has received guidance from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on implementing the federal budget sequestration in the Housing Choice Voucher program. This memorandum outlines the initial steps the Department of Housing Community Development (HCD) will take to implement that guidance on behalf of the FCRHA. The Department of Management and Budget (DMB) will forward additional information regarding a process for identification and notification of the countywide impact of sequestration within the next week.

Initial Actions to Implement Sequestration in the Housing Choice Voucher Program: Based on HUD guidance, it is anticipated that the funding received by the FCRHA in Calendar Year 2013 for the Housing Choice Voucher program will be reduced by approximately $2.5 million as compared to what was anticipated. (HUD budgets the HCV program on a Calendar Year basis.) As a result, and following in-depth consultation with DMB and guidance from the FCRHA, HCD intends to notify applicants and partners that effective immediately, the FCRHA will suspend new leasing in the program until further notice. Individuals and families currently leased under the program are not expected to be affected. Effective April 1, 2013, those households who have been awarded vouchers but have not yet leased will have their vouchers suspended.

As many as 150 new households who would have been served coming out of homelessness or the county's waiting lists will not receive assistance in 2013. The number of vouchers which turn over every year is approximately equal to the anticipated budget cuts and has no impact on families currently leased in the program; therefore the suspension of issuing new vouchers was deemed the most prudent immediate step.

Impact on Existing Program Participants; Ensuring Long-Term Program Sustainability: It is not anticipated that voucher holders who are currently leased will be immediately affected; however, new strategies to ensure the long-term sustainability of the program may become necessary. HCD is working closely with HUD and DMB to evaluate potential next steps, which will be brought to the FCRHA for consideration in April; the Board will be advised via memorandum of any additional steps as determined by the FCRHA. The primary guiding principle for the initial actions, and any subsequent steps to ensure long-term sustainability of the program under sequestration, is to ensure that those who are now dependent on their voucher can continue to rely on the subsidy to the greatest extent possible. The FCRHA will tap its Housing Choice Voucher program reserves to do so.

Department of Housing and Community Development
3700 Pender Drive, Suite 300
Fairfax, Virginia 22030-6039
Tel. 703-246-5100 • Fax 703-246-5115 • TTY 703-385-3578
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/rha

About the Housing Choice Voucher Program: The FCRHA receives federal funding under Section 8 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to operate the Housing Choice Voucher program (formerly known as the Section 8 Program). Participants in the program receive financial assistance to rent privately-owned housing units. HCD administers the Housing Choice Voucher rental subsidy program on behalf of the FCRHA for Fairfax County, and for the Cities of Falls Church and Fairfax, and the Towns of Herndon, Vienna and Clifton. Tenants generally pay 30 percent of their adjusted income, 10 percent of gross income, or $50.00 – whichever is higher. Using the federal funding, HCD pays the remainder of a reasonable rent directly to the landlord up to the established payment standard for the unit.

In FY 2012, the FCRHA received a total of $48,633,231 from HUD to provide housing assistance and to administer the program. A total of 3,537 vouchers were authorized in FY 2012, and 9,317 people were housed; the average household income served was $20,329, or about 21 percent of the area median income (AMI) for a family of three.

Should you have any questions, please contact me or Robert Easley, Acting Deputy Director, at 703-246-5105.

cc: Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority
Edward L. Long, Jr., County Executive
Patricia D. Harrison, Deputy County Executive
Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive
David P. Bobzien, County Attorney
Susan Datta, Chief Financial Officer
Dean Klein, Director, Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
George Braunstein, Executive Director, Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board
Merni Fitzgerald, Director, Office of Public Affairs
John L. Payne, Deputy Director for Real Estate, HCD
Robert Easley, Acting Deputy Director, HCD
Carol Erhard, Director, Rental Services Division, HCD

PCS/tf

Response to Questions on the FY 2014 Budget

Request By: Supervisor Hyland

Question: Please provide additional information on the proposed courtroom-related reductions in the Office of the Sheriff.

Response: As part of the FY 2014 Advertised Budget Plan, the following two proposed reductions were included:

- $255,000 and 3/3.0 SYE positions were included that would eliminate Deputy presence from various classes of Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court (JDRC) and some Circuit Court less emotionally capricious civil hearings

- $85,000 and 1/1.0 SYE position were included that would eliminate Deputy presence from JDRC status hearings

It should be noted that on April 10, 2013, Supervisor Hyland requested that consideration be given to restoring these two reductions. Accordingly, they have been added to the Consideration Item list.

Currently the Sheriff's Office provides courtroom security with the presence of a Deputy in all JDRC, General District, and Circuit courtrooms. There are 24 Deputies that provide security at all civil hearings; this proposal will remove three Deputies from less emotionally capricious civil hearings and one Deputy that provides security at JDRC status hearings. For perspective, there are currently 34 filled courtrooms, of which 8 are JDRC, 11 are General District Court, and 15 are Circuit Court, of these, 18 are reserved for civil hearings. Just under 100,000 civil cases are heard on an annual basis. Many cases are potentially volatile and require Deputy presence in the Courtroom; however, other cases are not as volatile. Currently one Deputy is assigned to be present during all of these hearings. It is proposed that Deputies only attend these hearings when there is credible concern for disruption. This proposal would remove three Deputies from those cases evaluated as less volatile. This would require three courtrooms to be covered by facility security staff. These courtrooms will continue to be video monitored from a central location and Judges will be able to confidentially contact security immediately should any issues arise. This would reduce the level of security for Judges and the public and increase the complexity of scheduling Deputies.

JDRC status hearings may be any type of hearing (child support, custody, etc.), generally the hearings last about 10 minutes, no evidence is heard, and the Judge asks the parties if they have resolved their differences so a judgment can be issued to bring the matter to closure, or a court date can be set.