

# FY27 Recommended Budget Information for Board of Commissioners

**1. Department Business Plans: Money Matters - Completed Plans**

2. WCPSS enrollment, total funding, state funding, local funding.

Operating Budget	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026
State	995,658,742	1,031,585,638	1,090,088,635	1,096,080,820	1,148,677,931	1,184,487,802	1,208,984,486
County	515,955,101	527,904,101	544,205,101	594,253,045	644,262,316	702,607,316	742,907,316
<b>TOTAL Budget</b>	<b>\$1,750,788,522</b>	<b>\$1,809,357,009</b>	<b>\$2,295,637,413</b>	<b>\$2,163,403,633</b>	<b>\$2,211,765,530</b>	<b>\$2,233,157,464</b>	<b>\$2,245,854,583</b>
WCPSS Membership	161,030	161,940	160,591	159,542	159,051	160,455	162,420
Charter School Membership	15,276	18,127	15,145	17,291	17,233	18,717	19,721
<b>TOTAL Budgeted Membership</b>	<b>176,306</b>	<b>180,067</b>	<b>175,736</b>	<b>176,833</b>	<b>176,284</b>	<b>179,172</b>	<b>182,141</b>

**3. WCPSS Maintenance and Operations Operating Funding**

FY26/School Year 2026-27 County Funded WCPSS Budget by DPI Purpose and Function	Purpose/Function \$	% of Total
<b>Instructional Services</b>		
Regular Instructional Services	\$270,323,878	36%
Special Populations Services	46,808,083	6%
Alternative Programs and Services	26,849,213	4%
School Leadership Services	24,026,325	3%
Co-Curricular Services	27,161,767	4%
School-Based Support Services	37,185,984	5%
<b>System-wide Support Services</b>		
Support and Developmental Services	\$9,219,317	1%
Special Populations Support and Development Services	8,267,867	1%
Alternative Programs and Services Support and Development Services	4,556,151	1%
Technology Support Services	22,939,981	3%
Operational Support Services (WCPSS Fund 02) - Maintenance	132,065,065	18%
Operational Support Services (WCPSS Fund 08) - Capital Outlay	963,164	0%
Financial and Human Resource Services	30,296,072	4%
Accountability Services	2,563,515	0%
System-wide Pupil Support Services	7,725,325	1%
Policy, Leadership, and Public Relations Services	10,575,366	1%
<b>Non-Programmed Charges</b>		
Payments to Other Governmental Units	\$81,380,243	11%
<b>Total Wake County Appropriation</b>	<b>\$742,907,316</b>	<b>100%</b>

The Board of Commissioners approves the total operating appropriation (\$742.9m for FY26) to WCPSS, and any operating reallocations that change purpose and function by more than 15%.

Growth in new schools was prioritized since the Great Recession as WCPSS worked to keep up with the exponential population growth in Wake County. Maintenance and Operations were deferred to support needs in schools and classrooms.

4. Could I get a list of COVID Food Insecurity programs that were cut from this budget with the annual cost and impact?

*These programs were funded with ARPA funds, so not technically cut from the budget. However, they are not continued and do have a programmatic impact for our partners.*

*Farm to Early Childcare Pilot: Discontinued the partnership program that provided fresh produce boxes from local farmers to 398 income enrolled day care children.*

*Annual Cost not Continued: \$72,255*

*Farmer's Market SNAP Match Pilot: Eliminates the SNAP matching benefit program across nine participating farmers markets that helped families purchase local food.*

*Annual Cost not Continued: \$72,255*

*Prescription Produce Box Pilot: Concluded the clinic-referral partnership that provided healthy food boxes to 1,000 qualifying patients to improve health outcomes.*

*Annual Cost not Continued: \$886,500*

*The County-facilitated Food Security Workgroup can leverage corporate sponsors to pick up the ongoing/recurring costs of the projects; especially Farm to Early Childcare and SNAP Match.*

5. Page 14 the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph from the top on the 2nd column lists the Carolina Mudcats as our Minor League Baseball team.

*This was corrected.*

6. Page 21 the table on the 1<sup>st</sup> column, is the table an example of a table or should there be data in the table?

*It is meant to be an example, yes.*

7. Page 25 the 1<sup>st</sup> column under General Fund is "The primary revenue sources are ad valorem taxes and the local options sales tax" should that be property tax?

*We will add property tax in this section; and the reason it includes Ad valorem is "Ad valorem is Latin for "according to value," referring to a tax levied based on the assessed monetary value of an item, such as real estate or personal property. Unlike flat fees, these taxes—commonly property, sales, or value-added taxes (VAT)—are calculated as a percentage of the asset's fair market value."*

8. Page 38 the 2<sup>nd</sup> column the date at the bottom is "updated December 4, 2023" I think we have updated the Business Development Grant since then to include leases.

*The 12/4/2023 date is still correct. The board has not adopted any policy changes since that date. Projects where the company is leasing space are eligible under the policy as long as the project is the cause of the investment being made. However, the Board will soon consider policy changes, and we will want to work on changes for the Adopted Budget document because policy changes were presented to committee in March, and we are taking those to the full board at the June 8 work session.*

9. Page 42 2<sup>nd</sup> column bottom "Yates Mill Park Advisory Board" I think we eliminated this board.

*Confirmed with Yvonne Gilyard that the Yates Mill Advisory Board was dissolved; will remove from the book page.*

10. Page 43 1<sup>st</sup> column bottom "Scheduled to take effect January 1, 2027" will Phil Berger's bill placing a moratorium on property reevaluation change this reevaluation?

*From the May 14, 2026 Legislative Update "Senator Berger's bill only applies to counties with revaluations taking effect this year, or January 1 2026. After granting some exemptions, this is about nine counties. Wake's next reval takes effect January 1 2027, or next year's budget cycle. As currently constructed, the bill would **not** delay our revaluation process."*

11. Page 68 Total Revenue by Fund Opioid Settlement Fund is 0 for FY 2027 are we not expecting a payment next year?

*The budget book reflects the current budget that was appropriated in prior years. There currently isn't an estimate for the FY27 adopted timeframe. Behavioral Health will bring future payments/appropriations to regular Board meetings or future adopted budget processes.*

12. Page 68 Total Revenue by Fund under Internal Service Fund Risk Management is \$8,135,000 for FY 2027 and previous years have been 0, is there a specific reason why such a large amount? On page 84 General Fund Expenditure Summary shows Risk Management - Cost of Claims jump 154.6%.

*The Risk Management line in the Internal Service Fund section reflects 0 for previous years because FY27 is the first year we budgeted Risk Management into a separate fund. It was part of the Non-Departmental budget. This enables improved management and monitoring.*

13. Page 83 General Fund Expenditure Summary General Services Administration for FY 2027 has increased \$24,790,536 from FY 2026 Amended is this large jump due to department consolidation?

*The County's budget has reflected the cost of services that GSA provides to departments in those departments' budgets; for example utilities, lease management, security, and housekeeping. In the FY27 budget, these costs are removed from department budgets and only reflected in the GSA budget, who manages these costs and services. As part of the financial system implementation this change was identified as a time efficiency and effectiveness business improvement, allowing staff to redirect efforts to higher impact activities. Ability to manage and monitor remains the same through different functionality.*

14. Page 124 General Services Administration Other under Expenditure jumps from \$5,127,404 to \$22,140,808 why the large jump?

*Same reason as last question; utilities, lease management, security, housekeeping shifted from departments' budgets to GSA's budget.*

15. Page 124 General Services Administration County Building Agreements under Expenditures by Division jumps from \$68,133 in FY 2026 to \$8,060,154 in FY 2027 why the large jump?

*Similar to the last question; property leases shifted from departments' budgets to GSA's budget.*

16. Page 136 Soil & Water Conservation District How much have we collected in FY2026 of Roll Back Taxes?

*\$10.3 million budgeted in the County Capital Agricultural Conservation Easements budget. See page 306.*

17. Page 143 Planning, Development and Inspections under Division Purpose and Goals the last sentence has "FY 2026" I think this should be FY 2027.

*Thank you, will correct.*

18. Page 144 Libraries under Expenditure Other FY 2026 Amended is \$9,120,940 FY 2027 Recommended is \$6,061,115 why such a large decrease in one year?

*Utilities, lease management, security, housekeeping shifted from departments' budgets to GSA's budget; in this case Libraries to GSA.*

19. Page 146 Libraries The Percent of Population Within a 10 Drive of a Library the percentage drops every year since FY 2023 why?

*Several areas currently outside the 10-minute library drive time are experiencing population growth; this reason causes the largest fluctuations. Increased traffic patterns and road congestion have also extended travel times to libraries beyond the 10-minute baseline.*

20. Page 163 Behavioral Health 1<sup>st</sup> column under FY27 Discussion of an "Alternate Emergency Response pilot" can I get the details of this pilot?

*Wake County, the City of Raleigh, and Alliance Health will partner on a non-law-enforcement crisis response pilot: four teams of clinicians and peer specialists responding to eligible behavioral-health 911 calls to reduce reliance on law enforcement.*

21. Page 181 Public Health Administration 2<sup>nd</sup> column first full paragraph "Successfully transitioned two public Healthdedicated date" I think there should be a space between Health and dedicated.

*Thank you, will correct.*

22. Page 239 Emergency Communications Number of FTE's is 0 in the table.

*Correct, the County FTEs are authorized in the Information Technology department.*

23. Page 245 Non Departmental Revenue Summary Lease/Rental Vehicle Tax FY2027 Recommended \$3,350,000 due to the new agreement with Go Triangle should this be 0?

*Wake County levies its own 1.5% Vehicle Rental Tax separate and distinct from the from the 5% Vehicle Rental Tax levied by GoTriangle that has been the subject of dispute over the past few years. The County tax is not restricted to use for public transportation purposes, and it serves as a revenue source for the County's General Fund. The \$3.35 million on page 245 is the FY 2027 estimate for the County levied tax.*

*The 5% tax levied by GoTriangle would not be reflected anywhere in the County's financials as those dollars do not flow to Wake County, even when the GoTriangle Board was historically allocating those funds to support the Wake Transit Plan. All of the transit plan revenues for Wake, Durham, and Orange are held and managed by GoTriangle.*

For more information on the Wake County tax: <https://www.wake.gov/departments-government/tax-administration/gross-receipts-tax/rental-vehicle-tax>

24. Page 257 Grants and Donations Revenue Federal FY2025 was \$6,735,797, FY2026 is \$4,008,887 and FY 2027 Recommended is \$1,577,701 which Federal Grants are we losing?

*We are not losing federal grants; the timing of when we receive(d) grants is at play. Continuum of Care grants were awarded during the FY26 fiscal year, so they are reflected in the FY26 amended column and not the FY27 Recommended column. We anticipate those awards during the year, so they would be appropriated in the FY27 Amended budget. Similar with our Public Health Infrastructure Grant; it is reflected in the Amended column. With implementation of the new financial system, we are exploring tables that can differently represent multi-year grants.*

25. Page 262 Major Facilities Fund Summary under Expenditures Indoor Sports Facility FY 2027 Recommended \$5,350,000 is this the Indoor Sports Facility that was planned for Cary? If so, is this still a viable project?

*Yes, that is for the Cary Indoor Sports Project. Cary has stated the project is no longer viable and will not move forward, but the funding allocation is governed by the 23<sup>rd</sup> Amendment to the Interlocal Agreement between Wake County and the City of Raleigh. We are bound to allocate the funding until the City and County amend the ILA. Recommendations for repurposing those funds will be shared as part of the next amendment process currently planned for this summer. However, staff is considering postponing that process given the legislation recently filed by Representative Paré (House Bill 1215). A delay would require an ILA amendment to extend the deadline with approval from the commissioners and city council.*

*None of the funding planned or appropriated for the project has been sent to the Town of Cary; it has only been set aside for the purpose of an Indoor Sports Facility. To date, a total of \$5.35 million has been appropriated and it is being held in reserve by Wake County for future projects, pending amendment of the ILA.*

26. Page 270 Fire Tax District Number of FTE's is 0.

*Correct, the County funds contracts, not County FTE.*

27. This is a general request - not for this year - but future budgets - if it is a budget page that involves personnel expense if you could include the number of FTE's on the budget table. If this is too much work the current method is fine.

*We are exploring approaches in the new financial and budgeting software.*

28. Can you summarize the total budget funding for Affordable Housing (Housing Development & Preservation) for FY 27, and the next several years appear to look like a stable investment?

	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	FY 2030	FY 2031	FY 2032	FY 2033
Transfers From General Fund	14,225,000	14,225,000	14,225,000	14,225,000	14,225,000	14,225,000	14,225,000
<b>Total Sources</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>
Development Program	6,275,000	6,275,000	6,275,000	6,275,000	6,275,000	6,275,000	6,275,000
Expanded Development Program	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Major Home Repair Program	950,000	950,000	950,000	950,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
Preservation & Acquisition Support	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
<b>Total Uses</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>	<b>14,225,000</b>

29. NC Education Lottery: How is our lottery calculated and how much is it?

There are *different funding mechanisms* for the lottery:

The Public School Building Capital Fund is \$100 million and distributed to all counties at a dollars per average daily membership (ADM). Wake budgets \$10 million annually for this revenue in the Debt Service Fund.

The Public School Repair and Renovation Fund is \$50 million and is distributed to each county at an equal amount of \$500 thousand.

30. Does WCPSS receive funding for operations from the NC Lottery?

Per the NC Lottery website: In FY25, \$40M was received for School Staff and \$2.5M for Transportation. The FY25 total lottery funding for Wake County (including pre-k and college scholarships) was \$64,346,784. Refer to this source for more information may be found here: <https://nclottery.com/EducationCounty/Wake>

31. What are average capital costs for new schools and renovations of schools?

Average cost of a new ES - \$95M

Average cost of renovation of ES - \$70M

Average cost of a new MS - \$130M

Average cost of renovation of MS - \$90M

Average cost of a new HS - \$200M

Average cost of renovation of HS - \$150M

32. What was the total amount of unencumbered appropriations from the prior fiscal year returned to the fund balance?

Add to Fund Balance		65,485,304
Less Fund Balance Restrictions and Commitments:	Change in FY25	
	ROD Automation	64,231
	Revaluation Reserve	616,086
	LEO Separation Allowance	(3,235,640)
	Future Appropriation - Excess ABC Revenue	(830,000)
	Future Appropriation - Behavioral Health	12,846,097
	Future Appropriation - Agricultural Easements	2,439,215
	Non-MOA Opioid Settlement Funds	331,533
	Future Business Incentive Grants	263,000
	Assigned Agricultural Easements	(3,643,220)
		8,851,302
Net Total Uncommitted Add to Fund Balance (NTUAFB)		56,634,002
OPEB Leg 2 Deposit: 25% of NTUAFB if NTUAFB ≥ \$5M		14,158,501
	Max Deposit Allowed under Leg 2 per Policy	10,000,000
	30% Fund Balance Hold Back	13,990,201
NTUAFB Available for BOC Appropriation		32,643,801

33. What was the scope of the unfunded social services mobile unit and cost?

*The scope of the mobile unit is to expand access to Human Services through direct, community-based service delivery and provide flexible, mobile services that scale based on community need. As part of staff discussion on Regional Centers in late summer/early fall, staff will consider a host of options for optimal and accessible service delivery.*

34. What was the cost of the unfunded respite services for informal kinship caregivers? What, if any respite, is being provided?

*The cost of the request was \$40,000 to expand respite services to reduce caregiver fatigue and increase caregiver stability and keep children safely with relatives and fictive kin; provide caregivers with short-term relief to sustain placements. (Formal Kinship is when the child has come into the County's custody. Informal is family members voluntarily caring for children (like grandparents) and that prevents children from coming into custody.)*

*Formal Kinship Care: Families may request respite through their social worker, and the Placement Team works to identify respite options through foster care resources (overnight) and youth engagement activities.*

*Informal Kinship Care: No formal respite is available; however, families can access limited respite-style activities, such as Saturday afternoon drop-off programs for children.*

35. What was the cost to continue the ARPA funded food program?

*Farm to Early Childcare Pilot: Discontinued the partnership program that provided fresh produce boxes from local farmers to 398 income enrolled day care children.*

*Annual Cost not Continued: \$72,255*

*Farmer's Market SNAP Match Pilot: Eliminates the SNAP matching benefit program across nine participating farmers markets that helped families purchase local food.*

*Annual Cost not Continued: \$72,255*

*Prescription Produce Box Pilot: Concluded the clinic-referral partnership that provided healthy food boxes to 1,000 qualifying patients to improve health outcomes.*

*Annual Cost not Continued: \$886,500*

36. When and how will updates on horizon issues related to utilities be reported?

*Updates are provided at the Growth, Sustainability and Economic Development Committee. Next will be in October.*

37. Does this budget account for resources related to Farmland Preservation threats exacerbated by the pressures connected to tariffs and wartime restrictions?

*The Soil and Water Conservation District budget includes ongoing core service delivery supporting farmland preservation and the FY27 budget added a Farmland Preservation Manager to support the strategic direction of the program.*

38. Please provide more details on how contractual services are used in the division summary for libraries.

*The Libraries Division has contracts for the following services – for moving and storing of library books, maintenance of library equipment, the online book catalog and database, web marketing tools, and various performers for Library programs.*

39. What opportunities for supporting food pantries as a horizon issue have been evaluated during this budget and is there a process for cooperative extension to address this emerging issue throughout the year?

*The County's role via the food insecurity work group has been to facilitate strategies to develop sustainable strategies and connecting food distribution sites with private and corporate organizations.*

40. How does this proposed budget address the desperate need for foster care families in our local communities?

*Ongoing commitment to the kinship unit, increased engagement of community-based organizations in the recruitment of foster families.*

41. What was the process for determining the maximum amount of dollars transferred from the fund balance?

*Staff reviewed the projections for revenue and the outstanding expenditure adjustments and requests. The utilization of \$35 million of fund balance roughly equates to the estimated lower than anticipated property tax revenue due to increased appeals and the Blue Ridge loophole impacts.*

42. **Fund Balance Transfer:** What is the total list of one time expenses that are covered with the one time fund balance transfer? I am interested in identifying the list of one-time requests fully covered by the transfer rather than the tax rate increase. On average, how much does our general fund balance grow annually? If possible it would be good to see a 10-year fund balance growth trend? How long do we anticipate it will take to replace the funds we are using this year, restoring our fund balance to current levels? What is our policy for the ideal amount of available fund balance?

*Below are tables reflecting changes in fund balance from the FY25 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report and fund balance policy language in the FY27 Recommended Budget Book.*

*>Link to FY25 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report*

*[Wake County FY25 Annual Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.pdf](#)*

*>Link to FY27 Budget Book [Wake County Recommended Budget.pdf](#)*

*A list of one-time expenses funded with use of fund balance is not identified. The utilization of \$35 million of fund balance roughly equates to the estimated lower than anticipated property tax revenue due to increased appeals and the Blue Ridge loophole impacts. It is a one-time balancing strategy in response to unanticipated significant impacts on our largest revenue source, property tax revenues. Impacts on property tax appeals, exemptions and other legislative decisions will be monitored and incorporated into FY28 budget planning.*

**Fund Balance of Governmental Funds Last Ten Fiscal Years  
(modified accrual basis of accounting)**

	Fiscal Year									
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
<b>General Fund</b>										
Non-spendable	\$ 1,087,851	\$ 1,028,455	\$ 1,914,948	\$ 1,577,971	\$ 327,421	\$ 1,223,658	\$ 2,583,042	\$ 1,171,948	\$ 1,253,884	\$ 1,016,446
Restricted	73,843,284	74,634,703	77,963,695	88,159,377	76,120,829	99,775,772	138,319,844	129,982,709	126,909,447	125,504,567
Committed	200,494,326	220,513,579	237,734,967	262,893,367	262,893,367	380,421,054	422,471,176	460,531,566	490,655,235	561,426,077
Assigned	1,134,000	-	-	-	-	500,000	-	-	3,643,220	-
<b>Total General Fund</b>	<b>\$ 276,559,461</b>	<b>\$ 296,176,737</b>	<b>\$ 317,613,610</b>	<b>\$ 352,630,715</b>	<b>\$ 339,341,617</b>	<b>\$ 481,920,484</b>	<b>\$ 563,374,062</b>	<b>\$ 591,686,223</b>	<b>\$ 622,461,786</b>	<b>\$ 687,947,090</b>
<b>All Other Governmental Funds</b>										
Non-spendable	\$ 1,054,756	\$ 963,368	\$ 907,632	\$ 553,520	\$ 25,426,938	\$ 372,891	\$ 191,449	\$ 326,850	\$ 40,062,737	\$ 52,186,203
Restricted	256,655,959	147,124,422	229,381,219	271,479,941	202,588,007	263,993,410	301,083,310	492,825,071	391,433,688	436,120,575
Committed	3,460,568	3,756,640	3,998,730	3,821,043	2,906,568	3,784,057	5,070,034	5,623,370	7,021,864	16,295,375
Assigned	234,606,723	227,731,010	191,567,046	179,175,130	283,558,905	400,833,474	451,116,089	466,569,282	493,567,480	722,093,689
Unassigned	(17,712)	-	(248,211)	(368,989)	-	(468,248)	(3,047)	(612)	-	(3,117,786)
<b>Total All Other Governmental Funds</b>	<b>\$ 495,760,294</b>	<b>\$ 379,575,440</b>	<b>\$ 425,606,416</b>	<b>\$ 454,660,645</b>	<b>\$ 514,480,418</b>	<b>\$ 668,515,584</b>	<b>\$ 757,457,835</b>	<b>\$ 965,343,961</b>	<b>\$ 932,085,769</b>	<b>\$1,223,578,056</b>

**Changes in Fund Balances of Governmental Funds Last Ten Fiscal Years  
(modified accrual basis of accounting)**

	Fiscal Year									
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
<b>Revenues</b>										
Taxes	\$ 1,068,205,202	\$ 1,118,023,378	\$ 1,173,020,937	\$ 1,282,185,781	\$ 1,410,853,726	\$ 1,472,932,002	\$ 1,579,834,763	\$ 1,687,252,012	\$ 1,831,601,107	\$ 2,048,869,482
Intergovernmental	140,095,040	135,511,608	114,580,623	108,638,730	144,284,737	314,558,884	296,673,328	195,280,405	158,620,242	166,570,947
Charges for services	70,562,864	71,653,479	74,274,439	85,543,976	75,997,210	72,714,662	83,410,361	81,123,055	107,387,382	106,702,421
Fines and forfeitures	42,805	-	376	54	-	2,505,908	1,979,766	5,193,290	1,894,167	2,878,365
Licenses and permits	5,185,433	5,371,824	5,381,270	5,799,060	5,568,944	6,607,475	6,067,616	5,448,058	7,365,864	6,951,290
Investment earnings	5,128,545	4,307,934	9,473,624	20,468,846	14,307,146	(3,816,927)	(11,166,953)	48,148,249	79,953,807	76,304,460
Miscellaneous	(1,116,598)	1,001,799	693,150	1,629,450	955,961	883,110	2,898,485	4,252,525	661,062	552,638
<b>Total revenues</b>	<b>1,288,103,291</b>	<b>1,335,870,022</b>	<b>1,377,424,419</b>	<b>1,504,265,897</b>	<b>1,651,967,724</b>	<b>1,866,385,114</b>	<b>1,959,697,366</b>	<b>2,026,697,594</b>	<b>2,187,483,631</b>	<b>2,408,829,603</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>										
General government	76,489,586	76,915,004	75,318,980	98,208,006	720,470,136	266,998,795	171,475,819	152,151,263	128,967,236	147,434,856
Human services	206,528,545	213,132,353	197,901,887	205,974,447	206,401,683	224,229,930	325,060,060	259,987,170	319,845,297	352,332,924
Education	743,976,648	796,583,759	781,773,290	833,134,178	876,169,328	880,035,452	939,992,025	963,361,769	1,119,783,513	1,217,900,051
Community and environmental services	107,481,314	104,193,484	111,962,523	145,708,108	125,514,080	110,236,339	131,703,017	162,079,764	183,786,383	166,329,954
Public safety	162,428,708	166,933,080	188,317,280	192,802,511	204,873,753	180,726,927	189,262,756	247,837,790	280,257,606	314,601,638
Infrastructure	26,880,922	28,220,046	28,557,988	29,819,778	29,732,643	28,963,727	31,430,175	60,437,576	66,077,057	73,688,431
Principal	170,027,054	188,894,216	178,804,981	190,431,748	193,181,554	251,923,303	269,143,143	319,805,458	252,359,467	270,985,847
Interest	98,236,050	89,476,403	93,708,750	98,286,386	104,928,259	96,539,380	105,180,806	107,190,385	117,931,336	119,413,571
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b>1,592,048,827</b>	<b>1,664,348,345</b>	<b>1,656,345,679</b>	<b>1,794,365,162</b>	<b>2,461,271,436</b>	<b>2,039,653,853</b>	<b>2,163,247,801</b>	<b>2,272,851,175</b>	<b>2,469,007,895</b>	<b>2,662,687,272</b>
Excess of revenues over (under) expenditures	(303,945,536)	(328,478,323)	(278,921,260)	(290,099,265)	(209,303,712)	(173,268,739)	(203,550,435)	(246,153,581)	(281,524,264)	(253,857,669)
<b>Other Financing Sources (Uses)</b>										
Transfers in	309,595,234	329,903,244	333,113,962	362,738,779	411,766,460	446,037,432	494,775,712	516,088,940	527,395,522	567,871,390
Transfers out	(309,145,234)	(329,742,244)	(332,663,962)	(362,288,779)	(411,316,461)	(445,587,432)	(498,280,713)	(528,735,684)	(540,522,495)	(575,171,390)
Refunding bonds issued	191,835,000	162,895,000	-	113,940,000	63,675,000	-	-	-	-	44,915,000
Payment to refunded escrow agent	(233,084,360)	(190,000,000)	-	(124,534,612)	(77,054,156)	-	-	74,504,180	(182,549,690)	(49,468,918)
Bonds issued and premiums	42,128,289	153,487,962	239,143,833	220,947,457	55,463,468	301,196,089	326,348,364	371,292,106	272,510,674	367,058,075
Bond anticipation notes issued	1,301,000	98,928,537	-	168,652,564	53,328,720	200,183,143	262,291,757	142,157,051	56,230,528	201,272,165
Repayment of bond anticipation notes	-	-	(218,684,653)	(103,526,168)	-	(157,909,659)	(232,870,052)	(213,676,808)	(72,976,016)	(140,371,831)
Drawdown installment notes issued	-	3,928,079	114,447,523	163,293,070	239,242,065	42,325,490	21,456,797	67,489,340	229,738,676	153,061,407
Repayment of drawdown installment notes	-	-	(114,890,022)	(166,778,650)	-	(281,567,557)	-	(66,183,126)	(153,354,951)	(252,208,143)
Limited obligation bonds issued	-	-	155,290,000	196,805,000	-	302,410,000	-	116,496,730	137,000,000	278,745,000
Issuance of right to use debt	5,027	2,089,630	1,235,305	17,946	16,203	12,007	-	281,255	5,470,160	6,388,186
Leases	-	-	-	-	(16,203)	(12,007)	-	-	-	-
Financing agreement proceeds	-	-	-	-	2,498,956	-	-	-	-	-
Financing agreement	-	-	-	-	(2,498,956)	-	-	-	-	-
Sales of assets and materials	1,870,446	420,537	744,559	227,836	91,111	236,971	224,399	217,042	99,227	268,741
Total other financing sources (uses)	4,505,402	231,910,745	346,389,109	354,170,599	317,946,016	407,324,477	373,946,264	479,931,026	279,041,635	602,359,682
<b>Net change in fund balances</b>	<b>\$(299,440,134)</b>	<b>\$(96,567,578)</b>	<b>\$ 67,467,849</b>	<b>\$ 64,071,334</b>	<b>\$ 108,642,304</b>	<b>\$ 234,055,738</b>	<b>\$ 170,395,829</b>	<b>\$ 233,777,445</b>	<b>\$ (2,482,629)</b>	<b>\$ 348,502,013</b>
Debt service as a percentage of noncapital expenditures	16.96%	16.86%	16.73%	16.40%	16.30%	17.23%	17.41%	18.95%	15.46%	15.14%

**Fund Balance**

**General Fund**

The County shall maintain a fund balance position that rating agencies deem is adequate to meet the County's existing needs and potential future challenges. Therefore, the County has adopted a policy that requires management to maintain a total General Fund balance of at least 15% and an amount committed for working capital of at least 10% of the following fiscal year's General Fund adopted budget to provide the County with adequate working capital and investment income.

Management is expected to manage the budget so that revenue shortfalls and expenditure increases do not impact the County's amount committed for working capital. If a catastrophic economic event occurs which results in a deviation of 5% or more from total adopted budgeted revenues or expenditures, the amount committed for working capital can be reduced by Board action. At that time, the Board will also adopt a plan on how to return the amount committed for working capital back to the required level for fiscal health. When it is appropriate for fund balance to be assigned, the Board of Commissioners delegates authority to the County Manager.

**Operating Funds**

The County will maintain a combined General Fund and Debt Service Fund total fund balance of at least 30% of General Fund and Debt Service Fund combined revenues.

*Adopted May 16, 2011 and revised June 17, 2013 and May 19, 2014.*

43. What is the expenditure change between FY26 and FY27, regardless of revenue source, Base then Recommended.

*Total growth in the General Fund from FY26 Adopted to FY27 Base Budget is \$34.7M.*

*Total Growth from FY27 Base Budget to FY27 Recommended Budget is \$78.4M.*

FY26 Adopted	<b>2,168,946,000</b>
Base Adjustments	34,662,000
FY27 Adjusted Expenditure Base	2,203,608,000
Recommended Additions	78,413,000
FY27 Recommended	<b>2,282,021,000</b>

44. **ARPA Transition:** Please share the balance scorecard rankings for the roughly 50 ARPA programs that were vetted for continuation. What was the process for scoring across key areas? What is the estimated impact of the discontinuation of programs that showed promise? How many less beneficiaries? How many impacted nonprofits?

*Attached is a matrix report of the evaluations of the ARPA funded projects that were not one-time in nature and were submitted for consideration of continued funding in FY27.*

*The scoring framework was designed to evaluate programs objectively across five core operational metrics. Evaluation was based on a comprehensive review of multiple internal and external data sources, including Budget and Management Services (BMS) analyst interviews, fiscal year expansion requests, department business plans, Finance Department ARPA records, program questionnaires, program data, and follow-up interviews with department staff. Programs were evaluated and scored based on the following criteria:*

- *Data Quality and Collection: Assessment of whether the program actively tracks a robust variety of performance measures that directly align with its foundational programmatic goals.*
- *Programmatic Impact: Evaluation of the data to determine overall program efficacy, proven track records of success, and success rates in effectively reaching target populations.*
- *Design and Operational Quality: Analysis of the program's structural design and an assessment of whether the managing department is the most appropriate organizational fit for administration.*
- *Operational Risk: Evaluation of the County's level of risk related to successful implementation of the program.*
- *Strategic Alignment: Assessment of how closely the program aligns with the Wake County Strategic Plan, mandated service requirements, or established community needs assessments.*

*All ARPA funded pilots were considered pilots and not guaranteed for continued funding or continued operation by the County. A combination of the factors cited above and financial sustainability influenced decisions. The County is committed to understanding the communities non-profit capacity and supporting connections between non-profits, identifying service and client adjacencies and regional impacts to strengthen non-profits' ability to serve the community and sustain funding and operations.*

45. **Strategic Investments:** If our investments this year are primarily moving forward public safety goals in the strategic plan, what area of our strategic plan is slowing progress because of limited investment and tight funding this year?

*Investments in the FY27 Recommended budget do increase funding to continue public safety core services, notably in Sheriff Office Detention and EMS, that support public safety strategic plan goals. The County still is advancing initiatives across all goal categories in the strategic plan, and the Board of Commissioners will have a strategic plan retreat after their summer break to receive an update on goal progress.*

46. **Revenue Alternatives:** Beyond property tax increases and fund balance transfer, what other revenue sources were evaluated? Please provide documentation regarding why these alternatives were or were not utilized and why they were insufficient compared to the property tax increase?

*Property tax and sales tax are the largest revenue sources, approximately 88-90% of the General Fund budget. EMS fees were evaluated and increased and reimbursements for administration of benefit programs were adjusted reflected in the Charges for Services line item. Four percent (4%) or approximately \$100 million of the \$2 billion budget are funded by charges for which we review for appropriateness.*

	FY26 Adopted Budget		FY27 Rec'd Budget	
	Budget	% of Total Budget	Budget	% of Total Budget
Taxes	1,952,935,398	90%	2,035,780,366	89%
Federal	12,619,222	1%	12,884,197	1%
State	58,968,764	3%	61,135,618	3%
Local	6,571,000	0%	6,578,310	0%
Charges For Services	90,367,611	4%	97,497,866	4%
Licenses & Permits	8,197,018	0%	7,947,352	0%
Miscellaneous	362,422	0%	496,772	0%
Appropriated FB	35,061,201	2%	50,940,823	2%
Transfers	3,863,164	0%	8,759,496	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,168,946,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$2,282,021,000</b>	<b>100%</b>

47. **Hardship Mitigation:** What percent of homeowners do we anticipate will experience hardship from the proposed annual property tax increase? What is possible to proactively provide relief and protect these residents?

*Preparing, will provide separately.*

48. **Medicaid Administration:** What is the total number of current FTE who handle administrative caseload for Medicaid? To what degree is the team currently understaffed? What is the anticipated hiring plan for these 25 new FTE? How many do we anticipate bringing on before the new requirements begin January 2027 and do we believe we will be in a position to handle backlog before new expansion requirements? What is our timeline for exploring AI technologies for efficiencies to potentially offset additional headcount for these new requirements?

*At present, Wake County Social Services has approximately 187 Family & Children's Medicaid (FCMA) Eligibility Caseworkers and 61 Adult Medicaid (AMA) Eligibility Caseworkers supporting Medicaid administration functions across application processing, recertifications, ongoing case maintenance, and specialized program areas. The additional 25 FTE positions will support operational readiness for upcoming federal and state requirements anticipated in January 2027 (HR1 changes). Hiring efforts are expected to occur in a phased approach to support effective onboarding, training, and operational integration. The anticipated plan is to first hire the Program Manager position, followed by the two Supervisor positions, and then conduct a mass hiring event for the remaining 21 Eligibility Caseworker positions. This phased structure will allow leadership and supervisory support to be established in advance of onboarding new staff while minimizing disruption to ongoing operations. The division continues to evaluate staffing alignment, workload distribution, and program needs to ensure resources are strategically deployed in advance of implementation timelines.*

*The department has also prioritized training, onboarding, and process improvement initiatives to enhance efficiency and support long-term sustainability. Current efforts include expanded cross-training initiatives (Total Case Management), workflow standardization, best practice development, and evaluation of operational processes to identify efficiencies and reduce administrative burden where possible.*

*The department continues to partner with the Department of Health Benefits and NCDHHS IT team, including providing operational feedback to IBM and Accenture regarding opportunities to improve NCFAST functionality and explore future efficiencies. The department also agreed to serve as a pilot county for potential AI technology related to managing evidence and verifications within NCFAST; however, the State has not yet moved forward with this project, and no start date has been identified. Because NCFAST is a state-managed system, counties have no control over integrating external AI tools or applications, as the State does not permit outside programs to interface with NCFAST and eligibility determinations must ultimately be completed by an eligibility worker. Additionally, Wake County's IT Department, in collaboration with Social Services, is actively exploring opportunities to introduce new technologies (including AI) aimed at improving client communication, document submission, and workflow efficiencies to better support both clients and staff, and potentially decrease future staffing needs. The functionality of AI technologies within the social services space are being evaluated, including a thorough consideration of return on investment, environmental and social impacts, and employee and client training. Within these functions, we recognize the human element that remains a vital and valuable part of benefits administration.*

49. **Discussion Summary:** Please provide a summary document that extracts the discussion sections from the budget to highlights, specific funding considerations and priorities?

*The budget message and the content of the Budget Book represent the summary of the information on the FY27 Recommended Budget.*

*[Fiscal Year 2027 Recommended Budget | Wake County Government](#)*

50. **Tax Rate for the State Gap:** The budget message says that the property tax could have been \$.19 lower in fiscal year 26 without needing to fund the state gap and that our overall tax rate would be \$.30 if the state fully funded it's priorities please provide a breakdown of the math used to reach these two specific figures as they seem to represent different assumption?

*The property tax per penny generates approximately \$31 million.  
\$600 million could have been provided by the state is approximately 19 cents  
(\$600 million/\$31 million = \$19.31 cents)*

Amount that State could have funded	600,000,000
Per penny generates	31,075,000
Equivalent per penny	19.31

*Wake's property tax rate in FY26 is 51.71 cents. If we didn't tax approximately 19 cents our property tax rate would be approximately 30 cents. The figures in the message were rounded. The calculation produces a 32.40 cent property tax rate.*

Equivalent per penny State could have funded	19.31
FY26 Wake County property tax rate	51.71
Property tax rate Wake County could be	32.40

51. **Personnel Changes:** On page 67 recommended budget personnel adjustments does the parentheses represent a reduction in FTE?

*Yes, parentheses represent a reduction or decrease.*

52. **Child Welfare:** On page 59 it says that one of the items not funded is additional group home capacity for youth awaiting placement then on page 197 it says that we are including one time funding for the youth awaiting placement program at a tune of 2.4 million please help me reconcile and understand how these two statements work together.

*The budget includes another year of one-time funding to cover temporary staffing costs for this 24/7 operation of supporting youth temporarily housed in our buildings. The budget also includes a contract for qualified residential services, and security costs for our facility at Blue Ridge Road. The \$2.4M budget for FY27 reflects the projected expenditures of providing 24/7 care for children in our building for FY26. While the FY26 budget included funding to incentivize new Level II and III group homes, those efforts did not yield the results we had hoped for. The department will coordinate with Blue Cross/Blue Shield on placement and residential provider capacity efforts. DSS Foster Care room and board payments combined with BCBS mental health funding is expected to attract new providers.*

53. **Defining personal responsibility.** The budget mentions "promoting personal responsibility" (pg 202) and "promoting the financial responsibility of parents" (pg 200). What specific policy or program goals does this language represent?

*This question does not directly address a budget decision. Staff will bring this information back in the upcoming weeks to focus this collection of information more targeted to FY27 budget decisions.*

54. **Food and Nutrition:** With demand at record levels and federal and state challenging mounting, what specific steps are we taking to maintain our investments in and collaborations for food and nutrition services?

*Topic included in slides for discussion.*

55. **Non-Profit Partners:** Which nonprofit partners (especially those supporting FNS) are seeing a reduction in county funding in this budget and what is the anticipated impact on their service capacity?

List of non-profits who requested funding

Non-Profit	FY27 Expansion Request	FY27 Recommended
United Arts Council – Increase for Marketing	\$150,000	\$0
United Arts Council – Increase available Grant Funding	\$100,000	\$50,000
Communities in Schools – General Operational Budget Increase	\$12,200	\$0

List of FY27 Recommended Budget for Non-Profits

Non-Profit	Total Appropriation in FY27 Budget
United Arts Council	\$503,620
East Wake Education Foundation	\$59,500
Communities in Schools	\$107,800
Marbles Kids Museum	\$495,600
Community Success Initiative	\$50,000
Methodist Home for Children (Curtis Center)	\$80,000
StepUp Ministries	\$28,080

56. **Libraries:** What is the timeline for completing this library staffing analysis?

*The study will be complete in September.*

57. **The following are budget-related but aren't budget-specific questions:**

**Items partially or not funded:** Please provide an 'impact report' for each item that was not funded or partially funded (pg 59). Some areas of inquiry include:

- Understanding direct impact (to people and to strategic progress) - Does the lack of funding disproportionately impact specific zip codes, income levels or vulnerable populations? How many residents are estimated to be affected and what specific strategic progress is stalled?
- Understanding operational risks - What, if any, are the immediate risks to compliance or service delivery by not funding these areas?
- Understanding future fiscal impact - What is the projected cost of fixing this delay or catching up in the next 2 to 3 fiscal years?

*The Manager, informed by review of narrative, data and analysis, made budget decisions within the landscape of our current fiscal environment, operational and technological business improvements, strategic and core service delivery priorities, and the larger global political and financial climate.*