



THE THOMAS JEFFERSON INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

Th Jefferson

Ninth Annual

Fairfax County Budget Analysis

*Recession Dramatically Cut Government Spending
Decade of Excessive Spending Caused Today's Deficit*

Volume One

By:

Michael W. Thompson

December 2009

Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy

The Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy is a non-partisan research and education organization devoted to improving the lives of the people in Virginia. The Institute was organized in 1996, and was the only state and local government focused public policy foundation in Virginia based on a philosophy of limited government, free enterprise and individual responsibility. It is a “solutions tank” seeking better ways to accomplish the policies and programs currently being undertaken by state and local government – always based on the Institute’s underlying philosophy. The first study was published in February 1997.

The work of the Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy is geared toward educating our political, business and community leadership about the issues facing our society here in Virginia. The Institute offers creative solutions to these problems in a non-partisan manner.

The Thomas Jefferson Institute is a fully approved foundation by the Internal Revenue Service. It is designated a 501 (c) 3 organization and contributions are tax-deductible under the law. Individuals, corporations, associations and foundations are invited to contribute to the Thomas Jefferson Institute and participate in our programs.

For more information on the programs and publications of the Thomas Jefferson Institute, please contact:

Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy

9035 Golden Sunset Lane

Springfield, Virginia 22153

703/440-9447

email: info@thomasjeffersoninst.org

website: www.thomasjeffersoninst.org

This paper, “*Ninth Annual Fairfax County Budget Analysis – Volume One*” is published by the Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy. This paper does not necessarily reflect the views of the Thomas Jefferson Institute or its Board of Directors. Nothing in this study should be construed as an attempt to hinder or aid any legislation.

Ninth Annual

Fairfax County Budget Analysis

Recession Dramatically Cut Government Spending

Decade of Excessive Spending Caused Today's Deficit

By: Michael W. Thompson

This is the ninth consecutive year that the Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy has produced an annual analysis of Fairfax County government's General Fund Budget and Public School's overall budget. These numbers do not include debt service (bond payments) or those "off budget" government operations of independent agencies such as the Fairfax County Water Authority. This is an overall analysis of what many would refer to as the "operating budgets" of the county government and school system.

Fairfax County budget documents are used as the basis for this study and are reproduced in the Appendices found in Volume II of this study.

This year's analysis shows that the deep recession continues to reduce county spending to well under the rate of inflation and population growth. However, this report also shows (pages 3, 3-A, 3-B, and 4) that today's spending difficulties are the result of ten years of spending beyond this formula. Had spending been limited to this inflation and population formula for the past ten years – a formula approved by the heralded Cole Commission in 1993 as the benchmark to review county spending -- then today our county government and school system would not be mired in the need for continued and deep budget cuts.

The "underspending" numbers in this annual four-year budget analysis do not include debt service for the county or for the school system since these are obligations based on bond issues passed by the voters and paying these bonds is locked in by law. What these numbers used in this analysis do reflect is the "operations budget" and this spending can be changed should our elected officials decide to do so.

This brief analysis of the Fairfax County budget is not a substitute for a careful management review for each and every program in government or in the school system. This budget analysis is not a detailed critique of the many programs funded by our county or by our schools. It is an initial management tool as recommended by a well-respected group of business and academic leaders in 1993 but clearly not paid attention to by the Board of Supervisors over the past ten years.

Fully 17 years ago, the highly acclaimed Cole Commission did an analysis of the Fairfax County budget and looked at its spending and taxing methodologies. This citizen commission – including leading business leaders and academics – determined that a good initial analysis of spending was to compare actual spending to what would have been spent had government and the school system allowed spending to increase only at the rate of inflation (Consumer Price Index – CPI) and population growth. This annual budget analysis by the Thomas Jefferson Institute follows this landmark study's recommendation

on how to compare spending with what “could have been done” under the CPI - population formula.

The purpose of these annual budget analyses is to determine whether county government and the county school system are spending above the base formula of CPI (inflation) and population growth. If government limits its spending to this level, the financial burden of government remains constant on the taxpayers. If spending exceeds this formula, then the burden of government is increasing and if it is less than this formula then spending is not increasing the burden of government on the people. This analysis does not get into a review of specific programs in any detailed way. Government should, through its leaders, always strive to “run its shop” in the most efficient and effective manner. And government should always prioritize its spending so that elected leaders, with involvement from the taxpayers, can determine if spending taxpayer money is in areas that are truly the proper role of government and in ways that meet the priorities of its citizens. And how government spends its money should be as transparent as possible.

Our county is blessed with one of the highest per capita incomes in the country. We have smart business leaders, academics and government workers – retired and working – who can offer a fresh and sensible analysis of government spending. The county should rely on these people to help analyze its spending. Seventeen years ago, many Supervisors had a Citizens Budget Oversight Committee that looked at the budget and offered ideas on how taxpayers’ monies could be better spent. In the mid-1990’s this effective “outside expertise” disappeared. Today, Springfield Supervisor, Patrick Herrity, and Braddock Supervisor, John Cook, are each working with a group of people in their districts to review county spending. All Supervisors should bring similar groups together to help understand how the taxpayers’ money is spent and offer creative alternatives to current government programs and policies.

This annual analysis compares actual spending over the past four years with what would have been spent had increases been aligned to the growth of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and population. Calculations also show this comparison for the past three years and the past two years. This CPI-population formula is used since keeping government spending at this level would, as mentioned earlier, keep the burden of government the same on the taxpayers in inflation-adjusted dollars. And it would keep the price of providing public education the same on a per student basis in inflation-adjusted dollars as well. In the past two or three years, during the current recession and falling property values, the rate of growth in government spending has decreased sharply. Indeed, spending has been less than in the previous year on both the government and school side of the budget.

With the large number of government spending experts and practical business leaders living in our midst, our county should have an on-going group of independent and outside analysts review county government and county school spending. And such an independent analysis should become part of the normal course of doing business by our county government and the School Board. There also needs to be a programmatic audit and it should include a prioritization of spending needs. Whether in “good” economic times or “bad” economic times, a continued analysis of how county government spends our money is something that should be established.

Two years ago, the County Executive openly opposed not only the idea of an outside budget analysis, but criticized the respected Cole Commission's analysis of spending (rate of inflation and population growth) as "simplistic" and "primitive." This response to the 2007 budget analysis was poorly done using incorrect numbers and different starting years than did the Jefferson Institute analysis. When these obvious errors were brought to the county's attention in a detailed letter from the Thomas Jefferson Institute, there was never a response. That silence further indicated that the county's review of the Institute's analysis was indeed incorrect and based on purposeful distortions. Otherwise, the county would have responded. It would be interesting to know how many hours were put into the country's seriously flawed response, what the taxpayers paid for this analysis, and why such a faulty analysis would have been published in the first place.

But what the 2007 response from the county clearly showed was this: the county bureaucracy does not want anyone other than itself having a say in the annual budget. That is an attitude that needs to change if a truly transparent government is to be created in Fairfax County.

Four Year Analysis and Ten Year Review

This year's Budget Analysis shows these interesting facts:

- 1) Over the past four years, the combined net "underspending" (below the CPI and population formula) of the county and school budgets was \$786,779,800 – that's almost \$521 million below "break-even" from a CPI/inflation perspective.
- 2) Over the past three years, because of the downturn in property values, spending was below the CPI-population formula by \$418,380,568.
- 3) Over the past two years, as government continued to face declining income from property taxes, spending was below the CPI-population formula by \$377,230,000.
- 4) And this study also shows that over the past four years, the vast bulk of underspending was focused on government, non-school, spending. Government has made the largest reductions in spending while the school system has faced less severe reductions.

It is instructive to go back and review the spending in Fairfax County since FY 2000. Using FY 2000 as the base year for government and school spending, we find that today the county government would have had a surplus in every year except the current FY 2010 budget – during a severe recession. And that deficit would have been small.

On the next two pages are the ten year budget figures using FY 2000 as the base year. These numbers show what the spending was in each fiscal year and what that spending would have been for the government and the schools had it been limited to the rate of inflation of population growth. As mentioned earlier, in the school system the student enrollment is the number used for population growth.

Ten Year Analysis

Fairfax County Budget – Spending Above/Below the Rate of Inflation and Population Growth

(Does not include county and school debt service)

Gov't/Non-School Budget –2000 Base Year Analysis

Fiscal Year	Actual Budget in millions*	Population in thousands	Cost/Capita	Inflation Adjusted cost/capital	Overspent Underspent per/capita
2000(base year)	\$ 920	966	\$ 952.28	N/A	N/A
2001 (actual)	\$ 975	981	\$ 993.88	(2.5%) \$ 976.09	\$ 17.79
2002 (actual)	\$ 1,011	998	\$ 1,013.03	(2.4%) \$ 999.52	\$ 13.51
2003 (actual)	\$ 1,066	1,016	\$ 1,049.21	(3.1%) \$ 1,030.51	\$ 18.70
2004 (actual)	\$ 1,140	1,019	\$ 1,115.46	(3.3%) \$ 1,064.52	\$ 50.94
2005 (actual)	\$ 1,262	1,022	\$ 1,212.12	(5.1%) \$ 1,118.81	\$ 93.31
2006 (actual)	\$ 1,454	1,041	\$ 1,396.73	(4.5%) \$ 1,169.16	\$ 227.57
2007 (actual)	\$ 1,438	1,059	\$ 1,357.88	(4.7%) \$ 1,224.11	\$ 133.77
2008 (actual)	\$ 1,473	1,040	\$ 1,416.35	(6.0%) \$ 1,297.56	\$ 118.79
2009 (revised)	\$ 1,528	1,049	\$ 1,456.63	(2.5%) \$ 1,330.00	\$ 126.63
2010 (adopted)	\$ 1,429	1,056	\$ 1,353.22	(2.5%) \$ 1,363.25	(\$ 10.03)

Had spending on the government side of the ledger been limited to the rate of inflation and population growth since 2000, the financial headache faced by Fairfax County today would not exist. A budget deficit of \$10.03 per citizen of Fairfax County would mean a total deficit of only \$ 10,591,680. But because of the spending appetite by Fairfax County over the past ten years, dramatically building the base of government in “good” economic times as if those “boom times” would continue, huge cuts have had to take place in the past couple of years and again in the upcoming Fiscal Year 2011 budget which is scheduled for debate in early 2010.

Fairfax County K-12 Budget – Spending Beyond the Rate of Inflation and Population Growth

K-12 School Budget –2000 as Base Year

Fiscal Year	Actual Budget in millions*	Population in thousands	Cost/Capita	Inflation Adjusted cost/capital	Overspent (Underspent) per/capita
2000 (base yr)	\$ 1,272	155	\$ 8,206.45	(3.4%) N/A	N/A
2001 (actual)	\$ 1,376	158	\$ 8,708.86	(2.5%) \$ 8,411.61	\$ 297.25
2002 (actual)	\$ 1,444	161	\$ 8,968.94	(2.4%) \$ 8,613.49	\$ 335.45
2003 (actual)	\$ 1,508	163	\$ 9,251.53	(3.1%) \$ 8,880.51	\$ 371.02
2004 (actual)	\$ 1,630	164	\$ 9,939.02	(3.3%) \$ 9,173.57	\$ 765.45
2005 (actual)	\$ 1,767	164	\$10,774.39	(5.1%) \$ 9,641.42	\$ 1,132.97
2006 (actual)	\$ 1,910	164	\$11,646.34	(4.5%) \$10,075.28	\$ 1,571.06
2007 (actual)	\$ 2,039	164	\$12,432.93	(4.7%) \$10,548.82	\$ 1,884.11
2008 (actual)	\$ 2,144	166	\$12,915.66	(6.0%) \$11,181.75	\$ 1,773.91
2009 (estimated)	\$ 2,267	170	\$13,335.29	(2.5%) \$11,461.29	\$ 1,874.00
2010 (approved)	\$ 2,203	174	\$12,600.92	(2.5%) \$11,747.82	\$ 853.10

Had the School Board restricted spending during the past ten years to the rate of inflation and student population, the current Fairfax County school budget would be \$853.10 per student over that reasonable formula used by the Cole Commission in the early 1990's as a benchmark of county over-spending. Thus, the School Board spent heavily during the "boom times" of dramatically increasing property values and put itself into a much more vulnerable position financially when the current recession commenced.

These numbers indicate that had spending in Fairfax County by the government and the school system been limited to the CPI-population growth for the past ten years, the financial situation faced in our county today simply would not exist.

Indeed, had the recommendations from the 1993 Cole Commission been followed since 2000, the county government and school board budgets would not been in such dire shape today. Indeed, had the recommended spending restraints been followed, the county government would face a relatively small deficit in this year's budget of only \$10.6 million and the schools would have enjoyed a surplus of \$148 million.

Fairfax County needs to control its spending today and it needs to establish a long-term outside review panel of experts – similar to the Cole Commission in the early 1990's but on a permanent basis – to assist in prioritizing and limiting spending. The county and the school system must limit its spending in future “good times” or it will merely find itself in the same position it is in today at the end of the next economic cycle.

County Spends Beyond its Adopted Budget

The Board of Supervisors has been spending above its approved budgets, even during times when everyone knew the housing market was heading for a crisis and that county property taxes would be less than hoped. During the three years where complete numbers are available -- FY 2006, '07 and '08 -- the average actual spending above the approved budgets was \$38,777,601.

Here is what the Fairfax County government's budget documents show. These numbers are net of the school transfer and the debt service for the school and county bond issues. Thus, these numbers reflect the county's “operating budget.”

2006:	A) Adopted	\$ 1,360,795,986
	B) Revised	\$ 1,522,179,896
	C) Actual	\$ 1,453,526,454
	B – C =	\$ 68,653,442 more in “revised” than actual spending at year end
	C – A =	\$ 92,730,468 more spending than adopted budget

2007:	A) Adopted	\$ 1,435,500,378
	B) Revised	\$ 1,502,818,741
	C) Actual	\$ 1,453,563,006
	B – C =	\$ 49,255,725
	C – A =	\$ 18,062,628 more spending than the adopted budget

2008:	A) Adopted	\$ 1,467,572,854
	B) Revised	\$ 1,535,531,110
	C) Actual	\$ 1,473,112,561
	B – C =	\$ 62,418,549
	C – A =	\$ 5,539,707 more

spending than the adopted budget.

2009:	A) Adopted	\$ 1,438,191,126
	B) Revised	\$ 1,507,962,066
	C) Actual	not yet reported
	B-C =	cannot yet be calculated
	C-A =	cannot be calculated at this time, but
		documents show the revised spending is \$
		69,770,940 more than the adopted budget

Three year total spending above adopted budgets: \$ 116,332,803.

Three year average above adopted budgets: \$ 38,777,601

Clearly, the Board of Supervisors cannot seem to spend within its own approved budgets. Had it done so, then the county's fiscal difficulties would be substantially less today.

Schools Spend Less than Adopted Budgets

In the base years of this study – 2006, 2007 and 2008 – the School Board lists in its Proposed Budget the “estimated” spending for the past year and then the actual spending is shown for two previous fiscal years. This makes sense since actual spending numbers aren't available when budgets are drawn up for the next year since spending for the current fiscal year is still occurring.

However, what is interesting from a management point of view is that in each of these years, the “estimated” spending shown in the proposed budget documents ends up being substantially more than what is shown the following year under the “actual” spending numbers. In fact, these “estimated” spending numbers have averaged \$80,873,098 more than the actual spending as reported in the subsequent year budget documents. This is only a three year average since the annual spending numbers for the FY 2009 budget are not yet available. Why is the “estimated” spending continually so different from the actual spending numbers reported in the following year?

And the annual budget documents also show the actual spending by the schools in Fiscal Years 2006, 2007 and 2008 averaged \$36,007,679 less than the approved budgets for those years. The school system is not spending all that is appropriated to it by the Board of Supervisors. If this is the case, then the schools may not actually need all the funds that it requests from the Supervisors. Indeed when the estimated figures for a fiscal year are combined with the actual spending for that fiscal year, the school board is spending on average over the three year period \$116,880,777 less than what is indicated in its own budget figures presented to the School Board and the Board of Supervisors when asking for the next budget. This number is reached by adding the “estimated”

spending number that is continually over the approved budget with the “actual” spending number that is continually under the approved budget. Again, this is a budget management issue that needs to be confronted.

Here are the numbers from the school’s budget documents. Each year’s analysis requires numbers from three years of budget documents.

2006:	A) Approved spending	\$ 1,931,367,218	
	B) Estimated spending	\$ 1,992,177,528	
	C) Actual spending	\$ 1,910,433,820	
		B – C = \$	81,743,708 estimated spending in excess to actual spending
		A – C = \$	20,933,398 less than approved budget
2007:	A) Approved spending	\$ 2,085,242,967	
	B) Estimated spending	\$ 2,114,230,232	
	C) Actual spending	\$ 2,038,808,780	
		B – C = \$	75,431,452 estimated spending in excess to actual spending
		A – C = \$	46,434,187 less than approved budget
2008:	A) Approved spending	\$ 2,184,797,764	
	B) Estimated spending	\$ 2,229,586,448	
	C) Actual spending	\$ 2,144,142,313	
		B – C = \$	85,444,135 estimated spending in excess to actual spending
		A – C = \$	40,655,451 less than approved budget
2009	A) Approved spending	\$ 2,220,638,507	
	B) Estimated spending	\$ 2,267,104,764	
	C) Actual spending	not yet available	
		B – C =	can’t yet be determined
		A – B =	\$ 46,466,257 estimated spending more than approved spending

Three year average estimated spending over actual budget = \$80,873,098.

Three year average less spending than approved budget = \$36,007,679

Over the most recent three year period with complete numbers available the school system spent \$108 million less than the adopted school budgets. This shows that the School Board is good at staying below its adopted budgets. These numbers also show that the “estimated” spending is continually in excess of actual spending at year end. The difference in the total of estimated spending above the approved budgets each year and the actual spending numbers which are below the approved budgets each year averages \$81 million over the three years for which these numbers are available. This money management issue should be analyzed in more detail to determine why this happens.

Suggested Steps Toward Better Budget Management

This analysis shows that better budget management needs to be instituted in Fairfax County by the government and the school system. Best business practices need to be implemented. Prioritization of spending needs to take place. And contracting out of government services and programs need to be researched and implemented where possible as other governments throughout the country have accomplished.

Here are several budget management ideas that should be considered by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and the School Board:

- 1) The General Assembly should pass legislation requiring staggered terms for the members of the Board of Supervisors and the School Board so that half of each governing board faces the voters every two years. This simple change would bring a continual review by the public of the county government and school systems and this would create better government overall.
- 2) The Board of Supervisors should agree not to allow future budgets to increase any faster than the rate of inflation and population growth. If the old spending habits over the past ten years are allowed to come back into practice, the government and school budget crisis faced today will again appear several years from now.
- 3) The Board of Supervisors should establish a county-wide "Citizens Budget/Spending Oversight Committee" similar to the highly respected Cole Commission that was appointed by former Chairman of the Board Supervisors Tom Davis in the early 1990's. Business Leaders, respected economists and federal government auditors should be members of this Oversight Committee and it should be an on-going commission that can assist our elected leaders in better managing the county budget including prioritizing programs that are funded.
- 4) Each Supervisor should have his/her own "Citizens Budget Oversight Committee" to assist in the budget review process. Access to this expertise will provide the Supervisors with the budget oversight that the citizens expect.
- 5) Fairfax County government and the School Board should put its checkbook on line so that the taxpayers can review how our money is being spent. States and localities around the country are doing this and Fairfax should follow their lead consistent with privacy laws. All RFP's for professional contracts and all contracts with outside vendors should also be on line. This will allow interested citizens to see how tax money is spent and it will help build greater confidence between the taxpayer and local government.
- 6) Fairfax County Board of Supervisors should appoint an independent Inspector General/Auditor whose responsibility is to find misspending, fraud, and programs that could be more efficient and effective. An independent Inspector General/Auditor could be very important to the future of taxpayer confidence in county government.

- 7) The State of Virginia has recently saved fully 25% through a competitive bidding process for maintenance of its state vehicle fleet of some 4600 cars and vans. The County should learn from the Virginia government and contract out its maintenance for the county fleet. The School Board should do the same for its bus and vehicle fleet. Competitive sourcing should be a key policy initiative by the Board of Supervisors/School Board.
- 8) All new and current regulations should be reviewed to find out if they are necessary in today's world, if they are accomplishing the public good at a reasonable price, and if they need to be re-written or eliminated. This is a review that should take place on a regular basis.
- 9) Proposed new regulations need to have oversight by the Board of Supervisors before they are crafted and implemented. The recent example of a "tree ordinance" requiring the planting of trees by developers was more than 120 pages long. The Board of Supervisors has sent these back for re-drafting but how did so much time and effort go into a "tree ordinance?" The Board of Supervisors should require a full accounting of the costs involved in researching, drafting and finalizing these tree regulations to see if these costs are really justified.
- 10) All open positions in county government should be frozen and hiring only key management jobs should be considered. Then the county and Board of Supervisors should review these frozen slots to determine if they are really needed in county government. All newly created positions in the past three years should be eliminated unless required by a federal or state government mandate.
- 11) A program review needs to be instituted to determine how effective county programs are in accomplishing their mission. Without such a set of matrixes, it is difficult to know how well each and every program is doing.
- 12) The School Board should create a serious two-year citizens panel to study the budget without restraints on the panel's work. When the School Board last had a citizen's panel look at its budget in 2003, the School Board Chair ordered the panel not to look at the cost of instructional programs. Yet, almost 85% of the school budget is instructional programs. For 85% of the budget to be off-the-table in a budget analysis makes the whole process questionable.
- 13) Study after study has shown that teaching students to read through a phonics-based program is significantly better than other reading programs. And many studies show that a phonics-based reading program can reduce the number of students in special education classes. Indeed, recent studies show that the reading scores of African American students in Richmond exceed those of African American students in Fairfax County in the early grades. Richmond has a phonics-based reading program. The School Board should make a phonics-based reading program the basic reading program in Fairfax County. This could reduce the cost of Special Education significantly and help students at the same time.
- 14) Public private partnerships in building all government construction projects – from county transportation and building projects to new school construction and

improvements to current school projects – should be the first option in all cases if the price and product are better. Governments and school systems all over the state and throughout the country are finding significant savings using public private partnerships. Indeed, South County High School was built at a savings of many millions of dollars by using this management tool.

- 15) The Gibson Consulting Group study of the school system a few years ago needs to be taken off the shelf, dusted off and its recommendations reviewed and publicly determined to be followed or to tell the taxpayers why they are not. This type of programmatic study/review should be completed on a regular basis.
- 16) The state of Virginia has recently contracted out its information technology needs to the private sector and other states and localities have done the same with the expectations to save millions of dollars over a few years. The county and school system should learn from the problems with the state contract, issue a Request for Proposal for the county's IT services, and see what comes in. If money can be saved and services remain at least the same, then the county can make the decision whether this is a good idea.
- 17) The Board of Supervisors and School Board should eliminate all duplication of services between the County and School Board, consolidating those services to the government unit (school or government) that achieves the best result at the best price for taxpayers. Among the services that might be consolidated are payroll processing, media and audio-visual, maintenance, warehousing, public works design and construction, and non-supervisory Human Services.
- 18) William Eggers at Deloitte is a well respected expert in bringing governments into the 21st century. Eggers and other key thinkers in this area of government reform should be asked to become part of a true "outside reform team" to look at county government and the school system to find ways to bring significant modernization to the way the entire government system is established. Eggers' books and articles are a wonderful resource. This county should take advantage of thinkers and experts that are sprinkled throughout Fairfax County.

Conclusion

This annual financial review of the Fairfax County and Fairfax Public School budget is an effort to bring to light why reasonable and logical government reform should be brought to government policy. The results can be important to controlling government spending and avoiding the deficits we see today in Fairfax County.

If the County and the School Board don't confront its long-term spending issues they are destined to once again spend heavily during "expanding economic times" and face substantial deficits during "recessionary times." This can be avoided if true financial management takes priority and long-term planning concerns be addressed in a realistic manner

About the Author

Michael Thompson is currently the Chairman and President of the Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy, a non-partisan Virginia focused foundation dealing with the issues of economic development (including transportation and urban growth issues), education, government reform, and environmental stewardship. This foundation has gained broad based respect from political and business leaders throughout Virginia.

Prior to working for the Thomas Jefferson Institute, Mr. Thompson was for 24 years the owner and president of the Thompson Creative Marketing Group, a nationally recognized marketing and public affairs company in Springfield, Virginia. He was also the president of the Mather Furniture Company, a family owned business in Georgia. He is the past President of the Virginia Leadership Council, the state's Board of Directors for the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's largest small business organization with over 6,000 members in our state. He also serves as Vice Chairman of a national award winning foundation working with college and university student leaders around the world, the Fund for American Studies.

Mr. Thompson has been an active leader in the Virginia Republican Party and served in many leadership capacities at the state and local level. He is active in his community and has served three terms as President of the Springfield District Council, an organization representing over 200 homeowner associations. He helped found and remains on the Board of Directors of the Occoquan Watershed Coalition in Fairfax County. He serves on Supervisor Pat Herrity's Citizens Budget Oversight Committee and was a member of Governor Bob McDonnell's government reform transition team. Thompson has served on several Fairfax County commissions and task forces.

Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy
Board of Directors

Michael Thompson: Chairman and President: For over twenty years Mr. Thompson owned his own marketing company. He has been very active in national, state and local politics as well as a number of state and community organizations, commissions, and committees, Springfield, VA.

Randal C. Teague: Secretary/Treasurer: A Partner in the law firm of Vorys, Sater Seymour and Pease, Washington, DC.

John Alderson: President of the John Alderson Insurance Agency, Daleville, VA.

Warren Barry: Former State Senator and small business owner. Heathsville, VA.

William W. Beach: Director of the Center for Data Analysis and John M. Olin Senior Fellow in Economics at the Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C.

James W. Beamer: Managing Director for Legislative Outreach, Dominion Resources Services, Inc., Richmond, VA.

Stephen Cannon: Chairman, Constantine Cannon, PC, former Sr. VP and General Counsel of Circuit City Stores, Washington DC

James W. Dyke, Jr: Partner, McGuireWoods and former Sec. of Education, McLean, VA.

Robert L. Hartwell: President, Hartwell Capitol Consulting, Sr Consultant to American Systems, International, Occoquan, VA.

Alan I. Kirshner: Chairman and CEO of Markel Corporation, Glen Allen, VA.

Jay Poole: Former V. P. for Agriculture Policy and Programs, Altria, Glen Allen, VA.

Joseph Ragan: Founder and President of Joe Ragan's Coffee, Springfield, VA.

John Rust: Partner, Rust and Rust law firm & former State Delegate, Fairfax, VA.

John Ryan: Retired Senior Counsel & Dir. of Gov't. Affairs for Bristol Myers Squibb, Washington DC.

Robert W. Shinn: President of Public Affairs, Capital Results, Richmond, VA.

Todd A. Stottlemeyer: Exec VP, Inova Health System, Fairfax, VA.

Dr. Robert F. Turner: Law professor at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Robert W. Woltz, Jr: President and CEO of Verizon-Virginia, Richmond, VA.



*“... a wise and frugal government, which shall
restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave
them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of
industry and improvement, and shall not take from
the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the
sum of good government, and this is necessary to close
the circle of our felicities.”*

Thomas Jefferson

1801

Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy
9035 Golden Sunset Lane
Springfield, Virginia 22153
703.440.9447
info@thomasjeffersoninst.org
www.thomasjeffersoninst.org