

TRIAL COURTS
Fund 0060 General, Department 201
Lawrence G. Lees, County Executive Officer

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 201 - TRIAL COURTS (FUND 0060)
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$1,639,248	\$1,703,160	\$1,682,969	\$1,682,969	
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	(\$3)	\$376	\$0	\$0	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$1,158,243	\$1,223,220	\$1,279,300	\$1,279,300	
Total Revenues:	\$2,797,488	\$2,926,757	\$2,962,269	\$2,962,269	
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$9,120	\$10,452	\$11,108	\$11,108	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$664,048	\$627,946	\$1,660,182	\$1,660,182	
OTHER CHARGES	\$1,285,313	\$1,301,838	\$1,336,925	\$1,336,925	
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$0	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000	
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$437,082	\$618,333	\$617,849	\$617,849	
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$2,395,564	\$2,558,570	\$3,651,064	\$3,651,064	
Net Cost:	(\$401,924)	(\$368,187)	\$688,795	\$688,795	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The "Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997" (AB233), Chapter 850, became effective on January 1, 1998. The legislation finds and declares that the judiciary of California is a separate and independent branch of government, recognized by the Constitution and statutes of the State.

The Legislature has previously established the principle that the funding of trial court operations California Rules of Court (CRC 810) is most logically a function of the state. Such funding is necessary to provide uniform standards and procedures, economies of scale, and structural efficiency and simplification. This decision also reflects the fact that the overwhelming business of the trial courts is to interpret and enforce provisions of state law and to resolve disputes among the people of the State of California.

The County transferred responsibility for five court facilities to the Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), on December 17, 2008. The County is the managing party in three facilities: Burney Joint Use Building, Justice Center, and Juvenile Hall. The AOC is the managing party in the Main Courthouse and Courthouse Annex. A Joint Occupancy Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding between the County and the AOC memorialize the party's roles and responsibilities. The County is obligated to pay the AOC an annual County Facility Payment (currently \$457,370), to offset the Court's historical expense for operations and maintenance of the court facilities.

The expenses remaining in this budget unit are considered County costs under the rules of "trial court funding." This includes court facilities, maintenance of effort (MOE) responsibilities, debt payment on courthouse renovation and justice center construction, and the costs associated with the collection division. They also include the County Facility Payment (CFP) and revenues received from the AOC for the Court's share of operations and maintenance in the facilities managed by the County. Starting in FY 2010-11, this budget also includes costs to relocate staff from the Public Safety Building.

Other Revenue consists of fines, fees, and forfeitures collected pursuant to various legislative codes and retained by the County.

BUDGET REQUESTS

The costs remaining in the County's Court budget are for non-CRC 810 costs. This includes court facilities, the maintenance of effort (MOE) allocation, debt payments on the Justice Center facility and the Courthouse renovation project, inmate transportation, and all costs associated with the collection division. In December 2008 the County transferred responsibility for 5 court facilities to the Administrative Office of the Courts. The County Facility Payment (CFP) is \$457,370. Total requested appropriations for FY 2013-14 are \$3.6 million.

Revenues remain flat, a symptom of the economic downturn which affects the public's ability to pay court fines and fees. Requested revenues are \$2.9 million.

The State selected property for its new Redding Courthouse on Court Street across from the existing Main Courthouse. The County negotiated the sale of the Public Safety Building and adjacent parking lots to the AOC. Included for a third year is an appropriation (\$1 million) for costs associated with relocating the Sheriff and Probation departments. Also included is one fixed asset, a wireless bridge system or point-to-point wireless system to bypass the Public Safety Building for network connectivity to CalWORKS and the Redding Police Department.

The Net County Cost for this budget unit is increasing \$129,347, largely due to the flat revenues from court fines and fees and potential costs to relocate from the Public Safety Building.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommended budget is as requested by the department head.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The AOC's timeline to commence construction of the New Redding Courthouse has been delayed until at least 2014-15. The County's holding over in the Public Safety Building was extended to December 31, 2013; with the timing of the new courthouse still uncertain, the County will seek to amend the holding over in the Public Safety Building until December 2014. Future budgets will be impacted by the need to provide alternative office space for both Probation and Sheriff staff and operations during the construction of the new courthouse and the remodel of the existing courthouse.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

This budget was prepared by the County Administrative Office.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

CONFLICT PUBLIC DEFENSE
 Fund 0060 General, Budget Unit 203
 Lawrence G. Lees, County Executive Officer

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 203 - CONFL PUBLIC DEFENDER (FUND 0060)
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$9,863	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$18,266	\$14,986	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,000
Total Revenues:	\$28,130	\$14,986	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,000
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$1,854,450	\$1,892,086	\$2,357,905	\$2,357,905	\$2,357,905
OTHER CHARGES	\$17,879	\$26,352	\$35,616	\$35,616	\$35,616
APPROP FOR CONTINGENCY	\$0	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$1,872,329	\$1,918,438	\$2,643,521	\$2,643,521	\$2,643,521
Net Cost:	\$1,844,199	\$1,903,452	\$2,629,521	\$2,629,521	\$2,629,521

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Conflict Public Defense budget funds competent legal representation for persons unable to afford counsel in certain kinds of cases where life or liberty is at stake. Primary legal services are provided by staff in the County's Public Defender Office (Budget unit 207). 2011 Realignment, signed by the Governor on April 4, 2011 and effective October 1, 2011, requires the Public Defender to provide defense for Probation, Mandatory Supervision, and Post Release Community Supervision Revocation Hearings. Effective July 1, 2013, this will also include most Parole Revocation Hearings as well. For cases in which the Public Defender must declare a legal conflict of interest, a local, private attorney provides services through a single contract (Budget unit 203). Federal and State laws mandate that these services be provided, however, the cost of providing legal counsel to indigent clients falls mainly to the County. In cases where both the Public Defender and local contracted public defender must declare a conflict, the courts will appoint an attorney.

BUDGET REQUESTS

The FY 2013-14 budget requests appropriations of \$2.64 million and projects revenue of \$14,000. The net county cost of this budget unit is anticipated at almost \$2.63 million, an increase of \$74,245, or 2.9 percent compared to FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget. The increase is due to increasing the Conflict Public Defender contract reimbursable expenses based on historical expenditures, \$10,000 in new appropriations to account for anticipated increase in revocation hearings effective July 1, 2013, and increased A-87 central services charges. This budget unit is anticipated to finish FY 2012-13 under budget by \$637,692, or 25 percent, primarily due to lower than anticipated investigation expenses and a projection to close the fiscal year without the need to expend the \$250,000 contingency. Therefore the Requested Budget also includes a roll-over budget of the \$250,000 contingency which is the historical amount budgeted from contingency reserve for investigative and court ordered costs outside of the County's control. In the event expenses exceed budget authority during the fiscal year, the Board will be asked to consider appropriating these contingency funds. Finally, as mentioned above, as part of 2011 Realignment (AB 109), the local Superior Courts will be responsible to hear nearly all revocation hearings

(parole, probation, Post Release Community Services, and Mandatory Supervision) effective July 1, 2013 and this includes a new responsibility for the County to staff the prosecution and defense functions for these revocation hearings. The Community Corrections Partnership Plan approved by the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee and the Board of Supervisors included \$10,000 in AB 109/2011 Realignment funds to fund revocation hearings that the County's Public Defender's Office may not be able to represent due to a potential conflict; these funds are carried over from FY 2012-13.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommended budget is as requested by the department head.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Expenditures for the conflict public defense are difficult to predict due to the nature of the Court-ordered expenses in which the County has no discretion or control. FY 2009-10 saw indigent defense costs increase dramatically with the conclusion of one death penalty case. The defense costs for this one case alone exceeded three million dollars since FY 2005-06. The FY 2013-14 Requested Budget assumes no new death penalty cases. Should one or more new death penalty cases be assigned in Shasta County, then the cost of this budget could rise dramatically.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

This budget was prepared by the County Administrative Office.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
 Fund 0060 General, Budget Unit 207
 Jeffrey E. Gorder, Public Defender

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 207 - PUBLIC DEFENDER (FUND 0060)
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$53,568	\$69,723		\$132,525	\$132,525
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$31,624	\$26,261		\$25,000	\$25,000
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$0	\$668		\$0	\$0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$0	\$0		\$6,192	\$6,192
Total Revenues:	\$85,193	\$96,652		\$163,717	\$163,717
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$2,496,920	\$2,775,245		\$2,912,982	\$2,912,982
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$522,695	\$578,026		\$518,687	\$518,687
OTHER CHARGES	\$72,955	\$73,981		\$60,764	\$60,764
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	(\$11,630)	\$0		\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$3,080,941	\$3,427,253		\$3,492,433	\$3,492,433
Net Cost:	\$2,995,747	\$3,330,600		\$3,328,716	\$3,328,716

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Public Defender budget unit funds competent legal representation for persons unable to afford counsel in certain kinds of cases where life or liberty is at stake. Primary legal services are provided by staff in the County's Public Defender Office and, for cases in which the Public Defender must declare a legal conflict of interest, by local, private attorneys through a single contract for services. Although the Public Defender has always provided defense for Probation Revocation Hearings, the 2011 Realignment legislation, signed by the Governor on April 4, 2011 and effective October 1, 2011, requires the Public Defender to now also provide defense for Mandatory Supervision and Post Release Community Supervision Revocation Hearings. Effective July 1, 2013, this will also include most state Parole Revocation Hearings as well.

Federal and State laws mandate that these services be provided, however, the cost of providing legal counsel to indigent clients falls mainly to the County.

BUDGET REQUESTS

The FY 2013-14 budget requests appropriations of \$3.57 million, which is \$76,821, or 2.2 percent, more than the \$3.49 million FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget. Revenues are requested at \$163,732, which is \$72,129, or 78.7 percent, more than the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget. This increase is solely due to 2011 Realignment revenue from the state which partially funds required work for revocation hearings, as well as an additional 2011 Realignment revenue allocation from the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) Executive Committee to help fully fund one attorney position and a part-time, extra-help social worker position; \$6,192 is from Probation Department 2011 Realignment/AB109 Restricted fund balance and so is shown as a Tran-in from Probation in the budget. The net county cost is requested at \$3.40 million, which is nearly identical to the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget net county cost. In addition, due to thoughtful and efficient operations throughout the year the department projects \$118,641 in savings at the end of FY 2012-13.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommends a decrease in expenditures and net county cost of \$80,000 because the high profile, complex securities fraud case the department has been handling is estimated to conclude at the end of FY 2012-13. The CEO and department head agreed to reductions in extra-help, Professional Investigation Services, Information Technology charges, and Transportation and Travel that total \$80,000. The CEO and the department head both acknowledge that costs could increase in this budget due to new case filings.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The department has been assigned a very complex securities' fraud case that has required the full-time commitment of one attorney and one investigator. Professional forensic accountant services were required in the defense of this case, as well as out-of-state expert witnesses. This case is being prosecuted by the state Attorney General's Office. Because the department has never defended a white collar crime of this magnitude, the department received an additional General Fund allocation of \$250,000 to fund several affected expenditure accounts such as Professional Investigative Services which were necessary to prepare for this case. The case went to trial in March of 2013 and is it is estimated it may conclude by May 2013, though it is difficult to predict.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

The department head concurs with this budget as recommended.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

GRAND JURY
 Fund 0060 General, Budget Unit 208
 Lawrence G. Lees, County Executive Officer

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 208 - GRAND JURY (FUND 0060)
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$20	\$0		\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$20	\$0		\$0	\$0
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$64,938	\$70,614		\$76,707	\$76,707
OTHER CHARGES	\$265	\$43,431		\$36,078	\$36,078
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$65,204	\$114,045		\$112,785	\$112,785
Net Cost:	\$65,184	\$114,045		\$112,785	\$112,785

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Grand Jury is selected each year by the Superior Court to investigate and report on the operations, accounts and records of the officers, departments, or functions of the County, and/or cities. The Grand Jury investigates aspects of county and city government's functions and duties, county and city departments, county and city officials, service districts, and special districts funded in whole or in part by public monies. The Grand Jury also reviews criminal investigations and returns indictments for crimes committed in the county and may bring formal accusations against public officials for willful misconduct or corruption in office.

BUDGET REQUESTS

This budget funds Grand Jury expenses including mileage, per diem, training, and other transportation costs. Also included are modest allocations for office expense, non-legal services, professional services and an allocation for the payment of rent for office space specifically for the Grand Jury. This space allows Grand Jury members a private place to meet and store materials.

The FY 2013-14 requested budget is essentially status quo with the exception of a 17 percent reduction in A-87 Central Service Costs. The requested net county cost is \$112,785.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommended budget is as requested by the department head.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

None.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

This budget was prepared by the County Administrative Office.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

PUBLIC SAFETY-GENERAL REVENUE
Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 220

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 220 - PUBLIC SAFETY GEN REVENUES (FUND 0195)
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: POLICE PROTECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	\$60,754	\$34,595		\$50,000	\$50,000
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$2,226,819	\$960,641		\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$2,287,574	\$995,236		\$50,000	\$50,000
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$2,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$2,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$0
Net Cost:	(\$287,574)	(\$995,236)		(\$50,000)	(\$50,000)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Public Safety General Revenue budget unit reflects revenue or charges allocated to the Public Safety Fund as a result of cash flow needs. The Auditor-Controller recognizes Proposition 172 revenue in excess of budget appropriations here, prior to designating it in the Public Safety Fund Balance for future appropriation by the Board of Supervisors.

BUDGET REQUESTS

The Public Safety fund group anticipates interest earnings of \$50,000 in the fund for FY 2013-14.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommended budget is the same as the requested budget.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The timing of payments to and from outside agencies often results in negative cash within the Public Safety Fund. Each of the departments has worked to stay current on billing for services and no grant funds are disbursed to outside agencies prior to receipt of the offsetting revenue. The Auditor-Controller changed the transfer-in of the General Fund contribution to the first of the month which has also helped improve the cash flow in this fund.

Sales tax revenue from Public Safety Augmentation (Proposition 172) is distributed to counties based on their percentage of statewide sales tax collection. In FY 2012-13, the County's pro-rata share of statewide sales tax declined from 0.005211 to 0.004889, our lowest share in ten years. The final Prop 172 receipt is not received until August, but based on receipts to date it is projected to just make our target budget. Year-to-date receipts are just over 1 percent ahead of the prior year.

When receipts exceed the budget we have utilized one-half of the excess to repay a loan from the General Reserve to the Public Safety Fund in 2009. Accordingly, \$1,629,801.60 has been repaid; the balance remaining on this loan is \$370,198.40.

The balance in the Prop 172 Reserve at June 30, 2012 was \$1,928,840. The CEO has authorized the use of \$507,854 of the Reserve in the FY 2013-14 budget to offset additional operating expense for the new Juvenile Rehabilitation Facility.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

Not applicable.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

COUNTY CLERK/REGISTRAR OF VOTERS-COUNTY CLERK
Fund 0060 General, Budget Unit 221
Catherine Darling Allen, County Clerk/Registrar of Voters

State Controller Schedules
County Budget Act
January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
Governmental Funds
Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 221 - COUNTY CLERK (FUND 0060)
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: OTHER PROTECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
LICENSES, PERMITS & FRANCHISES	\$50,149	\$50,930	\$56,000	\$56,000	\$56,000
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$123,505	\$120,547	\$136,068	\$136,068	\$136,068
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$15	\$10	\$100	\$100	\$100
Total Revenues:	\$173,669	\$171,488	\$192,168	\$192,168	\$192,168
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$208,852	\$206,326	\$230,168	\$230,168	\$230,168
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$39,889	\$39,664	\$40,754	\$40,754	\$40,754
OTHER CHARGES	\$8,186	\$12,954	\$19,884	\$19,884	\$19,884
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$256,928	\$258,944	\$290,806	\$290,806	\$290,806
Net Cost:	\$83,258	\$87,455	\$98,638	\$98,638	\$98,638

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This budget unit funds the mandated duties required of the County Clerk. These functions include issuing marriage licenses, fictitious business name filings, and passport applications that cannot be performed by any other office.

BUDGET REQUEST

The FY 2013-14 requested budget includes expenditures in the amount of \$290,806 and revenues in the amount of \$192,168 which results in a status quo budget as compared to the FY 2012-13 adjusted budget. The requested budget meets the status quo budget requirement.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO concurs with the requested budget.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

None.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

The department head concurs with this budget as recommended.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 227
Steven S. Carlton, District Attorney

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 227 - DISTRICT ATTORNEY (FUND 0195)
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$303,076	\$351,921	\$116,439	\$116,439	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$2,058,165	\$1,932,688	\$1,959,041	\$1,959,041	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$112,320	\$97,610	\$119,000	\$119,000	
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$70,407	\$4,880	\$88,000	\$88,000	
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$3,242,999	\$3,562,782	\$3,562,990	\$3,562,990	
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE C/A	\$646	\$185	\$0	\$0	
Total Revenues:	\$5,787,615	\$5,950,068	\$5,845,470	\$5,845,470	
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$5,466,020	\$5,549,206	\$5,823,884	\$5,823,884	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$1,016,468	\$955,229	\$1,064,614	\$1,064,614	
OTHER CHARGES	\$266,543	\$296,397	\$308,461	\$308,461	
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$6,648	\$29,839	\$0	\$0	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	(\$977,240)	(\$968,848)	(\$920,554)	(\$920,554)	
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$5,778,440	\$5,861,824	\$6,276,405	\$6,276,405	
Net Cost:	(\$9,174)	(\$88,243)	\$430,935	\$430,935	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of the District Attorney is responsible for investigating, charging, and prosecuting all criminal violations in the County on behalf of the people of the State of California. The department evaluates all reported crimes to determine if sufficient evidence exists to prosecute. In those cases where there is a finding of sufficient evidence, a criminal complaint is filed and prosecution proceeds. The District Attorney is also required to file petitions and attend court proceedings involving criminal activities of juveniles. The office provides legal advice to the Grand Jury and conducts investigations and presents evidence for all indictments issued by the Grand Jury.

BUDGET REQUESTS

Total FY 2013-14 requested appropriations are almost \$6.23 million. Salaries and Benefits are increasing slightly by \$121,435, or 2.1 percent, from \$5.7 million to \$5.8 million primarily due to a decrease in unallocated salary savings (\$493,690 to \$476,804) and increases in extra-help, retirement, and Other Post Employment Benefit costs. One Chief Deputy District Attorney, two District Attorney Investigators and one Deputy Chief Investigator will be held vacant throughout the fiscal year in order to achieve the unallocated salary savings. Services and Supplies is increasing \$100,606, or 10.5 percent, primarily due increases in areas such as Office Expense, Professional and Special Services, Information Technology (IT) charges, and Special Department Expense. The department is working on scanning paper case files in to an electronic database (saving hard case files storage costs) which the attorneys can access in Court on laptops. The attorneys can also use the laptops to access and work on case files when they are out of the office. This increases the efficient use of attorney's time and helps mitigate the need for additional attorney positions, even though case filings are on the rise. However, it also contributes to

higher IT charges. These increases are primarily due to a 28% in felony case filings and 12% increase in overall case filings. Central Service A-87 charges will increase by \$11,676 (3.9 percent) from \$296,785 to \$308,461.

Cost Applied accounts are the mechanism for charging back expenses incurred on behalf of other County departments. They serve to reduce the operating expense of the department. Charge-backs include: Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) - Social Services, for provision of welfare fraud and in-home supportive services fraud investigation and prosecution; and Miscellaneous General for the Illegal Dumping Prevention Program. The Sheriff is charged back for provision of blood alcohol testing services. In total, the District Attorney's requested budget includes \$988,042 in cost-applied credits, a decrease of \$17,121, or 1.7 percent.

Revenue streams continue to be challenged. The County General Fund contribution remains status quo at almost \$3.53 million, and includes funding for the state mandated Child Abduction program. This program was previously funded in arrears by the SB 90 state mandated reimbursement process, which was sporadic. On March 1, 2011, the Board approved an update to County Administrative Policy 2-101 which requires all SB 90 state mandated reimbursement payments to be deposited in to the General Fund instead of being recognized in individual department budgets. Proposition 172 revenues are decreasing by 3 percent, from \$1,115,492 to \$1,081,332 as receipts are projected to decline in FY 2013-14. 2011 Realignment (AB 109) revenue to fund Post Release Community Supervision revocation hearings is increased from \$61,603 in the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget to \$116,164 in the FY 2013-14 Requested Budget, an increase of 88.6 percent; however this includes an augmentation from the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC) in the amount of \$50,000 (which includes use of Probation's AB109 Restricted fund balance in the amount of \$4,553, shown as a Trans-in from Probation). All Vertical Prosecution state revenue has been permanently cut as a result of the Governor's FY 2011-12 Trigger Cuts; although at one time funded at above \$200,000 annually (FY 2007-08 \$238,776), now this equates to an annual loss of approximately \$80,000. Total revenues are requested at the same level as the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget, \$5.8 million. The Department requests use of the Public Safety fund balance in the amount of \$388,954, an increase of \$216,328, or 125.3 percent, from the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget of \$172,626.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommends the department increase unallocated salary savings by \$72,747, to offset a commensurate recommended reduction in the HHSA cost-applied needed to balance with the HHSA - Social Services budget. Additionally, the CEO recommends some increases in Salaries and Benefits to match the Salaries and Benefits worksheet, and to amounts budgeted in cost-applieds (by \$30,000 for blood alcohol testing) and trans-in (by \$11,000 for SINTF program) in order to balance with the Sheriff's budgets. The final result will be an increase in approved use of Public Safety fund balance from \$388,954 to \$430,935. This will make this budget over the FY 2013-14 status quo budget target by \$223,760. The department has offered up \$89,000 in additional FY 2012-13 projected budget savings to help offset this increase.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

General Fund and Proposition 172 revenues continue to stay flat or decline and constitute 79.2 percent of the District Attorney's total revenues. The CCPEC approved FY 2013-14 funding augmentations in the District Attorney's (and Public Defender's) budgets as they will be responsible to staff nearly all revocation hearings beginning July 1, 2013 as part of the continued transfer of state responsibilities to counties; this will include all Mandatory Supervision, all Post Release Community Supervision, and most of state Parole's revocation hearings, as well as the Probation revocation hearings they have always staffed. The CCPEC augmented this revenue because the 2011 Realignment allocation the District Attorney (and Public Defender) receive from the state (which is separate from the CCP allocation) is only about half the amount necessary to fund one full-time attorney and does not include any funding for support staff, training, equipment, supplies, etc. The state and a nine-member CEO workgroup are currently working on new CCP and DA/DPD permanent funding allocation methodologies for FY 2014-15 and beyond, as well as 2011 Realignment growth allocations (however, the state Department of Finance has the authority to

make the final determination on the growth allocations). The Governor's 2012 November ballot initiative, called the Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act of 2012, which included a temporary increase in the state sales tax rate and income tax for people earning over \$250,000 annually in order to fund education and a Constitutional Amendment to protect realignment funding for counties, was approved by the voters on November 6, 2012. The Constitutional Amendment protects the state funding source for 2011 Realignment revenue which comes from Vehicle License Fees (VLF) in the statewide amount of \$453.4 million (\$300 million freed up by an additional \$12 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) and \$153.4 million that was previously dedicated to cities and Orange County for general purpose use) and 1.0625% of the state's sales and use tax (SUT) that would have ordinarily gone to the state general fund. Both of these funding sources, though now constitutionally protected, are not stable, as receipts are directly related to the health of the economy. The state has projected that the statewide revenue for 2011 Realignment will grow, as the AB109 population grows, through FY 2013-14, and will then decline slightly and stabilize in FY 2014-15 as the AB109 population stabilizes, should the realigned programs be successful in reducing recidivism. In order for the funding amounts to grow statewide the state would have to dedicate more of its SUT to the 2011 realigned programs, i.e., the 1.0625% would need to be increased. The District Attorney and his staff are to be commended for working proactively towards difficult budget solutions that protect public safety and the fiscal health of the County during one of the biggest shifts in public safety responsibilities in recent history.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

As an elected official the District Attorney reserves the right to appeal the CEO recommendations.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES
Fund 0192 Child Support Services, Budget Unit 228
Terri M. Love, Director of Child Support Services

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 228 - CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES (FUND 0192)
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	\$19,941	\$10,267	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$6,949,416	\$6,924,728	\$7,720,627	\$7,720,627	\$7,720,627
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$592	\$186	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$71,247	\$53,436	\$35,624	\$35,624	\$35,624
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE C/A	\$0	\$1,545	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$7,041,197	\$6,990,162	\$7,776,251	\$7,776,251	\$7,776,251
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$5,302,524	\$5,260,494	\$6,071,872	\$6,071,872	\$6,071,872
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$1,519,498	\$1,564,496	\$1,587,520	\$1,587,520	\$1,587,520
OTHER CHARGES	\$205,802	\$152,403	\$143,358	\$143,358	\$143,358
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$17,469	\$33,686	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$7,045,294	\$7,011,080	\$7,802,750	\$7,802,750	\$7,802,750
Net Cost:	\$4,096	\$20,918	\$26,499	\$26,499	\$26,499

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) provides the following services to the public: 1) establishment of paternity, 2) location of absent parents, 3) establishment of child and medical support orders, 4) modification and enforcement of existing child/medical support orders, 5) collection and distribution of child support monies pursuant to federal and state regulations, and 6) public outreach, to ensure awareness and accessibility to Child Support services.

In 2012, the department took a new collaborative negotiation family conference approach to establishing orders. Parents are invited to the DCSS office to meet with a Child Support Specialist trained in court order negotiation. These parents work together to come up with an agreeable support order amount. The family conference agreements prevent the parents from having to appear in court to have a judicial officer make the decision. This frees up valuable court time for more difficult matters that require judicial assistance.

In addition to traditional court ordered remedies, DCSS utilizes all other collection tools made available by legislation and regulation. These include, but are not limited to, the following intercept programs: federal income tax, state income tax, state sales tax, unemployment benefit, disability benefit, workers' compensation benefit, social security benefit, and lottery winnings. Along with the Franchise Tax Board's full collection service, other enforcement programs include the State Licensing Match System (SLMS) which now includes fishing and hunting licenses, New Employee Registry (NER) match system, and the Employment Development Department (EDD) match system. DCSS may issue administrative wage withholding orders and bank levies. Currently, more than 65 percent of DCSS' total collections are through wage withholding orders.

DCSS continues to increase efficiencies through technology. Paper case files are nonexistent, with all documents scanned into the statewide-automated system and use of laptops in court provides attorneys full access to automated child support case files. Customer service remains an important focus demonstrated by walk-in service, with no appointment required, lobby wait time of 10 minutes or less, and telephone calls returned within 24 hours. Shasta DCSS is a regional call center and a regional training center. The Call Center is focused on a 90/10 resolution rate, with only 10 percent or less of the calls being referred for further action.

The primary source of the funding to support operations is from by the federal government (66 percent), with a 34 percent state share-of-cost of all authorized federal Title IV-D expenditures, as long as the local agency is in compliance with current program standards.

BUDGET REQUESTS

This is essentially a status quo budget request, slightly decreased from the 2012-13 Adjusted Budget; the final state allocation letter will not be received until the governor signs the budget. FY 2013-14 requested appropriations are approximately \$7.8 million, a slight decrease of \$49,123 (0.63 percent) compared to the previous year's adjusted budget appropriation. Salaries and Benefits are status quo at just over \$6 million. The Department has reviewed vacant positions and requests five positions to be deleted in FY 2013-14: Supervising Child Support Specialist, Child Support Specialist I/II, Legal Secretary, Accounting Technician, and Account Clerk III. Revenues are estimated to be almost \$7.8 million at the approved Federal and State share ratios. No County General Fund support is requested.

In the midst of flat budgets and a decrease in staffing the department collected over \$19 million in FY 2011-12 in current child support and arrears payments. The department has an open caseload of over 13,127 cases; of these 25 percent are active Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) cases, 58 percent are former TANF, and 17 percent have never received TANF benefits.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

With some minor technical adjustments, budget is recommended as requested by the department. Any changes necessitated by their conditionally approved state budget will be made after the adoption of the final budget.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The Governor has proposed that counties assume responsibilities for the state's Child Support Services program in Phase II of his Realignment Proposal. There is little information or detail available on Phase II of his Phase II Realignment Proposal. The federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act will have some impact on the Child Support Program; however, the extent of the impact is still unknown. The state DCSS and the California Child Support Directors Association have formed a workgroup to analyze the effects of the federal health care reform legislation.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

The department head concurs with the budget as recommended.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

SHERIFF/CORONER-SHERIFF PATROL/ADMINISTRATION
 Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 235
 Tom Bosenko, Sheriff/Coroner

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 235 - SHERIFF (FUND 0195)
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: POLICE PROTECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
LICENSES, PERMITS & FRANCHISES	\$68,518	\$115,205	\$64,300	\$64,300	
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$1,097,028	\$552,219	\$100	\$100	
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	(\$732)	\$0	\$0	\$0	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$9,255,864	\$9,419,612	\$8,429,445	\$8,429,445	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$2,803,498	\$2,714,408	\$2,611,164	\$2,611,164	
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$68,353	\$92,590	\$77,000	\$77,000	
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$4,773,227	\$4,428,832	\$4,491,473	\$4,491,473	
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE C/A	\$58,720	\$80,740	\$2,500	\$2,500	
Total Revenues:	\$18,124,478	\$17,403,609	\$15,675,982	\$15,675,982	
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$11,455,113	\$11,915,476	\$12,817,828	\$12,817,828	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$2,371,129	\$2,647,236	\$2,873,800	\$2,873,800	
OTHER CHARGES	\$1,613,412	\$1,827,077	\$1,490,360	\$1,490,360	
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$473,566	\$778,387	\$139,874	\$139,874	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	(\$72,129)	(\$19,794)	(\$4,500)	(\$4,500)	
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$255,518	\$98,330	\$54,364	\$54,364	
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$16,096,610	\$17,246,714	\$17,371,726	\$17,371,726	
Net Cost:	(\$2,027,868)	(\$156,894)	\$1,695,744	\$1,695,744	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Sheriff's Office is organized into four major divisions and the Coroner's Office as follows: Custody, Services, Patrol, and Investigations. The Burney Station, Boating Safety, Animal Control, Dispatch and Civil functions are contained in separate budget units but may also serve in the areas of custody, services, patrol and investigations.

The 235 budget unit includes all activities of the Redding Area Patrol, Investigations, and Services Division, as well as the Office of the Sheriff. Activities included for the Patrol Division are: Patrol for the county (with the exception of the Intermountain area patrol which is a separate Sheriff budget), Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT), Sexual Assault Enforcement Team (SAFE), the City of Shasta Lake enforcement unit, Federal Campground Patrol contract, Bureau of Land Management/Bureau of Reclamation patrol contract, Abandoned Vehicle Services, Redding Basin school officers, and the Drug and Alcohol Resistance Education (DARE) program.

Activities included for the Services Division are: Crime Analysis, Records, Warrants, Training, Recruitment, Emergency Services (including search and rescue), Integrated Public Safety Systems, and the Court Officer.

The Office of the Sheriff includes the administrative and accounting units, as well as grants administration.

The Investigations Division includes two major sub-divisions: Major Crimes including the Crime Lab and Elder Abuse Program; and Drug Task Forces including Anti-Drug Abuse (ADA) Shasta Interagency Narcotics Task Force (SINTF), California Multi-jurisdictional Methamphetamine Enforcement Team (CAL-MMET), the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA), and the Marijuana Investigation Team which has cooperative funding agreements with the United States Forest Service (USFS), United States Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), and Federal Block Grant funding under the Marijuana Suppression Program (MSP), and HIDTA.

BUDGET REQUESTS

The requested appropriations for FY 2013-14 total a little over \$17.5 million, a 8.1 percent, or \$1,542,066, decrease from the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget. Salaries and Benefits are increased by \$153,791, or 1.2 percent, and a net of one additional unfunded, vacant position transferred from the Burney budget (one full-time Sergeant). There are also two add/deletes of vacant positions requested in FY 2013-14: delete one Integrated Public Safety Programmer I/II/III and add one Agency Staff Services Analyst I/II; and delete one Legal Process Clerk I/II and add one Typist Clerk I/II. There are no unallocated salary savings requested in FY 2013-14. The Sheriff would very much like to request additional Deputy Sheriff position allocations in future years as funding becomes available. Services and Supplies have decreased 10.2 percent, or \$322,367, primarily due to decreases in special department expense, minor equipment, information technology professional services, professional and special services, and liability insurance for experience. Expenditures that increased were communications expense, miscellaneous insurance, maintenance of equipment for radios and vehicles, information technology charges for hardware, facilities management charges for maintenance of structures, professional pre-employment services, rents and leases, and fleet and fuel costs. Other Charges have decreased 31.1 percent, or \$672,514, due to decreases in contributions to other agencies and counties due to the dissolution of CAL-MMET programs (reduced by \$587,576, from \$1.58 million to \$995,155) and decreases in Central Services (A-87) charges by \$84,938, from \$580,143 to \$495,205. Intrafund Transfers have decreased by 49.8 percent, or \$4,469, from \$8,969 in the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget to \$4,500. Other Financing Uses expenditures have decreased by \$13,618 (20 percent) from \$67,982 to \$54,364 due to decreases in the SINTF and SAFE programs, as well as the deletion of one-time trans-out to the Burney substation (\$7,000) and the Coroner (\$1,452) in FY 2012-13. There is only one requested capital asset which is a rebudget of the automated fingerprint identification system upgrade in the amount of \$139,874; it is estimated the project will be complete in FY 2012-13 but there are some consultant retention payments that may not be made until FY 2013-14.

Requested Revenue totals just over \$15.5 million, including a Public Safety Augmentation (Prop. 172) allocation of \$5.9 million (3.5 percent decrease) and a 2.6 percent decrease in General Fund support from \$4.3 million to \$4.2 million. The Sheriff has been very conservative with his FY 2013-14 revenue projections. Overall requested revenue has decreased 9.1 percent, or \$1.56 million, in a large part due to expected reductions or elimination of federal revenues such as Anti-Drug Abuse, SINTF, and marijuana suppression grants. The state Remote Access Network (RAN) and Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) local fee statutory authority expired on December 31, 2011 and so this revenue was deleted from the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget going forward in the amounts of \$180,000 and \$80,000 respectively. Both programs will continue in FY 2013-14 as sources for new funding is researched; RAN should have sufficient funding through the end of FY 2013-14 (the RAN Board is aware and is working on the issue) by use of Restricted fund balance, and AVA by contracted vehicle recycling revenues. Charges for Services is decreased by \$98,526 (3.6 percent) primarily due to a 57.2 percent decrease in charges to the federal government for marijuana eradication contract revenue but there is a small 2.5 percent (\$57,000) increase in the City of Shasta Lake contract revenue. Miscellaneous Revenues is decreased 47.7 percent from \$147,147 to \$77,000 solely due to a decrease in the RAN Trust Fund. Other Financing Trans-In revenue has decreased \$217,977 (4.7 percent), from \$4.59 million to \$4.37 million in FY 2012-13 due to decreases in General Fund support, a Title III grant, and Public Health Tran-In which represents Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Homeland Security revenues (decreased from \$192,355 to \$116,461).

Overall, total expenditures exceed total revenue by \$1.95 million, a one percent increase from the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget. The Sheriff request use of the Public Safety fund in the amount of \$1.95 million to balance this budget; of this amount \$752,114 is from use of Sheriff's various Restricted accounts leaving \$1,202,354 to be funded from Public Safety fund balance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommends adding \$159,263 in unallocated salary savings (one full-time deputy and normal turnover) to decrease Salaries and Benefits by that same amount. The CEO recommends various minor changes to Services and Supplies which nets a reduction in the amount of \$29,890. Finally, the CEO recommends an increase in General Fund support in the amount of \$112,000 to fund a deputy sheriff dedicated to assisting with enforcing the County's medical marijuana ordinance (with related Services and Supplies for the new law enforcement officer funded by Public Safety fund balance; a vacant deputy sheriff position will be funded instead of adding a new position allocation), along with a few other revenue adjustments which altogether increase revenue in the amount of \$129,351. The CEO's recommended changes will decrease the use of Public Safety fund balance in the amount of \$258,724, for a net use of the Public Safety fund balance in FY 2013-14 in the amount of \$943,630.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

General Fund and Proposition 172 revenues continue to stay flat or decline and constitute 65.2 percent of this Sheriff's budget's total revenues. The state and a nine-member CEO workgroup are currently working on new AB 109 permanent funding allocation methodologies for FY 2014-15 and beyond, as well as 2011 Realignment growth allocations (however, the state Department of Finance has the authority to make the final determination on the growth allocations). The Governor's 2012 November ballot initiative, called the Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act of 2012, which included a temporary increase in the state sales tax rate and income tax for people earning over \$250,000 annually in order to fund education and a Constitutional Amendment to protect realignment funding for counties, was approved by the voters on November 6, 2012. The Constitutional Amendment protects the state funding source for 2011 Realignment revenue which comes from Vehicle License Fees (VLF) in the statewide amount of \$453.4 million (\$300 million freed up by an additional \$12 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) and \$153.4 million that was previously dedicated to cities and Orange County for general purpose use) and 1.0625% of the state's sales and use tax (SUT) that would have ordinarily gone to the state general fund. Both of these funding sources, though now constitutionally protected, are not stable, as receipts are directly related to the health of the economy. The state has projected that the statewide revenue for 2011 Realignment will grow, as the AB109 population grows, through FY 2013-14, and will then decline slightly and stabilize in FY 2014-15 as the AB109 population stabilizes, should the realigned programs be successful in reducing recidivism. In order for the funding amounts to grow statewide the state would have to dedicate more of its SUT to the 2011 realigned programs, i.e., the 1.0625% would need to be increased. The Sheriff and his staff are to be commended for working proactively towards difficult budget solutions that protect public safety and the fiscal health of the County during one of the biggest and most challenging public safety changes in decades.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

As an elected official the Sheriff reserves the right to appeal the CEO recommendations.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

SHERIFF / CORONER-BOATING SAFETY
 Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 236
 Tom Bosenko, Sheriff/Coroner

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 236 - BOATING SAFETY (FUND 0195)
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: POLICE PROTECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
TAXES	\$112,682	\$90,622		\$86,872	\$86,872
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$633,921	\$701,865		\$625,678	\$625,678
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$10	\$0		\$0	\$0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$104,220	\$84,219		\$84,220	\$84,220
Total Revenues:	\$850,834	\$876,708		\$796,770	\$796,770
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$535,986	\$478,180		\$514,276	\$514,276
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$259,530	\$265,688		\$273,340	\$273,340
OTHER CHARGES	\$41,523	\$12,038		\$9,154	\$9,154
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$0	\$74,488		\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$837,040	\$830,395		\$796,770	\$796,770
Net Cost:	(\$13,794)	(\$46,313)		\$0	\$0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Boating Safety function of the Sheriff's Office is responsible for law enforcement, boating safety, and search and rescue activities on all waterways in Shasta County, except Whiskeytown Lake. The State Department of Boating and Waterways provides the majority of funding for this program but will not pay for central service (A-87) costs, Workers Compensation experience expense, liability or property insurance, Information Technology services, recruitment and basic equipping of officers, cellular telephone costs, or certain office expenses. Once these costs are deducted, the balance is reduced by the amount of anticipated boat tax. The remainder is funded by the State, Proposition 172 and General Fund revenue.

BUDGET REQUESTS

Total appropriations requested for FY 2013-14 are \$796,770, a 12.2 percent decrease from FY 2012-13, primarily due to a 100 percent decrease (from \$74,489 to zero) in Capital Assets requests as the state funded the purchase of a replacement boat and trailer in FY 2012-13; but also decreases in Salaries and Benefits, Services and Supplies, and A-87 central services charges. Funding for this program comes from these sources: State Boating Safety funds (\$584,990), unsecured property tax levied on boats (\$86,872, down from \$113,947 in FY 2012-13), sales tax revenue dedicated to public safety (Proposition 172) (\$36,688, down from \$38,913 in FY 2012-13), federal excise tax (\$4,000) and a requested General Fund Transfer (\$84,220).

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommended budget is as requested by the Sheriff.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

There appears to be a downward trend in the receipt of unsecured property tax revenue. If this trend continues then it could ultimately impact the General Fund or the level of services provided.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

As an elected official the Sheriff reserves the right to appeal the CEO recommendations.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

SHERIFF CIVIL UNIT
 Fund 0060 General, Budget Unit 237
 Tom Bosenko, Sheriff/Coroner

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 237 - SHERIFF CIVIL UNIT (FUND 0060)
 Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
 Activity: POLICE PROTECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$183,045	\$187,186	\$156,550	\$156,550	
Total Revenues:	\$183,045	\$187,186	\$156,550	\$156,550	
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$382,924	\$372,719	\$393,983	\$393,983	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$75,903	\$75,627	\$100,096	\$100,096	
OTHER CHARGES	(\$35,913)	\$14,275	\$20,006	\$20,006	
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$422,915	\$462,623	\$514,085	\$514,085	
Net Cost:	\$239,869	\$275,437	\$357,535	\$357,535	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Sheriff Civil Unit has jurisdictional authority for the County of Shasta to provide prompt, efficient, and impartial delivery of Civil Process Services. The office also serves criminal warrants, performs general law enforcement, and assists in the security needs of county officials.

BUDGET REQUESTS

FY 2013-14 requested expenditures of \$514,085 have increased by \$10,648, or 2.1 percent, from the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget primarily due to increases in worker's compensation experience and A-87 Central Services costs. Services and Supplies will decrease by \$3,576, or 3.4 percent, primarily in Fleet Management charges, which helps to keep total expenditures down.

Requested revenues of \$156,550 represent a 4 percent decrease in Civil Process fees from the prior year. Many of the activities of the Civil Unit are required by the Court and fees for services do not fully cover 100 percent of this budget's costs; therefore, the net General Fund cost of this department is requested at \$357,535, an increase of \$17,098 or 5 percent. However projected savings at the end of FY 2012-13 in the amount of \$17,200, or 5 percent, satisfies the FY 2013-14 status quo budget target.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommended budget is as requested by the Sheriff.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

None.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

As an elected official the Sheriff reserves the right to appeal the CEO recommendations.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

SHERIFF / CORONER-DETENTION / WORK RELEASE PROGRAM
 Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 246
 Tom Bosenko, Sheriff/Coroner

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010 Edition, revision #1

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2013-14

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 246 - DETENTION ANNEX/WORK FACILITY (FUND 0195)
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: DETENTION AND CORRECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2011-12 Actuals	2012-13		2013-14 Recommended	2013-14 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$0	\$601,915		\$665,472	\$665,472
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$0	\$8,514		\$0	\$0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$14,350	\$14,349		\$14,350	\$14,350
Total Revenues:	\$14,350	\$624,780		\$679,822	\$679,822
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$6,628	\$131,822		\$577,309	\$577,309
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$23,106	\$104,778		\$162,728	\$162,728
OTHER CHARGES	(\$17,022)	(\$7,794)		(\$3,374)	(\$3,374)
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$0	\$32,373		\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$12,711	\$261,181		\$736,663	\$736,663
Net Cost:	(\$1,638)	(\$363,599)		\$56,841	\$56,841

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Detention Annex was formerly a minimum/medium security inmate housing facility and a work release facility. The inmate-housing program was closed on January 12, 2003, and the facility was operated as a work release facility. Since 2009 the detention annex facility has been used to house south county patrol and the work release program was closed due to the decline in County discretionary revenue and revenues dedicated to public safety. No inmates were housed in the facility and the work release program was provided on a reduced scale from the Main Jail in fiscal years 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12. Due to the expansion of the work release program as funded by the state's 2011 Realignment (AB 109) this cost center is now being activated once more and the work release program will be operated from the Sheriff's facilities located at the Breslauer Campus. However, the detention annex will continue to be used for south county patrol.

BUDGET REQUESTS

Total FY 2013-14 requested appropriations are \$736,787, a 8.8 percent decrease, or \$71,341, from the FY 2012-13 Requested Budget amount of \$808,128, primarily due to a 100% decrease in capital assets (\$82,770 in FY 2012-13). Salaries and Benefits are requested at \$577,309, a 2.2 percent increase, or \$12,524, compared to the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget. Services and Supplies are requested at \$162,852, compared to \$167,867 in FY 2012-13. Other Charges are increasing by \$3,920 primarily due to a 56.7 percent decrease in the A-87 Central Services charges credit. There are no new capital assets requested. The expanded work release program will be able to serve up to 500 participants in FY 2013-14.

Revenue is primarily from the AB 109 allocation expected from the state in FY 2013-14 in the amount of \$665,472 as approved by the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee. Requested

revenue also includes a transfer-in from the General Fund in the amount of \$14,350, the same amount included in the FY 2012-13 Adjusted Budget and this funds some run-out costs before this budget was converted to a solely AB 109 program. The net county cost in the amount of \$56,965 is funded with 100% Sheriff AB 109 Restricted fund balance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommends one minor technical change that decreases the net county cost by \$124 and other than that the budget is recommended as requested.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

None.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

As an elected official the Sheriff reserves the right to appeal the CEO recommendations.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.