

**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 2014-15

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14 Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
1	2	3	4	5
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$1,703,160	\$1,649,084	\$1,662,925	\$1,662,925
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	\$376	\$0	\$200	\$200
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$1,223,220	\$1,048,801	\$1,165,700	\$1,165,700
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$0	\$7,243	\$18,293	\$18,293
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$2,926,757</b>	<b>\$2,705,129</b>	<b>\$2,847,118</b>	<b>\$2,847,118</b>
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$10,452	\$11,108	(\$9,050)	(\$9,050)
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$627,946	\$667,364	\$1,668,732	\$1,668,732
OTHER CHARGES	\$1,301,838	\$1,240,577	\$1,222,517	\$1,222,517
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$618,333	\$617,809	\$623,125	\$623,125
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$2,558,570</b>	<b>\$2,536,859</b>	<b>\$3,505,324</b>	<b>\$3,505,324</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>(\$368,187)</b>	<b>(\$168,270)</b>	<b>\$658,206</b>	<b>\$658,206</b>

**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 2014-15 are \$3.5 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 \$2.8 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 before December 31, 2015.

The Net County Cost for this budget unit is essentially status quo at \$638,406.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The CEO recommended budget is as requested by the department head, with adjustments to facilities operation and maintenance line items due to the AOC's estimate for the Main Courthouse and Courthouse Annex.

**PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

The AOC's timeline to commence construction of the New Redding Courthouse has been delayed until at least 2015-16. The County's holding over in the Public Safety Building was extended to December 31, 2015. 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 2014-15

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14	2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$14,986	\$19,075	\$14,000	\$14,000
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$14,986</b>	<b>\$19,075</b>	<b>\$14,000</b>	<b>\$14,000</b>
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$1,892,086	\$1,842,059	\$2,409,282	\$2,409,282
OTHER CHARGES	\$26,352	\$35,615	\$31,631	\$31,631
APPROP FOR CONTINGENCY	\$0	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$1,918,438</b>	<b>\$1,877,675</b>	<b>\$2,690,913</b>	<b>\$2,690,913</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>\$1,903,452</b>	<b>\$1,858,600</b>	<b>\$2,676,913</b>	<b>\$2,676,913</b>

**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 also includes 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 2014-15 budget requests appropriations of \$2.6 million and projects revenue of \$14,000. The net county cost of this budget unit is anticipated at \$2.67 million, an increase of \$47,392, or 1.8 percent compared to FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget. This budget unit is anticipated to finish FY 2013-14 under budget by \$556,433, or 21.2 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.

**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 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 2014-15

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14	2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$69,723	\$186,145	\$128,123	\$128,123
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$26,261	\$30,645	\$25,000	\$25,000
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$668	\$1,048	\$61,433	\$61,433
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$0	\$6,192	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$96,652</b>	<b>\$224,032</b>	<b>\$214,556</b>	<b>\$214,556</b>
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$2,775,245	\$2,733,809	\$3,181,412	\$3,181,412
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$578,026	\$507,155	\$514,357	\$514,357
OTHER CHARGES	\$73,981	\$60,763	\$72,436	\$72,436
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$3,427,253</b>	<b>\$3,301,729</b>	<b>\$3,768,205</b>	<b>\$3,768,205</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>\$3,330,600</b>	<b>\$3,077,696</b>	<b>\$3,553,649</b>	<b>\$3,553,649</b>

**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 2014-15 budget requests appropriations of \$3.77 million, which is \$245,449, or 7 percent, more than the \$3.52 million FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget. Salaries and Benefits are requested at almost \$3.2 million, compared to \$2.94 million in the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget, primarily due to the one-time increase in Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), and standard increases in retirement and health insurance. Services and Supplies are requested at \$514,357, or 0.8 percent less than the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget amount of \$518,705. Central Services A-87 charges have increased 19.2 percent over the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget, from \$60,764 to \$72,436.

Revenues are requested at \$214,556, which is \$20,839, or 10.8 percent, more than the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget. This increase is due to a one-time Risk Management rate rebate in the amount of \$61,433. More importantly, there is a projected 48.9 percent decrease in Public Defender 2011 Realignment revenues, from \$162,525 to \$83,123, which includes estimated growth funds to be received in FY 2014-15 in the amount of \$17,782 (down from \$23,919 in FY 2013-14), along with a 31.2 percent

decrease in realignment revenue allocated from the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) Executive Committee in the amount of \$45,000 (from \$91,808 in FY 2013-14) to help fund an extra-help Social Worker position (\$36,000) and financial support to help fund one full-time attorney position and one full-time social worker position dedicated to realignment (\$9,000); the department is using \$87,877 in realignment restricted fund balance leaving a \$14,719 balance. The net county cost is requested at \$3.55 million, which is a 6.7 percent increase (\$224,610) from the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget. However, due to thoughtful and efficient operations throughout the year the department projects \$124,552 in savings at the end of FY 2013-14.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Except for two minor technical changes that do not change the net county cost, the CEO recommends the budget as requested by the department head, including extending the sunset date for the CCP-funded attorney to June 30, 2015.

**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.

**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 2014-15

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14		2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$0	\$195	\$0	\$0	
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$195</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$70,614	\$71,809	\$77,838	\$77,838	
OTHER CHARGES	\$43,431	\$36,078	\$11,972	\$11,972	
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$114,045</b>	<b>\$107,887</b>	<b>\$89,810</b>	<b>\$89,810</b>	
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>\$114,045</b>	<b>\$107,692</b>	<b>\$89,810</b>	<b>\$89,810</b>	

**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 2014-15 requested budget is essentially status quo budget with the exception of a 67 percent reduction in A-87 Central Service Costs. The requested net county cost is \$89,810.

**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 2014-15

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14	2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	\$34,595	\$60,562	\$25,000	\$25,000
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$960,641	\$1,630,293	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$995,236</b>	<b>\$1,690,855</b>	<b>\$25,000</b>	<b>\$25,000</b>
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>(\$995,236)</b>	<b>(\$1,690,855)</b>	<b>(\$25,000)</b>	<b>(\$25,000)</b>

**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 \$25,000 in the fund for FY 2014-15.

**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 may result 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. The County's pro-rata share of statewide sales tax for public safety has declined in each of the last two fiscal years and it is currently 0.004734, the lowest it has been since 2000-01. 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.

The Adjusted FY 2013-14 Budget authorized the Juvenile Rehabilitation Facility to utilize \$507,854 of the Prop 172 Reserve. The balance remaining is \$2,011,428. The CEO's Recommended FY 2014-15 Budget includes the following use of the Prop 172 Reserve:

Beginning Balance, 7/1/2013	<u>\$2,011,428</u>
FY 2013-14, Probation 263	\$ 267,337
FY 2014-15, Probation 263	\$ 481,966
FY 2014-15, District Attorney 227	\$ 271,880
FY 2014-15, Sheriff 235	\$ 56,129
FY 2014-15, Boating 236	\$ 7,307
FY 2014-15, Jail 260	\$ 874,897
FY 2014-15, Dispatch 288	<u>\$ 51,484</u>
Total Used	\$2,011,000
Ending Balance, 6/30/2015	\$ 428

**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 2014-15

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14 Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
1	2	3	4	5
LICENSES, PERMITS & FRANCHISES	\$50,930	\$53,915	\$53,000	\$53,000
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$120,547	\$135,445	\$136,200	\$136,200
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$10	\$288	\$5,239	\$5,239
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$171,488</b>	<b>\$189,649</b>	<b>\$194,439</b>	<b>\$194,439</b>
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$206,326	\$234,527	\$247,025	\$247,025
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$39,664	\$66,850	\$76,093	\$76,093
OTHER CHARGES	\$12,954	\$19,883	\$15,398	\$15,398
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$258,944</b>	<b>\$321,262</b>	<b>\$338,516</b>	<b>\$338,516</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>\$87,455</b>	<b>\$131,612</b>	<b>\$144,077</b>	<b>\$144,077</b>

**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 2014-15 requested budget includes expenditures in the amount of \$338,516 and revenues in the amount of \$194,439 which results in a net county cost of \$144,077. The net county cost is increasing by \$439 compared to the FY 2013-14 adjusted budget and the department plans to end FY 2013-14 under budget by \$7,960.

**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 2014-15

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14 Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
1	2	3	4	5
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$351,921	\$142,560	\$52,850	\$52,850
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$1,932,688	\$1,930,891	\$1,725,011	\$1,725,011
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$97,610	\$75,123	\$109,156	\$109,156
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$4,880	\$60,827	\$363,360	\$363,360
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$3,562,782	\$3,562,990	\$3,659,131	\$3,659,131
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE C/A	\$185	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$5,950,068</b>	<b>\$5,772,392</b>	<b>\$5,909,508</b>	<b>\$5,909,508</b>
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$5,549,206	\$5,716,244	\$6,516,779	\$6,516,779
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$955,229	\$1,008,731	\$1,205,362	\$1,205,362
OTHER CHARGES	\$296,397	\$308,460	\$258,947	\$258,947
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$29,839	\$15,656	\$0	\$0
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	(\$968,848)	(\$877,495)	(\$948,783)	(\$948,783)
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$5,861,824</b>	<b>\$6,171,597</b>	<b>\$7,032,305</b>	<b>\$7,032,305</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>(\$88,243)</b>	<b>\$399,204</b>	<b>\$1,122,797</b>	<b>\$1,122,797</b>

**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 2014-15 requested appropriations are almost \$6.97 million. Salaries and Benefits are increasing by \$692,895, or 11.9 percent, from \$5.8 million to \$6.5 million primarily due to a one-time increase in Other Post-Employment Benefit costs, but also a reduction in Unallocated Salary Savings (USS) as the District Attorney is requesting to fill more vacant positions due to the increase in case filings, especially felonies, from \$549,551 to \$304,765. One Chief District Attorney Investigator and two District Attorney Investigators will be held vacant throughout the fiscal year in order to achieve the USS. Additionally, the District Attorney is requesting to delete one Chief Deputy District Attorney position and one Accountant Auditor III position and to add one Deputy District Attorney I/II/III position and one Staff Services Manager position; this nets a fiscal year savings of \$20,270. Services and Supplies is increasing by \$138,711, or 13 percent, primarily due to increases in areas such as liability experience insurance charges, jury & witness expense, transportation & travel, and information technology costs associated with software upgrades due

to the pending loss of support for the Microsoft Windows® XP operating system (April 2014). Central Service A-87 charges will decrease by \$49,514 (16.1 percent) from \$308,461 to \$258,947.

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 (HHS) - 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 \$1,014,761 in cost-applied credits, an increase of \$94,207, or 10.2 percent.

Revenue streams continue to be challenged. The County General Fund contribution has increased 3 percent for FY 2014-15, from \$3.5 million to \$3.6 million, and includes funding for the state mandated Child Abduction program. Proposition 172 revenues have decreased by 21.9 percent, from \$1,081,332 to \$844,641 as receipts are projected to decline in FY 2014-15. 2011 Realignment (AB 109) revenue to fund Post Release Community Supervision revocation hearings is decreased from \$116,164 in the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget to \$83,123, a 28.4 percent decrease. However the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee (CCPEC) approved an augmentation in the amount of \$45,762 (which is requested as Trans-in from the Probation budget) and the District Attorney will use approximately \$42,094 is his Restricted AB109 fund balance. Total revenues are requested at almost \$5.9 million, a small increase of \$52,788 (0.9 percent) over the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget of \$5.8 million. This cost center has a budget deficit in the amount of \$1,071,070, of which \$42,094 is funded with AB109 Restricted fund balance, leaving a net county cost of \$1,028,976, an increase of \$628,025 (141.8 percent) compared to the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget (\$443,045). In addition, the Department projects returning \$848,877 to the Public Safety fund balance at the end of FY 2013-14 (a net of \$785,908 after accounting for AB109 restricted funds returned to fund balance).

#### **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The CEO recommends several technical budget changes that overall increase the net county cost to \$1,122,797, less \$42,094 in AB109 Restricted funds, leaving \$785,908 to be funded with FY 2013-14 projected savings, \$271,880 with Prop 172 Reserves, and \$22,915 with Public Safety fund balance.

#### **PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

The CCPEC approved FY 2013-14 funding augmentations in the District Attorney's (and Public Defender's) budgets as are responsible to staff nearly all revocation hearings beginning July 1, 2013 as part of the continued transfer of state responsibilities to counties; this includes 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 funding allocation methodology for FY 2014-15, as well as 2011 Realignment revenue growth allocations (however, the state Department of Finance has the authority to make the final determination on the growth allocation distribution). The Governor's 2012 November ballot initiative, called the Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act of 2012, included a Constitutional Amendment to protect realignment funding for counties and 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 decline in FY 2014-15, although the AB109 population has not declined or stabilized as the state originally predicted. 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 2014-15

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14 Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
1	2	3	4	5
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	\$10,267	\$13,784	\$5,000	\$5,000
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$6,924,728	\$6,929,130	\$7,722,123	\$7,722,123
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$186	\$10,174	\$150,574	\$150,574
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$53,436	\$35,624	\$17,812	\$17,812
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE C/A	\$1,545	\$4,750	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$6,990,162</b>	<b>\$6,993,462</b>	<b>\$7,895,509</b>	<b>\$7,895,509</b>
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$5,260,494	\$5,291,741	\$6,419,816	\$6,419,816
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$1,564,496	\$1,565,314	\$1,708,952	\$1,708,952
OTHER CHARGES	\$152,403	\$143,358	\$163,872	\$163,872
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$33,686	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$7,011,080</b>	<b>\$7,000,414</b>	<b>\$8,292,640</b>	<b>\$8,292,640</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>\$20,918</b>	<b>\$6,951</b>	<b>\$397,131</b>	<b>\$397,131</b>

**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. After over just one year of implementing the family conference approach to establishing orders, over 70 percent of parents are making agreements without the need to go to court.

Appearances in Tribal Court are made by the lead DCSS attorney, who has received special permission from this court. Enforcement remedies include, but are not limited to, the following intercept programs: federal income tax, state income tax, unemployment benefits, disability benefits, workers' compensation benefits, social security benefits, and lottery winnings. Other enforcement programs include the State Licensing Match System (SLMS), which includes fishing and hunting licenses. DCSS may issue administrative wage withholding orders and bank levies. Currently, more than 70 percent of collections are through wage withholding orders. The department collaborates with the Probation Department to work with their clients who have child support obligations.

In fiscal year 2013-14, the department contracted with Turbo Court giving customers a simplified online process to open a new case or modify an existing order. Out of the area personal service of legal

documents are transmitted through encrypted email, eliminating the need for a courier service and reducing the time period required to complete the service process. Credit card payments are accepted over the phone. Customer service remains an important focus demonstrated by walk-in service, with no appointment required, a 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**

FY 2014-15 requested appropriations are almost \$8.3 million, an increase of \$489,889 (6.3 percent) compared to the previous year's adjusted budget appropriation. Salaries and Benefits are requested at \$6.4 million, a 5.7 percent increase in the amount of \$347,944, primarily due to a one-time increase in Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) (\$236,730), and increases in retirement, worker's compensation experience, and termination/special pay. The Department has reviewed vacant positions and requests two positions to be deleted in FY 2014-15: one Accounting Technician, and one Office Assistant I/II. Services and Supplies are requested at \$1.7 million, an increase of 7.6 percent, or \$121,431, compared to the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget, primarily due to increases in rents, utilities, and some professional services. Central Service A-87 costs will also increase by 14.3 percent, or \$20,514. Revenues are estimated at almost \$7.9 million at the approved Federal and State share ratios. No County General Fund support is requested. The department will balance their 2014-15 Requested Budget with the use of \$397,131 in fund balance. It is likely the department will underspend its 2013-14 approved budget by \$739,778, leaving almost \$1.8 million in general purpose fund balance at the end of FY 2014-15.

In the midst of flat budgets and a decrease in staffing the department collected over \$18.5 million in FY 2012-13 in current child support and arrears payments. The department has an open caseload of over 12,954 cases; of these 24 percent are active Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) cases, 58 percent are former TANF, and 18 percent have never received TANF benefits.

### **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

### **PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

In less than five years, 28 percent of the department's staff have retired and another 10 percent have made promotional transfers to other departments or left for other reasons, including employment outside county government. Approximately 40 percent of the current staff have less than five years of experience in the department. Transferring institutional knowledge and training new staff while addressing the needs of families and meeting compliance and performance requirements is an ongoing challenge.

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 2014-15

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14 Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
1	2	3	4	5
LICENSES, PERMITS & FRANCHISES	\$115,205	\$93,161	\$69,300	\$69,300
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$552,219	\$445,397	\$110	\$110
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$9,419,612	\$9,099,812	\$7,559,492	\$7,559,492
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$2,714,408	\$2,703,796	\$2,678,652	\$2,678,652
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$92,590	\$81,481	\$2,031,355	\$2,031,355
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$4,428,832	\$4,710,500	\$4,593,221	\$4,593,221
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE C/A	\$80,740	\$28,620	\$3,000	\$3,000
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$17,403,609</b>	<b>\$17,162,769</b>	<b>\$16,935,130</b>	<b>\$16,935,130</b>
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$11,915,476	\$12,564,719	\$13,846,015	\$13,846,015
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$2,647,236	\$2,665,437	\$2,642,393	\$2,642,393
OTHER CHARGES	\$1,827,077	\$1,761,601	\$1,558,853	\$1,558,853
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$778,387	\$241,060	\$20,000	\$20,000
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	(\$19,794)	(\$13,585)	(\$7,000)	(\$7,000)
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$98,330	\$54,364	\$67,364	\$67,364
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$17,246,714</b>	<b>\$17,273,597</b>	<b>\$18,127,625</b>	<b>\$18,127,625</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>(\$156,894)</b>	<b>\$110,827</b>	<b>\$1,192,495</b>	<b>\$1,192,495</b>

**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 Patrol Division (except the Burney Station), Investigations, and Services, as well as the Office of the Sheriff. Activities included for the Patrol Division are: Patrol for the County (with the exception of the Burney Station), Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT), Sexual Assault Enforcement Team (SAFE), the City of Shasta Lake enforcement unit (by contract), 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), the Marijuana Investigation Team which has cooperative funding agreements with the United States Forest Service (USFS), the United States Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), and Federal Block Grant funding under the Marijuana Suppression Program (MSP).

## **BUDGET REQUESTS**

The requested appropriations for FY 2014-15 total a little over \$18.3 million, a 0.2 percent, or \$38,935, decrease from the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget. Salaries and Benefits are increased by \$1,185,242, or 9.2 percent, due to increases in extra-help, overtime, retirement, worker's compensation experience, and a one-time increase in Other Post-Employment Benefit costs. There are no new positions requested in FY 2014-15. There are no unallocated salary savings requested in FY 2014-15. The Sheriff respectfully requests the Board support additional Deputy Sheriff position allocations in future years as funding becomes available. Services and Supplies have decreased 15.1 percent, or \$468,185, primarily due to decreases in communications, minor equipment, information technology professional services, facilities charges, professional and special services, and liability insurance experience charges. Other Charges have decreased 19.5 percent, or \$376,425, due to decreases in contributions to other agencies and counties due to the dissolution of Cal-MMET programs (reduced by \$504,977, from \$994,103 to \$489,126) and a 4.8 percent decrease (\$23,570) in Central Services (A-87) charges from \$495,205 to \$471,635. Intrafund Transfers have increased by 77.8 percent, or \$3,500, from \$4,500 in the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget to \$7,000. Other Financing Uses expenditures have increased by \$13,000 (23.9 percent) from \$54,364 to \$67,364 due to projected increases in the SINTF and SAFE programs. There are no capital assets requested in FY 2014-15.

Requested Revenue total almost \$15 million, which includes: a 21.9 percent decrease (almost \$1.3 million) in Proposition 172 (Public Safety Augmentation funds) from \$5.9 million to \$4.6 million; a 3 percent increase (\$128,834) in General Fund support from nearly \$4.3 million to a little over \$4.4 million; and a 4.3 percent decrease (\$24,517) in AB109 revenue from \$569,760 to \$545,243. The Sheriff has been very conservative with his FY 2014-15 revenue projections. Overall requested revenue has decreased 6.7 percent, or \$1 million, due to expected reductions in state revenues such as Proposition 172, AB109, and Peace Officer Standards & Training (POST) reimbursement, and federal revenues such as Anti-Drug Abuse, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Bureau of Reclamation, and marijuana suppression/eradication grants. The state Remote Access Network (RAN) and Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) local fee statutory authority expired on December 31, 2011 and this revenue has not been restored resulting in an annual revenue loss of \$260,000 (\$180,000 and \$80,000 respectively). Both programs will continue as sources for new funding are sought; RAN should have sufficient funding through the end of FY 2014-15 (the RAN Board is aware and is working on the issue) by using of restricted trust funds and AVA by contracted vehicle recycling revenues. Charges for Services are status quo at \$2.67 million. The City of Shasta Lake contract revenue will increase by \$30,000 (1.3 percent) when compared to the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget. Miscellaneous Revenues are increased 273 percent (\$320,368) from \$117,350 to \$437,718 solely due to a one-time increase in Prior Period Expenditure Adjustments (i.e., a Risk Management rate rebate). Other Financing Sources Transfers-In revenue has decreased \$64,505 (1.4 percent), from \$4.55 million to \$4.48 million due to decreases in a Title III grant, a Public Health Transfer-In which represents FEMA Homeland Security revenues (decreased from \$178,961 to \$29,025), and a Central Services A-87 Transfer-In (50 percent reduction from \$38,773 to \$19,386).

Overall, total expenditures exceed total revenue by \$3.38 million, a 43.9 percent increase (\$1 million) from the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget. The Sheriff has reduced this amount by \$842,406 with use of various Restricted accounts leaving \$2.5 million to be resolved during budget negotiations with the CEO. Additionally, the Sheriff projects savings at the end of FY 2013-14 in the amount of \$1.3 million.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The CEO recommends adding \$199,255 in unallocated salary savings (to account for normal annual turnover) to decrease Salaries and Benefits by that same amount. For a second FY the General Fund supports one full-time deputy sheriff position dedicated to assisting with enforcing the County’s medical marijuana ordinance; therefore the CEO recommends a new capital asset patrol vehicle for this deputy. The CEO also recommends increases to the General Fund transfer-in by \$103,753, Prop 172 by \$182,972, Rural/Small Sheriffs state subvention revenue by \$10,000, and the addition of anticipated SINTF revenues in the amount of \$125,000. Altogether, along with some technical adjustments, the CEO’s recommendations decrease the net County Cost to \$1.19 million, less \$842,406 in Restricted funds, leaving \$238,393 to be funded with FY 2013-14 projected savings, \$56,129 to be funded with Prop 172 Reserves, and \$55,403 to be funded with Public Safety fund balance.

This budget projects being over budget in FY 2013-14 in the Other Financing Uses object level. The Sheriff will continue to monitor this budget closely and will take a budget amendment to the Board of Supervisors prior to the end of the FY, if necessary, in order to keep this budget in balance and within Board-approved appropriations.

**PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

The state and a nine-member CEO workgroup are currently working on a new AB109 funding allocation methodology for FY 2014-15, as well as AB109 revenue growth allocations (however, the state Department of Finance has the authority to make the final determination on the growth allocations distribution). The Governor’s 2012 November ballot initiative, called the Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act of 2012, included a Constitutional Amendment to protect 2011 Realignment funding for counties and 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 decline in FY 2014-15, although the AB109 population has not declined or stabilized as the state originally predicted. 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 2014-15

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14		2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
TAXES	\$90,622	\$83,105		\$68,963	\$68,963
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$701,865	\$649,682		\$616,645	\$616,645
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$0	\$4,157		\$9,099	\$9,099
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$84,219	\$84,219		\$86,747	\$86,747
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE C/A	\$0	\$752		\$0	\$0
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$876,708</b>	<b>\$821,918</b>		<b>\$781,454</b>	<b>\$781,454</b>
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$478,180	\$497,769		\$515,008	\$515,008
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$265,688	\$207,641		\$249,498	\$249,498
OTHER CHARGES	\$12,038	\$9,154		\$28,712	\$28,712
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$74,488	\$0		\$0	\$0
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$830,395</b>	<b>\$714,564</b>		<b>\$793,218</b>	<b>\$793,218</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>(\$46,313)</b>	<b>(\$107,353)</b>		<b>\$11,764</b>	<b>\$11,764</b>

**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, worker's 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 2014-15 are \$783,296, a decrease of \$13,474, or 1.7 percent, compared to the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget, primarily due to decreases in Services and Supplies. Salaries and Benefits are status quo at \$515,008. Services and Supplies have decreased by \$23,930, or 8.8 percent, compared to the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget. A-87 Central Services charges will increase by \$19,558, or 213.7 percent. Funding for this program comes from these sources: State Boating Safety funds (status quo at \$584,990), unsecured property tax levied on boats (\$68,963, down from \$86,872), sales tax revenue dedicated to public safety (Proposition 172) (\$28,155, down from \$36,688), federal excise tax (\$3,500, down from \$4,000) and a 3 percent increase in the requested General Fund Transfer-in (\$86,747, up from \$84,220). Additionally, there is a one-time increase in Prior Period Expenditure Adjustments (i.e., a Risk Management rate rebate). Overall there is a deficit in this budget in the amount of \$9,922 in Unallocated Expenditures to be resolved during budget negotiations with the CEO.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The CEO recommends some technical adjustments that increase the total deficit to \$11,764 which will be funded with \$4,457 in FY 2013-14 projected savings and \$7,307 in Prop 172 Reserves.

**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 2014-15

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14		2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	5
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$187,186	\$193,274	\$174,369	\$174,369	\$174,369
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$0	\$911	\$26,327	\$26,327	\$26,327
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$187,186</b>	<b>\$194,185</b>	<b>\$200,696</b>	<b>\$200,696</b>	<b>\$200,696</b>
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$372,719	\$393,451	\$425,956	\$425,956	\$425,956
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$75,627	\$60,257	\$96,179	\$96,179	\$96,179
OTHER CHARGES	\$14,275	\$20,006	\$15,118	\$15,118	\$15,118
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$462,623</b>	<b>\$473,715</b>	<b>\$537,253</b>	<b>\$537,253</b>	<b>\$537,253</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>\$275,437</b>	<b>\$279,529</b>	<b>\$336,557</b>	<b>\$336,557</b>	<b>\$336,557</b>

**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 2014-15 requested expenditures of \$539,305 have increased by \$25,220, or 4.9 percent, from the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget primarily due to increases in Salaries and Benefits charges such as retirement, healthcare, and a one-time increase in Other Post-Employment Benefit. Services and Supplies will decrease by \$1,865, or 1.9 percent, and A-87 Central Services charges will decrease by \$4,888, or 24.4 percent.

Requested revenues of \$189,974 represent a 11.4 percent increase in Civil Process fees and a one-time increase in Prior Period Expenditure Adjustments (i.e., a Risk Management rate rebate) as compared to the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget. 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 is requested at \$349,331, a decrease of \$8,204 or 2.3 percent. Additionally, this budget projects savings at the end of FY 2013-14 in the amount of \$42,542, or 13.3 percent.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The CEO recommends some technical adjustments that further decrease costs by \$12,774 for a new total net General Fund cost of \$336,557.

**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 2014-15

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	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14	2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$601,915	\$656,600	\$629,911	\$629,911
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$8,514	\$2,606	\$500	\$500
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$0	\$588	\$16,149	\$16,149
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$14,349	\$14,349	\$14,781	\$14,781
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$624,780</b>	<b>\$674,144</b>	<b>\$661,341</b>	<b>\$661,341</b>
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$131,822	\$483,112	\$619,837	\$619,837
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$104,778	\$95,791	\$122,154	\$122,154
OTHER CHARGES	(\$7,794)	(\$3,374)	\$26,128	\$26,128
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$32,373	\$9,335	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$261,181</b>	<b>\$584,865</b>	<b>\$768,119</b>	<b>\$768,119</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>(\$363,599)</b>	<b>(\$89,278)</b>	<b>\$106,778</b>	<b>\$106,778</b>

**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 (AB109) 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 2014-15 requested appropriations are \$768,119, a 1.7 percent increase, or \$13,083, from the FY 2013-14 Requested Budget amount of \$755,036, primarily due to a decrease in capital assets and Services and Supplies. Salaries and Benefits are requested at \$619,837, a 7.4 percent increase, or \$42,528, compared to the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget. Services and Supplies are requested at \$122,154, compared to \$171,765 in FY 2013-14, a 28.9 percent decrease in the amount of \$49,211 primarily due to decreases in minor equipment and Facilities Management charges related to upgrading the building on Breslauer Way to prepare for the expanded Work Release program. A-87 Central Services charges will increase by \$29,502 (874.4 percent) from a \$3,373 credit to \$26,128 in charges as this cost center increases activity related to the expanded Work Release program. There are no new capital assets requested. The expanded work release program will be able to serve up to 500 participants in FY 2014-15.

Revenue is primarily from the AB109 allocation expected from the state in FY 2014-15 in the amount of \$626,061 as approved by the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee, down by 5.9

percent, or \$39,411. Requested revenue also includes a transfer-in from the General Fund in the amount of \$14,781, a 3 percent increase compared to the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget and this funds some run-out costs before this budget was converted to a solely AB109 program (General Fund only supports 1.9 percent of total expenditures). The net county cost in the amount of \$117,475 is funded with 100% Sheriff AB109 Restricted fund balance.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The CEO recommends one technical change that decreases the net county cost by \$10,697 and other than that the budget is recommended as requested by the department.

**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.

**VICTIM / WITNESS ASSISTANCE**  
 Fund 0060 General, Budget Unit 256  
 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 2014-15

Schedule 9

**Budget Unit: 256 - VICTIM WITNESS ASSISTANCE (FUND 0060)**  
**Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION**  
**Activity: JUDICIAL**

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14		2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$642,641	\$622,019		\$695,804	\$695,804
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$5,112	\$2,516		\$22,197	\$22,197
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$647,754</b>	<b>\$624,535</b>		<b>\$718,001</b>	<b>\$718,001</b>
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$675,028	\$587,375		\$737,831	\$737,831
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$85,342	\$97,434		\$152,982	\$152,982
OTHER CHARGES	\$83,764	\$68,457		\$67,725	\$67,725
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$26,468	\$0		\$0	\$0
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$870,603</b>	<b>\$753,267</b>		<b>\$958,538</b>	<b>\$958,538</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>\$222,849</b>	<b>\$128,732</b>		<b>\$240,537</b>	<b>\$240,537</b>

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Victim/Witness Assistance Program provides services to victims of crime including: crisis intervention, emergency financial assistance, resource and referral counseling, orientation to the criminal justice system, and court escort. The program assists victims of crime in preparing victim compensation applications, informs victims of their rights under the law, seeks criminal restitution, and provides advocacy and guidance to victims as necessary, which may include referrals and networking with other appropriate community agencies. Trained staff in the Claims Unit package and process fully verified claims, on behalf of victims for the trauma and loss associated with their experience, to the State Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (VCGCB). The cost of this budget unit is funded by the state through the VCGCB, the Office of Emergency Services, and County General Funds.

**BUDGET REQUESTS**

Total FY 2014-15 requested appropriations of \$958,538 reflect a 2 percent increase from the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget of \$18,795. Salaries and Benefits are increasing by \$18,990, or 2.6 percent, over the 2013-14 Adjusted Budget, and the department is keeping one Claims Specialist III position vacant in order to achieve \$57,183 in unallocated salary savings. The department requests to delete one Administrative Secretary I position and add one Legal Process Clerk I/II position with a net fiscal year savings of \$5,189. Services and Supplies will increase 10 percent, or \$13,890. However, A-87 Central Services charges are decreasing 28.3 percent, or \$14,085.

Requested Revenues of \$718,001 reflect a 1.7 percent increase or \$11,793. The FY 2014-15 Requested Budget net county cost is \$240,537 compared to FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget net county cost of \$233,535, an increase of \$7,002, or 3 percent. Additionally, at the end of FY 2013-14 the department projects a savings of \$116,042.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The CEO recommends this budget as requested by the department.

**PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

The department is vigorously pursuing increasing state allocations. Their victim assistance program is recognized as a leader in claims processing and should be 100 percent funded by the state.

**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.

**SHERIFF / CORONER-JAIL**  
**Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 260**  
**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 2014-15

Schedule 9

**Budget Unit: 260 - JAIL (FUND 0195)**  
**Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION**  
**Activity: DETENTION AND CORRECTION**

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2012-13 Actuals	2013-14 Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	2014-15 Recommended	2014-15 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
1	2	3	4	5
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$376,029	\$278,893	\$715,000	\$715,000
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	\$4,024	\$26,866	\$25,462	\$25,462
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$4,805,418	\$4,937,235	\$4,118,121	\$4,118,121
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$190,862	\$162,505	\$158,128	\$158,128
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$3,495	\$13,958	\$781,928	\$781,928
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$8,296,148	\$8,322,912	\$8,508,565	\$8,508,565
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE C/A	\$0	\$105	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Revenues:</b>	<b>\$13,675,978</b>	<b>\$13,742,476</b>	<b>\$14,307,204</b>	<b>\$14,307,204</b>
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$7,453,854	\$7,606,655	\$8,156,243	\$8,156,243
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$5,004,434	\$5,367,260	\$6,099,770	\$6,099,770
OTHER CHARGES	\$165,464	\$226,117	\$345,803	\$345,803
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$13,899	\$15,050	\$185,000	\$185,000
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	(\$73,276)	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$722,244	\$626,471	\$571,823	\$571,823
<b>Total Expenditures/Appropriations:</b>	<b>\$13,286,621</b>	<b>\$13,841,554</b>	<b>\$15,358,639</b>	<b>\$15,358,639</b>
<b>Net Cost:</b>	<b>(\$389,357)</b>	<b>\$99,077</b>	<b>\$1,051,435</b>	<b>\$1,051,435</b>

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Main Jail is a maximum security structure opened in 1984 to house sentenced and pre-sentenced inmates from Shasta County and other counties, as well as those to be returned to the State prison system.

The Jail, with a rated capacity of 381 inmates, operates under a 1993 Superior Court Capacity Release Order limiting the inmate population to no more than 10 percent of the Jail and 10 percent of each housing unit, or 343 inmates total. A floor of the Jail was closed in 2009, due to the decline in County discretionary revenue and revenues dedicated to public safety. The closed floor was reopened in the summer of 2012 and is now funded by the state's 2011 Realignment (AB109) program as approved by the County's Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee and the Board of Supervisors.

**BUDGET REQUESTS**

Total FY 2014-15 requested appropriations are just over \$15.2 million. Salaries and Benefits are requested at slightly over \$8.34 million, an increase of \$619,152 or 8 percent, primarily due to increases in overtime costs (\$160,800 or 24.9 percent), Termination and Special Pay, Retirement, and a one-time increase in Other Post-Employment Benefits costs. Worker's compensation experience charges have decreased (\$81,680 or 30.7 percent), as well as extra-help costs, helping to offset some of the Salaries and Benefits increases in the FY 2014-15 Requested Budget. Services and Supplies of nearly \$5.78 million have increased \$167,261, or 3 percent, from the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget primarily due to increases in household expense, liability and miscellaneous insurance charges, inmate medical costs,

and utilities. A-87 Central Services charges will increase 57.3 percent, or \$119,116, from \$208,049 to \$327,165. Debt service on the Jail building is included at \$571,823; this is the final bond payment. There are no capital assets requested. There are two jail projects rebudgeted in the FY 2014-15 Requested Budget; remodel of a booking room in to a sober cell and continued work on upgrades to the hot water system (Phase I).

Requested revenues for FY 2014-15 are more than \$13.4 million and include AB109 revenues in the amount of \$1.37 million (decrease of \$102,496, 6.9 percent), a 3 percent increase (\$247,539) in General Fund support (\$8.25 million to \$8.49 million), and a 21.9 percent decrease (\$671,864) in Proposition 172 support (\$3.07 million to \$2.39 million). Intergovernmental Revenues will decrease overall by \$800,474, 16.3 percent, from the FY 2013-14 Adjusted Budget, primarily due to decreases AB109 and Proposition 172 revenues; however, every revenue source in this category is decreasing. Total Charges for Services is requested at \$158,128; a slight decrease of \$3,321, or 2.1 percent. Miscellaneous Revenue is increasing by \$242,126 (931.3 percent) due to a one-time increase in Prior Period Expenditure Adjustments (i.e., Risk Management rate rebate). Expenditures exceed revenue in this budget by \$1.75 million, of which \$258,144 is funded from the Sheriff's Jail AB109 Restricted Fund Balance, leaving a deficit of \$1.49 million to be resolved during budget discussions with the CEO.

### **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The CEO recommends several changes which include technical changes, increasing unallocated salary savings from zero to \$189,839 (to account for normal annual turnover), as well as reductions in Other Financing Uses. Additionally, the CEO recommends increasing rebudgeted costs for the Phase I hot water system upgrade, along with new funding (from the Criminal Justice Construction trust fund) and expense for several other jail projects, which altogether reduce the net county cost of this budget by \$703,641, for a new net county cost of \$1,051,435 to be funded with restricted funds (\$258,144) and Prop 172 Reserves (\$874,897).

This budget projects being over budget in FY 2013-14 in the Salaries and Benefits and Services and Supplies which could increase Total Expenditures by \$38,571. The Sheriff will continue to monitor this budget closely and will take a budget amendment to the Board of Supervisors prior to the end of the FY, if necessary, in order to keep this budget in balance and within Board-approved appropriations.

### **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.