

Public Protection

TRIAL COURTS

Fund 0060 General, Budget Unit 20110

Melissa Fowler-Bradley, Court Executive Officer

	ACTUAL EXP/REV	ACTUAL BUDGET	ACTUAL EXP/REV	BUDGET REQUESTS	CAO RECOMMENDS	ADOPTED BY BOS
COUNTY BUDGET ACT (1985)	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	1,117,021	1,138,005	1,065,223	880,123	955,455	955,455
OTHER CHARGES	1,877,009	2,015,864	1,800,454	1,761,805	1,761,805	1,761,805
OTHER FINANCING USES	51,231	240,033	265,591	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES*****	\$3,045,261	\$3,393,902	\$3,131,268	\$2,641,928	\$2,717,260	\$2,717,260
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	2,285,457	2,419,524	2,265,126	1,919,010	1,956,099	1,956,099
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	328	325	90	142	142	142
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	1,323,424	1,631,550	1,281,540	1,303,272	1,303,272	1,303,272
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	44	0	-589	0	0	0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	40,147	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES*****	\$3,649,401	\$4,051,399	\$3,546,167	\$3,222,424	\$3,259,513	\$3,259,513
TRIAL COURTS EXP OVER (UNDER) REV	(\$604,140)	(\$657,497)	(\$414,899)	(\$580,496)	(\$542,253)	(\$542,253)

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 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.

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, and all costs associated with the collection division.

Requested net county cost is a negative (\$580,496). In essence, this means that estimated Trial Court revenues are budgeted to exceed estimated Trial Court expenditures by approximately \$580,000 during FY 2008-09, providing the County General Fund with a portion of its discretionary fiscal resources. Collection of court-ordered fines and fees declines in uncertain economic times. Revenue is estimated to decline by 20 percent.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CAO recommended budget is the same as the requested budget with minor technical adjustments within line-items.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The County and local courts are continuing Courthouse Facilities transfer negotiations with the State Administrative Office of the Courts. The outcome of these negotiations will not be known for some time, but will most likely affect future County General Fund resources.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

The department head concurs with the CAO's recommendation for this budget unit.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the Proposed Budget and as amended in the Supplemental Budget; increasing appropriations by \$30,000 for building maintenance.

POSITION ALLOCATION

There are no positions associated with this budget unit.

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

	ACTUAL EXP/REV	ACTUAL BUDGET	ACTUAL EXP/REV	BUDGET REQUESTS	CAO RECOMMENDS	ADOPTED BY BOS
COUNTY BUDGET ACT (1985)	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	1,956,514	0	0	0	0	0
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	2,612,059	2,190,000	2,158,821	2,347,135	2,347,135	2,347,135
OTHER CHARGES	68,696	15,812	15,737	20,351	20,351	20,351
APPROP FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	250,000	250,000	250,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES*****	\$4,637,270	\$2,205,812	\$2,174,558	\$2,617,486	\$2,617,486	\$2,617,486
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	13,149	0	0	0	0	0
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	76,735	0	75,125	30,000	30,000	30,000
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	340	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES*****	\$90,224	\$0	\$75,125	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
CONFL PUBLIC DEFENDER EXP OVER (UNDER) REV	\$4,547,046	\$2,205,812	\$2,099,433	\$2,587,486	\$2,587,486	\$2,587,486

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Conflict Public Defense 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 (Budget unit 207). 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.

BUDGET REQUESTS

The FY 2008-09 budget requests appropriations of \$2.62 million and projects revenue of \$30,000. The net county cost of this budget unit is anticipated to be \$2.59 million which is an increase of 17.3 percent over FY 2007-08. The request also includes a contingency of \$250,000 which is the historical amount transferred from contingency reserve for investigative and court ordered costs outside of the County's control. In the event expenses exceed budget authority, the Board will be asked to appropriate these funds. These funds roll-over to the General Fund in the event they are not appropriated during the fiscal year.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommended budget is the same as the requested budget.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The most pressing issue in this budget unit is the anticipated cost of defending one death penalty case. Costs for attorney time, investigation, expert witnesses and other ancillary services are expected to run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. Shasta County has begun the process of seeking state funding to offset the extraordinary cost, but there is no assurance of state funding.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

This budget was prepared by, and is recommended by, the County Administrative Office.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the Proposed Budget.

POSITION ALLOCATION

There are no positions associated with this budget unit.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

Fund 0060 General, Budget Unit 207

Neal Pereira, Public Defender

	ACTUAL EXP/REV	ACTUAL BUDGET	ACTUAL EXP/REV	BUDGET REQUESTS	CAO RECOMMENDS	ADOPTED BY BOS
COUNTY BUDGET ACT (1985)	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	0	2,425,044	2,328,611	2,676,009	2,676,009	2,676,009
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	1,481	549,293	485,484	547,320	548,386	548,386
OTHER CHARGES	0	62,727	62,762	100,071	79,720	79,720
FIXED ASSETS	0	14,360	0	0	0	0
OTHER FINANCING USES	0	4,906	19,266	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES*****	\$1,481	\$3,056,330	\$2,896,123	\$3,323,400	\$3,304,115	\$3,304,115
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	23,489	0	0	0
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	0	75,000	10,186	60,000	60,000	60,000
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	0	101,718	59,309	93,148	93,148	93,148
TOTAL REVENUES*****	\$0	\$176,718	\$92,984	\$153,148	\$153,148	\$153,148
PUBLIC DEFENDER EXP OVER (UNDER) REV	\$1,481	\$2,879,612	\$2,803,139	\$3,170,252	\$3,150,967	\$3,150,967

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. 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 2008-09 budget requests appropriations of just over \$3.3 million, an increase of 8.7 percent, or \$267,070 more than the FY 2007-08 Adjusted Budget. The net county cost is anticipated to be a little more than \$3.1 million as compared to almost \$2.9 million in FY 2007-08. Salary and Benefits costs have increased by \$250,965, or 10.3 percent, and includes Board approved (May 6, 2008) reclassifications of Public Defender Executive Assistant – Confidential to a Legal Office Executive Assistant – Confidential, and a Deputy Public Defender III position to a Senior Deputy Public Defender, as well as increases in health care and retirement as experienced by all departments. Services and Supplies are requested at approximately the same level as FY 2007-08 even though Utilities charges have increased 65 percent and Household Expense (due to the reassignment of more senior and expensive custodians to the office) has increased 86.6 percent. The Public Defender had no control over either of these costs. However, the department did decrease Services and Supplies costs in areas such as IT Hardware and Office Expense in order to keep this area of the budget status quo.

FY 2008-09 revenues have decreased slightly from FY 2007-08 due to Intoxicated Driver Program (DUI Court) grant-funding that paid for one position and some equipment last year and in FY 2008-09 will provide funding for the Deputy Public Defender position only. Public Defender fees will continue to be applied to the Conflict Public Defender budget for continuing cases and the fees will

be applied to the Public Defender's Office budget as new cases arise. Therefore this fee revenue is split between both budgets for FY 2008-09.

It is interesting to note that in FY 2008-09 the cost per case will remain in the \$300 range (\$317) and this includes all cases from simple misdemeanors to the most serious felonies. The Public Defender's Office management team includes over 80 years of combined legal and managerial experience. At current staffing levels the Public Defender's Office is fully capable to adequately and competently manage those cases assigned to it by the Court.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Minor, technical changes were made in the CAO's recommendations. Other than that the budget is recommended as requested by the department head.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

As a cautionary note, the Requested Budget does not include funding for penalty phase aspects of any death penalty cases that the department may be assigned in FY 2008-09.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

The department head concurs with this budget as recommended.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the Proposed Budget.

POSITION ALLOCATION

Title	As of Sept 08	08/09 Request	08/09 Rec	Change
Public Defender	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Assistant Public Defender	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Deputy Public Defender I/II/III	12.00	12.00	12.00	0.00
Legal Office Executive Assistant-Confidential	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Legal Process Clerk I/II	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00
Legal Secretary	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
Public Defender Investigator	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
Senior Deputy Public Defender	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00
Supervising Public Defender Investigator	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Total	26.00	26.00	26.00	0.00

GRAND JURY

Fund 0060 General, Budget Unit 208

Lawrence G. Lees, County Administrative Officer

	ACTUAL EXP/REV	ACTUAL BUDGET	ACTUAL EXP/REV	BUDGET REQUESTS	CAO RECOMMENDS	ADOPTED BY BOS
COUNTY BUDGET ACT (1985)	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	67,126	87,550	73,939	68,964	68,964	68,964
OTHER CHARGES	30,360	21,503	21,503	37,119	37,119	37,119
TOTAL EXPENDITURES*****	\$97,486	\$109,053	\$95,443	\$106,083	\$106,083	\$106,083
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	0	0	-53	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES*****	\$0	\$0	(\$53)	\$0	\$0	\$0
GRAND JURY EXP OVER (UNDER) REV	\$97,486	\$109,053	\$95,496	\$106,083	\$106,083	\$106,083

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.

Compared to the FY 2007-08 adjusted budget, the Net County Cost of the Grand Jury budget unit has decreased by \$2,970 (2.7%). The Services and Supplies line item decreased 21.2 percent. This is mainly due to a decrease in the Jury and Witness Mileage line item. The Grand Jury's A-87 Central Service costs for FY 2008-09 are \$37,119, an increase of \$15,616 (72.6 percent) from the previous year.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CAO recommendation is as requested by the Grand Jury Foreperson.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

None.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

This budget was prepared by, and is recommended by, the County Administrative Office.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the Proposed Budget.

POSITION ALLOCATION

There are no positions associated with this budget unit.

PUBLIC SAFETY-GENERAL REVENUE

Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 220

	ACTUAL EXP/REV 2006-07	ACTUAL BUDGET 2007-08	ACTUAL EXP/REV 2007-08	BUDGET REQUESTS 2008-09	CAO RECOMMENDS 2008-09	ADOPTED BY BOS 2008-09
STATE CONTROLLER COUNTY BUDGET ACT (1985)						
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	8,248	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES*****	\$8,248	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TAXES	721,444	0	412,263	0	0	0
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	61,661	30,000	-58,934	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES*****	\$783,105	\$30,000	\$353,329	\$0	\$0	\$0
PUBLIC SAFETY GEN REVENUES EXP OVER (UNDER) REV	(\$774,857)	(\$30,000)	(\$353,329)	\$0	\$0	\$0

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 does not anticipate interest earnings in the fund for FY 2008-09.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommended budget is the same as the requested budget.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Cash flow issues in FY 2007-08 resulted in interest expense estimated to be approximately \$120,000 by fiscal year-end. The timing of the General Fund transfer-in to this fund, as well as the timing of payments to and from outside agencies contributed to a negative cash situation.

Sales tax revenues from Public Safety Augmentation (Proposition 172) continue to decline. Receipts for FY 2007-08 have lagged the previous year on average by 1.8 percent. No excess revenue from this source is anticipated in FY 2007-08 or FY 2008-09.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

Not applicable.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the Proposed Budget.

POSITION ALLOCATION

There are no positions associated with this budget unit.

COUNTY CLERK/REGISTRAR OF VOTERS-COUNTY CLERK

Fund 0060 General, Budget Unit 221

Catherine Darling, County Clerk/Registrar of Voters

	ACTUAL EXP/REV	ACTUAL BUDGET	ACTUAL EXP/REV	BUDGET REQUESTS	CAO RECOMMENDS	ADOPTED BY BOS
COUNTY BUDGET ACT (1985)	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	195,827	232,228	208,312	230,427	230,017	230,017
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	38,828	67,761	52,893	51,617	51,617	51,617
OTHER CHARGES	10,349	-2,466	-2,465	12,493	12,493	12,493
APPROP FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	5,661	5,661	5,661
TOTAL EXPENDITURES*****	\$245,004	\$297,523	\$258,739	\$300,198	\$299,788	\$299,788
LICENSES, PERMITS & FRANCHISES	49,236	45,000	52,789	48,500	48,500	48,500
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	180,899	170,650	160,908	154,650	154,650	154,650
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	42	0	85	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES*****	\$230,177	\$215,650	\$213,782	\$203,150	\$203,150	\$203,150
COUNTY CLERK EXP OVER (UNDER) REV	\$14,827	\$81,873	\$44,957	\$97,048	\$96,638	\$96,638

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

There is a net General Fund cost for this budget of \$97,048, which is \$15,175 higher than the previous budget year. This is due to A-87 charges increasing from a negative figure last year to \$12,493 and revenue decreasing by six percent. The decrease is due to a reduction in fictitious business name filings and that the US Department of State reduced the allowable fee for processing passports from \$30 to \$25.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CAO recommended budget is as requested by the department head with a minor recalculation and account code adjustment for OPEB.

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.

POSITION ALLOCATION

Title	As of Sept 08	08/09 Request	08/09 Rec	Change
County Clerk	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Clerk/Elections Specialist I/II	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Total	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 227
Gerald Benito, District Attorney

	ACTUAL EXP/REV	ACTUAL BUDGET	ACTUAL EXP/REV	BUDGET REQUESTS	CAO RECOMMENDS	ADOPTED BY BOS
COUNTY BUDGET ACT (1985)	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	5,681,626	6,216,078	6,251,848	6,758,980	6,423,812	6,423,812
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	1,499,561	1,630,800	1,570,057	1,428,595	1,425,873	1,425,873
OTHER CHARGES	217,900	258,799	258,579	487,538	487,538	487,538
FIXED ASSETS	76,752	77,249	47,478	0	0	0
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	-1,210,968	-1,424,316	-1,363,460	-1,396,199	-1,149,592	-1,149,592
OTHER FINANCING USES	19,319	185,210	178,806	7,212	7,212	7,212
TOTAL EXPENDITURES*****	\$6,284,190	\$6,943,820	\$6,943,307	\$7,286,126	\$7,194,843	\$7,194,843
TAXES	1,291,984	1,356,583	1,356,583	1,319,148	1,319,148	1,319,148
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	116,783	108,500	90,328	96,500	283,500	283,500
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	839,451	1,778,705	1,508,031	1,500,900	1,506,339	1,506,339
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	191,029	245,050	260,373	221,700	228,175	228,175
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	20,823	25,000	33,951	20,000	30,000	30,000
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	3,014,947	3,207,537	3,205,856	3,191,478	3,652,681	3,652,681
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE F/A	3,428	0	4,205	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES*****	\$5,478,444	\$6,721,375	\$6,459,327	\$6,349,726	\$7,019,843	\$7,019,843
DISTRICT ATTORNEY EXP OVER (UNDER) REV	\$805,746	\$222,445	\$483,980	\$936,400	\$175,000	\$175,000

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

There have been no changes to the basic on-going mission and functions of this budget unit. The FY 2008-09 budget includes costs for a full year of the Consumer Protection (third year) and Illegal Dumping Prevention Programs (second year), previously approved by the Board of Supervisors. The Consumer Protection Program consists of one Deputy District Attorney and one District Attorney Investigator. However one-half of the District Attorney Investigator in the Consumer Protection Program is being left vacant to realize salary savings in the amount of \$41,150 in order to reduce expenditures this budget year. The Illegal Dumping Prevention Program consists of one District Attorney Investigator and one District Attorney Investigative Technician, along with costs for marketing and dump fee offsets. Both programs are fully funded through the General Fund.

The FY 2008-09 requested budget reflects appropriations of almost \$7.3 million after reducing expenditures by \$246,898 through unallocated salary savings. This is an increase of \$342,306, or 4.9 percent. Increases in salaries and benefits in the amount of \$542,902 (8.7 percent) are attributable to higher regular salaries, health insurance and other benefits, as well as termination pay due to some long-term employees' pending retirement. However, extra help and worker's comp have decreased. Services and supplies have been reduced by \$202,205 (12.4 percent), from \$1.6 million in FY 2007-08 to \$1.4 million in FY 2008-09. Other charges have increased by 88.4 percent, or \$228,739 due to increases in A-87 central service charges.

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: Social Services, for provision of welfare fraud investigation and prosecution, and for the Drug Endangered Children Program; Sheriff for SINTF; and Miscellaneous General for the Illegal Dumping Prevention Program. In total, the District Attorney's requested budget includes \$1.4 million in cost-applied credits.

Revenue streams remain generally stable except for some reductions in grant funding and homicide cost reimbursements. Due to the Governor's concerns with Local Community Benefit Committee (LCBC) grant fund processes, this Indian gaming grant money has not been distributed by the state to the LCBC for the past two fiscal years (FY 2007-08 and 2008-09). In FY 2008-09 this will mean a loss of \$103,000 to the department. This grant funding was used to fund some staffing in casino crimes prosecutions and the Domestic Violence Emergency Response Team.

The request includes Proposition 172 revenue of \$1.3 million and a General Fund Transfer-In of \$3 million (both status quo).

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CAO's recommendations includes a 15.1 percent increase in General Fund Transfer-In of \$468,200, and \$399,293 in unallocated expenditure reductions to be resolved during the supplemental budget process. The unallocated expenditure amount includes \$333,689 towards the department's solution to balance the budget. The department also increased unallocated salary savings in the amount of \$100,000 and reduced extra help expenditures in the amount of \$34,511 in order to balance the budget. The balance of the unallocated expenditure reductions are reductions in SINTF (\$37,686) and SAFE (\$20,000) grant transfer-ins from the Sheriff, to be resolved during the supplemental budget process, and \$8,921 in miscellaneous technical budget changes. Additionally, the Welfare Fraud Unit services will be reduced by the Department of Social Services in the amount of \$208,921, and so the department has increased unallocated salary savings in that same amount, again to be resolved during the supplemental budget process. Total unallocated salary savings are budgeted at \$555,819 and total unallocated expenditure reductions are recommended at \$399,293. These actions are necessary in order to balance the FY 2008-09 Proposed Budget. An additional General Fund Transfer of \$45,407 offsets the increases in A-87 Central Service costs associated with the Shasta County Administration Center.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The department has prepared the FY 2008-09 Proposed Budget with anticipated state budget cuts where they can be reasonably projected. Further reductions may be necessary during the supplemental budget process depending on actual state budget cuts. 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.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

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

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the Proposed Budget and as amended in the Supplemental Budget. In April, when the Proposed Budget is built, Proposition 172 revenue is estimated based on only eight months of receipts. At the time of this publication, receipts have now been received for eleven months, through July 2008. Year-to-date receipts have consistently lagged the prior year and are currently 1.41 percent less than the first eleven months of 2007-08. This is the weakest performance in the history of Proposition 172 one-half cent sales tax in Shasta County. This is not surprising given that the County's Bradley Burns sales tax has declined almost 14 percent.

The District Attorney, Sheriff and Chief Probation Officer took voluntary reductions to their FY 2007-08 budgets to reflect the decline in Proposition 172 revenue. In total they reduced their Proposition 172 revenue by \$664,329, or 4.5 percent.

The Proposition 172 revenue source will be closely monitored during the 2008-09 fiscal year, and if revenue is not adequate, public safety departments will need to adjust budgets accordingly. Total recommended County Proposition 172 revenue is \$14.2 million, a modest 2 percent increase. The CAO will provide information on a monthly basis to the District Attorney, Sheriff, and Chief Probation Officer to enable them to monitor this revenue.

The CAO did not recommend any use of Public Safety fund balance in the Proposed Budget. Past budgets have consistently relied on fund balance to close gaps in spending plans. However, for over a year the Fund has experienced periods of "negative cash" resulting in charges for negative interest. By June 30, 2008, the fund paid over \$68,000 in interest for short-term borrowing. A contributing factor in this deficit is reimbursement contracts with other governmental agencies wherein the County awaits reimbursement. Sufficient fund balance carryover has since been identified to relieve the District Attorney's shortfall, \$175,000, as well as the Sheriff's shortfall, \$564,627.

The recommended budget provides \$41.6 million in combined General Fund and Proposition 172 revenue to Public Safety, or just over \$2.2 million growth. Given the current economic climate and the continuing decline in County discretionary revenues as well as declining Proposition 172 sales tax revenue, the CAO did not recommend an increase to the \$2.2 million in the Supplemental Budget.

In the Preliminary Budget the District Attorney (DA) had \$399,293 in unallocated expenditures and so submitted various amendments to adjust budget units to allocate an additional \$175,000 in General Fund support from civil penalties as agreed to by the CAO. The budget amendments also amended actual funding needs based on cyclical grant funding adjustments. In the aggregate, appropriations and revenue are increased \$351,914, including a decrease in unallocated salary savings in the amount of \$89,418, and revenues increased by \$176,914. These changes put DA

over budget by \$175,000 and so the DA requested additional General Fund support in his budget appeal to the Board of Supervisors in this amount. The CAO is recommended that this budget shortfall be covered by the use of fund balance carryover. As such the District Attorney withdrew his intended appeal.

The final recommended General Fund Transfer-In to the District Attorney is just over \$3.9 million, and Proposition 172 revenue is \$1.3 million.

POSITION ALLOCATION

Title	As of Sept 08	08/09 Request	08/09 Rec	Change
District Attorney	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Accountant Auditor III	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Accounting Technician	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Assistant District Attorney	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Chief District Attorney's Investigator	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Chief Fiscal Officer	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Collection Clerk I/II	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Collection Clerk III	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Deputy Chief Investigator	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Deputy District Attorney I/II/III	17.00	17.00	17.00	0.00
District Attorney's Investigator I/II	13.00	14.00	14.00	1.00
Information System Coordinator I/II	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Investigative Technician I/II	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00
Legal Office Executive Assistant-Confidential	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Legal Process Clerk I/II	6.00	6.00	6.00	0.00
Legal Secretary	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00
Legal Services Supervisor	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Senior Deputy District Attorney	6.00	6.00	6.00	0.00
Senior District Attorney's Investigator	1.00	0.00	0.00	(1.00)
Supervising District Attorney's Investigator	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00
Total	66.00	66.00	66.00	0.00

CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES

Fund 0192 Child Support Services, Budget Unit 228

Terri M. Love, Director of Child Support Services

	ACTUAL EXP/REV	ACTUAL BUDGET	ACTUAL EXP/REV	BUDGET REQUESTS	CAO RECOMMENDS	ADOPTED BY BOS
COUNTY BUDGET ACT (1985)	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	6,044,362	7,224,403	6,279,967	6,898,318	6,898,318	6,898,318
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	1,692,556	1,827,574	1,626,065	1,666,546	1,666,546	1,666,546
OTHER CHARGES	767,767	457,099	457,100	129,006	129,006	129,006
FIXED ASSETS	23,549	495	453	0	0	0
APPROP FOR CONTINGENCY	0	18,782	0	101,795	101,795	101,795
TOTAL EXPENDITURES*****	\$8,528,234	\$9,528,353	\$8,363,585	\$8,795,665	\$8,795,665	\$8,795,665
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	291,521	296,781	290,013	312,989	312,989	312,989
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	7,955,090	8,655,839	7,859,019	8,121,104	8,121,104	8,121,104
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	1,000	0	0	0	0	0
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	20,533	0	752	0	0	0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	74,951	82,211	82,211	73,676	74,447	74,447
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE F/A	98	0	111	0	0	0
TOTAL REVENUES*****	\$8,343,193	\$9,034,831	\$8,232,106	\$8,507,769	\$8,508,540	\$8,508,540
CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES EXP OVER (UNDER) REV	\$185,042	\$493,522	\$131,479	\$287,896	\$287,125	\$287,125

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 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), New Employee Registry (NER) match system, and the Employment Development Department (EDD) match system. DCSS may issue administrative wage withholding orders and bank levies.

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 IV-D expenditures, as long as the local agency is in compliance with current program standards, or has an approved corrective action plan in place. The counties can no longer accumulate excess collection incentive revenues.

BUDGET REQUESTS

FY 2008-09 requested appropriations are approximately \$8.8 million, a decrease of \$732,688 (7.7 percent) compared to the previous year's adjusted budget appropriation. Revenues are estimated to be approximately \$8.5 million, with no cost to the county general fund.

Salaries and Benefits are requested at about \$7 million, \$326,085 less than FY 2007-08, even maintaining 26 vacant positions (compared to maintaining 13 vacant positions in FY 2007-08). The department has budgeted just over \$1.1 million in unallocated salary savings in order to balance their budget. A contingency for salary increases is budgeted in anticipation of negotiated salary increases.

Requested Services and Supplies have decreased by 8.8%, or \$161,028. Other Charges has decreased by over 71%, or \$328,093, mainly due to a 76.3% decrease in A-87 Central Service charges to the department. This is mainly due to the transition of processing, printing and mailing of child support payments centrally at the state level thereby reducing County Auditor-Controller and Treasurer central services to the department.

In October 2007 the department and the California Child Support Automated System (CCSAS) Business Partner began the planning phase of the conversion to the CCSAS application. The challenge will be to successfully convert from the current case management system to CCSAS using existing resources as a conversion augmentation will not be received in FY 2008-09. In fact the department's Electronic Data Processing (EDP) allocation has decreased by \$136,250 (\$12 million statewide), or 26.4% in FY 2008-09. The department is currently scheduled for conversion in August 2008. On November 1, 2008, Los Angeles County will be the last county to transition to the statewide system and this will finally allow California to pass federal certification. Once certification is achieved California will receive nearly \$200 million back from the federal government in penalties already paid.

Revenue is requested at the approved Federal and State share ratios. The department anticipates a reduction of approximately 1.9 percent due to a \$12.6 million shortfall statewide. However, this is uncertain until the department receives its final allocation letters. The department will receive \$192,989 in revenue from the Department of Social Services for leased office space. No County General Fund support is requested.

Collections for FY 2006-07 were \$21.7 million and are anticipated to decrease by 2 percent for FY 2007-08. The department has an open caseload of over 15,000 cases and of these 26 percent are active Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) cases, 56 percent are former TANF, and 18 percent have never received TANF benefits. The department recently began a pilot program to seize assets, and has also partnered with the Addicted Offender Program to assist those close to commencement to identify and potentially remove child support barriers that prevent them from supporting their children. The department has also reassigned some Child Support Specialists from the Customer Service Unit to carry caseloads. Child Support Assistants have replaced the Child Support Specialists in the Customer Service Unit to primarily answer phones and provide general information and referral to customers. This has provided some necessary relief to caseload carrying Child Support Specialists as the department has been forced to increase vacant positions from 13 to 26 in FY 2008-09 in order to balance the budget in the face of declining revenues and increased system transition duties and support.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The budget is recommended as requested by the department head. Any changes necessitated by their conditionally approved State budget will be made during the supplemental budget process.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The department's State budget allocation has remained flat for several years. In FY 2008-09 the EDP allocation was decreased by 26.4 percent and the department anticipates a reduction in its state and federal administrative allocation of 1.9 percent. Together with the conversion to a new statewide system (with some interface issues that are impacting staff productivity), it is difficult to maintain their excellent performance standards with a steadily decreasing staff. The department will again request from CDCSS the approval to use general-purpose funds in fund balance (\$287,896) to drawn down federal matching funds (\$558,982) in FY 2008-09.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

The department head concurs with the budget as recommended.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the Proposed Budget.

POSITION ALLOCATION

Title	As of Sept 08	08/09 Request	08/09 Rec	Change
Director of Child Support Services	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Account Clerk III	10.00	10.00	10.00	0.00
Accounting Technician	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
Assistant Director of Child Support Services	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Chief Child Support Attorney	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Child Support Assistant I/II	31.00	31.00	31.00	0.00
Child Support Assistant III	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Child Support Attorney I/II/III	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00
Child Support Program Manager	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
Child Support Specialist I/II	45.00	45.00	45.00	0.00
Child Support Specialist III	11.00	11.00	11.00	0.00
Executive Assistant-Confidential	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Information Systems Coordinator I/II	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Information Systems Coordinator III	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Legal Secretary	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00
Personnel Assistant	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Staff Services Analyst I/II	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Staff Services Manager	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Supervising Child Support Specialist	9.00	9.00	9.00	0.00
Total	126.00	126.00	126.00	0.00

SHERIFF/CORONER-SHERIFF PATROL/ADMINISTRATION

Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 235

Tom Bosenko, Sheriff/Coroner

	ACTUAL EXP/REV	ACTUAL BUDGET	ACTUAL EXP/REV	BUDGET REQUESTS	CAO RECOMMENDS	ADOPTED BY BOS
COUNTY BUDGET ACT (1985)	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	12,154,956	13,336,192	12,517,454	13,546,188	13,254,452	13,254,452
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	3,638,037	4,457,806	3,908,291	3,468,339	3,601,305	3,601,305
OTHER CHARGES	1,332,064	2,582,637	2,274,969	1,614,256	1,452,925	1,452,925
FIXED ASSETS	846,097	357,932	355,990	0	0	0
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	-101,288	-110,306	-111,876	-51,069	-51,069	-51,069
APPROP FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	63,852	63,852	63,852
OTHER FINANCING USES	108,928	467,236	167,677	115,363	144,829	144,829
TOTAL EXPENDITURES*****	\$17,978,794	\$21,091,297	\$19,112,506	\$18,756,929	\$18,466,294	\$18,466,294
TAXES	6,227,841	6,539,233	6,212,271	6,362,113	6,302,858	6,302,858
LICENSES, PERMITS & FRANCHISES	18,260	20,600	16,741	20,748	20,748	20,748
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	34,955	29,930	23,035	425	425	425
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	3,162,573	5,502,850	5,039,745	3,174,476	2,947,577	2,947,577
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	2,376,725	2,463,200	2,803,522	2,756,731	2,769,731	2,769,731
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	132,002	13,050	76,984	7,650	7,650	7,650
OTHR FINANCING SRCS TRAN IN	5,440,832	6,043,062	5,831,925	5,913,665	6,090,741	6,090,741
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE F/A	146	3,865	7,195	0	11,860	11,860
TOTAL REVENUES*****	\$17,393,333	\$20,615,790	\$20,011,418	\$18,235,808	\$18,151,590	\$18,151,590
SHERIFF EXP OVER (UNDER) REV	\$585,461	\$475,507	(\$898,913)	\$521,121	\$314,704	\$314,704

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, Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT), 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), and the Court Officer.

The Office of the Sheriff includes the Administrative and Accounting Units,

The Investigations Division includes two major sub-divisions: Major Crimes including the Crime Lab, Elder Abuse Program, Sexual Assault Felony Enforcement Team (SAFE), and Criminal Intelligence;

and Marijuana Eradication including United States Forest Service (USFS) Marijuana Eradication, Bureau of Land Management Marijuana Eradication, State Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) Marijuana Eradication, Anti Drug Abuse (ADA) Shasta Interagency Narcotics Task Force (SINTF), California Multi-jurisdictional Methamphetamine Enforcement Team (CAL-MMET), and most recently, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDA).

BUDGET REQUESTS

The requested appropriations for FY 2008-09 total \$18.7 million, an 11.1 percent decrease over the FY 2007-08 Adjusted Budget. Increases in Salaries and Benefits of \$190,230 are primarily due to negotiated wages, increases in health insurance rates and retirement expenses. However, extra help and worker's comp exposure charges are decreased. The Sheriff will be keeping two Deputy Sheriffs, one Public Safety Service Officer and one Agency Staff Services Analyst vacant in order to realize \$239,708 in Unallocated Salary Savings. Services and Supplies have decreased 22.7 percent, or \$1,020,839, primarily due to large decreases in discretionary spending in areas such as office expense (\$32,167), maintenance of equipment (\$40,861), minor equipment and radios (\$533,971), professional and special services (\$421,879), and special department expense (\$57,124). Additionally, liability insurance experience charges have decreased by \$96,382. Other Charges have decreased 36.4 percent, or \$922,544, almost exclusively due to reduced contributions to outside agencies (\$959,994). Intrafund Transfers have decreased by 53.7 percent, or \$51,069, primarily due to the Department of Social Services' cuts to Elder Abuse Investigations (\$46,653). Other Financing Uses have decreased 74.8 percent, or \$341,873, due to large scale reductions in the Trans-Out contributions to Probation and the District Attorney primarily due to reductions in the SAFE grant and SINTF program. There are no new positions and no fixed assets requested.

Requested Revenue totals \$18.2 million, including a Public Safety Augmentation (Prop. 172) allocation of \$6.36 million (2.7 percent decrease) and status quo General Fund support of \$5.8 million. Overall requested revenue has decreased 11.6 percent, or \$2,389,748, due to the anticipated reduction of many state and federal revenues and programs. Additionally, the Sheriff has been very conservative with his FY 2008-09 revenue projections. Taxes have decreased \$177,120, or 2.7 percent, due to a reduction in Prop 172 receipts. Intergovernmental Revenues have decreased \$2,338,140, or 42.4 percent. This is due to the suspension of several grants such as the Local Community Benefit Committee (State Indian Gaming) grant (\$43,000), and the State OES Marijuana Suppression Program grant (\$177,169), as well as the completion of several one-time grants and contracts with the Federal Department of Justice (\$82,050) and the State Department of Justice (\$20,000). Other grants such as the 2006 Federal FEMA DHS grant (\$179,550), and the 2006 Federal Emergency Management Assistant grant (\$424,455), have been completed, the 2007 grants have been carried over (\$383,100). Grant applications for FY 2008-09 have not yet been submitted. Other OES funded programs such as the Emergency Management Assistance grant (\$70,275) remain near FY 2007-08 levels. Additionally, several grants have been reduced for FY 2008-2009 by 10% in anticipation of cuts by the State including the CAL-MMET grant, the SAFE grant, the OCJP Anti-Drug Abuse grant and the COPS grant. Charges for Services has increased \$293,531, or 11.9 percent, primarily due to an increase in the contract with the City of Shasta Lake for the provision of law enforcement services (\$272,000), and increases in Charges for Services (\$65,000). Miscellaneous Revenue has decreased \$5,400, or 41.4 percent. Other Financing Trans-In has decreased \$129,397, or 2.1 percent, due to the completion of 2006 and 2007 Title III grants (Federal Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-determination Act of 2000) (\$143,974).

Overall, both expenditures and revenues have decreased just over 11 percent in FY 2008-09. The Sheriff and his staff have made corresponding decreases in expenditures where revenues have or are projected to decrease in order to attempt to be better prepared to work within anticipated state and federal budget cuts. The Sheriff has doubled up patrol (two Deputy Sheriffs in one response vehicle) in the evenings, depending on circumstances. This should save fuel and vehicle maintenance costs, however some lower priority calls may have increased response times. The Sheriff will plan to use inmate labor for some custodial and grounds maintenance work where appropriate in order to save revenues that can be used to preserve support staff positions. The Sheriff and his staff are to be commended for their diligence in searching for ways to reduce costs while preserving public safety.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

After various technical changes, the CAO recommends that all unfunded expenditures in the amount of \$389,166 are budgeted as Unallocated Expenditures for resolution during the supplemental budget process.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

In the aggregate the Sheriff combined budgets contain \$1 million in unallocated expenditure reductions which must be resolved in the supplemental budget process.

In the aggregate, the Sheriff submitted 11.5 vacant positions to realize unallocated salary savings in the amount of \$675,144. In addition, the Sheriff is willing to keep an additional 5 positions vacant to realize an additional \$322,271 in unallocated salary savings for FY 2008-09. However, this change will be made during the supplemental budget process.

The Sheriff has scaled back the HEC and Work Release programs in order to realize additional budget savings in FY 2008-09. However, he continues to work the Chief Probation Officer to find ways to enhance participation in both programs.

The Sheriff submitted an application for jail construction funding (AB 900). However, on May 8, 2008 the state announced conditional grant-funding awards and Shasta County was not funded.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

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

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the Proposed Budget and as amended in the Supplemental Budget. In April, when the Proposed Budget is built, Proposition 172 revenue is estimated based on only eight months of receipts. At the time of this publication, receipts have now been received for eleven months, through July 2008. Year-to-date receipts have consistently lagged the prior year and are currently 1.41 percent less than the first eleven months of 2007-08. This is the weakest performance in the history of Proposition 172 one-half cent sales tax in Shasta County. This is not surprising given that the County's Bradley Burns sales tax has declined almost 14 percent.

The District Attorney, Sheriff and Chief Probation Officer took voluntary reductions to their FY 2007-08 budgets to reflect the decline in Proposition 172 revenue. In total they reduced their Proposition 172 revenue by \$664,329, or 4.5 percent.

The Proposition 172 revenue source will be closely monitored during the 2008-09 fiscal year, and if revenue is not adequate, public safety departments will need to adjust budgets accordingly. Total recommended County Proposition 172 revenue is \$14.2 million, a modest 2 percent increase. The CAO will provide information on a monthly basis to the District Attorney, Sheriff, and Chief Probation Officer to enable them to monitor this revenue.

The CAO did not recommend any use of Public Safety fund balance in the Proposed Budget. Past budgets have consistently relied on fund balance to close gaps in spending plans. However, for over a year the Fund has experienced periods of "negative cash" resulting in charges for negative interest. By June 30, 2008, the fund paid over \$68,000 in interest for short-term borrowing. A contributing factor in this deficit is reimbursement contracts with other governmental agencies wherein the County awaits reimbursement. Sufficient fund balance carryover has since been identified to relieve the District Attorney's shortfall, \$175,000, as well as the Sheriff's shortfall, \$564,627.

The recommended budget provides \$41.6 million in combined General Fund and Proposition 172 revenue to Public Safety, or just over \$2.2 million growth. Given the current economic climate and the continuing decline in County discretionary revenues as well as declining Proposition 172 sales tax revenue, the CAO is not recommending an increase to the \$2.2 million in this supplemental budget.

For all of the Sheriff's budgets, the preliminary budget fully funded all current employee salaries and benefits, including bargained increases for FY 2008-09 but left 11.5 full-time positions vacant (10.5 in the Public Safety Fund departments and one in the Animal Control General Fund department) for unallocated salary savings in the amount \$675,134. The Sheriff initially proposed to add another 5 vacant full-time positions (three deputies in cost center 235, one legal process clerk in cost center 235, and one deputy in cost center 261) for additional unallocated salary savings in the amount of \$322,271 in the Supplemental Budget for a total of 16.5 full-time positions and \$997,405. Of those 16.5 positions 9.5 were deputies. After further discussion and more thorough analysis of projected fund balance, the Sheriff then requested that he be allowed to use fund balance carryover to fund those 5 positions. Of those five positions, the Sheriff also proposed to hold one deputy sheriff position vacant (cost center 235) and transferred the appropriation to the jail budget (cost center 260) in order to fill a correctional officer position previously held vacant in the Proposed Budget. The CAO concurred with this request. In total the Sheriff will have \$675,134 in unallocated salary savings and will be holding 11.5 full-time positions vacant (6.5 deputies – three in cost center 235, two in cost center 260 and 1.5 in cost center 261, three service officers – one in cost center 235 and two in cost center 260, one agency analyst in cost center 235, and one animal regulation officer in cost center 297). In total the Sheriff will utilize \$886,898 of the fund balance carryover. Fund balance is estimated to be \$697,328 at June 30, 2009.

In the Preliminary Budget the Sheriff had \$1,005,536 in unallocated expenditures. The Sheriff submitted various amendments to mitigate most of this deficit and to adjust budget units/grants to actual funding needs. The net effect of the amendments increased appropriations by \$834,217 and decreased revenue by \$52,681. This brought the Sheriff's unfunded deficit to \$886,898 and this is the amount the Sheriff intended to appeal to the Board of Supervisors. The CAO is recommended that this budget shortfall be covered by the use of fund balance. As such the Sheriff withdrew his

appeal.

In the aggregate, the CAO's recommended General Fund Transfer-In to the Sheriff's budget is almost \$18.5 million, and Proposition 172 revenue is \$11 million.

In cost center 235, the Preliminary Budget had \$389,166 in unallocated expenditures. In order to mitigate this reduction in expenditures and adjust budgets to actual grant funding needs nine budget amendments were processed. The amendments reallocated General Fund support between cost centers, reallocated the 10 percent health insurance decrease, moved the costs of three patrol vehicles and one K9 unit from the City of Shasta Lake contract to the Sheriff's patrol, increased budgeted utilities charges, and increased General Fund support in the amount of \$80,000 as recommended by the CAO. A \$314,704 deficit remained in this budget pending Board direction at Final Budget Hearings. The CAO is recommended that this budget shortfall be covered by the use of fund balance. As such the Sheriff withdrew his intended appeal.

POSITION ALLOCATION

Title	As of Sept 08	08/09 Request	08/09 Rec	Change
Sheriff-Coroner	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Accountant Auditor I/II	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00
Accounting Technician	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Administrative Secretary II	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
Administrative Secretary I	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Agency Staff Services Analyst I/II	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Captain	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00
Chief Fiscal Officer	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Crime Analyst	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Deputy Sheriff or Deputy Sheriff (Entry Level) or Deputy Sheriff Trainee	57.00	57.00	57.00	0.00
Executive Assistant-Confidential	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Investigative Technician I/II	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
Legal Process Clerk I/II	11.00	11.00	11.00	0.00
Lieutenant	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
Personnel Assistant	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Project Integration Specialist	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Public Safety Service Officer	4.00	4.00	4.00	0.00
Senior Account Clerk	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Senior Investigative Technician	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Senior Legal Process Clerk	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Senior Sheriff's Service Officer	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00
Sergeant	13.00	13.00	13.00	0.00
Sheriff's Program Manager	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Sheriff's Records Supervisor	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Undersheriff	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Total	120.00	120.00	120.00	0.00

SHERIFF / CORONER-BOATING SAFETY

Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 236

Tom Bosenko, Sheriff/Coroner

	ACTUAL EXP/REV	ACTUAL BUDGET	ACTUAL EXP/REV	BUDGET REQUESTS	CAO RECOMMENDS	ADOPTED BY BOS
COUNTY BUDGET ACT (1985)	2006-07	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09	2008-09
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	475,301	553,788	545,764	552,598	546,277	546,277
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	242,254	316,789	278,164	276,488	338,199	338,199
OTHER CHARGES	15,743	19,477	19,477	26,896	26,896	26,896
FIXED ASSETS	74,364	0	0	0	0	0
APPROP FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	1,603	1,603	1,603
OTHER FINANCING USES	10,000	11,260	11,260	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES*****	\$817,663	\$901,314	\$854,666	\$857,585	\$912,975	\$912,975
TAXES	175,270	153,757	184,277	178,243	169,424	169,424
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	641,737	591,490	588,191	587,374	587,374	587,374
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	83,070	147,610	85,899	85,899	156,177	156,177
TOTAL REVENUES*****	\$900,077	\$892,857	\$858,367	\$851,516	\$912,975	\$912,975
BOATING SAFETY EXP OVER (UNDER) REV	(\$82,414)	\$8,457	(\$3,700)	\$6,069	\$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 2008-09 are \$857,585 a 5 percent decrease from FY 2007-08. The budget represents a status-quo service level. Funding for this program comes from these sources: State Boating Safety funds (\$584,990), unsecured property tax levied on boats (\$144,053), sales tax revenue dedicated to public safety (Proposition 172) (\$34,190), federal excise tax (\$2,384) and a requested General Fund Transfer (\$85,899). Expenditures exceed revenues by \$6,069.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

After various technical changes, the CAO recommends that all unfunded expenditures in the amount of \$4,110 are budgeted as Unallocated Expenditures for resolution during the supplemental budget process.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

None.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

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

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the Proposed Budget and as amended in the Supplemental Budget. There was \$4,110 in unallocated expenditures in the Preliminary Budget and the budget amendment decreased health insurance and OPEB charges, reallocated General Fund support, and rebudgeted minor equipment funded with a Title III grant from FY 2007-08. There is no remaining deficit in this budget.

POSITION ALLOCATION

Title	As of Sept 08	08/09 Request	08/09 Rec	Change
Boating Safety Officer	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Deputy Sheriff or Deputy Sheriff (Entry Level) or Deputy Sheriff Trainee	3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
Sergeant	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Total	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00