

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 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$1,921,668	\$1,639,248		\$1,685,071	\$1,685,071
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	\$14	(\$3)		\$0	\$0
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$1,180,253	\$1,158,243		\$1,232,400	\$1,232,400
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$3,101,937	\$2,797,488		\$2,917,471	\$2,917,471
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$0	\$9,120		\$10,455	\$10,455
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$676,795	\$664,048		\$1,510,286	\$1,510,286
OTHER CHARGES	\$1,334,948	\$1,285,313		\$1,309,142	\$1,309,142
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$0	\$0		\$25,000	\$25,000
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$694,180	\$437,082		\$622,036	\$622,036
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$2,705,924	\$2,395,564		\$3,476,919	\$3,476,919
Net Cost:	(\$396,013)	(\$401,924)		\$559,448	\$559,448

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 2012-13 are \$3.4 million.

Revenues continue to decline, a symptom of the economic downturn which affects the public's ability to pay court fines and fees. Requested revenues are \$2.9 million, a drop of over \$360,000 (11 percent).

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 second year is an appropriation of \$800,000 for costs associated with relocating the Sheriff and Probation departments. Also included is one fixed asset, a wireless bridge system or point-to-point wireless system to bypass the Public Safety Building for network connectivity to CalWORKS and the Redding Police Department.

The Net County Cost for this budget unit is increasing \$184,819, or 5 percent, largely due to the continuing decline in revenues from court fines and fees.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

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

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The AOC's timeline for construction of the New Redding Courthouse has been pushed up to Spring of 2014. The County's holding over in the Public Safety Building has been extended until December 31, 2013. 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 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$0	\$9,863	\$0	\$0	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$25,677	\$18,266	\$14,000	\$14,000	
Total Revenues:	\$25,677	\$28,130	\$14,000	\$14,000	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$1,878,147	\$1,854,450	\$2,292,924	\$2,292,924	
OTHER CHARGES	\$28,257	\$17,879	\$26,352	\$26,352	
APPROP FOR CONTINGENCY	\$0	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$1,906,404	\$1,872,329	\$2,569,276	\$2,569,276	
Net Cost:	\$1,880,727	\$1,844,199	\$2,555,276	\$2,555,276	

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). 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 2012-13 budget requests appropriations of \$2.57 million and projects revenue of \$24,000. The net county cost of this budget unit is anticipated at \$2.55 million, an increase of \$28,673, or 1.1 percent compared to FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget. The increase is due to budgeting the Conflict Public Defender contract reimbursable expenses allowed by the contract but never included in the Requested Budget (approximately \$22,000 annually) and additional IT Department services that may be needed for database work related to the over one million pages of discovery on the Armitage Ponzi Scheme case. This budget unit is anticipated to finish FY 2011-12 under budget by \$662,549. The request also includes a contingency of \$250,000 which is the historical amount budgeted from contingency reserve for investigative and court ordered costs outside of the County's control. It is anticipated that this contingency will not be used in FY 2011-12. In the event expenses exceed budget authority, the Board will be asked to appropriate these contingency funds. These funds roll-over to the General Fund in the event they are not appropriated during the fiscal year. Finally, the Community Corrections Partnership Plan approved by the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee and the Board of Supervisors includes \$10,000 in AB 109/2011 Realignment funds to fund any Post Release Community Supervision revocation hearings that the County's Public Defender's Office may not be able to represent due to a potential conflict; these funds are carried over from FY 2011-12.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

With one minor technical change, the CEO recommended budget is as requested by the department head.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Expenditures for the conflict public defense are difficult to predict due to the nature of the Court-ordered expenses in which the County has no discretion or control. FY 2009-10 saw indigent defense costs increase dramatically with the conclusion of one death penalty case. The defense costs for this one case alone have exceeded three million dollars since FY 2005-06. The FY 2012-13 Requested Budget assumes no new death penalty cases. Should one or more new death penalty cases be assigned in Shasta County, then the cost of this budget could rise dramatically. Along with the recently concluded capital case, one of the defendants in a complex ponzi scheme is being represented by the Conflict Public Defender. This case has over a million pages of discovery and ancillary expenses, such as investigative costs and expert witness fees, may have a significant impact on this budget unit.

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 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$18,158	\$53,568		\$61,603	\$61,603
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$27,319	\$31,624		\$30,000	\$30,000
Total Revenues:	\$45,477	\$85,193		\$91,603	\$91,603
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$2,542,505	\$2,496,920		\$2,774,093	\$2,774,093
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$491,559	\$522,695		\$647,552	\$647,552
OTHER CHARGES	\$74,047	\$72,955		\$73,982	\$73,982
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	\$0	(\$11,630)		\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$3,108,112	\$3,080,941		\$3,495,627	\$3,495,627
Net Cost:	\$3,062,635	\$2,995,747		\$3,404,024	\$3,404,024

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 2012-13 budget requests appropriations of \$3.49 million, which is \$13,611, or 0.4 percent, more than the \$3.48 million FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget. Revenues are requested at \$91,603, which is \$14,034, or 18.1 percent, more than the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget primarily due to 2011 Realignment revenue from the state for Post Release Community Supervision revocation hearings. The net county cost is anticipated to be \$3.40 million, which is nearly identical to the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget net county cost. In addition, due to thoughtful and efficient operations throughout the year the department projects \$323,313 in savings at the end of the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

With one minor technical change, the recommendation is as requested by the department head.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The department has been assigned a very complex securities' fraud case that has required the full-time commitment of one attorney and one investigator. Professional forensic accountant services may be required in the defense of this case, as well as out-of-state expert witnesses. This case is being prosecuted by the state Attorney General's Office and the department has never defended a white collar

crime of this magnitude. However, even though the department has met the FY 2012-13 status quo budget target, several affected expenditure accounts such as Professional Investigative Services, have been increased in order to prepare for this case. The case is scheduled to begin in June 2012 and may be concluded within six months, though it is difficult to predict.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

The department head concurs with this budget as recommended.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

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

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

County of Shasta
 Financing Sources and Uses by Budget Unit by Object
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$0	\$20		\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$0	\$20		\$0	\$0
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$55,340	\$64,938		\$74,426	\$74,426
OTHER CHARGES	\$16,972	\$265		\$43,431	\$43,431
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$72,312	\$65,204		\$117,857	\$117,857
Net Cost:	\$72,312	\$65,184		\$117,857	\$117,857

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 2011-12 adjusted budget, the Net County Cost of the Grand Jury budget unit has increased by \$40,744 (53 percent). This is due to a substantial increase in the A-87 Central Service costs of an additional \$43,165 (162 percent) compared to the previous year. The increase is primarily due to services provided by County Counsel; A-87 is on a 2 year cycle. Absent the increase in A-87 charges the requested budget is essentially status quo.

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 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	\$37,749	\$60,754		\$0	\$0
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$1,032,783	\$2,226,819		\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$1,070,533	\$2,287,574		\$0	\$0
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$0	\$2,000,000		\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$0	\$2,000,000		\$0	\$0
Net Cost:	(\$1,070,533)	(\$287,574)		\$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 2012-13.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommended budget is the same as the requested budget.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

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

Sales tax revenue from Public Safety Augmentation (Proposition 172) has improved somewhat. The final receipt for 2010-11 was received in August 2011. Total receipts exceeded budget by \$1,032,784. One-half, or \$516,391, was utilized as partial repayment of a \$2 million loan to Public Safety from the General Reserve. The balance was moved to a designation in the Public Safety Fund. Receipts for the first 8 months of 2011-12 are 12.5 percent over the prior year.

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 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
LICENSES, PERMITS & FRANCHISES	\$50,314	\$50,149	\$51,000	\$51,000	\$51,000
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$119,665	\$123,505	\$130,700	\$130,700	\$130,700
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$479	\$15	\$100	\$100	\$100
Total Revenues:	\$170,458	\$173,669	\$181,800	\$181,800	\$181,800
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$216,262	\$208,852	\$227,266	\$227,266	\$227,266
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$42,907	\$39,889	\$40,534	\$40,534	\$40,534
OTHER CHARGES	\$8,673	\$8,186	\$12,954	\$12,954	\$12,954
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$267,843	\$256,928	\$280,754	\$280,754	\$280,754
Net Cost:	\$97,384	\$83,258	\$98,954	\$98,954	\$98,954

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 2012-13 requested budget includes expenditures in the amount of \$280,438 and revenues in the amount of \$181,800 which results in a status quo budget as compared to the FY 2011-12 adjusted budget. The requested budget meets the status quo budget requirement.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

A technical correction was made in salaries and benefits increasing the general fund cost of the budget by \$316. Due to savings in FY 2011-12, the budget meets the status quo budget requirement

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 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$184,542	\$303,076		\$110,000	\$110,000
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$2,110,203	\$2,058,165		\$1,974,974	\$1,974,974
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$166,833	\$112,320		\$124,450	\$124,450
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$85,997	\$70,407		\$62,050	\$62,050
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$3,693,924	\$3,242,999		\$3,567,390	\$3,567,390
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE C/A	\$644	\$646		\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$6,242,144	\$5,787,615		\$5,838,864	\$5,838,864
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$5,608,835	\$5,466,020		\$5,705,196	\$5,705,196
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$1,107,213	\$1,016,468		\$966,172	\$966,172
OTHER CHARGES	\$235,777	\$266,543		\$296,785	\$296,785
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$19,758	\$6,648		\$0	\$0
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	(\$1,019,428)	(\$977,240)		(\$1,005,163)	(\$1,005,163)
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$348,298	\$0		\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$6,300,454	\$5,778,440		\$5,962,990	\$5,962,990
Net Cost:	\$58,309	(\$9,174)		\$124,126	\$124,126

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 2012-13 requested appropriations are \$5.98 million. Salaries and Benefits are increased by \$107,190, or 1.9 percent, from \$5.6 million to \$5.7 million primarily due to a decrease in unallocated salary savings (\$674,490 to \$321,575) and an increase in extra-help costs (\$102,117 to \$118,535). Two District Attorney Investigators, one Deputy Chief Investigator, one Deputy District Attorney, and one Legal Process Clerk will be held vacant throughout the fiscal year in order to achieve these savings. Services and Supplies is decreasing \$126,255, or 11.6 percent, primarily due a reduction in IT Hardware charges (fewer personal computers being purchased). Central Service A-87 charges will increase by \$74,194 (33.3 percent) from \$222,591 to \$296,785, primarily due to increases in building and equipment use charges associated with inhabiting a larger County-owned facility (i.e., their new offices on the corner of West and Shasta Streets).

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 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 \$985,163 in cost-applied credits, a slight increase of \$13,010, or 1.3 percent.

Revenue streams continue to be challenged. The County General Fund contribution has been increased by \$13,107, due entirely to increases in costs to fund the state mandated Child Abduction program; otherwise the General Fund contribution is static. This program was previously funded in arrears by the SB 90 state mandated reimbursement process, which has been sporadic. On March 1, 2011, the Board approved an update to County Administrative Policy 2-101 which requires all SB 90 state mandated reimbursement payments to be deposited in to the General Fund instead of being recognized in individual department budgets. Proposition 172 revenues are projected to increase by 11.4 percent, from \$1,001,699 to \$1,115,492. 2011 Realignment (AB 109) revenue to fund Post Release Community Supervision revocation hearings is increased from \$53,568 in the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget to \$61,603 in the FY 2012-13 Requested Budget; an increase of 15 percent. All Vertical Prosecution state revenue has been permanently cut as a result of the Governor's FY 2011-12 Trigger Cuts; although at one time funded at above \$200,000 annually (FY 2007-08 \$238,776), now this is an annual loss of approximately \$80,000. Total revenues are requested at \$5.7 million which reflects a reduction of \$50,075 (0.9 percent). The Department requests use of the Public Safety fund balance in the amount of \$214,106, an increase of \$84,894, or 65.7 percent, from the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget of \$129,212.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommends the department increase unallocated salary savings by \$172,114, with commensurate reductions in related benefit accounts thereby consistently budgeting all unallocated salary savings in one expenditure account in accordance with historical budgeting practices. Additionally, the CEO recommends some increases to amounts budgeted in cost-applieds (by \$20,000 for blood alcohol testing) and trans-in (by \$10,302 for SINTF program) in order to balance with the Sheriff's budgets. Finally, the CEO recommends adding \$60,000 COPS revenue in FY 2012-13 as this program was funded by 2011 Realignment and the revenue is coming in as expected. The final result will be a decrease in approved use of Public Safety fund balance from \$214,106 to \$124,126.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Annual loss of Vertical Prosecution revenue and changing the source of state funding for the COPS program (at one time funded with state general fund and now funded by state Vehicle License Fee revenue via realignment) provides fiscal challenges to the department as they strive to maintain current service levels. Further reductions may be necessary during the fiscal year depending on additional or actual state budget cuts, potential federal budget cuts, and/or further reductions in General Fund or Prop 172 revenues. Finally, Assembly Bill (AB) 109 (signed by the Governor on April 4, 2011 with the effective date of October 1, 2011) transfers new responsibilities for Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) revocation hearings to the District Attorney (and Public Defender's) Office. AB 118 provided limited new funding to the District Attorney (and Public Defender) for PRCS revocation hearings duties for FY 2011-12 only. The state and a nine-member CEO workgroup are currently working on new AB 109 and AB 118 funding allocation methodologies for FY 2012-13; it will likely be several years before a permanent and on-going funding allocation methodology will be approved by the state. AB 109 continues to reduce the role of the state Board of Parole and requires the local superior courts to hear all parole and PRCS revocation hearings effective July 1, 2013; this could further impact our District Attorney's Office as they may be required to present evidence at these local hearings. The Governor is working to qualify a 2012 November ballot initiative, called the Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act of 2012, which includes a temporary increase in the state sales tax rate and income tax for people earning over \$250,000 annually in order to fund education and a Constitutional Amendment to protect realignment funding for counties. This ballot initiative could decide the future success of those public safety and health and human services programs transferred to the counties in FY 2011-12. 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 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	\$22,688	\$19,941	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$22,000
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$7,315,233	\$6,949,416	\$7,736,297	\$7,736,297	\$7,736,297
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$57	\$592	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$73,061	\$71,247	\$53,436	\$53,436	\$53,436
Total Revenues:	\$7,411,040	\$7,041,197	\$7,811,733	\$7,811,733	\$7,811,733
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$5,569,625	\$5,302,524	\$6,084,489	\$6,084,489	\$6,084,489
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$1,465,918	\$1,519,498	\$1,606,981	\$1,606,981	\$1,606,981
OTHER CHARGES	\$233,553	\$205,802	\$152,404	\$152,404	\$152,404
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$192,263	\$17,469	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$7,461,361	\$7,045,294	\$7,843,874	\$7,843,874	\$7,843,874
Net Cost:	\$50,320	\$4,096	\$32,141	\$32,141	\$32,141

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.

DCSS continues to increase efficiencies through technology. Paper case files are nonexistent, with all documents scanned into the statewide-automated system. Customer service remains an important focus demonstrated by walk-in service, with no appointment required and a wait time of 10 minutes or less. Telephone calls are returned within 24 hours. Shasta DCSS is a regional call center. Both Siskiyou and Modoc DCSS calls are answered and resolved at this location. 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 department has submitted interest to the state DCSS to expand this service out to other county DCSS offices.

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.

BUDGET REQUESTS

This is essentially a status quo budget request; the final state allocation letter will not be received until the governor signs the budget. FY 2012-13 requested appropriations are approximately \$7.8 million, a slight decrease of \$75,501 (1 percent) compared to the previous year's adjusted budget appropriation. Salaries and Benefits are status quo at just over \$6 million. The Department requests one position change from an Account Clerk III to an Office Assistant Supervisor. Revenues are estimated to be \$7.8 million at the approved Federal and State share ratios. No County General Fund support is requested.

In the Governor's Proposed Budget a Revenue Stabilization Fund (RSF) in the amount of \$18.7 million was established and will be distributed to Local Child Support Agencies statewide. Shasta County's share is expected to be \$278,954 in FY 2012-13, the same amount received in FY 2011-12. Since FY 2009-10, the department has expanded activities in this area to be eligible for receipt of the RSF dollars. A specialized Make Our Work Count (MOWC) team was formed with a strong emphasis on ensuring that cases report correctly on the monthly federal performance report. Additionally, emphasis is placed on direct contact with customers through personal telephone calls, personal service of legal documents, and an emphasis on reaching child support stipulations rather than relying heavily on the court process to obtain initial or modified child support cases.

In the midst of flat budgets and a decrease in staffing the department collected over \$19 million in FY 2010-11 in current child support and arrears payments. The department has an open caseload of over 13,369 cases; of these 25 percent are active Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) cases, 57 percent are former TANF, and 18 percent have never received TANF benefits.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

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

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The Governor has proposed that counties assume responsibilities for the state's Child Support Services program in Phase II of his Realignment Proposal. There is little information or detail available on Phase I or Phase II of the Governor's Realignment Proposal. The Governor has not yet been able to fully implement Phase I.

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 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
LICENSES, PERMITS & FRANCHISES	\$50,236	\$68,518	\$49,800	\$49,800	
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$1,609,567	\$1,097,028	\$100	\$100	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$8,396,529	\$9,255,864	\$9,731,046	\$9,731,046	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$2,713,439	\$2,803,498	\$2,695,190	\$2,695,190	
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$28,546	\$68,353	\$0	\$0	
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$4,687,545	\$4,773,227	\$4,459,408	\$4,459,408	
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE C/A	\$22,082	\$58,720	\$1,500	\$1,500	
Total Revenues:	\$17,508,679	\$18,124,478	\$16,937,044	\$16,937,044	
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$11,499,545	\$11,455,113	\$12,949,149	\$12,949,149	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$2,894,328	\$2,371,129	\$2,940,959	\$2,940,959	
OTHER CHARGES	\$1,752,577	\$1,613,412	\$1,696,530	\$1,696,530	
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$136,291	\$473,566	\$94,019	\$94,019	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	(\$13,877)	(\$72,129)	(\$70,369)	(\$70,369)	
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$57,626	\$255,518	\$78,361	\$78,361	
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$16,326,492	\$16,096,610	\$17,688,649	\$17,688,649	
Net Cost:	(\$1,182,187)	(\$2,027,868)	\$751,605	\$751,605	

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, as well as grants administration.

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 (HIDTA).

BUDGET REQUESTS

The requested appropriations for FY 2012-13 total a little over \$17.5 million, a 8 percent, or \$1,542,806, decrease from the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget. Salaries and Benefits are increased by \$193,802, or 1.5 percent, and include four new positions funded with 2011 Realignment (AB 109), two Deputy Sheriffs, one Crime Analyst, and 1 Legal Process Clerk, as well as filling two vacant Deputy Sheriff positions. There are unallocated salary savings budgeted in the amount of \$437,149 generated by keeping ten positions vacant during the fiscal year (six Deputy Sheriffs, one Investigative Technician, one Crime Analyst, one IPSS Programmer, and one Legal Process Clerk). Services and Supplies have decreased 2.8 percent, or \$81,586, primarily due to decreases in special department expense, information technology hardware, rents and leases of structures, professional transcribing, office expense, maintenance of equipment, clothing and personal supplies, and professional and special services. Expenditures that increased were liability insurance experience, mail services, professional pre-employment services, professional health services, professional veterinary services and animal care, information technology professional services, minor equipment, and fleet and fuel costs. Other Charges have decreased 15.2 percent, or \$304,106, due to decreases in contributions to other agencies and counties due to the dissolution of CAL-MMET programs (reduced by \$284,182, from \$1.4 million to \$1.1 million) and decreases in Central Services (A-87) charges by \$19,924, from \$600,067 to \$580,143. Intrafund Transfers have increased by 1,138.7 percent, or \$64,688, from \$5,681 in the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget due to an inter-department agreement with the Health and Human Services Agency for elder and adult abuse investigations. Other Financing Uses expenditures have decreased by \$88,404 (53 percent) from \$166,765 to \$78,361 due to decreases in the SINTF and SAFE programs, as well as deletion of a one-time trans-out to Fleet Management for a vehicle replacement during FY 2011-12. There are three capital assets (radios, repeaters, and automated fingerprint identification system upgrade) rebudgeted from FY 2011-12 in the total amount of \$94,019.

Requested Revenue totals just over \$16.7 million, including a Public Safety Augmentation (Prop. 172) allocation of \$6.1 million (11.9 percent increase), a \$1 million decrease in General Fund support from \$5.27 million to \$4.27 million due to the reduction of a one-time increase in FY 2011-12, and a 25 percent decrease in the additional General Fund Transfer-In which now allocates \$58,159 to offset the A-87 increase attributable to the new Administration Center (this is being phased out over the next three fiscal years). The Sheriff has been very conservative with his FY 2012-13 revenue projections. Overall requested revenue has decreased 4.7 percent, or \$824,042, in a large part due to the reduction in General Fund support. The state Remote Access Network (RAN) and Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) local fee statutory authority expires in June 30, 2012 and so this revenue is deleted from the FY 2012-13 Requested Budget in the amounts of \$90,000 and \$80,000 respectively. Both programs will continue in FY 2012-13 as sources for new funding is researched; RAN by use of Public Safety fund balance and AVA by contracted vehicle recycling revenues. Charges for Services is increased by \$65,664 (2.5 percent) primarily due to a 3.1 percent increase in the City of Shasta Lake contract revenue and a 3.7 percent increase in federal marijuana eradication contract revenue. Miscellaneous Revenues is decreased 100 percent from \$62,054 by deleting a one-time use of the Sheriff's Inmate Welfare Fund in FY 2011-12. Other Financing Trans-In revenue has decreased \$1.44 million (24.7 percent), from \$5.85 million to \$4.41 million in FY 2011-12 due to decreases in General Fund support, a Title III grant, and Public Health Tran-In which represents Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Homeland Security revenues (decreased from \$313,600 to \$72,103).

Overall, total expenditures exceed total revenue by \$846,871, a 45.9 percent increase from the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget. The Sheriff request use of the Public Safety fund in the amount of \$846,871 to balance this budget.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommends some technical changes in the way unallocated salary savings are budgeted along with some minor changes to other Salaries and Benefits accounts which increase Salaries and Benefits by \$14,224. The CEO also recommends some increases to Services and Supplies accounts such as Clothing/Personal Supplies (\$2,163), Professional and Special Services (\$2,995), and Minor Equipment (\$116,380) that increase Services and Supplies in the amount of \$121,561 for a total increase in overall expenditures of \$135,785. Finally, the CEO recommends budgeting additional revenue for 2011 Realignment (\$10,424), COPS (\$109,147), and FEMA (\$60,033) as well as a Tran In from Public Health (\$54,947) for a total increase in revenue in the amount of \$231,051, thereby decreasing use of the Public Safety fund balance in the amount of \$95,266. This will offset the increased use of fund balance in the Jail, Burney and Boating Safety budgets.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Assembly Bill (AB) 109 (signed by the Governor on April 4, 2011 with the effective date of October 1, 2011) transfers new responsibilities for certain low-level offenders who previously would have been housed in state prison and supervised by state parole to counties to serve their sentences in county jails instead and to be supervised by Probation Departments under the Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) program. Additionally, PRCS revocation hearings, now heard in local courts, must be prosecuted by the District Attorney and defended by the Public Defender's Office. State parolees who violate parole must await their hearing in front of the state Board of Parole Hearings in county jails if sentenced must serve their remanded sentence in county jails as well, not to exceed 180 days per sentence. As of July 1, 2013 the local courts will be hearing all revocation hearings for state parolees and PRCS. As of the end of April 2012 there were 20 offenders serving sentences from between three and six years in the County Jail. Offenders now sentenced to county jails instead of state prison, awaiting their PRCS revocation hearing, state parole hearing, and/or serving their revocation sentence in county jails are all impacting our local County Jail. The AB 109 population is projected to plateau in FY 2014-15 because if 2011 Realignment is successful then counties will send fewer low-level offenders to prison and thus fewer low-level offenders will be released to PRCS. AB 109 will fund the re-opening of the closed floor in our County Jail, as well as additional two Deputy Sheriffs for Compliance Team filed visits/checks, and the expansion of the Sheriff's Work Release program to 500 participants if state 2011 Realignment funding materializes in FY 2012-13 as projected by the state. However, the funding for AB 109 was only provided for one year via AB 118; FY 2011-12 only. The state and a nine-member CEO workgroup are currently working on new AB 109 funding allocation methodologies for FY 2012-13; it will likely be several years before a permanent and on-going funding allocation methodology will be approved by the state. The Governor is working to qualify a 2012 November ballot initiative, called the Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act of 2012, which includes a temporary increase in the state sales tax rate and income tax for people earning over \$250,000 annually in order to fund education and a Constitutional Amendment to protect realignment funding for counties. This ballot initiative could decide the future success of those public safety and health and human services programs transferred to the counties in FY 2011-12. 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 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
TAXES	\$138,431	\$112,682		\$113,947	\$113,947
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$616,362	\$633,921		\$707,903	\$707,903
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$0	\$10		\$0	\$0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$85,898	\$104,220		\$84,220	\$84,220
Total Revenues:	\$840,693	\$850,834		\$906,070	\$906,070
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$547,031	\$535,986		\$540,815	\$540,815
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$261,412	\$259,530		\$274,417	\$274,417
OTHER CHARGES	\$36,684	\$41,523		\$12,038	\$12,038
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$0	\$0		\$80,000	\$80,000
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$845,128	\$837,040		\$907,270	\$907,270
Net Cost:	\$4,435	(\$13,794)		\$1,200	\$1,200

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 2012-13 are \$906,070, a 1.9 percent decrease from FY 2011-12, primarily due to a 71 percent decrease (from \$41,523 to \$12,038) in A-87 Central Services charges. Funding for this program comes from these sources: State Boating Safety funds (\$664,990, includes a one-time augmentation of \$80,000 to purchase a replacement boat and trailer), unsecured property tax levied on boats (\$113,947, down from \$132,584 in FY 2011-12), sales tax revenue dedicated to public safety (Proposition 172) (\$39,913, up from \$37,518 in FY 2011-12), federal excise tax (\$4,000) and a requested General Fund Transfer (\$84,220).

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommends some technical changes in the way unallocated salary savings are budgeted along with some minor changes to other Salaries and Benefits accounts which increase overall expenditures by \$1,200 and thus use of FY 2012-13 Public Safety fund balance by the same amount.

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 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 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$180,137	\$183,045		\$163,000	\$163,000
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$52	\$0		\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$180,189	\$183,045		\$163,000	\$163,000
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$351,713	\$382,924		\$385,489	\$385,489
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$70,637	\$75,903		\$103,672	\$103,672
OTHER CHARGES	(\$34,986)	(\$35,913)		\$14,276	\$14,276
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$387,363	\$422,915		\$503,437	\$503,437
Net Cost:	\$207,174	\$239,869		\$340,437	\$340,437

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 2012-13 requested expenditures of \$502,236 have increased by \$47,744, or 10.5 percent, from the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget primarily due to increases in extra-help, information technology, postage, transportation and travel, fuel, and A-87 Central Services costs. Due to the restructuring of some supervisory duties in the office, the department requests replacing one Sheriff Civil Supervisor position with a Legal Secretary position.

Requested revenues of \$163,000 represent a 0.5 percent increase in Civil Process fees from the prior year. Many of the activities of the Civil Unit are required by the Court and fees for services do not fully cover 100 percent of this budget's costs; therefore, the net General Fund cost of this department is requested at \$339,236, an increase of \$46,944 or 16.1 percent. Even though this budget did not meet its General Fund status quo target, the Sheriff's other General Fund budget (Animal Control) exceeded its General Fund status quo target by \$94,382. Therefore, together, the Sheriff's General Fund budgets have met their FY 2012-13 status quo target.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommends some technical changes in the way unallocated salary savings are budgeted along with some minor changes to other Salaries and Benefits accounts which increase the object level by \$1,155 and Services and Supplies by the amount of \$45 for a total increase in use of General Fund by \$1,201; still within the FY 2012-13 status quo target.

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 2012-13

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	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12		2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$0	\$0	\$735,714	\$735,714	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$328	\$0	\$0	\$0	
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$25	\$0	\$0	\$0	
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$41,675	\$14,350	\$14,350	\$14,350	
Total Revenues:	\$42,028	\$14,350	\$750,064	\$750,064	
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$3,828	\$6,628	\$506,755	\$506,755	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$32,575	\$23,106	\$167,833	\$167,833	
OTHER CHARGES	\$3,059	(\$17,022)	(\$7,294)	(\$7,294)	
CAPITAL ASSETS	\$0	\$0	\$82,770	\$82,770	
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$39,462	\$12,711	\$750,064	\$750,064	
Net Cost:	(\$2,565)	(\$1,638)	\$0	\$0	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

BUDGET REQUESTS

While the program has closed down and minimal work release operations were run out of the Main Jail budget there were only minimal "run-out" costs after closure. However, due to the state's 2011 Realignment transfer of responsibilities for supervision and incarceration of low-level offenders, this budget is being increased in order to fund an expanded work release program. There are six new position allocations requested for this budget in FY 2012-13: one Correctional Sergeant, four Correctional Officers I/II, and one Public Safety Service Officer. Salaries and Benefits are requested at \$506,755. Services and Supplies are requested at \$167,833. Other Charges show a credit of \$7,294, even though \$500 is budgeted for Support and Care of Inmates, due to a \$7,794 A-87 Central Services charges credit. There are three new capital assets requested in order to get the work release program expanded: one trailer, one truck, and one vehicle. Total FY 2012-13 appropriations are requested at \$750,064. The expanded work release program will be able to serve up to 500 participants in FY 2012-13.

Revenue is primarily from the AB 109 allocation expected from the state in FY 2012-13 in the amount of \$735,714 as approved by the Community Corrections Partnership Executive Committee. Requested revenue also includes a transfer-in from the General Fund in the amount of \$14,350, the amount included in the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CEO recommends the budget as requested.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

None.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

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

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

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 2012-13

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2010-11 Actuals	2011-12 Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	2012-13 Recommended	2012-13 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
1	2	3	4	5
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$686,140	\$671,132	\$706,208	\$706,208
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$57,936	\$1,086	\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$744,077	\$672,219	\$706,208	\$706,208
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$661,068	\$679,692	\$685,166	\$685,166
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$134,498	\$101,608	\$113,572	\$113,572
OTHER CHARGES	\$53,027	\$39,597	\$78,850	\$78,850
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$848,594	\$820,898	\$877,588	\$877,588
Net Cost:	\$104,517	\$148,678	\$171,380	\$171,380

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 2012-13 requested appropriations of \$877,588 reflect a slight increase from the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget of \$2,501, or less than one-half percent. Salaries and Benefits at the same amount as the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget, or \$685,166, and Services and Supplies will decrease 18 percent, or \$24,999.

Requested Revenues of \$706,208 reflect a status quo revenue budget. The FY 2012-13 Requested Budget net County cost is \$171,380; the FY 2011-12 Adjusted Budget net County cost was \$168,880, a slight increase of \$2,500, due to the corresponding slight increase in Salaries and Benefits. Even though the requested budget is essentially status quo, at the end of FY 2011-12 the department projects a savings of \$23,398.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The budget is recommended as requested.

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.