

Public Protection

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

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 201 - TRIAL COURTS
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual Estimated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$2,120,583	\$2,030,630		\$1,981,466	\$1,981,466
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	\$644	\$215		\$0	\$0
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$1,524,493	\$1,602,149		\$1,535,744	\$1,535,744
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	(\$3,965)	(\$89)		\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$3,641,755	\$3,632,905		\$3,517,210	\$3,517,210
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$0	\$0		\$3,121	\$3,121
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$803,749	\$703,267		\$926,605	\$926,605
OTHER CHARGES	\$1,447,945	\$1,519,402		\$1,468,308	\$1,468,308
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$1,264,561	\$700,984		\$694,466	\$694,466
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$3,516,255	\$2,923,654		\$3,092,500	\$3,092,500
Net Cost:	(\$125,499)	(\$709,251)		(\$424,710)	(\$424,710)

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 of \$484,610, 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.

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 \$484,610.

Appropriations of \$3 million include operations and maintenance of the court facilities, debt service on courthouse bonds, professional collections services provided by the Superior Court, and inmate transportation charges.

The decline in expected revenues is a symptom of the continuing economic downturn which affects the public’s ability to pay court fines and fees. Requested revenues are \$3.5 million.

Requested net county cost is a negative (\$694,741). In essence, this means that estimated Trial Court revenues are budgeted to exceed estimated Trial Court expenditures by approximately \$694,741 during FY 2010-11, providing the County General Fund with a portion of its discretionary fiscal resources.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CAO recommended budget includes an additional \$200,000 for start-up costs for the relocation of staff from the Public Safety Building should the Administrative Office of the Court select it for the new courthouse. Charges for Services is reduced \$70,000 to more accurately reflect revenue anticipated from the Court for facility operations and maintenance.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The nuance of the transfer of responsibility for the Court facilities is still unclear. We have little history on which to project the operations and maintenance charges for the facilities and the receipt of revenue from the AOC for the same. Amendments to this budget may be necessary as the year progresses.

The AOC will present the Public Safety Building Site to the State Public Works Board on May 17, 2010. If selected, there are many steps to prepare for the relocation. The Third Floor will be vacated by June or July 2010 upon completion of the old library building remodel. In preparation for moving the Sheriff and Probation to temporary offices the CAO will authorize a records management program whereby documents will be either shredded, or scanned into digital format before shredding. Additionally, Information Technology will begin work on relocation of the telecommunications link between the Public Safety Building, the Court, City of Redding Police Department, and CalWORKS. The CAO will work to secure office space for the Sheriff and Probation until such time as they can move into the main courthouse and annex once the Court has vacated.

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.

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

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 203 - CONFL PUBLIC DEFENDER
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	5
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$45,878	\$32,156		\$20,000	\$20,000
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$2	\$454		\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$45,880	\$32,611		\$20,000	\$20,000
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$2,710,589	\$2,866,330		\$2,299,580	\$2,299,580
OTHER CHARGES	\$20,352	\$25,492		\$28,257	\$28,257
APPROP FOR CONTINGENCY	\$0	\$0		\$250,000	\$250,000
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$2,730,941	\$2,891,823		\$2,577,837	\$2,577,837
Net Cost:	\$2,685,060	\$2,859,212		\$2,557,837	\$2,557,837

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. These court appointed attorneys are paid at an hourly cost and are a significant expense to the County.

BUDGET REQUESTS

The FY 2010-11 budget requests appropriations of \$2.58 million and projects revenue of \$20,000. The net county cost of this budget unit is anticipated at 2.58 million, a decrease of \$349,360 or 12 percent compared to FY 2009-10 Adjusted Budget. 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. 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 CAO 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 2010-11 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 may have a significant impact on this budget unit.

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.

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

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 207 - PUBLIC DEFENDER
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$0	\$32,173	\$0	\$0	\$0
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$20,789	\$25,471	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,000
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$111,870	\$18,893	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$132,659	\$76,538	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,000
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$2,606,267	\$2,608,545	\$2,691,302	\$2,691,302	\$2,691,302
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$495,075	\$472,015	\$474,235	\$474,235	\$474,235
OTHER CHARGES	\$79,719	\$89,713	\$74,048	\$74,048	\$74,048
APPROP FOR CONTINGENCY	\$0	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$3,181,062	\$3,170,275	\$3,489,585	\$3,489,585	\$3,489,585
Net Cost:	\$3,048,402	\$3,093,736	\$3,465,585	\$3,465,585	\$3,465,585

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 2010-11 budget requests appropriations of just over \$3.2 million, a status quo budget. Revenues are requested at \$43,000. The net county cost is anticipated to be a little less than \$3.2 million.

General Fund departments were directed to take a 5 percent reduction in net county cost which could be achieved by savings in either FY 2009-10 or

2010-11. The Public Defender's target reduction is \$161,108, which is achieved by savings of \$135,999 in FY 2009-10.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The department turned in what is essentially a status quo budget; however, they have 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. A contingency reserve in the amount of \$250,000 is recommended. Other minor technical modifications are included. The Shasta County Court's Intoxicated Driver Program has ended, and the \$19,000 revenue is removed.

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 2010-11. Should one or more new death penalty cases be assigned to the department, then the cost of this budget could rise dramatically.

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 Administrative Officer

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 208 - GRAND JURY
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$195	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$195	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$69,360	\$76,096	\$74,062	\$74,062	\$74,062
OTHER CHARGES	\$37,119	\$60,026	\$16,972	\$16,972	\$16,972
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$106,479	\$136,123	\$91,034	\$91,034	\$91,034
Net Cost:	\$106,284	\$136,123	\$91,034	\$91,034	\$91,034

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 2009-10 adjusted budget, the Net County Cost of the Grand Jury budget unit has decreased by \$41,606 (31.4 percent). This is due to a substantial decrease in the A-87 Central Service costs of \$43,055 (71.7 percent) compared to 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.

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

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 220 - PUBLIC SAFETY GEN REVENUES
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: POLICE PROTECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Reconunended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	(\$26,087)	\$19,096	\$0	\$0	\$0
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$0	\$815,430	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	(\$26,087)	\$834,526	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Net Cost:	\$26,087	(\$834,526)	\$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.

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.

BUDGET REQUESTS

The Public Safety fund group does not anticipate interest earnings in the fund for FY 2010-11.

Sales tax revenues from Public Safety Augmentation (Proposition 172) continue to decline. Receipts for FY 2009-10 have lagged the previous year on average by approximately 10 percent. No excess revenue from this source is anticipated in FY 2010-11.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommended budget is the same as the requested budget.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

Not applicable.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The timing of payments to and from outside agencies often results in negative cash within the

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, County Clerk/Registrar of Voters

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 221 - COUNTY CLERK
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: OTHER PROTECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
LICENSES, PERMITS & FRANCHISES	\$55,312	\$49,555	\$53,500	\$53,500	\$53,500
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$138,255	\$125,368	\$122,200	\$122,200	\$122,200
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$25	\$1,476	\$100	\$100	\$100
Total Revenues:	\$193,592	\$176,399	\$175,800	\$175,800	\$175,800
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$202,590	\$190,898	\$219,541	\$219,541	\$219,541
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$44,524	\$42,467	\$46,223	\$46,223	\$46,223
OTHER CHARGES	\$12,492	\$14,371	\$8,674	\$8,674	\$8,674
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$259,607	\$247,737	\$274,438	\$274,438	\$274,438
Net Cost:	\$66,015	\$71,338	\$98,638	\$98,638	\$98,638

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

BUDGET REQUEST

The FY 2010-11 requested budget includes expenditures in the amount of \$274,438 and revenues in the amount of \$175,800 which results in a net county cost increase of 2 percent as compared to the FY 2009-10 adjusted budget. Due to the projected savings in the Elections budget (19.7 percent) and in aggregate with the County Clerk budget, both will meet the 5 percent reduction goal.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CAO concurs with the requested budget. In aggregate with the Elections budget, the department meets the 5 percent reduction goal.

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
Gerald Benito, District Attorney

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 227 - DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10 Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
1	2	3	4	5
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$377,447	\$301,874	\$265,500	\$265,500
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$1,944,684	\$2,432,849	\$2,126,172	\$2,126,172
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$224,723	\$150,946	\$181,600	\$181,600
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$4,336	\$80,796	\$84,100	\$84,100
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$4,117,469	\$7,939,963	\$3,588,179	\$3,588,179
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE P/A	\$6,000	\$870	\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$6,674,660	\$10,907,300	\$6,245,551	\$6,245,551
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$6,292,293	\$5,891,829	\$6,051,880	\$6,051,880
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$1,182,683	\$1,087,130	\$1,043,293	\$1,043,293
OTHER CHARGES	\$487,337	\$381,134	\$235,280	\$235,280
FIXED ASSETS	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	\$200,000
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	(\$1,131,366)	(\$985,795)	(\$1,067,497)	(\$1,067,497)
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$440,109	\$4,288,229	\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$7,271,057	\$10,662,528	\$6,462,956	\$6,462,956
Net Cost:	\$596,396	(\$244,772)	\$217,405	\$217,405

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

With the completion of the old library building remodel, the District Attorney's requested

appropriations will decline \$4.8 million, or 43.5 percent, due to project costs. Total FY 2010-11 requested appropriations are \$6.2 million. Salaries and Benefits is essentially status quo net of unallocated salary savings. Services and Supplies is decreasing \$284,907 (21.4 percent) primarily due to cancellation of personal service agreements and leases. Central Service A-87 expense will decline \$154,839 (43.8 percent).

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 \$1 million in cost-applied credits.

Revenue streams continue to be challenged. The County General Fund contribution and Proposition 172 revenues remain static. The Transfer-In from Accumulated Capital Outlay, which reimbursed for the remodel of the old library building, will cease with the completion of the project. Total revenues of \$6 million, reflecting a \$5.2 million (46 percent) reduction in project revenue.

An increase in 2009-10 revenue due to timing of receipts from State agencies is expected to result in a significant carryover at June 30, 2010. If realized, the surplus will be \$430,786. The District Attorney will repay the General Reserve for a \$211,812 loan advanced in 2003-04, and utilize \$217,397 to offset the net county cost in the 2010-11 requested budget.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

As requested by the department head with several revisions. Delete two positions vacant since February 2009, a Deputy District Attorney I/II/III, and a Legal Process Clerk I/II. There is no net effect on Salaries and Benefits due to the offset to unallocated salary savings. The transfer-out to Capital Projects is increased by \$200,000 to align the budget with the Land, Buildings and Improvements budget. A transfer-in from Accumulated Capital Outlay offsets this expense.

The CAO's recommended budget approves the use of Public Safety fund balance in the amount of \$217,405.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The department has prepared the FY 2010-11 Requested Budget with anticipated state budget cuts where they can be reasonably projected. Further reductions may be necessary during the fiscal year depending on additional or actual state budget cuts, and/or further reductions in General Fund, Prop 172, or the new state Local Safety and Protection Account (0.15 percent of the Vehicle License Fee) revenues. 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.

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

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 228 - CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
REVENUE FROM MONEY & PROPERTY	\$266,857	\$37,183		\$20,500	\$20,500
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$7,618,614	\$7,375,558		\$8,100,856	\$8,100,856
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$1,432	\$6		\$0	\$0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$74,447	\$70,980		\$73,061	\$73,061
Total Revenues:	\$7,961,351	\$7,483,727		\$8,194,417	\$8,194,417
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$6,006,603	\$5,807,172		\$6,631,626	\$6,631,626
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$1,557,322	\$1,791,089		\$1,511,548	\$1,511,548
OTHER CHARGES	\$129,006	\$229,978		\$233,554	\$233,554
FIXED ASSETS	\$13,266	\$0		\$0	\$0
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	\$0	(\$47)		\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$7,706,198	\$7,828,193		\$8,376,728	\$8,376,728
Net Cost:	(\$255,152)	\$344,465		\$182,311	\$182,311

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.

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 2010-11 requested appropriations are approximately \$8.3 million, a decrease of \$130,566 (1.5 percent) compared to the previous year's adjusted budget appropriation. Revenues are estimated to be \$8.1 million, with no cost to the county general fund.

Salaries and Benefits are requested at approximately \$6.6 million, \$142,989 less than FY 2009-10.

Changes to the Position Allocation will result in a net reduction of 4.0 FTE's as follows: add one Staff Services Analyst I/II to assist with completion of state mandated compliance/data reliability audits, in addition to other duties; and delete 5 vacant positions - 2 Account Clerk III, and 3 Child Support Specialist I/II.

Revenue is requested 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 2010-11. During FY 2009-10, the department expanded activities in this area to be eligible for receipt of the RSF dollars. A specialized HIT Team (High Impact Team) was formed with a strong emphasis on direct contact with customers through personal telephone calls, personal service of legal documents, and emphasis on reaching child support stipulations rather than rely heavily on the court process to obtain initial or modified child support cases.

In the midst of flat budgets, a decrease in staffing, and transition to latest child support enforcement collection system (CSE), the department collected over \$23 million in current child support and arrears payments. The department was recognized by the State Department of Child Support Services as the "Most Improved in Collection on Current Support" for the medium size counties. The department has an open caseload of over 15,044 cases; of these 23 percent are active Temporary Assistance to Needy Families

(TANF) cases, 55 percent are former TANF, and 22 percent have never received TANF benefits. In December 2008 the department implemented the Enterprise Customer Service Solution (ECSS) which is a statewide skill level based call routing system. The department is committed to providing convenient access for the public and encourages using technology wherever possible to increase efficiencies, collections, and customer service satisfaction.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The budget is recommended as requested by the department head with minor adjustments. 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 State Department of Child Support Services is considering ways to share services across counties as a way to decrease costs, while maintaining the same or increased level of service. Shasta County is now a call center, taking calls for Siskiyou/Modoc. Shasta is also a part of the State Business Continuity Plan. Should another county have an emergency or ECSS outage, calls will be routed to our call center.

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

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 235 - SHERIFF
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: POLICE PROTECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
LICENSES, PERMITS & FRANCHISES	\$34,005	\$45,944	\$28,270	\$28,270	
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$764,507	\$1,851,727	\$0	\$0	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$9,221,591	\$8,276,806	\$8,474,637	\$8,474,637	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$2,802,107	\$2,855,973	\$2,786,279	\$2,786,279	
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$10,351	\$10,838	\$150	\$150	
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$6,090,740	\$5,344,705	\$4,669,415	\$4,669,415	
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE F/A	\$36,851	\$21,668	\$3,500	\$3,500	
Total Revenues:	\$18,960,156	\$18,407,662	\$15,962,251	\$15,962,251	
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$13,381,973	\$11,967,710	\$12,146,461	\$12,146,461	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$3,139,895	\$2,993,829	\$3,015,385	\$3,015,385	
OTHER CHARGES	\$1,757,060	\$1,961,200	\$1,885,767	\$1,885,767	
FIXED ASSETS	\$57,395	\$328,490	\$0	\$0	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	(\$65,363)	(\$65,120)	(\$9,551)	(\$9,551)	
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$243,683	\$142,315	\$136,655	\$136,655	
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$18,514,644	\$17,328,425	\$17,174,717	\$17,174,717	
Net Cost:	(\$445,512)	(\$1,079,237)	\$1,212,466	\$1,212,466	

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 2010-11 total a little over \$15.1 million, a 15.9 percent, or \$2,864,847, decrease over the FY 2009-10 Adjusted Budget. Salaries and Benefits have decreased \$837,343, or 6.8 percent, primarily due to a budget error in the Employer Share Health Insurance charges. The Sheriff's Unallocated Salary Savings have decreased by \$32,139, or 5.4 percent, from \$592,940 to \$560,801. The Sheriff will be keeping several positions vacant in order to realize these budgeted salary savings during FY 2010-11. Services and Supplies have decreased 5.1 percent, or \$163,367, primarily due to decreases in minor equipment, liability insurance, and transportation and travel charges. Expenditures that increased were maintenance of equipment, facilities maintenance, rents and leases, postage, utilities, and professional and special services. Other Charges have decreased 75 percent, or over \$1.6 million, almost exclusively due to unallocated expenditures; A-87 Central Services charges have remained relatively flat. Intrafund Transfers have decreased by 49.7 percent, or \$9,449, from \$19,000 in the FY 2009-10 Adjusted Budget. Other Financing Uses revenue has remained unchanged. There are no new positions and no new fixed assets requested in FY 2010-11.

Requested Revenue totals just over \$15.1 million, including a Public Safety Augmentation (Prop. 172) allocation of almost \$4.82 million (7.9 percent increase), General Fund support of almost \$4.24 million (19.3 percent decrease), and an additional General Fund Transfer-In in the amount of \$74,049 to offset the A-87 increase attributable to the new Administration Center. Overall requested revenue has decreased 11.8 percent, or \$2,022,959, due to the anticipated reduction of many state and federal revenues and programs as well as a decrease in Fines, Forfeitures & Penalties, as well as General Fund support. The Sheriff has been very conservative with his FY 2010-11 revenue projections. Charges for Services revenue remains flat in FY 2010-11. Intergovernmental Revenues have decreased \$341,647, or 4 percent. This is due to the projected reduction in funding for state programs

funded with the Local Safety and Protection Account (state General Funds were replaced with Vehicle License Fee-based revenue in FY 2008-09) like the CAL-MMET and the Rural County Law Enforcement grants. Other sources that are projected to decrease are the Federal Emergency Management Assistance reimbursements and the Remote Access Network fund. The federal Marijuana Suppression and Department of Justice grants are also reduced. The Sheriff has submitted several grant applications for FY 2010-11 in which notification of award has not yet been received; if awarded this could increase revenues in the amount of \$474,609. Charges for Services revenue in FY 2010-11 remains flat. Other Financing Trans-In has decreased \$1,034,109 or 19.2 percent, primarily due to the reduction in General Fund support.

Overall, total expenditures have been decreased by 15.9 percent and total revenue has been decreased by 11.8 percent. Primarily due to the \$1.2 million in unallocated expenditures this budget has been requested with no net cost to the Public Safety fund when compared to the FY 2009-10 Adjusted Budget net cost.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CAO recommends the following changes to expenditures: increase Salary and Benefits in the amount of \$650,754 to correct the health insurance budget error and increase Unallocated Salary Savings to achieve additional reductions during the fiscal year; and increase Total Other Charges by \$1.34 million to reverse the Unallocated Expenditures; these changes increase total expenditures by almost \$2 million. The CAO recommends the following changes to revenue: increase Intergovernmental Revenue to increase Prop 172 revenue by \$349,571 and to budget a federal Department of Justice grant in the amount of \$117,474; and increase General Fund Trans-in by \$309,717; these changes increase total revenue by \$775,762. The CAO recommendations create a use of fund balance in the amount of \$1.2 million which will be funded by the use of the Sheriff's designated funds.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The Sheriff has prepared the FY 2010-11 Proposed Budget with anticipated state budget cuts where they can be reasonably projected. Further reductions may be necessary during the

fiscal year depending on additional or actual state budget cuts, and/or further reductions in General Fund, Prop 172, or the new state Local Safety and Protection Account (0.15 percent of the Vehicle License Fee) revenues.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

The department head concurs with this budget as recommended.

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

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 236 - BOATING SAFETY
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: POLICE PROTECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
TAXES	\$143,926	\$159,026		\$149,466	\$149,466
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$639,287	\$744,255		\$613,930	\$613,930
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$27,699	\$0		\$0	\$0
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$0	\$449		\$0	\$0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$156,177	\$159,481		\$84,220	\$84,220
Total Revenues:	\$967,090	\$1,063,213		\$847,616	\$847,616
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$610,939	\$541,767		\$556,985	\$556,985
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$332,325	\$239,283		\$253,947	\$253,947
OTHER CHARGES	\$27,264	\$25,649		\$36,684	\$36,684
FIXED ASSETS	\$0	\$174,425		\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$970,528	\$981,125		\$847,616	\$847,616
Net Cost:	\$3,438	(\$82,087)		\$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 2010-11 are \$847,616, a 21 percent decrease from FY 2009-10. The prior year included fixed assets of

\$212,084. Absent the fixed assets, the FY 2010-11 budget request is essentially status quo. Funding for this program comes from these sources: State Boating Safety funds (\$584,990), unsecured property tax levied on boats (\$149,466), sales tax revenue dedicated to public safety (Proposition 172) (\$25,440), federal excise tax (\$3,500) and a requested General Fund Transfer (\$84,220).

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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.

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

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 237 - SHERIFF CIVIL UNIT
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: POLICE PROTECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$190,097	\$177,979	\$158,771	\$158,771	
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$51	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total Revenues:	\$190,148	\$177,979	\$158,771	\$158,771	
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$475,300	\$361,994	\$381,324	\$381,324	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$86,544	\$65,970	\$74,013	\$74,013	
OTHER CHARGES	\$111,704	\$86,657	(\$34,987)	(\$34,987)	
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$673,550	\$514,622	\$420,350	\$420,350	
Net Cost:	\$483,401	\$336,642	\$261,579	\$261,579	

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 2010-11 requested expenditures of \$414,841 have decreased by \$134,966, or 24.5 percent, from the FY 2009-10 Adjusted Budget due to a significant decline in Central Service Cost A-87. Requested revenues of \$158,771 are a 20.8 percent decrease from the prior year. Many of the activities of the Civil Unit are required by the Court and are not offset by a fee for service; therefore, the net General Fund cost of this department is requested at \$256,070, a decrease of \$93,237 or 26.6 percent.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CAO recommended budget is as requested by the department head with an increase of \$5,509 to Salaries and Benefits for health insurance (\$5,230) and Other Post Employment Benefits (\$279).

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.

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

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

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

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$229,145	\$9,698	\$0	\$0	\$0
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$502,917	\$15,196	\$0	\$0	\$0
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$3,151	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$81,074	\$74,798	\$41,675	\$41,675	\$41,675
Total Revenues:	\$816,289	\$99,692	\$41,675	\$41,675	\$41,675
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$414,669	\$4,241	\$3,823	\$3,823	\$3,823
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$354,371	\$52,877	\$34,793	\$34,793	\$34,793
OTHER CHARGES	\$29,531	\$28,688	\$3,059	\$3,059	\$3,059
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$798,572	\$85,808	\$41,675	\$41,675	\$41,675
Net Cost:	(\$17,716)	(\$13,884)	\$0	\$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. In 2009 the entire facility was closed due to the decline in County discretionary revenue and revenues dedicated to public safety. No inmates are housed in the facility and work release operations are now provided on a reduced scale as a program operated in the Main Jail.

BUDGET REQUESTS

While the program has closed down and minimal work release operations are now included in the Main Jail budget there remains ongoing "run-out" costs after closure. Appropriations for Central Service A-87 costs, worker's compensation experience, liability exposure and experience, other miscellaneous insurance, along with facility maintenance charges total \$41,675 in FY 2010-11.

Four positions remain unfunded and will be transferred to the Main Jail. Revenue is from a transfer-in from the General Fund, \$41,675.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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.

VICTIM / WITNESS ASSISTANCE
Fund 0060 General, Budget Unit 256
Gerald Benito, District Attorney

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 256 - VICTIM WITNESS ASSISTANCE
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: JUDICIAL

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$861,641	\$782,998		\$727,336	\$727,336
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$9,872	\$10,557		\$0	\$0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$26,290	\$0		\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$897,804	\$793,555		\$727,336	\$727,336
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$653,941	\$633,823		\$704,579	\$704,579
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$307,814	\$83,354		\$84,740	\$84,740
OTHER CHARGES	\$67,424	\$58,973		\$56,869	\$56,869
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$1,029,179	\$776,151		\$846,188	\$846,188
Net Cost:	\$131,375	(\$17,404)		\$118,852	\$118,852

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 2010-11 requested appropriations of \$846,189 reflect a decrease from the FY 2009-10 Adjusted Budget of \$1 million, or 15.8 percent. Salaries and benefits will increase 2.7 percent, and Services and Supplies will decrease 62

percent. The sharp decline is attributable to the cessation of the Child Abuse Treatment (CHAT) grant.

Requested Revenues of \$727,336 reflect a decrease of \$209,296, or 22.3 percent, primarily due to the CHAT grant, and the Crime Victims' Rights State Mandate suspension.

The FY 2010-11 requested net County cost is \$118,852; the FY 2009-10 adopted net County cost was \$96,125, an increase of \$22,727. At the end of FY 2009-10 the department projects a savings of \$27,788, for a net decrease of \$5,061. Therefore, the target 5 percent reduction has been met.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CAO recommends the budget as requested by the department head. In December 2009, the County Administrative Office instructed General fund departments that a 5 percent reduction in net County cost was required for the 2010-11 budget. Since then the District Attorney has obtained funding for the Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) from Shasta Regional Medical Center. This resulted in a savings of \$27,700 to the General Fund in 2009-10. The combined savings

to the General Fund from SART and the projected yearend carryover is \$55,488.

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 CAO recommendations.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.

SHERIFF / CORONER-JAIL
Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 260
Tom Bosenko, Sheriff/Coroner

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 260 - JAIL
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: DETENTION AND CORRECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
FINES, FORFEITURES & PENALTIES	\$292,976	\$628,024	\$448,200	\$448,200	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$3,314,402	\$3,060,660	\$3,022,671	\$3,022,671	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$291,524	\$474,633	\$271,867	\$271,867	
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$99,522	\$27,836	\$1,094	\$1,094	
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$7,731,275	\$8,484,593	\$8,049,829	\$8,049,829	
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE F/A	\$0	\$300	\$0	\$0	
Total Revenues:	\$11,729,701	\$12,676,048	\$11,793,661	\$11,793,661	
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$6,952,783	\$6,976,493	\$6,793,413	\$6,793,413	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$4,256,957	\$3,791,815	\$4,066,393	\$4,066,393	
OTHER CHARGES	\$312,646	\$401,779	\$404,460	\$404,460	
FIXED ASSETS	\$26,951	\$0	\$243,200	\$243,200	
OTHER FINANCING USES	\$592,185	\$951,715	\$547,298	\$547,298	
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$12,141,525	\$12,121,803	\$12,054,764	\$12,054,764	
Net Cost:	\$411,823	(\$554,245)	\$261,103	\$261,103	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The Jail operates under a 1993 Superior court Capacity Release Order limiting the inmate population to no more than 10 percent of the Jail and 10 percent of each housing unit, or 381 inmates. A floor of the Jail was closed in 2009, due to the decline in County discretionary revenue and revenues dedicated to public safety.

BUDGET REQUESTS

The Jail will continue to keep a floor closed during FY 2010-11 due to continuing fiscal constraints. Total FY 2010-11 requested appropriations are \$11.6 million, including a reduction of \$444,800 in unallocated expenditure reductions. Salaries and Benefits are requested in the amount of \$6.8

million, a decrease of \$300,286 or 4.2 percent. Services and Supplies of \$4 million are essentially status quo. Debt service on the Jail building is included (\$547,299). A transfer-out to capital projects is for the roof, siding, and closed circuit television (CCTV) projects (\$280,000). Adjusting total appropriations for the unallocated expenditure reductions nets a \$662,683 reduction from the prior year, or 5 percent.

Requested Revenues of \$11.6 million include a General fund transfer-in of \$8 million, and \$2.6 million from Proposition 172. A transfer in from the Criminal Justice Trust Fund of \$455,000 is to offset a portion of the debt service as well as the roof, siding and CCTV projects.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CAO recommended budget reduces overtime costs by \$30,000 for additional savings in Salaries and Benefits. There are other technical corrections to Other Post Employment Benefits and transfer-out to capital projects. The CCTV project will not

be completed before June 30, and is rebudgeted. The unallocated expenditure reduction (\$444,800) is mitigated by utilization of fund balance carryover in the amount of \$261,103, and additional Proposition 172 revenue, \$154,071.

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.

SHERIFF / CORONER-BURNEY STATION
Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 261
Tom Bosenko, Sheriff/Coroner

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 261 - BURNEY SUBSTATION
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: DETENTION AND CORRECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$336,749	\$296,261		\$295,740	\$295,740
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$17,567	\$17,230		\$13,875	\$13,875
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$0	\$2		\$0	\$0
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$1,586,378	\$1,465,572		\$1,341,339	\$1,341,339
OTHER FINANCING SRCS SALE F/A	\$0	\$1		\$0	\$0
Total Revenues:	\$1,940,696	\$1,779,066		\$1,650,954	\$1,650,954
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$1,473,102	\$1,259,273		\$1,288,962	\$1,288,962
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$391,711	\$356,922		\$327,209	\$327,209
OTHER CHARGES	\$39,684	\$49,442		\$41,283	\$41,283
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	(\$6,525)	(\$6,676)		(\$6,500)	(\$6,500)
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$1,897,973	\$1,658,961		\$1,650,954	\$1,650,954
Net Cost:	(\$42,722)	(\$120,104)		\$0	\$0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Burney Enforcement Division of the Sheriff's Department provides law enforcement services to residents in Eastern Shasta County. The services provided include: patrol, investigations, animal control, and other public and police services. In 2009, and continuing in 2010-11, many services were curtailed due to a decline in revenue dedicated to public safety.

BUDGET REQUESTS

Total FY 2010-1110 requested appropriations are \$1.6 million, a 6.7 percent reduction from the prior year. Reductions in employee retirement expense and workers' compensation insurance contribute to the reduction. Controlled spending will result in a savings in Services and Supplies of 10 percent in 2009-10; the budget request for 2010-11 is further reduced by 22.4 percent. Central Service Cost A-87 is declining 16.5 percent.

Primary revenue sources include Proposition 172, \$295,740, and General Fund support, \$1.3 million.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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.

PROBATION-JUVENILE HALL
Fund 0195 Public Safety, Budget Unit 262
Wesley Foreman, Chief Probation Officer

State Controller Schedules
 County Budget Act
 January 2010

County of Shasta
 Detail of Financing Sources and Financing Uses
 Governmental Funds
 Fiscal Year 2010-11

Schedule 9

Budget Unit: 262 - JUVENILE HALL
Function: PUBLIC PROTECTION
Activity: DETENTION AND CORRECTION

Detail By Revenue Category and Expenditure Object	2008-09 Actuals	2009-10		2010-11 Recommended	2010-11 Adopted by the Board of Supervisors
		Actual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		
1	2	3	4	5	
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	\$726,102	\$642,942	\$958,800	\$958,800	
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$69,439	\$76,665	\$58,000	\$58,000	
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	\$535	\$2,069	\$0	\$0	
OTHR FINANCING SOURCES TRAN IN	\$2,914,815	\$2,801,208	\$2,556,757	\$2,556,757	
Total Revenues:	\$3,710,893	\$3,522,885	\$3,573,557	\$3,573,557	
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$2,413,211	\$2,196,522	\$2,259,355	\$2,259,355	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$1,210,679	\$1,064,154	\$1,129,109	\$1,129,109	
OTHER CHARGES	\$132,867	\$201,567	\$185,093	\$185,093	
Total Expenditures/Appropriations:	\$3,756,758	\$3,462,245	\$3,573,557	\$3,573,557	
Net Cost:	\$45,864	(\$60,640)	\$0	\$0	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Shasta County Juvenile Hall is a 24-hour a day detention facility administered by the Probation Department to house up to 56 juveniles per day. The youth detained are either wards of the court or juveniles being detained for alleged criminal conduct, either awaiting disposition or court-ordered placement. Juvenile Hall staff is responsible for facilitating rehabilitative programming to minors in a secure custodial setting, while ensuring the safety and security of the minors and public.

This budget unit reflects the cost of maintaining a detention center with a philosophy based on rehabilitative values. Probation is committed to providing quality service to the community by reducing criminogenic factors within the County's juvenile population.

BUDGET REQUESTS

Total FY 2010-11 requested appropriations are essentially status quo, less than 1 percent over the previous year, comprised of Salaries and Benefits

(\$2.2 million), Services and Supplies (\$1.1 million), and Other Charges (\$185,093). Professional Admin Services, Probation administrative overhead, is increasing \$78,203 (20 percent). With the closure of the Crystal Creek boys Camp a greater share of overhead is picked up by Hall. Other Charges declined 8 percent due to a decrease in A-87 Central Service charges. There are no current vacancies. The department did not add 10 percent to health insurance, choosing to absorb any increase through salary savings due to attrition. Spending on consumable items such as office and building supplies will be held to a minimum. No new fixed assets or equipment are requested.

Requested revenues of \$3.5 million are also essentially status quo. There is no growth in the General Fund Transfer-in (\$2.5 million); or Public Safety Augmentation (Prop 172) revenue (\$575,580). For the first time the department will utilize Juvenile Justice Block Grant revenue in the amount of \$321,220 to balance the budget.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The CAO recommendation is a \$2,000 technical reduction to communications expense, offset by a reduction in Intergovernmental revenue.

PENDING ISSUES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Due to the continuing decline in County discretionary revenue, as well as revenues dedicated to public safety, the census in the Juvenile Hall has been held at approximately 35 minors.

Senate bill 81, enacted in 2007, has created the potential for local detention facilities being asked to house more serious offenders for longer periods of time. The full impact is yet unknown; however, additional staff will be required to offset increased security risk in the event the Hall is impacted by SB 81.

The department was successful in its application for SB 81 (Local Youthful Offender Rehabilitative Facility Construction Funding Program, chapter 75

- signed into law by the Governor on August 24, 2007) lease-revenue bond funding in the amount of \$15 million for the purpose of constructing a new local Juvenile Hall facility. A new project budget (16902) has been established for the construction of the new Juvenile Hall project and the total project cost will be \$17.5 million with an estimated opening date in the summer of 2012. It is also currently estimated that the County's share of the total project costs will be \$2.5 million and this amount has been funded from the County's capital funds. Funding for increased operational costs (between \$100,000 to \$500,000 per year) has not yet been identified.

DEPARTMENT HEAD CONCURRENCE OR APPEAL

The department head concurs with the recommended budget.

FINAL BOARD ACTION

Adopted as presented in the proposed budget.