



# Law & Justice

## *Section E*

The Sutter County Gang Task Force, a collaboration between the Sutter County Sheriff's Department, Yuba City Police Department, Sutter County District Attorney's Office, and the Narcotics Enforcement Team, has been successful in reducing the number of shootings by taking gang members, drugs and guns off the streets.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY					
DEPT HEAD: JAMIE E. MURRAY		UNIT: CHILD SUPP SERV REIMB/ADJUSTME FUND: CHILD SUPP SERV REIMB/ADJUSTME 0112 0-112			
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	2,551,520	1,792,106	2,718,469	2,613,734	3.9-
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	211,082	144,227	235,951	244,420	3.6
OTHER CHARGES	246,121	222,961	310,090	238,166	23.2-
CAPITAL ASSETS	0	0	0	21,000	***
* GROSS BUDGET	3,008,723	2,159,294	3,264,510	3,117,320	4.5-
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	128	194	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	3,008,851	2,159,488	3,264,510	3,117,320	4.5-
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	0	.0
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0
* TOTAL BUDGET	3,008,851	2,159,488	3,264,510	3,117,320	4.5-
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	582	0	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	2,985,573	2,204,853	3,218,600	2,981,816	7.4-
GENERAL REVENUES	9,404	4,668	10,800	10,800	.0
CANCELLATION OF OBLIGATED F/B	0	0	35,110	124,704	255.2
AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE 7/1	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	2,995,559	2,209,521	3,264,510	3,117,320	4.5-
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	13,292	50,033-	0	0	.0
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	33.00	33.00	32.00	31.00	3.1-

## Purpose

The mission of the Sutter County Department of Child Support Services is to enhance the quality of life for children and families by providing child support establishment and enforcement services which ensures that both parents share the obligation to support their children. The Department is responsible for:

- Establishing paternity and child support orders;
- Enforcing the obligation of parents to provide child support and medical support to their minor children; and

- Recouping from non-custodial parents a portion of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) grants paid to families who are dependent on CAL-WORKS.

Department mandates involve:

- Locating and determining the income and assets of non-custodial parents;
- Enforcing support obligations; and
- Collections and disbursement of child support to families.

The department establishes paternity through court actions that follow DNA genetic testing

of parents and children. The department has the authority to attach income; place liens on real and personal property; intercept Federal and State tax refunds; report delinquencies to credit bureaus; and suspend or withhold business, professional and driver's licenses.

## Major Budget Changes

### Salaries & Benefits

- (\$70,730) Decrease in Other Pay due to the retirement of five (5) Child Support Specialists in FY 2011-12
- \$15,000 Increase in Extra Help for special data processing project
- (\$49,005) Decrease in general salaries and benefits due to reduction in step salary for new employees and position changes

### Other Charges

- (\$67,291) Decrease in Interfund Overhead (A-87) Cost Plan charges as provided by the Auditor-Controller's office

### Capital Asset

- \$21,000 Increase due to request for new vehicle to replace 1999 vehicle

### Revenues

- (\$236,784) Decrease due to reduction in one-time revenue source in the prior year

## Program Discussion

There are no General Funds appropriated to this Department. Beginning in FY 2009-10, this budget has been maintained as an operating budget in Special Revenue Fund (0-112) rather than budget unit #2-108.

Local program costs are 100% reimbursed by Federal (66% share) and State (34% share) funding. The funding consists of three allocations, the Base Administrative Allocation funding (\$2,890,188), Revenue Stabilization Augmentation (\$79,450), and the Electronic Data Processing (EDP) funding (\$12,178). The EDP funding is an annual request and cannot be relied upon for approval each fiscal year.

With the continuation of the Revenue Stabilization Augmentation (RSA) and the State Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) funding, we continue to target Early Intervention programs and monitor the progress of this program. This funding allowed us to maintain our current staffing levels.

With the completion of BackFile Project to image all of our open case files we now have open office space where shelving previously held our paper case files. We propose to remodel the space into a conference/training room.

Due to the retirement of a Legal Secretary and a business process redesign, the department is requesting to replace the Legal Secretary position with an additional Child Support Specialist I/II. The CSS I/II position will allow this office to increase its' annual collections of \$8.4M. It is estimated that 80% of our collections (\$6.7M) is circulated within the Sutter County economy.

## Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$3,117,320 a 4.5 % reduction compared to FY 2011-12. This budget unit does not receive any funding from the General Fund. All funding is provided through State and Federal sources.

The recommended budget reflects a proposed change in two positions:

- Eliminating the Legal Secretary due to a retirement; and
- Funding a Child Support Specialist I/II position.

In FY 2010-11, the Chief Child Support Attorney position was unfunded and it is recommended that this continue for FY 2012-13.

Additional reductions in this budget unit could jeopardize the amount of State and Federal funding that this budget unit would receive in the future. The budget unit must spend all of the funding that is received from these sources in order to maintain this level of funding.

## Use of Fund Balance

The Child Support Services fund contains a Restricted Fund Balance in the amount of \$223,961 as of July 1, 2011. It is estimated that the Restricted Fund Balance will equal \$167,031 at July 1, 2012.

The FY 2012-13 Recommended Budget includes a cancellation of Obligated Fund Balance from the Restricted Fund Balance account (#31170) in the amount of \$124,704 leaving an estimated ending balance of \$42,327.

# District Attorney Criminal Division (2-125)

Carl V. Adams, District Attorney

E X E C U T I V E S U M M A R Y						
DEPT HEAD: CARL V ADAMS	UNIT: DISTRICT ATTORNEY	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-125	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	3,156,615	2,115,628	3,176,423	3,063,002	3.6-	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	144,508	67,304	147,340	142,340	3.4-	
OTHER CHARGES	246,596	118,692	225,263	213,021	5.4-	
* GROSS BUDGET	3,547,719	2,301,624	3,549,026	3,418,363	3.7-	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	3,547,719	2,301,624	3,549,026	3,418,363	3.7-	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	292,088	180,313	409,825	424,501	3.6	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	143,122	170,662	240,516	137,101	43.0-	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	435,210	350,975	650,341	561,602	13.6-	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	3,112,509	1,950,649	2,898,685	2,856,761	1.4-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	31.50	30.50	30.50	30.00	1.6-	

## Purpose

This budget unit funds the entire District Attorney's operation including administration, with the exception of one partially grant-funded Deputy District Attorney position in the Anti-Drug Abuse budget (2-302). The District Attorney is responsible for both adult and juvenile criminal prosecution. The District Attorney's Office provides a number of collateral activities including the Victim/Witness Assistance Program, assistance to law enforcement, investigative assistance to the Grand Jury, and on rare occasions, investigative support for the County Administrative Office.

## Major Budget Changes

### Salaries & Benefits

- (\$113,421) Decrease to Salaries & Benefits primarily due to holding one additional Senior Criminal Investigator position vacant and unfunded for FY 2012-13

### Services & Supplies

- (\$5,000) Decrease in Subscriptions to generate additional budget reductions

### Revenues

- (\$105,865) Decrease in CalEMA revenue due to elimination of

Statutory Rape Vertical  
Prosecution Grant

## Program Discussion

The District Attorney is responsible for both adult and juvenile criminal prosecution. The District Attorney also administers the grant-funded Victim/Witness Assistance Program and provides legal and investigative assistance to other departments and agencies.

Approximately five of the 28 FTEs in the District Attorney's Office are reimbursed by State programs. This includes Welfare Fraud Investigation and the Victim-Witness Assistance program. Mandated activities involving child abduction are also reimbursed by the State.

The Victim/Witness Program provides support services to victims and witnesses of crimes as constitutionally required under the Victims' Bill of Rights Act of 2008: Marsy's Law. This program provides victims with information and referrals to other service agencies and provides victims and witnesses with court support services including a general orientation to the criminal justice system, information on case status and disposition and court transportation and escort when required. Victim Advocates also assist victims with claims for assistance from the California Restitution Fund.

District Attorneys are mandated to provide Child Abduction Program services under the provisions of California Family Code §3130. The Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act requires that the District Attorney assist the Courts in locating and returning children who are unlawfully removed and detained from the Court's

jurisdiction. Reimbursement for these activities has not been paid by the State in recent years.

The Welfare Fraud Prosecution Program investigates and prosecutes criminal welfare fraud, including cases from the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families and CalFresh programs, as well as vendor fraud cases. The program is funded by federal and state welfare administration funds received by the Human Services Department for administering Federal and State welfare programs at the local level. The small amount to investigate In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) fraud has been eliminated.

The Statutory Rape Vertical Prosecution (SRVP) program provided funding to assist the District Attorney's efforts to prosecute criminal cases against adults who have sexual contact of all types (voluntary or not) with minors. These grants were funded by Vehicle License Fee related revenue, which was eliminated by the state budget trigger cuts. It is unlikely the state will restore funding for the FY 2012-13 budget. If the State appropriates funding for this program, the budget will be adjusted accordingly. Regardless of whether the SRVP grants are funded in the future, the District Attorney is still obligated to prosecute these crimes. The D.A. received \$65,594 last fiscal year for this program.

### Sutter County Gang Task Force

The Sutter County Gang Task Force was formed by action of the Sutter County Board of Supervisors in October of 2008. The intent was to accomplish better investigation and prosecution through a cooperative and focused approach.

There has been a significant increase in gang activity in the last decade. Gang-related cases have increased from almost none in 2001 to an explosion of such cases during the last several years. There has been a 75% increase in cases where gang enhancements are charged. Gang cases are always difficult and time-consuming to prosecute because victims and witnesses are often themselves gang members and often refuse or are reluctant to cooperate with law enforcement. Fiscal year costs have been affected by arrests made in a series of gang-related homicides dating back to 2004 and 2005.

#### General Criminal Prosecution

At the start of 2012, there were 6 individuals charged with murder in various stages of the legal process. Two of these cases are death penalty cases. The costs associated with a murder trial can be significant and the number of cases pending is very high in Sutter County. The Criminal Division budget does not include any provision for the cost of changes of venue nor for special prosecutions as that cost is speculative.

The District Attorney's office and the general fund have benefited in the past from various grants which paid for the prosecution and investigation of specific crime types. Much of the grant funding is gone this year but the crimes in those categories still continue.

However, the District Attorney's office continues to prosecute crimes such as sexual assault despite the loss of funding. The current prosecutor staff is 18% below the experience level of this office just six years ago based on years of experience. The reduction in experience is compounded by a prosecutor staff reduction in from 11 to 10 positions. At the same time, the Office is dealing with a

23% increase in misdemeanor crime and a 75% increase in cases where gang enhancements are charged.

## **Recommended Budget**

This budget is recommended at \$3,418,363, which is a decrease of \$130,663 (3.7%) compared to FY 2011-12. The General Fund provides approximately 57% of the financing for this budget unit and is reduced by \$41,924 (1.4%) for FY 2012-13.

It should be noted that these funding calculations reflect the addition of Public Safety Augmentation Funds (Proposition 172), which are transferred into the Public Safety fund through the Public Safety General budget unit (2-210). California voters enacted Proposition 172 in 1993, which established a permanent statewide half-cent sales tax for support of local public safety functions.

During FY 2011-12, the District Attorney eliminated one filled Legal Secretary II position and left vacant one full-time Deputy District Attorney position, two full-time Senior Criminal Investigator positions and one half-time Victim Advocate position to further reduce costs. These positions remain vacant and unfunded. For FY 2012-13, the District Attorney has agreed to leave vacant and unfunded one additional Senior Criminal Investigator position. One of the vacant and unfunded Senior Criminal Investigator positions, currently assigned to the Anti-Drug Abuse (2-302) budget unit, is recommended to be eliminated as it is a Limited-Term position.

Due to the State's ongoing fiscal crisis, all State grants and State-funded programs, such as Child Abduction, are potentially at risk of being reduced or eliminated. Any



significant budget cuts at the State level could have a further impact on the District Attorney's Office budget.

There is currently \$28,048 budgeted for State Citizens' Option for Public Safety (COPS) revenue and \$133,101 budgeted for California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA) grant revenue in the District Attorney's budget.

Further reductions are not recommended at this time as they would result in the elimination of additional personnel and would directly affect the current level of service provided to the County.

## **Use of Fund Balance**

This budget unit is within the Public Safety Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.

**District Attorney  
Anti-Drug Abuse (2-302)**

*Carl Adams, District Attorney*

E X E C U T I V E   S U M M A R Y					
DEPT HEAD: CARL V ADAMS	UNIT: ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ENFORCEMENT		FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY		0015 2-302
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>					
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	570,178	440,871	509,067	374,780	26.4-
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	950	1,000	900	900	.0
OTHER CHARGES	4,471	2,083	4,478	4,070	9.1-
* GROSS BUDGET	575,599	443,954	514,445	379,750	26.2-
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	575,599	443,954	514,445	379,750	26.2-
<b>OTHER REVENUES</b>					
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	376,010	132,563	310,851	185,802	40.2-
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	376,010	132,563	310,851	185,802	40.2-
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	199,589	311,391	203,594	193,948	4.7-
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	40.0-

**Purpose**

Since January, 1988, the Board of Supervisors has used Anti-Drug Abuse grant funds from the State of California to impact and curtail the use, manufacture and sale of illegal drugs and narcotics in Sutter County. This money funds a portion of the County’s participation in NET-5 (Narcotics Enforcement Team – 5).

**Revenue**

- (\$125,049) Decrease in revenue related to the completion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act grant program

**Major Budget Changes**

**Salaries and Benefits**

- (\$134,287) Decrease in Salaries & Benefits due to the elimination of two Limited-Term positions

**Program Discussion**

The Anti-Drug Abuse budget consists of one staff member from each of the three law enforcement Departments: a Deputy District Attorney, a Deputy Sheriff and a Deputy Probation Officer. With the addition of the one-time ADA Recovery Act funds in 2010, the County added a Senior Criminal Investigator and a Probation Officer to the Anti-Drug effort. Those funds have been expended and the personnel have returned to their respective departments. The staff funded

by the grant augments Sutter County's efforts to arrest and prosecute individuals who participate in the manufacture, use or sale of illegal drugs.

The California Emergency Management Agency, as the grant administrative agency, continues to make grant funds available to each County for local anti-drug efforts.

Grant awards have fluctuated as follows:

- FY 2000-01           \$183,515
  - FY 2001-02           \$190,489
  - FY 2002-03           \$185,896
  - FY 2003-04           \$213,378
  - FY 2004-05           \$216,786
  - FY 2005-06           \$198,946
  - FY 2006-07           \$123,451
  - FY 2007-08           \$142,791
  - FY 2008-09           \$137,563
  - FY 2009-10           \$123,451
  - FY 2010-11           \$150,858
- (plus a one-time American Recover and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) stimulus grant of \$308,863 to be spent by March 2012)
- FY 2011-12           \$185,802

The FY 2012-13 grant amount was initially projected to be \$185,802. However, as of the time of this writing, it is uncertain whether revenues will be fully realized. This situation will be monitored and, if necessary, further recommendations will be presented to the Board of Supervisors during the mid-year budget review. The District Attorney's Office administers the grant. The Sheriff, Chief Probation Officer and the District Attorney all concur with the current distribution of funds.

Due to the State's ongoing fiscal crisis, all state grant funds are potentially in peril. At this time, it is not known if the Anti-Drug Abuse grant will be affected.

## **Recommended Budget**

This budget is recommended at \$379,750, which is a decrease of \$134,695 (26.2%) compared to FY 2011-12. This decrease is primarily related to the completion of the ARRA stimulus grant program funding in FY 2011-12. Along with the completion of the ARRA funding, two vacant Limited-Term positions are recommended to be eliminated from the Anti-Drug Abuse budget unit; one Limited-Term Senior Criminal Investigator position and one Limited-Term Deputy Probation Officer III position.

Any further reductions to this budget unit would directly affect the level of services provided. Due to the lack of any budgeted services and supplies in this budget unit, all reductions would necessarily involve personnel. These reductions would subsequently be further reflected in the District Attorney, Probation and Sheriff's budget units.

## **Use of Fund Balance**

This budget unit is within the Public Safety Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.

# Grand Jury (2-104)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY					
UNIT: GRAND JURY	FUND: GENERAL			0001 2-104	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	45,712	24,133	33,353	35,353	6.0
OTHER CHARGES	3,911	918	6,008	6,184	2.9
* GROSS BUDGET	49,623	25,051	39,361	41,537	5.5
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	1,091	830	600	1,377	129.5
* NET BUDGET	50,714	25,881	39,961	42,914	7.4
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	50,714	25,881	39,961	42,914	7.4
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0

## Purpose

The Grand Jury is impaneled once each year and has three basic functions: weigh criminal charges and determine whether indictments should be returned; weigh allegations of misconduct against public officials and determine whether to present formal accusations requesting their removal from office; and act as the public's "watchdog" by investigating and reporting upon the affairs of local government.

## Major Budget Changes

### Services & Supplies

- \$2,000 Increase in Utilities due to change in meeting location for Grand Jury

### Intrafund Transfers

- \$777 Increase in Intrafund Postage due to increased use of postage services

## Program Discussion

The Grand Jury serves as an ombudsperson for citizens of the County. It may receive and investigate complaints by individuals concerning the actions and performances of public officials.

The Grand Jury's 19 members are appointed by the Superior Court. Grand jurors generally serve for one year. Some jurors may serve for a second year to provide an element of continuity from one jury to the next. Continuity of information is also provided by documents collected and retained in the Grand Jury library. The

## Grand Jury (2-104)

---

Superior Court provides staff services to the Grand Jury.

Members of the Grand Jury are sworn to secrecy and most of the jury's work is conducted in closed session. All testimony and deliberation are confidential.

Money appropriated in this budget is used for office supplies, clerical support, grand juror training, travel expenses and other costs incurred by the Grand Jury members.

### Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$42,914, which is an increase of \$2,953 (7.4%) compared to FY 2011-12. The General Fund provides 100% of the financing for this budget unit.

The increase in costs for FY 2012-13 are primarily due to a change in meeting location for the Grand Jury. This change was out of the control of both the County and the Grand Jury and was necessitated by a reorganization of the Superior Court's offices.

It should be noted that many of the expenditures incurred by each year's Grand Jury are authorized in Government Code and are not restricted by the County's annual budget. These expenditure items are based on the needs of each year's Grand Jury and may vary from year to year. The County ultimately has limited ability to affect or predict expenditures.

### Use of Fund Balance

This budget unit is within the General Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.

# Probation Juvenile Hall Unit (2-309)

Christine D. Odom, Chief Probation Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: CHRISTINE D ODOM	UNIT: BI-COUNTY JUVENILE HALL	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-309	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
EXPENDITURES						
OTHER CHARGES	1,555,537	887,812	1,600,000	1,440,300	10.0-	
* GROSS BUDGET	1,555,537	887,812	1,600,000	1,440,300	10.0-	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	1,555,537	887,812	1,600,000	1,440,300	10.0-	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	10,215	3,995	3,000	3,000	.0	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	10,215	3,995	3,000	3,000	.0	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	1,545,322	883,817	1,597,000	1,437,300	10.0-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0	

## Purpose

The Juvenile Hall and Maxine Singer Youth Guidance Center are Bi-County institutions owned equally by Yuba and Sutter Counties. Pursuant to a 1975 Joint Powers Agreement (JPA), the facilities are administered by Yuba County. All Juvenile Hall and Camp staff is employed by Yuba County. Juvenile Hall's main purpose is the detention of youth pending Court proceedings, although some commitments are made to the facility. The Camp provides a multi-faceted long term commitment program.

## Major Budget Changes

### Other Charges

- (\$159,700) Decrease in Sutter County's budgeted share of cost for the bi-county facility

## Program Discussion

The capacity for the Bi-County facilities consists of 60 beds within the Camp, 45 beds for temporary detention in the Juvenile Hall building and a 15-bed Security Housing Unit. The total of 120 beds allows the two counties to provide comprehensive programs for minors locally.

This budget reflects Sutter County's share of operational costs of this bi-county facility. Cost sharing by the counties is normally calculated by a formula based on 50% of certain agreed-upon "base costs," in addition to a pro-rata share of certain variable costs, that are determined monthly based upon the proportional number of minors detained from each respective county. As a result of a reduction in available funding from both counties over the past few years and concerns about decreasing revenues, it is proposed that each county be prepared to pay the amount

# Probation

## Juvenile Hall Unit (2-309)

---

*Christine D. Odom, Chief Probation Officer*

necessary this year to keep the two facilities operational, irrespective of population.

Every year the probation departments have done their best to keep the Camp Singer program open through difficult fiscal times; fully understanding that the day would come when there could be no additional cuts to be made, absent eliminating the camp program. Knowing that the Boards and CAO's in each county fully support these facilities and the long standing joint agreement to run these bi-county programs, the departments believe that the proposed budget will allow us to use the next year to determine how to establish an agreement that will ensure continued operation regardless of the ebb and flow of population, changes in administration and challenging fiscal times. This proposed budget is required to allow time to consider a number of complex issues that impact the joint operation of these facilities.

Each county has over the years benefited from decreased bookings at a variety of times, as each department has strived to implement programs and practices that reduce or minimize the need for long periods of detention. At the same time, youth who were previously sent to group homes out of the area, are now able to participate in a camp program in their own community, along with their families, while also giving back to the community with extensive community service. While one could argue that the reduced need for camp or juvenile hall beds would allow consideration for closure of the Camp, the reality is that there will always be a need for both facilities as they serve entirely different needs. The Juvenile Hall is reserved for short term detention or in rare instances, long term commitments for youth who have failed all other programs or some youth who are being tried as adults for more serious crimes. The

Camp is a long-term treatment program. We believe that both programs are needed to keep intact our strong array of graduated sanctions using the principles of effective intervention.

The current JPA establishes a pro rata division of certain items in the budget based upon population and a limited agreement in regards to A-87 costs. Consequently, although a yearly budget is adopted in consideration of a 50/50 split, the actual billings each month change dramatically based upon changes in population and variations in revenue, especially for bed-space rental by other counties. It is believed that both counties benefit from the availability of these two programs at a budgeted total cost of approximately \$2.8 million dollars, which is virtually unheard of in California.

Dramatic changes have occurred with these programs over the past 37 years, including increased responsibilities taken on by Yuba County Probation that are not reflected in the current JPA. This budget has been cut as much as it can be without closure, with the exception of a determination of whether to cut one Deputy Superintendent (DSI) from the program. The departments are therefore asking each Board to agree to a commitment to pay the amounts necessary to keep the doors open for FY 2012-13. This means each county will pay approximately one-half of actual costs, for FY 2012-13, without a pro rata division of the billing, although Yuba will budget \$17,610 more than Sutter in order to assist with the cost of the DSI for the first six months of the FY. Even with that agreement, a review of the revenue and expenses will have to occur at mid-year to determine if additional cuts will have to be made to the budget. If revenues do not come in as expected, one DSI will have to be eliminated from the program.

# Probation Juvenile Hall Unit (2-309)

---

*Christine D. Odom, Chief Probation Officer*

In the mean time, the chief probation officers will carry out a thorough review of actual costs associated with the operations, management structure and related program issues to include the general administrative oversight that is not currently reflected in the current pro rata agreement/billing or in the budget prepared by Yuba County. We anticipate having the assessment completed and recommendations made prior to the preparation of the FY 2013-14 budget.

## Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$1,440,300, which is a decrease of \$159,700 (10.0%) compared to FY 2011-12. The CAO supports paying the budgeted amount, in lieu of the actual pro rata share of each county, to enable the continued operation of this vital facility.

## Use of Fund Balance

This budget unit is within the Public Safety Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.



# Probation Delinquency Prevention Commission (2-303)

Christine D. Odom, Chief Probation Officer

E X E C U T I V E   S U M M A R Y					
DEPT HEAD: CHRISTINE D ODOM	UNIT: DELINQUENCY PREVENT COMMISSION FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY				0015 2-303
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	372	0	990	997	.7
OTHER CHARGES	67	2	10	3	70.0-
* GROSS BUDGET	439	2	1,000	1,000	.0
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	439	2	1,000	1,000	.0
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	.0
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	561-	2	0	0	.0
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0

## Purpose

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission (JJC) provides oversight of juvenile justice programs and delinquency prevention activities as determined by the Commission. Activities include inspection of the Bi-County Juvenile Hall/Maxine Singer Youth Guidance Center, and sponsorship of public awareness events. Along with the Yuba City Rotary, JJC members sponsor the Rodger Kunde Youth Service Award, an ongoing recognition program for individuals in Sutter County who have made contributions benefiting youth in our community.

## Program Discussion

The Commission membership is composed of no fewer than 7 and no more than 15 adults and students. The Juvenile Court Judge appoints members of the Commission.

This budget remains at a constant level each year. In April 2012, a “Stop Bullying” event was sponsored by the JJC to present information to the community on bullying prevention, and was used to showcase the “PLUS” and “G.R.E.A.T.” programs. Refreshments are acquired for public awareness events and to thank commissioners for their voluntary participation in commission activities. Funds are also used to compensate student commissioners for travel costs.

## Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$1,000, which is the same as in FY 2011-12. This budget unit does not receive financing from the General Fund as it is funded by Realignment funds, which are transferred from the Local Health and Welfare Trust, Social Services Fund (0-248).

# Probation Delinquency Prevention Commission (2-303)

---

*Christine D. Odom, Chief Probation Officer*

Due to the small amount of this budget, no reductions are recommended.

## Use of Fund Balance

This budget unit is within the Public Safety Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: CHRISTINE D ODOM	UNIT: PROBATION	FUND: TRIAL COURT			0014 2-304	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE	ADOPTED BUDGET	CAO RECOMMEND	% CHANGE OVER	
	2010-11	3-31-12	2011-12	2012-13	2011-12	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	4,040,053	2,970,145	4,342,590	4,595,610	5.8	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	127,284	83,575	208,716	424,603	103.4	
OTHER CHARGES	295,123	174,783	350,964	425,015	21.1	
* GROSS BUDGET	4,462,460	3,228,503	4,902,270	5,445,228	11.1	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	4,462,460	3,228,503	4,902,270	5,445,228	11.1	
<b>OTHER REVENUES</b>						
USER PAY REVENUES	757,289	117,461	1,187,199	2,264,116	90.7	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	709,909	233,923	692,121	391,885	43.4-	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	1,467,198	351,384	1,879,320	2,656,001	41.3	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	2,995,262	2,877,119	3,022,950	2,789,227	7.7-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	43.00	48.00	43.00	48.00	11.6	

**Purpose**

“Within an environment of integrity and professionalism, the Sutter County Probation Department provides for the welfare and safety of the community through prevention, intervention, and enforcement efforts; thereby emphasizing accountability and self-sufficiency.”

The Probation Department serves both juveniles and adults. The Department serves as an arm of the Court preparing court investigations, including contact with victims; handling juvenile delinquency matters and supervising juvenile and adult offenders. The Department also operates a wide variety of prevention and intervention services. More recently, the Department has assumed responsibility for Postrelease Community Supervision (PRCS) and non-serious/non violent cases that were previously supervised by State Parole.

The Chief Probation Officer of Sutter County is appointed by the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, with the approval of all Sutter County Judges and with the consensus of the Board of Supervisors and Juvenile Justice Commission. Welfare & Institutions Code §270, et seq. and Penal Code §1203, et seq. delineate the responsibilities of the Department related to juveniles and adults falling under their purview.

**Major Budget Changes**

**Salaries & Benefits**

- \$253,020 Increase in Salaries & Benefits costs primarily related to Public Safety Realignment – AB 109 staff whose costs are completely offset by AB 109 revenue

**Services & Supplies**

- \$121,114 Increase in Professional and Specialized Services due to a variety of adjustments, including renting a leased building for juvenile services to provide space for expanded adult services at the main Probation Department and to contract with a former Deputy Probation Officer to provide research analysis

**Other Charges**

- \$95,821 Increase in Interfund Miscellaneous Transfer to fund an Intervention Counselor position with JJCPA funds, replacing an unfunded Deputy Probation Officer position and a Community Corrections Performance Incentives Fund (CCPIF/SB 678) funded Intervention Counselor position

**Revenues**

- \$613,469 AB 109 revenue to offset probation costs for Realignment staff and newly leased space
- \$183,690 Increase in anticipated revenue from CCPIF/SB 678 to offset program and staffing costs
- \$57,369 Increase in use of Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) funds to offset program costs

- \$63,168 Increase in anticipated revenue from State Juvenile Probation & Camp Funds

**Program Discussion**

**Adult Unit**

The Adult Unit performed 953 Criminal Court investigations in 2011, and supervised, on average, 721 largely felony offenders (not including those with active warrants) and an average of 95 Postrelease Community Supervision (PRCS) cases; with the ultimate goal of reducing offender risk and recidivism, while improving offender outcomes and public safety.

Reduced caseloads incorporating the use of evidence-based practices (EBP) and counseling staff for drug offenders is provided through funding from SB 678, AB 109 and a long term Drug Court grant. An Officer providing services via an Anti-Drug Abuse Grant, in coordination with NET-5, is allocated within a budget overseen by the District Attorney, overseeing 50 commercial drug offenders. One officer is currently assigned to the Sutter-Yuba County Gang Task Force, carrying a caseload of 54 gang members. Both officers also perform task force enforcement duties.

**Public Safety Realignment**

Unheralded change occurred within the California Criminal Justice System in October 2011 with the advent of Public Safety Realignment. California state prisons have been operating significantly over capacity for many years. A series of court cases, including a recent decision by the United States Supreme Court, found health care, treatment and rehabilitation to be unacceptably poor in our state's prisons. This court action and a dismal record of re-offense and recidivism, led to the passage of AB 109, AB 117 and associated

legislation. Over the next three years the state is significantly reducing the number of inmates to be housed in state prisons, thereby transferring considerable responsibility to the counties.

Three different groups of offenders will be affected by this change in law. Beginning October 1, 2011, individuals who were convicted of specified low level felonies are no longer eligible for incarceration in state prisons. Instead, if they are sentenced to be incarcerated, it will be in the county jail rather than prison. Further, specified individuals who have completed their prison sentence after October 1, 2011, will be supervised by County Probation rather than State Parole under PRCS. Finally, those under supervision by State Parole who violate conditions of parole will serve their parole violation time in county jail rather than state prison.

The Chief Probation Officer chairs the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) that designs the local approach to Realignment. The mission and goal of the Sutter County CCP is to comply with the Public Safety Realignment Act by adopting evidence-based, cost-effective policies and practices that reduce recidivism, improve offender outcomes and promote public safety. The Department has been preparing for this opportunity for several years and while challenges are certainly ahead, the Chief Probation Officer and staff relish the chance to design a system that provides resources to improve outcomes through an array of new programs and practices, in coordination with committed justice partners. On March 20, 2012, the CCP approved a request to further amend the CCP Phase I Plan to authorize the creation of a Resource Center to address the needs of felony offenders in Sutter County. AB 109 has required a complete overhaul of adult services, programs and practices, in addition to the added responsibility for an entirely

new population. As a result the CCP approved the expenditure of funds to add vocational, educational and mental health services. The CCP also approved the expenditure of Realignment funds for the Probation Department to secure a lease to assure that adequate space was available for these additional services, as well as for the additional probation and substance abuse treatment staff already approved in the Phase I Plan. The original proposal was to locate a Resource Center, some adult officers and substance abuse treatment staff at a separate location from the main Probation Department on Boyd Street. In view of concerns about the need to keep all adult services intact, to afford staff the opportunity to continue to work together in effecting behavior change, and to properly monitor adult offenders, the Department recommended and the CCP authorized the use of Realignment funds to secure new space for juvenile services, so that the Boyd Street building could be used for expanded adult services. Operationally, and in the spirit of the local goals to offer enhanced services and evidence-based practices to all offenders, this idea holds the most merit since there appears to be no way to house all adult and juvenile services together.

While a Constitutional Amendment is still being sought to guarantee future Public Safety Realignment funding, it is very clear that the State needs local partners to assist them in repairing a broken state prison system. Probation Departments in California have a proven history of success in implementing forward thinking programs for the benefit of local communities. The Department has taken on new responsibilities with dedication and commitment that will serve this community and the future of local corrections very well.

## **Community Corrections Performance Incentive Fund (CCPIF/SB678)**

As a result of the Department's reduction of the probation revocation rate by 22% in 2010 for probation violators being sent to State Prison, the Department received \$446,680 in revenue from CCPIF/SB 678. Continued efforts in that regard will result in revenue in excess of \$800,000 in FY 2012-13, to further the Department's efforts to keep reduced caseloads and evidence-based programs in place. The Department has expanded the use of evidenced based practices, to include assessment of risk and needs; and targeted case planning and management to address criminogenic needs, placing the most resources with those offenders who are at greatest risk to reoffend. These funds have also been used to retain staff when other funding sources have been lost. In order to expect staff to continue to properly effect offender behavior change in a meaningful way, it will be imperative that staffing ratios of 1 to 50 offenders for regular caseloads and 1 to 35 for high risk and specialized caseloads be achieved and sustained.

As a result of the reduction of offenders who are eligible for commitment to state prison, it is likely that this revenue source will be significantly reduced in the next few years, requiring a reliance on Realignment funds to continue to concentrate efforts on harm-reduction and public safety, which in the end results in reduced recidivism and a healthier, more productive system overall.

## **Juvenile Unit**

In 2010, the Juvenile Unit provided intake services for 153 fewer juvenile referrals than the prior year for a total of 570, including violations of probation, and supervised an average of 139 minors. The ultimate goals are to reduce the number of offenders who enter the juvenile justice system or to minimize their time within the system with the ultimate intent

of reducing offender risk and recidivism, while improving offender outcomes and public safety.

Specialized caseloads include out-of-home placement, Aftercare Supervision for Camp Singer Wards, and caseload carrying School Resource Officers for Feather River Academy, Yuba City High School/Albert Powell and River Valley High School.

It is believed the answer to reducing juvenile crime is intervention at the earliest possible age, in coordination with families, to provide education and support regarding risk factors and to build and emphasize protective factors. Prevention and intervention services are provided with a truancy officer for Yuba City Unified School District and an officer at Gray Avenue Middle School. With the elimination of the prevention officer in the elementary schools, services to the lower grades are limited to facilitation of the Gang Resistance Education And Training (GREAT) program for elementary and middle school students.

Support services are provided by probation officers with Functional Family Therapy (FFT), and Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) for Adolescents with Substance Abuse Disorders.

## **Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)**

Effective February 2011, AB 1628 transferred responsibility for DJJ Wards to community supervision under the jurisdiction of the Courts and supervision of county probation upon their discharge from the institution, in return for \$15,000 per Ward. The proposed FY 2012-13 State Budget no longer proposes the elimination of DJJ. However, although counties currently pay \$2,560/year per Ward, the Governor's May Revision proposes \$24,000 per year/Ward as an alternative to closure. This proposed increase was received too late to include in the proposed budget. The

department will monitor costs during the FY and will return to the BOS, if additional funds are needed for this line item. The Chief Probation Officers of California have vehemently opposed closure of DJJ and continue to work with the Governor to find alternatives to meet the needs of counties as well as the State.

### **Funding Concerns for Juvenile Services**

Comprehensive juvenile services have been supported via a complex combination of State, Federal and local funding, including Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA), Juvenile Probation and Camp Funds (JPCF), Title IV-E, Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) and YCUSD revenues. JJCPA, JPCF and YOBG funds have been included in the programs realigned to counties by the State. The funds would be in danger of elimination by the legislature each year if a Constitutional Amendment is not in place.

Outside revenue has allowed the Department to fund 87.3% of the staffing costs for comprehensive juvenile services that are available for offenders and other young people and families in the community. Should the State fail to support services at their current level, the impact on the community will be far reaching and will result in even greater costs for years to come both fiscally and to the well-being of families overall.

The juvenile division and the population it serves has fully benefited from the implementation of evidence-based practices, with officers showing their commitment to adapting to principles of effective intervention for the well being of the offenders and the community they serve.

Although the Juvenile Hall population has been at an unprecedented low, there are continuing concerns regarding juvenile gang

violence, juvenile sex offenders, and youth with mental health or developmental disorders.

### **Departmental Needs & Future Goals**

The Department has faced a sea of change over the past few years, especially with the arrival of Public Safety Realignment. The Department has relished the opportunity to spearhead the implementation of programs and practices that will improve outcomes for offenders, while assuring public safety and reducing victimization. The weight of this responsibility has come at a cost, as the administrative staff and some line staff have taken on the majority of the responsibility for development and implementation of Realignment plans and programs for the County. While this proposed budget does not include the addition of new administrative or fiscal staff to assist with added Realignment responsibilities, these requests will likely be included in the Phase II Public Safety Realignment Plan.

The other significant change anticipated in FY 2012-13, is the likely retirement of the Chief Probation Officer by the end of 2012. The transition to a new administration will make it more important than ever that a solid management and fiscal unit be in place. Given the continued request for reduced unreimbursed costs, the Department is once again unable to request a much needed reorganization of the Department.

### **Recommended Budget**

This budget is recommended at \$5,445,228, which is an increase of \$542,958 (11.1%) compared to FY 2011-12. However, the Department's unreimbursed cost has been decreased by \$233,723 (7.7%). These changes, which have resulted in a savings to the General Fund, are primarily related to Public Safety Realignment as described above.

No further reductions are recommended for this budget. Public Safety Realignment has greatly shifted the responsibility of offender supervision from the state to counties. For the present, funding through Realignment has been made available to enable the takeover of this monumental task. However, continued funding is in question due to the lack of a Constitutional Amendment guaranteeing the Public Safety Realignment funding in future years. This issue will continue to be closely monitored by the County so adjustments to budgets can be made as necessitated by future funding availability.

This budget unit receives \$71,000 in Realignment (1991) funds, which are transferred from the Local Health and Welfare Trust, Social Services Fund (0-248).

## **Use of Fund Balance**

This budget unit is within the Trial Court Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY					
DEPT HEAD: MARK R VAN DEN HEUVEL UNIT: PUBLIC DEFENDER		FUND: TRIAL COURT			0014 2-106
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	133,562	100,663	136,450	135,774	.5-
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	563,101	377,773	504,800	502,200	.5-
OTHER CHARGES	15,559	5,807	7,326	7,637	4.2
* GROSS BUDGET	712,222	484,243	648,576	645,611	.5-
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	712,222	484,243	648,576	645,611	.5-
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	10,762	4,223	7,500	28,603	281.4
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	10,762	4,223	7,500	28,603	281.4
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	701,460	480,020	641,076	617,008	3.8-
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.0

## Purpose

The Public Defender’s Office, when appointed by the Court, represents Defendants charged with crimes committed in Sutter County who cannot afford their own attorney. These crimes include felonies, misdemeanors, and juvenile crimes. In addition, the Public Defender’s Office is appointed to represent parents in Juvenile Dependency actions involving the Welfare Department, individuals being requested for appointment of conservatorships through the County Counsel’s Office, along with Writ of Habeas Corpus filings and Reise filings for those individuals detained at the Sutter-Yuba Mental Health facility or our local private facilities. On civil matters, the Public Defender’s Office is appointed on Contempt matters involving the Family Support Division and when private attorneys file complaints for contempt against an indigent

person and to those whose parental rights are being requested to be terminated in adoption matters.

## Major Budget Changes

### Services & Supplies

- (\$2,600) Decrease in Professional & Specialized Services due to reduction in contract attorney costs

### Revenue

- \$23,753 Increase in revenues due to Public Safety Realignment 2011

## Program Discussion

This budget funds the Sutter County Public Defender’s Office that staffs the Sutter

County Public Defender, three Deputy Felony attorneys who handle the criminal Felony appointment cases and Violation of Probation cases, two Deputy Misdemeanor attorneys who handle the Misdemeanor appointment cases, two Deputy Juvenile attorneys who alternate handling Juvenile delinquency appointment and dependency appointment cases on an alternating weekly basis, and one Deputy attorney that handles the Conservatorship hearings, Writ of Habeas Corpus proceedings, and Reise hearings. In addition, the Public Defender's Office represents individuals charged in homicide cases, Petition for Involuntary Treatment under Penal Code §2970, sexually violent predator cases, termination of parental rights, family law and child support contempt actions, individuals seeking relief from firearms prohibition under Welfare and Institutions Code §8103 and appointments on mental health issues arising from a local private facility.

The Public Defender's Office utilizes one investigator who handles the investigative work for all cases assigned to the office for the Felony, Misdemeanor, and Juvenile attorneys.

Excluding the Salaries and Employee Benefits that pertain to the Public Defender and Interfund Information Technology expenses, 93% of the Public Defender budget under Services and Supplies is designated solely for the salaries of the Deputy Public Defenders assigned to felony, misdemeanor, juvenile, and conservatorship cases and the costs associated with the investigator.

## **Recommended Budget**

This budget is recommended at \$645,611 which is a decrease of \$2,965 (0.5%) compared to FY 2011-12. However, due to

additional financing provided through Public Safety Realignment, the unreimbursed cost of the budget has decreased \$24,068 (3.8%). The General Fund provides 96.2% of the financing for this budget unit.

In order to maintain the quality of services provided to indigent defendants and assure that court proceedings are not interrupted or delayed because the Public Defender's Office is unable to accept an appointment, it is requested that the Services and Supplies portion of the budget be reduced. This reduction would be accomplished through a reduction in Professional & Specialized Services by reducing investigative services costs and the contract costs of certain Deputy Public Defenders. The budget for investigative services is being reduced by \$5,000.

In comparing court appointed misdemeanor cases in the first eight months of FY 2010-11 with the first eight months of FY 2011-12, there was a 10% decrease in appointed cases. As a result, the Deputy Misdemeanor Public Defenders contracts will be reduced for a total annual savings of \$4,800. This is the second reduction in two years.

In comparing appointed felony cases for the first eight months of FY 2010-11 with the first eight months of FY 2011-12, there was a 9% decrease in appointed felony cases and a 55% decrease in violation of probation cases. The reduction in violation of probation cases is believed to be directly related to the implementation of AB 109 Public Safety Realignment as of October 1, 2011. As a result, each of the Deputy Felony Public Defender contracts will be reduced for a total annual savings of \$7,200.

It is expected that appointed violation of probation cases will continue to drop until July 2013, when the Public Defender's

office, by law, will be appointed to parole and Post Release Community Supervision revocation proceedings. As a result, in FY 2013-14, it is anticipated that additional funding will be required to cover the costs of violation of probation cases not previously handled by the Public Defender prior to Public Safety Realignment.

For FY 2012-13, the cost of conservatorship cases is being included in the Professional & Specialized Services account after inadvertently being excluded in FY 2011-12.

Though the Superior Court is ordering in some cases, as a condition of probation, payment of a nominal fee for reimbursement to the County of Sutter for the services of the Public Defender's Office, it is difficult to predict how much revenue will be received for FY 2012-13. The Sutter County Public Defender's Office has been able to collect for services rendered to those who have been involuntarily held at private psychiatric centers. Based upon the first seven months of the FY 2011-12, it is anticipated the Department should receive reimbursement revenues totaling \$4,850 for FY 2012-13.

Further reductions for the Public Defender's Office are not recommended. Additional reductions would directly impact the number of Deputy Public Defenders available to provide assistance to court appointed individuals. A greater budget reduction would result in elimination of a Deputy Public Defender position that would directly impact either the felony or misdemeanor appointments. This would lead to services becoming unavailable to court appointed defendants and a strong possibility of having experienced attorneys unwilling to work for less than what was previously offered considering the increased number of appointments that they would each receive.

Another possible consequence of further reductions, after already incurring a 9.6% reduction for FY 2011-12, would be the unavailability of Deputy Public Defenders from the Public Defender's Office taking on the additional case load. This would likely result in the utilization of court-appointed attorneys who would charge the County an hourly rate for representation rather than that of a Deputy Public Defender under contract. Costs to the County would greatly increase.

### Use of Fund Balance

This budget unit is within the Trial Court Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF INMATE WELFARE	FUND: SHERIFF INMATE WELFARE			0184 0-184	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	87,820	47,942	90,608	89,607	1.1-	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	142,757	99,468	168,650	168,348	.2-	
OTHER CHARGES	0	0	50	50	.0	
* GROSS BUDGET	230,577	147,410	259,308	258,005	.5-	
* NET BUDGET	230,577	147,410	259,308	258,005	.5-	
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	26,992	37,995	40.8	
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0	
* TOTAL BUDGET	230,577	147,410	286,300	296,000	3.4	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	282,090	177,594	284,500	290,000	1.9	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0	
GENERAL REVENUES	3,480	2,474	1,800	6,000	233.3	
AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE 7/1	0	0	0	0	.0	
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	285,570	180,068	286,300	296,000	3.4	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	54,993-	32,658-	0	0	.0	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.0	

## Purpose

The operation of the Sheriff Inmate Welfare Fund (SIWF) is mandated by California Penal Code §4025(e) and Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations. The money in this fund is to be used by the Sheriff for the benefit, education and welfare of jail inmates.

## Major Budget Changes

There are no major budget changes for FY 2012-13.

## Program Discussion

The law provides:

“The money and property deposited in the inmate welfare fund shall be expended by the sheriff primarily for the benefit, education, and welfare of the inmates confined within the jail. Any funds that are not needed for the welfare of the inmates may be expended for the maintenance of county jail facilities. Maintenance of county jail facilities may include the salary and benefits of personnel used in the programs to benefit the inmates, including, but not limited to, education, drug and alcohol treatment, welfare, library, accounting, and other programs deemed appropriate by the sheriff. Inmate welfare funds shall not be

used to pay required county expenses of confining inmates in a local detention system, such as meals, clothing, housing, or medical services or expenses, except that inmate welfare funds may be used to augment those required county expenses as determined by the sheriff to be in the best interests of inmates. An itemized report of these expenditures shall be submitted annually to the Board of Supervisors.”

### **Recommended Budget**

This budget is recommended at \$296,000, which is an increase of \$9,700 (3.4%) compared to FY 2011-12. The General Fund does not provide any financing for this budget unit. The increase in this budget is due to an increase in the Appropriation for Contingency. This contingency is recommended for mitigation of possible increased costs due to Public Safety Realignment.

This fund is financed by revenue generated from inmate use of public telephones and inmate purchases from the jail commissary.

### **Use of Fund Balance**

The Sheriff’s Inmate Welfare Fund contains a Restricted Fund Balance in the amount of \$236,185 as of July 1, 2011. It is estimated the Restricted Fund Balance will equal \$285,485 at July 1, 2012. There are no recommended uses for this fund balance in FY 2012-13.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF-COMMUNICATIONS	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 1-600	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	1,768,860	1,290,709	1,842,145	1,826,560	.8-	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	194,613	120,956	178,597	178,335	.1-	
OTHER CHARGES	790,808	451,506	735,740	761,052	3.4	
CAPITAL ASSETS	277,158	75,632	103,059	200,000	94.1	
* GROSS BUDGET	3,031,439	1,938,803	2,859,541	2,965,947	3.7	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	105,530-	53,199-	53,199-	0	100.0-	
* NET BUDGET	2,925,909	1,885,604	2,806,342	2,965,947	5.7	
<b>OTHER REVENUES</b>						
USER PAY REVENUES	288,195	97,798	282,818	262,846	7.1-	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	3,795	421	7,200	116,000	1,511.1	
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES	5	0	0	0	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	291,995	98,219	290,018	378,846	30.6	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	2,633,914	1,787,385	2,516,324	2,587,101	2.8	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	25.00	25.00	24.00	25.00	4.2	

**Purpose**

This budget unit provides 9-1-1 emergency dispatch for Sheriff, Fire and Ambulance. It also includes the Records and Civil units.

**Major Budget Changes**

**Salaries & Benefits**

- (\$15,585) General salary and benefits adjustments

**Other Charges**

- \$27,795 Increase in Interfund Information Technology charges

**Capital Assets**

- \$96,941 Increase in Capital Assets due to the upgrade of the 911 telephone system, part of which will be funded by a State allocation

**Intrafund Transfers**

- (\$53,199) Decrease in revenue from Emergency Services grant

**Revenues**

- (\$15,000) Decrease in fingerprint fee revenue based on projections

- (\$21,526) Decrease in Interfund Transfer-In Special Revenue due to reduction in equipment being purchased
- \$108,800 Increase in State Sheriff 911 Reimbursement to partially fund the upgrade of the 911 telephone system

## Program Discussion

The Communications Center has the responsibility of answering incoming 911 calls as well as non-emergency calls for service. Radio-dispatching services for the Sheriff's Office as well as the Fire Department are provided. At times the Communications Center also assists and communicates with Animal Control, Public Works, and Fish & Game field personnel. The Communications Center is staffed 24 hours per day, 365 days per year, with a minimum of two dispatchers on duty at all times.

The Criminal Records Technicians provide a wide range of functions including fingerprinting, permit issuance, criminal offender registration, records release requests, and maintenance of agency reports and records including court mandated functions.

The Civil Unit is charged with the processing of civil process as prescribed by law. It is the goal of the Civil Unit to serve all received process in a reasonable and timely manner while maintaining an impartial stance between all parties involved or having an interest in a case. The civil process includes summons and complaints, small claims documents for a civil lawsuit, restraining orders, and any other notice or order from the courts. The civil unit is also

charged with placing a levy on bank accounts, wages, vehicles, or any asset of the judgment debtor.

## Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$2,965,947, which is an increase of \$159,605 (5.7%). The General Fund provides approximately 57% of the financing for the Sheriff's Department and is increased in the Communications budget by 2.8%.

The recommended increase in the Communications budget is primarily due to the recommended Capital Assets purchase for the 911 telephone system. This is recommended at \$200,000 and is partially funded by the State. The State will not pay for the maintenance of a 911 telephone system beyond five years of the purchase date. The current system is aging and parts may not be available if the system requires repair at any point in the near future.

The recommended budget includes the continued use of Sheriff's Assessment Fee Funds (0-225) to fund a Sheriff's Legal Specialist position. These funds were first used for this purpose in FY 2011-12. This maintains the General Fund contribution for this position at \$0 for another year.

For the second consecutive year, it is recommended to leave three positions vacant and unfunded in the Communications budget. These positions are a Criminal Records Technician, a Public Safety Dispatcher and a Supervising Public Safety Dispatcher. Defunding and leaving these positions vacant negatively impacts the level of service internally and to the public. Further reductions are not recommended at this time.

## **Use of Fund Balance**

This budget unit is within the Public Safety Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF'S COURT BAILIFFS	FUND: TRIAL COURT			0014 2-103	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	526,975	392,095	523,238	541,582	3.5	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	7,202	6,382	8,100	7,800	3.7-	
OTHER CHARGES	683	630	592	378	36.1-	
* GROSS BUDGET	534,860	399,107	531,930	549,760	3.4	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	534,860	399,107	531,930	549,760	3.4	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	524,588	0	531,930	549,760	3.4	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	524,588	0	531,930	549,760	3.4	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	10,272	399,107	0	0	.0	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	.0	

### Purpose

The Sheriff's Court Bailiffs budget provides bailiffs for the Sutter County Superior Court under a contract. The bailiffs are responsible for the Court's security and decorum, and for the care and custody of inmates present in the Court. Bailiffs also provide for the care and security of the jury.

### Program Discussion

The Sheriff's Court Bailiffs unit provides security services for courtrooms in the Sutter County Superior Court. One Correctional Sergeant and five Correctional Officers are assigned to this unit.

### Major Budget Changes

#### Salaries & Benefits

- \$18,344 General salary and benefits adjustments

### Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$549,760, which is an increase of \$17,830 (3.4%) compared to FY 2011-12. The General Fund does not provide any financing for this budget unit as it is 100% funded by the State.

Trial court security was a component of Public Safety Realignment in FY 2011-12. Therefore, funding is first deposited into the County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140) before it is transferred into this operating budget. The

County Local Revenue Fund 2011 is discussed in greater detail in its own budget narrative.

### **Use of Fund Balance**

This budget unit is within the Trial Court Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF-CORONER	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-201	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	4,892,084	3,557,114	5,167,121	4,789,611	7.3-	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	412,005	335,007	380,345	405,451	6.6	
OTHER CHARGES	552,461	291,027	560,862	462,020	17.6-	
CAPITAL ASSETS	232,496	0	22,052	127,000	475.9	
* GROSS BUDGET	6,089,046	4,183,148	6,130,380	5,784,082	5.6-	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	110,526-	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	5,978,520	4,183,148	6,130,380	5,784,082	5.6-	
<b>OTHER REVENUES</b>						
USER PAY REVENUES	577,113	108,153	755,395	762,546	.9	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	83,463	16,820	27,400	51,245	87.0	
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES	14,580	0	0	0	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	675,156	124,973	782,795	813,791	4.0	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	5,303,364	4,058,175	5,347,585	4,970,291	7.1-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	51.50	51.50	49.50	50.50	2.0	

**Purpose**

This budget unit finances the administration, patrol division, detective division, evidence and property control, coroner's and public administrator's functions of the Sheriff's Department.

**Major Budget Changes**

**Salaries & Benefits**

- (\$252,278) Decrease in Permanent Salaries due primarily to holding three Deputy Sheriff positions vacant and unfunded and moving one Legal Secretary position to the NET-5 budget unit

- (\$45,113) Decrease in Other Pay due to less retirement pay outs than in FY 2011-12
- \$45,000 Increase in Overtime due to current projections
- (\$54,187) Decrease in County Contribution to Retirement

**Other Charges**

- (\$71,255) Decrease in Liability Insurance charges

**Capital Assets**

- \$104,948 One replacement patrol vehicle and two replacement K9 patrol vehicles

Revenues

- (\$400,000) Decrease in Small County Law Enforcement revenue due to Public Safety Realignment of Rural Sheriff’s grant money
- \$400,000 Increase in Interfund Transfer-In Realignment due to Public Safety Realignment of Rural Sheriff’s grant money

Program Discussion

The Sheriff’s Department patrols approximately 604 square miles of unincorporated Sutter County as well as a portion of Yuba City’s incorporated area under contract.

The Sheriff’s Office is also the County Coroner and is responsible for determining the circumstances, manner, and cause of all deaths reportable to the Coroner. Field death investigations, postmortem examinations, and related forensic tests are used to establish a medical cause of death. Autopsies are provided to the Coroner through a contract with Forensic Medical Group, based in Fairfield, while morgue services are provided via contract by three local mortuaries.

Ongoing Projects

The Live Fire Shoot House is complete and Range Masters have been trained and certified to conduct live fire training inside the shoot house. Repairs to the primary range have been completed. Once the Live Fire Shoot House policy is reviewed and approved we anticipate a modest revenue stream as the shoot house will become an

asset available for use by North State agencies for advanced training.

Though this narrative addresses the Sheriff-Coroner 2-201 budget, its impact on the overall Sheriff’s Office, made up of eight different budgets units, must be mentioned to place it in perspective. The FY 2011-12 unreimbursed costs (URC) of the eight budgets and their budget titles and functions are as follows:

**Sheriff/Corner \$5,347,585**

Administration, patrol deputies, detectives, coroner investigations, public administrator duties, internal and background investigations.

**Jail Operations \$7,220,870**

Custody, housing, feeding, transportation work and release programs and medical care of inmates.

**Communications \$2,516,324**

Operation of the Sheriff and Fire dispatch, and the business call and 911 call center. Dispatchers also perform several clerical duties.

**Live Oak Services \$225,108**

Operation of the Live Oak Sub Station and Live Oak patrol area.

**Bailiffs \$0**

Although Sheriff’s Bailiff’s still operate Court Security, the operational costs are now borne by the State.

**Boat Patrol \$70,224**

County’s share of operating the Boat Patrol.

**Sheriff’s Inmate Welfare Fund \$0**

The operation of Sheriff Inmate Welfare is for the benefit, education and welfare of jail inmates.

**Net-5/Gang Task Force \$39,582**

Net-5 has been operational in the Yuba Sutter area for over 30 years. A gang suppression element to Net-5 was added in 2008. Most of the cost of the task force is absorbed in the Sheriff 2-201 budget and this cost was for 1/3 of a secretarial position.

The gross unreimbursed cost for the eight budget units within the Sheriff’s Department equaled \$15,419,693. Public Safety functions are generally credited with Proposition 172 / Public Safety Augmentation Fund revenues, and the Sheriff’s functions therefore receive approximately \$4,208,500 to offset the gross unreimbursed cost. Therefore, the Sheriff’s Office’s net URC to the General Fund was approximately \$11,211,300 for FY 2011-12.

When the Sheriff’s Department is requested to identify significant budget reduction opportunities, a major difficulty in reducing the Sheriff’s URC further arises, in that each budget cannot be reduced equally. Generally, the Jail budget (2-301) cannot be further reduced without falling below minimum staffing levels. Additionally, with the implementation of the State Public Safety Realignment plan, the work load and population of the jail is anticipated to increase. The Communications budget (1-600) cannot be safely reduced as the division is currently held at the minimum staffing level required to maintain the 24-hour operation. The Live Oak Contract budget (2-208) is maintained at contracted levels and is 80% funded by the City of Live Oak, thus any cuts would have a minimal impact.

**Recommended Budget**

This budget is recommended at \$5,784,082, which is a decrease of \$346,298 (5.6%). The General Fund provides approximately 57% of the financing for the Sheriff’s Department and is reduced in the Sheriff-Coroner budget by \$277,294 (5.2%) compared to FY 2011-12.

It should be noted that these funding calculations reflect the addition of Public Safety Augmentation Funds (Proposition 172), which are transferred into the Public Safety fund through the Public Safety General budget unit (2-210). California voters enacted Proposition 172 in 1993, which established a permanent statewide half-cent sales tax for support of local public safety functions.

For FY 2012-13, it is recommended that an additional three currently vacant Deputy Sheriff positions be left vacant and unfunded for a total of six vacant and unfunded Deputy Sheriff positions and one vacant and unfunded Patrol Lieutenant position. Even with these vacancies, the Sheriff’s number of filled Deputy Sheriff positions will be higher than the average over the past several years. Since FY 2008-09, the average number of filled Deputy Sheriff positions in the Sheriff-Coroner budget unit has been 29. The current recommendation provides for 30 filled Deputy Sheriff positions.

No further reductions are recommended at this time. Any further reductions would mean a reduction in staffing. As indicated above, the recommended budget maintain reductions implemented in FY 2011-12, which included leaving three Correctional Officer positions vacant and unfunded and eliminating one Food Service Worker in the Jail budget (2-301), and leaving one Supervising Public

Safety Dispatcher position and one Public Safety Dispatcher position vacant and unfunded in the Communications budget (1-600). Additionally, in order to achieve a budget reduction, no high mileage patrol cars were replaced in FY 2011-12. Also, one Sheriff's Legal Specialist position was agreed to be funded for one year through the expenditure of funds from the Sheriff's Assessment Fees special revenue fund (0-225).

In FY 2010-11, three Deputy Sheriff positions were left vacant and unfunded. These positions remained vacant and unfunded throughout FY 2011-12 along with the addition of a Patrol Lieutenant position. Three additional Deputy Sheriff positions were recommended to be unfunded in FY 2011-12, but these positions were ultimately funded.

Capital Assets are recommended at \$127,000 for the purchase of three vehicles: one patrol vehicle and two K9 patrol vehicles. Funds from the Sheriff's Asset Seizure fund (0-286) and COPS funds are recommended to be used to fund these purchases. The remainder of COPS funds, including funds to be received during FY 2012-13, will be recommended to fund replacement security equipment, such as firearms and tasers, for the Sheriff's Office.

### **Use of Fund Balance**

This budget unit is within the Public Safety Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: NET 5 SHERIFF	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-202	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	0	0	0	60,204	***	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	0	0	0	950	***	
OTHER CHARGES	25,728	30,148	39,582	65,267	64.9	
* GROSS BUDGET	25,728	30,148	39,582	126,421	219.4	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	25,728	30,148	39,582	126,421	219.4	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	126,421	***	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	0	0	0	126,421	***	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	25,728	30,148	39,582	0	100.0-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	1.00	***	

### Purpose

The Narcotic Enforcement Team (NET 5) is a task force composed of the Yuba City Police Department and the Sheriff’s Offices of Sutter and Yuba Counties. Each agency contributes one third of the funding. This budget unit finances Sutter County’s share of these costs, which include the salaries of a Commander and a Legal Secretary, building rental, and services and supplies used in NET 5 operations.

### Major Budget Changes

#### Salaries & Benefits

- \$60,204 Increase in Salaries & Benefits due to the transfer of a Legal Secretary position from the Sheriff-Coroner budget unit to Net 5

### Other Charges

- \$25,685 Increase in Contribution to Other Agencies offset by CalMMET revenue from Public Safety Realignment

### Revenues

- \$85,651 Increase in Interfund Miscellaneous Transfer of CalMMET revenue due to Public Safety Realignment
- \$40,770 Increase in Contribution from Other Agencies for Yuba City’s and Yuba County’s share of the Legal Secretary position expenses

## Program Discussion

As of January 1, 2012, the California Department of Justice Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement (BNE) is no longer participating in NET 5. This situation gave the County the choice of either eliminating the NET 5 program or self-financing the program with CalMMET funds along with the City of Yuba City and the Yuba County Sheriff's Office. The NET 5 program is vital to law enforcement operations within both Sutter and Yuba counties and therefore the decision was made to continue the operation of NET 5.

After collaborating with Yuba City and Yuba County during the winter and spring of FY 2011-12, the following actions were accomplished:

- A lease was renegotiated to retain the previous NET 5 facility for a base of planning and operations.
- A Commander in charge of coordinating NET 5 operations was chosen. The Commander, who is retained on contract, is one of the preeminent and most experienced task force coordinators in the State.
- A budget was established to pay for the Commander's contract, the Legal Secretary position and operational costs.

## Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$126,421, which is an increase of \$86,839 (219.4%) over FY 2011-12. This increase is offset by CalMMET revenue transferred in from the County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140)

and results in a no unreimbursed cost for the General Fund. The County Local Revenue Fund 2011 is discussed in greater detail in its own budget narrative.

## Use of Fund Balance

This budget unit is within the Public Safety Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF BOAT PATROL	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-205	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	236,874	129,262	247,699	243,054	1.9-	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	11,493	9,659	13,368	17,368	29.9	
OTHER CHARGES	33,330	17,697	46,594	41,418	11.1-	
* GROSS BUDGET	281,697	156,618	307,661	301,840	1.9-	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	281,697	156,618	307,661	301,840	1.9-	
<b>OTHER REVENUES</b>						
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	217,178	159,428	214,800	214,800	.0	
GENERAL REVENUES	18,625	16,770	22,637	17,605	22.2-	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	235,803	176,198	237,437	232,405	2.1-	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	45,894	19,580-	70,224	69,435	1.1-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	.0	

## Purpose

The Sheriff's Office Boat Patrol - Search and Rescue Unit is responsible for patrolling approximately 187 miles of waterways in or bordering Sutter County.

## Major Budget Changes

There are no major budget changes.

## Program Discussion

Responsibilities of the Boat Patrol unit include enforcement of boating laws and regulations, assistance to stranded boaters, inspection of vessels for proper equipment, supervision of organized water events, search

and rescue operations, recovery of drowning victims, investigation of boating accidents, boating safety presentations, and evacuation of citizens in flood conditions.

Several boats and crafts of various sizes and designs are used to accomplish the unit's mission. The unit will also summon surrounding counties for mutual aid from their sheriff's boat patrol units as the need arises.

## Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$301,840, which is a decrease of \$5,821 (1.9%) compared to FY 2011-12. The General Fund provides approximately 57% of the financing

for the Sheriff's Department, which includes the Boat Patrol budget unit.

It should be noted that these funding calculations reflect the addition of Public Safety Augmentation Funds (Proposition 172), which are transferred into the Public Safety fund through the Public Safety General budget unit (2-210). California voters enacted Proposition 172 in 1993, which established a permanent statewide half-cent sales tax for support of local public safety functions.

Total expenditures for the Boat Patrol budget unit are largely reimbursed by the State Department of Boating and Waterways. These reimbursements are derived from boat registration fees. The County contributes collected boat taxes, and pays for expenditures not subject to State reimbursement. As indicated above, this budget unit also receives, in concept, a share of Proposition 172 funding.

The Department of Boating and Waterways' allocation to Sutter County is likely to remain at \$214,800 as it has for the past several years. Thus, any expenditure increases beyond the allocation and collected boat taxes would become a County General Fund cost.

No reductions are recommended for this budget unit. The Sheriff staffs this budget unit with personnel from the Sheriff-Coroner budget unit (2-201). Any reductions to the Sheriff-Coroner budget unit may correspondingly reduce Boat Patrol staffing.

## Use of Fund Balance

This budget unit is within the Public Safety Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF LIVE OAK CONTRACT	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-208	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	962,157	777,564	1,029,239	1,093,655	6.3	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	16,462	13,540	16,542	16,800	1.6	
OTHER CHARGES	94,427	52,715	107,085	102,891	3.9-	
* GROSS BUDGET	1,073,046	843,819	1,152,866	1,213,346	5.2	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	1,073,046	843,819	1,152,866	1,213,346	5.2	
<b>OTHER REVENUES</b>						
USER PAY REVENUES	68	20	0	0	.0	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	904,425	628,664	927,758	1,003,394	8.2	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	904,493	628,684	927,758	1,003,394	8.2	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	168,553	215,135	225,108	209,952	6.7-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	.0	

## Purpose

This budget finances the law enforcement services the Sheriff's Office provides under contract to the City of Live Oak and surrounding unincorporated area.

## Major Budget Changes

### Salaries & Benefits

- \$64,416 General salary and benefits adjustments

### Revenues

- \$75,636 Increased contract revenue due to overall operating cost increases

## Program Discussion

The City of Live Oak contracts with Sutter County to provide law enforcement services to approximately 8,500 citizens in Live Oak. Sheriff's personnel operate out of a substation staffed by seven patrol deputies, one sergeant, and one lieutenant.

## Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$1,213,346, which is an increase of \$60,480 (5.2%) compared to FY 2011-12. The General Fund cost is decreased by \$15,156 (6.7%).

The majority of costs for patrolling the area in and around the City of Live Oak are shared 80% by the City and 20% by the County. The salary and benefits of a

Lieutenant position, all dog handling-related items, and new patrol vehicles are costs covered in full by the City. The Sheriff provides some law-enforcement services to the City of Live Oak at no charge for which the City would have to pay if it were to have its own police department, or if it had a typical contract for sheriff services. Among these services are dispatch, detectives (for major felonies), records, narcotics, and special enforcement detail (SWAT).

No reductions are recommended for this budget unit. The Sheriff staffs this budget unit with personnel from the Sheriff-Coroner budget unit (2-201). Any reductions to the Sheriff-Coroner budget unit may correspondingly reduce Live Oak Contract staffing. Any changes to staffing levels would necessitate an adjustment to the contract between Sutter County and the City of Live Oak.

### **Use of Fund Balance**

This budget unit is within the Public Safety Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: COUNTY JAIL	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-301	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	4,470,118	3,380,109	4,561,894	4,985,703	9.3	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	788,159	637,386	795,948	811,670	2.0	
OTHER CHARGES	2,053,516	430,130	2,113,439	2,594,545	22.8	
* GROSS BUDGET	7,311,793	4,447,625	7,471,281	8,391,918	12.3	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	7,311,793	4,447,625	7,471,281	8,391,918	12.3	
<b>OTHER REVENUES</b>						
USER PAY REVENUES	378,353	126,201	183,241	462,720	152.5	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	85,914	94,983	53,170	102,053	91.9	
GENERAL REVENUES	8,525	0	14,000	10,000	28.6-	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	472,792	221,184	250,411	574,773	129.5	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	6,839,001	4,226,441	7,220,870	7,817,145	8.3	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	52.00	55.00	51.00	55.00	7.8	

## Purpose

The Sheriff’s Jail Division operates the Main Jail and the adjacent Minimum Security Facility. This budget unit funds the jail staff and operates the County’s 352-bed Correctional Facility. The Division is divided into two programs: (1) jail security and support; and (2) transportation. The Jail Division provides a secure, sanitary, and habitable setting for those in custody who are either accused or sentenced. The jail staff also transports prisoners to courts and other facilities.

The Sheriff also manages and operates the Alternative Sentencing and Outside Work Release Programs.

## Major Budget Changes

### Salaries & Benefits

- \$423,809 General Salaries & Benefits adjustments primarily due to five new Correctional Officer positions added in FY 2011-12 and funded by Public Safety Realignment/AB 109

### Other Charges

- \$464,054 Interfund Jail Medical increase due to cost increases in the Jail Medical budget unit (4-134)

Revenues

\$353,770 Increase in Interfund Miscellaneous Transfer to fund five new Correctional Officer positions through Public Safety Realignment

\$48,883 Increase in Federal Aid due to estimated revenue for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program

Program Discussion

Current Status

The minimum security facility is currently being upgraded so more serious offenders can be housed. The facility should be completed by June 30, 2012.

Public Safety Realignment

Through AB 109, signed into law on April 4, 2011, the State of California enacted a realignment of funds and responsibilities to counties, often referred to as Public Safety Realignment or 2011 Realignment. This realignment pertains to sentenced felons who prior to Public Safety Realignment would have been under State custody or under the supervision of State parole. Public Safety Realignment specifically applies to those felons convicted of what are being called “non-non-non” crimes, in that the crimes are not deemed of a sexual, violent, or serious nature. In short, these felons are now the responsibility of counties and will now serve their sentences in county jails rather than in State prisons.

Public Safety Realignment became operational on October 1, 2011. This budget reflects the addition of five new Correctional

Officer positions, approved in FY 2011-12, to mitigate the influx of realigned inmates. The cost of these new positions is fully funded by 2011 Realignment funding through the County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140). The County Local Revenue Fund 2011 is discussed in greater detail in its own budget narrative.

While the size of the State-to-County prisoner shift is still uncertain, it is expected that once the additional correctional staff are hired and trained the Jail will comply with recent Correctional Standards Authority (CSA) inspection recommendations. The CSA is charged by law with ensuring county compliance with correctional standards.

The Jail budget unit’s correctional positions are not generally subject to target cost reductions. AB109 prohibits the use of Public Safety Realignment funds to supplant a county budget. The funds are intended to increase jail staffing levels beyond those prior to Public Safety Realignment.

One side-effect of Public Safety Realignment is the loss of State parolee housing reimbursement. As parolees become the responsibility of county probation departments, the State is freed from housing felons upon their violation of probation conditions. This is likely to cause an increase in the Jail’s average daily population numbers over time.

The County has received a conditional award of approximately \$10 million from the State under AB900 for the expansion of the main jail. The project is being coordinated by the Sheriff’s Office in conjunction with the Public Works Department, County Counsel and the County Administrator’s Office. When completed, the project will add one “pod” containing 28 maximum security beds, a

women's dormitory with 14 beds and a women's activity yard. The jail medical area will also be updated.

## **Recommended Budget**

This budget is recommended at \$8,391,918, which is an increase of \$920,637 (12.3%) compared to FY 2011-12. The General Fund provides approximately 57% of the financing for the Sheriff's Department as a whole. The Jail's budgeted unreimbursed cost has increased \$596,275 (8.3%) versus FY 2011-12. The increase in unreimbursed cost is primarily due to the increase in Jail Medical costs.

Jail Medical expenses are budgeted to increase by \$464,054 over FY 2011-12. The total Jail Medical budget is now over \$2 million, an increase of nearly 29% in one year. This increase in cost is due to both a recommended increase in nursing staff and due to a continued escalation in utilization of hospital services by inmates. The Jail Medical budget (4-134) is discussed in greater detail in its own budget narrative.

Though overall budget reductions are a necessity of the FY 2012-13 Recommended Budget, no reductions are recommended for the Jail budget unit. The effects of Public Safety Realignment are likely to be more fully realized during FY 2012-13 with an anticipated increase in Jail population and related increases in costs in staffing, inmate medical costs, and other related expenses.

## **Use of Fund Balance**

This budget unit is within the Public Safety Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance

# County Administrative Office *Stephanie J. Larsen, County Administrative Officer*

## Trial Court Funding (2-109)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: STEPHANIE J LARSEN	UNIT: TRIAL COURT FUNDING	FUND: TRIAL COURT			0014 2-109	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
EXPENDITURES						
OTHER CHARGES	987,608	665,913	961,887	961,887	.0	
* GROSS BUDGET	987,608	665,913	961,887	961,887	.0	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	987,608	665,913	961,887	961,887	.0	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	139,323	116,894	153,500	153,995	.3	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	589,401	508,334	650,050	650,000	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	728,724	625,228	803,550	803,995	.1	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	258,884	40,685	158,337	157,892	.3-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0	

### Purpose

The Trial Court Funding budget unit accounts for mandated Maintenance of Effort and Court Facilities Payments to the State. Shared costs for utilities and maintenance are also paid out of this budget unit. This budget unit accounts for the receipt of court-generated revenues to partially offset these costs.

### Major Budget Changes

There are no major budget changes for FY 2012-13.

### Program Discussion

Fourteen years ago, the State Legislature passed landmark legislation titled the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997, which shifted primary funding responsibility for the local Trial Courts from the counties to the State. Prior to that time,

the Superior and Municipal Courts were considered County Departments, Court employees were County employees, and the counties constructed and maintained all court facilities.

The transition that began in 1997 was completed in 2009. The former Municipal Courts have been consolidated into one Superior Court in each county, and its employees are now local court employees. The final step in the process was to resolve the lingering issue concerning which entity should have responsibility for the provision of court facilities. This issue was addressed with the passage of the Court Facilities Act of 2002, which provided for a transition of responsibility for trial court facilities from the counties to the State.

Sutter County negotiated with the State to transfer responsibility for funding the two courthouses. The agreement was approved by the Board of Supervisors in December 2008. Due to this transfer, the County is



now obligated to make an annual maintenance-of-effort payment (Court Facilities Payment) to the State equivalent to its recent historical expenditures for maintenance of the courthouses. The Court Facilities Payment has been fixed at \$117,887 annually. In return, the County has been permanently relieved of its responsibility to maintain, renovate, and replace the two transferred court facilities. However, County departments still partially occupy the Court buildings and therefore must pay for their share of utility and maintenance costs. For FY 2012-13, a budget of \$120,000 is once again recommended for these shared costs.

Financial records, dating back to the 1997 transition of court facilities from the County to the State, show FY 2010-11 as the first year an unreimbursed cost was budgeted for this budget unit during that period. This is primarily attributed to decreasing fee and fine revenue during recent fiscal years. This trend seems to have stabilized during FY 2011-12.

### **New Courthouse**

In April 2011, the State purchased from the County a 3.8 acre site on the southeast corner of Civic Center Boulevard and Veterans Memorial Circle as the location for the new Sutter County Courthouse.

As envisioned, the new three-story Courthouse would consist of seven courtrooms and a 78,700 square foot building surrounded by 220 parking spaces. The total project cost, to be paid by the State, is currently estimated at \$72.8 million. Construction of the courthouse was anticipated to begin in February 2013 with construction to be completed by August

2014. However, the Governor's 2012 May Revise has put that plan in jeopardy. The County is currently waiting to hear whether or not the project is scheduled to begin as originally planned.

### **Recommended Budget**

This budget is recommended at \$961,887, which is the same as FY 2011-12. The General Fund provides 16.4% of the financing for this budget unit. One-time revenue of \$495 is being budgeted for repayment of the Trial Court Fund's share of a worker's compensation reserve from the Worker's Compensation Dividend Fund (0-165). The fund has had no activity since 1998 and is recommended to be closed.

### **Use of Fund Balance**

This budget unit is within the Trial Court Fund. The budget does not include the use of any specific fund balance.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: STEPHANIE J LARSEN	UNIT: SUPERIOR COURT	FUND: TRIAL COURT			0014 2-112	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12	
EXPENDITURES						
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	681,057	458,141	543,126	543,126	.0	
OTHER CHARGES	2,310	0	1,860	1,860	.0	
* GROSS BUDGET	683,367	458,141	544,986	544,986	.0	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	683,367	458,141	544,986	544,986	.0	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	90,336	83,121	88,050	88,050	.0	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	3,909	2,770	4,000	4,000	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	94,245	85,891	92,050	92,050	.0	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	589,122	372,250	452,936	452,936	.0	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0	

**Purpose**

This budget unit contains certain court-related operational costs, such as jury witness fees and expenses related to indigent defense, that are not statutorily considered the responsibility of the State of California. The budget is prepared by the County Administrative Office.

may have a conflict of interest in representing co-defendants in a case.

**Recommended Budget**

The recommended budget is \$544,986, which is the same as FY 2011-12. Both revenue and expense projections show this budget to be stable as budgeted throughout FY 2011-12.

**Major Budget Changes**

There are no major budget changes for FY 2012-13.

**Program Discussion**

The expenses in this budget unit are related to indigent defense provided outside of the Public Defender budget unit. The majority of these expenses are incurred in paying for conflict counsel attorneys. Conflict attorneys represent clients when the Public Defender

# County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140)

---

## Purpose

The County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140) was established in FY 2011-12 pursuant to legislation enacting Public Safety Realignment. This fund was required by AB 118 to be established by the County for the purpose of receiving revenue from the State to fund realigned public safety programs.

## Major Budget Changes

This is a newly established fund with no prior funding history.

## Program Discussion

In FY 2011-12, several bills were passed by the California Legislature, which provided the framework for Public Safety Realignment. The initial Public Safety Realignment legislation was titled AB 109 and was signed into law on April 4, 2011. Subsequently, AB 117 amended the program structure established in AB 109, while AB 118 established the financial structure for Public Safety Realignment.

Legislation required several new accounts, established by Sutter County as new departments within fund 0-140, to be created for receipt of realigned funds. These new departments are:

- Trial Court Security 2-105
- District Attorney and Public Defender 2-120
- Local Law Enforcement Services 2-203
- CCP Planning 2-306
- Local Community Corrections 2-307
- Juvenile Justice Account 2-308
- Health and Human Services 4-105
- Mental Health Account 4-106

This fund is designed to be a “pass-through” budget where funds will immediately pass through to the appropriate operating budget or special revenue fund as budgeted.

### **Trial Court Security 2-105**

This department receives money to fund security services for Sutter County Superior Court provided through the Sheriff’s Court Bailiffs budget unit (2-103). Security is provided by the Bailiffs who are responsible for the courts’ security and decorum, and for the care and custody of inmates present in the court. Bailiffs also provide for the care and security of the jury.

### **District Attorney and Public Defender 2-120**

This department receives money to enhance the District Attorney’s budget unit (2-125) and Public Defender’s budget unit (2-106) to mitigate the expected increase in caseload due to Public Safety Realignment.

### **Local Law Enforcement Services 2-203**

This department receives money for a variety of purposes and programs including Jail Booking Fees (2-301), Rural County Sheriff’s funding (2-201), and California Multijurisdictional Methamphetamine Enforcement Team (2-202) funds for the Sheriff’s Office, Juvenile Probation funding for the Probation Department (2-304) and Citizens’ Option for Public Safety (COPS) funding for the District Attorney (2-125), Sheriff-Coroner (2-201), County Jail (2-301) and Probation (2-304) departments.

### **CCP Planning 2-306**

This department receives money for funding the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) start-up and planning. The CCP is responsible for designing the local approach to Realignment implementation. The mission and

# County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140)

---

goal of the Sutter County CCP is to comply with the Public Safety Realignment Act by adopting evidence-based, cost-effective policies and practices that reduce recidivism, improve offender outcomes and promote public safety. The Probation Department (2-304) has responsibility for this department.

## **Local Community Corrections 2-307**

This department receives money to fund the majority of programs implemented by the CCP. The Probation Department (2-304) has responsibility for this department.

## **Juvenile Justice Account 2-308**

This department receives money for juvenile probation programs including the Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) program and the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) Re-Entry program. The Probation Department (2-304) has responsibility for this department.

## **Health and Human Services 4-105**

This department receives money for a variety of Welfare/Social Services (5-101, 5-206, 5-209) programs including Adult Protective Services, Foster Care Assistance, Foster Care Administration, Child Welfare Services, Adoption Services and Child Abuse Prevention, and for Mental Health Services (4-102) programs including Drug Court and both Drug Medi-Cal and Non-drug Medi-Cal Substance Abuse Treatment Services.

## **Mental Health Account 4-106**

This department receives money to fund Mental Health Services (4-102) and the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Maintenance of Effort (MOE) payment through Welfare/Social Services (5-204).

## **Recommended Budget**

This budget is recommended at \$19,835,665. All funding is provided by the State through Public Safety Realignment.

As previously stated, this fund is designed to be a “pass-through” budget where funds will immediately pass through to the appropriate operating budget or special revenue fund as budgeted. Funding budgeted to be used completely each fiscal year will pass through to an operating budget, while funds not used completely in a single fiscal year will pass through to a special revenue fund, so any unused funds will remain separate across budget years. This prevents fund balances from becoming co-mingled and will allow each department responsible for these realigned funds to accurately and more easily track the expenditure and fund balance of individual revenue streams.

## **Use of Fund Balance**

This budget unit should contain no fund balance at year-end as each revenue stream is immediately transferred upon receipt to either a corresponding operating budget or a special revenue fund for holding.

# County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140)

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DEPT HEAD:

UNIT: TRIAL COURT SECURITY

FUND: COUNTY LOCAL REVENUE FUND 2011 0140 2-105

	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
OTHER CHARGES	0	0	0	549,760	***
* GROSS BUDGET	0	0	0	549,760	***
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	0	0	0	549,760	***
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	0	.0
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0
* TOTAL BUDGET	0	0	0	549,760	***
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	0	264,507	0	549,760	***
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
GENERAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE 7/1	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	0	264,507	0	549,760	***
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	0	264,507-	0	0	.0
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0

# County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140)

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DEPT HEAD:

UNIT: DISTRICT ATTY & PUBLIC DEFENDR FUND: COUNTY LOCAL REVENUE FUND 2011 0140 2-120

	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
OTHER CHARGES	0	0	0	47,506	***
* GROSS BUDGET	0	0	0	47,506	***
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	0	0	0	47,506	***
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	0	.0
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0
* TOTAL BUDGET	0	0	0	47,506	***
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	19,472	0	47,506	***
GENERAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE 7/1	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	0	19,472	0	47,506	***
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	0	19,472-	0	0	.0
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0

# County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140)

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DEPT HEAD:

UNIT: LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICES FUND; COUNTY LOCAL REVENUE FUND 2011 0140 2-203

	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
OTHER CHARGES	0	0	0	1,225,854	***
* GROSS BUDGET	0	0	0	1,225,854	***
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	0	0	0	1,225,854	***
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	0	.0
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0
* TOTAL BUDGET	0	0	0	1,225,854	***
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	0	299,915	0	545,400	***
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	419,943	0	680,454	***
GENERAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE 7/1	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	0	719,858	0	1,225,854	***
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	0	719,858-	0	0	.0
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0

# County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140)

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DEPT HEAD:

UNIT: CCP PLANNING

FUND: COUNTY LOCAL REVENUE FUND 2011 0140 2-306

	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
OTHER CHARGES	0	0	0	100,000	***
* GROSS BUDGET	0	0	0	100,000	***
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	0	0	0	100,000	***
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	0	.0
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0
* TOTAL BUDGET	0	0	0	100,000	***
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	182,375	0	100,000	***
GENERAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE 7/1	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	0	182,375	0	100,000	***
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	0	182,375-	0	0	.0
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0



# County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140)

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DEPT HEAD:

UNIT: LOCAL COMMUNITY CORRECTION ACC FUND: COUNTY LOCAL REVENUE FUND 2011 0140 2-307

	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
OTHER CHARGES	0	0	0	1,116,295	***
* GROSS BUDGET	0	0	0	1,116,295	***
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	0	0	0	1,116,295	***
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	0	.0
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0
* TOTAL BUDGET	0	0	0	1,116,295	***
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	451,950	0	1,116,295	***
GENERAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE 7/1	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	0	451,950	0	1,116,295	***
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	0	451,950-	0	0	.0
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0

# County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140)

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DEPT HEAD:

UNIT: JUVENILE JUSTICE ACCOUNT

FUND: COUNTY LOCAL REVENUE FUND 2011 0140 2-308

	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
OTHER CHARGES	0	0	0	291,000	***
* GROSS BUDGET	0	0	0	291,000	***
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	0	0	0	291,000	***
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	0	.0
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0
* TOTAL BUDGET	0	0	0	291,000	***
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	151,213	0	291,000	***
GENERAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE 7/1	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	0	151,213	0	291,000	***
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	0	151,213-	0	0	.0
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0

# County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140)

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DEPT HEAD: UNIT: HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES FUND: COUNTY LOCAL REVENUE FUND 2011 0140 4-105

	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
OTHER CHARGES	0	1,521,324	0	6,561,962	***
* GROSS BUDGET	0	1,521,324	0	6,561,962	***
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	0	1,521,324	0	6,561,962	***
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	0	.0
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0
* TOTAL BUDGET	0	1,521,324	0	6,561,962	***
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	3,960,525	0	6,561,962	***
GENERAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE 7/1	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	0	3,960,525	0	6,561,962	***
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	0	2,439,201-	0	0	.0
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0

# County Local Revenue Fund 2011 (0-140)

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DEPT HEAD:

UNIT: MENTAL HEALTH ACCOUNT

FUND: COUNTY LOCAL REVENUE FUND 2011 0140 4-106

	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2010-11	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 3-31-12	ADOPTED BUDGET 2011-12	CAO RECOMMEND 2012-13	% CHANGE OVER 2011-12
EXPENDITURES					
OTHER CHARGES	0	3,559,670	0	9,943,288	***
* GROSS BUDGET	0	3,559,670	0	9,943,288	***
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	0	3,559,670	0	9,943,288	***
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	0	0	.0
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0
* TOTAL BUDGET	0	3,559,670	0	9,943,288	***
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	3,958,150	0	9,943,288	***
GENERAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE 7/1	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	0	3,958,150	0	9,943,288	***
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	0	398,480-	0	0	.0
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0