



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 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11
EXPENDITURES					
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	2,502,359	2,054,893	2,579,725	2,645,739	2.6
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	279,268	164,830	196,790	235,951	19.9
OTHER CHARGES	91,769	170,685	243,925	310,090	27.1
CAPITAL ASSETS	7,580	0	0	0	.0
* GROSS BUDGET	2,880,976	2,390,408	3,020,440	3,191,780	5.7
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	386	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	2,881,362	2,390,408	3,020,440	3,191,780	5.7
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	237,253	0	100.0-
INCREASE IN DESIGNATIONS	0	0	0	310,686	***
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0
* TOTAL BUDGET	2,881,362	2,390,408	3,257,693	3,502,466	7.5
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	646	438	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	2,878,317	2,454,579	3,041,731	3,218,600	5.8
GENERAL REVENUES	9,952	7,463	10,800	10,800	.0
CANCELLATION P/Y DESIGNATIONS	0	0	167,452	0	100.0-
UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE 7/1	30,155	205,162	37,710	273,066	624.1
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	2,919,070	2,667,642	3,257,693	3,502,466	7.5
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	37,708-	277,234-	0	0	.0
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	33.00	33.00	33.00	33.00	.0

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

- 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
- 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

- (\$82,438) Decrease in Salaries and Benefits due to defunding the Information Systems Coordinator position
- \$58,674 Increase in Salaries and Benefits due to funding the approved Child Support Specialist I/II position
- \$89,778 General salary and benefits adjustments

Services & Supplies

- \$22,422 Increase in Office Expenses
- \$10,986 Increase in Employee Training and Transportation/Travel

Other Charges

- \$67,241 Increase in Interfund Overhead (A-87) costs

Revenues

- \$79,450 Increase due to additional funding from the State for an Early Intervention Program
- \$97,419 Increase due to allocation from Federal Advance

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 Administrative funding (\$2,890,188), the Electronic Data Processing (EDP) funding (\$84,271) and, for the third year, Early Intervention Revenue Stabilization Funding (\$79,450). The EDP funding was increased by 15% for FY 2010-11 and will remain for FY 2011-12. This is an annual request and cannot be relied upon for approval each fiscal year.

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

The CSDA Annual Training Conference will be held in Sacramento in September 2011. We recommend a slight increase in the Training and Transportation/Travel to take advantage of this local training opportunity. It will enable us to have greater participation in the conference because it will be in Northern California.

Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$3,502,466. 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 change in two positions that was approved by the Board

of Supervisors in FY 2010-11 and will continue for FY 2011-12. The approved change is:

- Defunding the Information Systems Coordinator position due to a retirement
- Funding an approved 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 2011-12.

Other recommended increases, as reflected under “Major Budget Changes” are based on increased State and Federal funding.

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 Reserves/Designations

The Child Support Services fund contains a Designation for Future Appropriations account. This account is recommended to increase \$310,686. The estimated ending balance in this account will be \$342,777.

**District Attorney
Criminal Division (2-125)**

Carl V. Adams, District Attorney

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: CARL V ADAMS	UNIT: DISTRICT ATTORNEY	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-125	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	3,285,707	2,517,423	3,524,554	3,242,903	8.0-	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	149,543	105,266	198,485	147,340	25.8-	
OTHER CHARGES	204,215	136,647	243,039	225,263	7.3-	
CAPITAL ASSETS	32,464	0	21,500	0	100.0-	
* GROSS BUDGET	3,671,929	2,759,336	3,987,578	3,615,506	9.3-	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	3,671,929	2,759,336	3,987,578	3,615,506	9.3-	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	315,920	203,397	422,378	409,825	3.0-	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	266,676	109,466	240,466	240,516	.0	
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES	3,413	0	0	0	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	586,009	312,863	662,844	650,341	1.9-	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	3,085,920	2,446,473	3,324,734	2,965,165	10.8-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	32.50	31.50	32.50	30.50	6.2-	

Purpose

This budget unit funds the entire District Attorney's operation including administration, with the exception of one grant-funded Deputy District Attorney position and one Senior Criminal Investigator position in the Anti-Drug Abuse budget (see budget unit 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

- (\$65,092) Elimination of one full-time Legal Secretary position
- (\$34,330) Unfund and leave vacant one half-time Victim Advocate position
- (\$104,739) Unfund and leave vacant one full-time Deputy District Attorney position
- (\$90,212) Unfund and leave vacant one full-time Senior Criminal Investigator position

- (\$51,540) Unfund and leave vacant one full-time Senior Criminal Investigator position for nine months

Services & Supplies

- (\$51,145) General decreases in various services and supplies accounts to generate additional budget reductions

Other Charges

- (\$17,776) Total decrease due primarily to a \$26,598 reduction to Interfund Information Technology charges offset by increase of \$10,476 in Interfund Fuel & Oil costs

Revenues

- (\$12,553) General revenue adjustments primarily related to the following:
 - Reduction in Interfund Welfare reimbursement revenue for investigation and prosecution of Welfare Fraud cases
 - Increase in use of Special Revenue Fund monies

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 6 of the 31 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. One half-time Victim Advocate position is being eliminated from this program.

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. A small amount to investigate In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) fraud is included.

The Statutory Rape Vertical Prosecution (SRVP) program provides 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 are funded by Vehicle License Fee related revenue, which will be discontinued on June 30, 2011 if the State does not approve further funding. The District Attorney has chosen not to include this revenue in the FY 2011-12 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. will receive funds for this program of \$33,009, which must be expended by December, 2011.

Sutter County Gang Task Force

The Sutter County Gang Task Force was formed by action of the Sutter County Board of Supervisors in October, 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. 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 2010-11 costs have been affected by arrests made in a series of gang-related homicides going back to 2004 and 2005.

General Criminal Prosecution

At the start of FY 2010-11, there were 10 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 without precedent 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.

Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$3,615,506. The General Fund provides approximately 59% of the financing for this budget unit and is decreased by \$411,959 (an estimated 16.2%) compared to FY 2010-11.

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.

The District Attorney's operations will be strongly impacted by the proposed budget. The elimination of staff and the defunding of other positions will necessitate reductions in caseload. The District Attorney is planning to implement a diversion program for many misdemeanors. In such cases there would be no prosecution, conviction nor

sentence. Other duties in the office will be reassigned and many operations reduced.

The District Attorney is eliminating one filled Legal Secretary II position as part of the budget reduction. Though the related work load will likely increase, there are no other viable alternatives to reducing costs.

Further, the District Attorney will defund and leave 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 are currently vacant. As originally planned in FY 2009-10, one of the Senior Criminal Investigator positions will be refilled from the Anti-Drug Abuse budget unit (2-302) in March 2012, upon the expiration of the Anti-Drug Abuse Recovery Act grant.

Due to the State's fiscal crisis, all State grants and State-funded programs, such as Child Abduction, are potentially at risk of being reduced or eliminated. At the time of this writing, it is not known if there will be further reductions to the District Attorney's programs. However, 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 \$105,865 budgeted for California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA) grant revenue in the District Attorney's budget. Receipt of this revenue is contingent upon the extension of Vehicle License Fee (VLF) public safety related funding. If the State does not extend this funding past the current sunset date of June 30, 2011, this revenue may not be realized.

Mid-year adjustments may need to be made to account for this situation.

Further reductions are not recommended at this time. The District Attorney has reduced this budget unit's General Fund cost by approximately \$360,000 compared to FY 2010-11. Budgeted reductions approved in FY 2010-11 previously reduced the budgeted unreimbursed cost by \$125,211 over FY 2009-10. Further reductions would result in the elimination of additional personnel and would directly affect the current level of service provided to the County.

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget does not include any Reserves or Designations.

District Attorney Anti-Drug Abuse (2-302)

Carl Adams, District Attorney

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: CARL V ADAMS	UNIT: ANTI-DRUG ABUSE ENFORCEMENT	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY	0015 2-302			
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	348,055	466,712	560,073	509,067	9.1-	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	900	950	900	900	.0	
OTHER CHARGES	4,605	2,412	3,132	4,478	43.0	
* GROSS BUDGET	353,560	470,074	564,105	514,445	8.8-	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	353,560	470,074	564,105	514,445	8.8-	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	140,548	227,811	401,746	310,851	22.6-	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	140,548	227,811	401,746	310,851	22.6-	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	213,012	242,263	162,359	203,594	25.4	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	.0	

Purpose

Since January 1988, the Board of Supervisors has accepted grant funds from the State of California to be used to impact and curtail the use, manufacture and sale of illegal drugs and narcotics in Sutter County.

Major Budget Changes

Salaries & Benefits

- (\$51,006) Decrease due to transfer of Deputy Probation Officer III position and Senior Criminal Investigator position out of the budget unit effective March 2012

Revenues

- (\$90,895) Decrease in CalEMA grant revenue due to March 2012 expiration of Anti-Drug Abuse Recovery Act funding

Program Discussion

The Anti-Drug Abuse (ADA) budget consists of one staff member from each of the three Departments involved: a Deputy District Attorney, a Deputy Sheriff, and a Deputy Probation Officer. With the addition of the ADA Enforcement Recovery Act program, grant money was used to support one new Limited Term Senior Criminal Investigator and one new Limited Term Deputy Probation Officer III in this program. The additional staff provided by the grant augments Sutter County's efforts to arrest and aggressively

prosecute individuals who participate in the manufacture, use, or sale of illegal drugs.

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

CalEMA Grant awards have fluctuated as follows:

- The FY 2000-01 grant was \$183,515
- The FY 2001-02 grant was \$190,489
- The FY 2002-03 grant was \$185,896
- The FY 2003-04 grant was \$213,378
- The FY 2004-05 grant was \$216,786
- The FY 2005-06 grant was \$198,946
- The FY 2006-07 grant was \$123,451
- The FY 2007-08 grant was \$142,791
- The FY 2008-09 grant was \$137,563
- The FY 2009-10 grant was \$123,451
- The FY 2010-11 grant was \$150,858

Recommended Budget

The recommended budget is \$514,445. This represents a decrease of \$49,660 (8.8%) compared to FY 2010-11. This decrease is related to the transfer of one Deputy Probation Officer II position and one Senior Criminal Investigator position out of the budget unit, effective March 2012. No additional reductions are recommended. The General Fund cost increase of \$41,235 compared to FY 2010-11 is directly related to the expiration of grant funds.

The FY 2011-12 CalEMA grant amount is projected to be \$150,858. ADA Recovery Act grant funds of \$308,863 awarded in 2010 must be expended before March 1, 2012. The District Attorney's Office administers the grant.

The Sheriff, Chief Probation Officer and District Attorney all concur with the current distribution of funds.

Due to the State's 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 but there is room for optimism since the funding is largely from Federal funds.

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 Reserves/Designations

This budget does not include any Reserves or Designations.

Grand Jury (2-104)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY					
UNIT: GRAND JURY	FUND: GENERAL				0001 2-104
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11
EXPENDITURES					
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	29,277	26,252	25,950	33,353	28.5
OTHER CHARGES	4,427	1,512	4,228	6,008	42.1
* GROSS BUDGET	33,704	27,764	30,178	39,361	30.4
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	1,419	987	600	600	.0
* NET BUDGET	35,123	28,751	30,778	39,961	29.8
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	15	0	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	15	0	0	0	.0
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	35,108	28,751	30,778	39,961	29.8
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

- \$7,403 General increase in Services and Supplies based upon the prior four years' historical expenses

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 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.

Grand Jury (2-104)

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

The Total Budget is \$39,961. The General Fund provides 100% of the financing for this budget unit, which is increased \$9,183 (29.8%) compared to FY 2010-11.

Upon reviewing prior years' budget data, it was noted the Grand Jury budget unit has historically been under-budgeted.

In an attempt to remedy this situation and provide a more accurate appropriation for the Grand Jury budget, the FY 2011-12 recommended budget is based upon the prior four years' average annual expenditures. Although there is a resulting overall increase in General Fund budgeted costs, this approach is being utilized in order to provide a more realistic approach to budgeting annual Grand Jury expenses.

Additionally, 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 Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

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 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
OTHER CHARGES	1,767,919	1,170,557	1,897,341	1,600,000	15.7-	
* GROSS BUDGET	1,767,919	1,170,557	1,897,341	1,600,000	15.7-	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	1,767,919	1,170,557	1,897,341	1,600,000	15.7-	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	15,911	2,931	9,000	3,000	66.7-	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	15,911	2,931	9,000	3,000	66.7-	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	1,752,008	1,167,626	1,888,341	1,597,000	15.4-	
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 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

- (\$297,341) 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. The Probation Department's extensive use of "Camp Singer" as a local commitment program affords families the opportunity to work on their issues together as opposed to sending minors out of the area to group homes.

The line-item figures in the budget unit reflect Sutter County's share of the total operational costs of this bi-county facility. Cost sharing by the counties is calculated by a formula based on 50% of certain agreed-upon "base costs," in addition to a pro-rata share of certain variable costs, which are determined monthly based upon the proportional number of minors detained from each respective county. The formula provides that "no County shall pay

Probation

Juvenile Hall Unit (2-309)

Christine D. Odom, Chief Probation Officer

less than 25% of these variable costs." There is continued discussion about modifying the JPA to more inclusively reflect A-87 overhead costs. This action could result in increased costs to Sutter County not currently reflected in the recommended budget.

Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$1,600,000. The General Fund provides approximately 70% (\$1,122,880) of the financing for this budget unit and is reduced by \$305,861 (21.4%) compared to FY 2010-11.

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.

The budget for Other Charges is reduced by \$297,341 (15.7%) compared to FY 2010-11. This decrease is due to a combination of factors including a reduction of personnel related expenses for Yuba County and reduced utilization by Sutter County.

Placer, Tuolumne, Colusa and Calaveras counties continue to contract to utilize the Maxine Singer Youth Guidance Center, generating revenue at the rate of \$3,500 per month/per minor. Bed space rental for the Camp has increased significantly over the past year. The recommended budget assumes 10 contract beds per month for a total of \$420,000. It also assumes \$160,000 (1/2 to Sutter County) in Juvenile Probation and Camp Funds (JPCF) from Vehicle License Fee revenues that face elimination absent action by

State Legislators. This revenue is reflected in the recommended budget through the reduced share of cost. It is anticipated that Juvenile Hall can cover any lost JPCF funds within its recommended budget.

The average daily population ratio for the period of July 2010 – February 2011 places Sutter County's average share at 58%, compared to the 65% estimated for FY 2010-11. At the time of this writing, the Sutter County share has dropped to an all time low of 37%.

While a reduced population for Sutter County is believed to be a direct result of the commitment by staff to implement evidenced based practices, the ability to identify this lower use as a new trend would be premature. As a result, the department has used a conservative estimate of 59% for Sutter County for cost sharing for FY 2011-12. This recommendation is based on the possibility that contract bed rentals could potentially decline and additional funds would be required to keep the facility operational.

Should the Probation Department be successful in keeping Sutter County's population reduced to a level that results in budget savings, it is recommended those excess funds be used to offset any potential losses in State revenue for juvenile probation services.

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

Probation Delinquency Prevention Commission (2-303)

Christine D. Odom, Chief Probation Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DEPT HEAD: CHRISTINE D ODOM

UNIT: DELINQUENCY PREVENT COMMISSION FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY

0015 2-303

	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11
EXPENDITURES					
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	303	0	990	990	.0
OTHER CHARGES	5	0	10	10	.0
* GROSS BUDGET	308	0	1,000	1,000	.0
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	308	0	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	692-	0	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 2010, a prescription drug awareness event included a prescription drug drop off opportunity to emphasize the importance of safely disposing of prescription drugs. 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. This budget unit does not receive financing from the General Fund. This program is funded by Realignment funds, which are transferred to this budget from the Local Health and Welfare Trust, Social Services Fund #0248.

**Probation
Delinquency Prevention Commission (2-303)**

Christine D. Odom, Chief Probation Officer

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: CHRISTINE D ODOM	UNIT: PROBATION	FUND: TRIAL COURT			0014 2-304	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	4,027,856	3,267,789	4,262,199	4,326,205	1.5	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	145,375	82,238	182,240	208,716	14.5	
OTHER CHARGES	203,206	177,619	342,183	350,964	2.6	
* GROSS BUDGET	4,376,437	3,527,646	4,786,622	4,885,885	2.1	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	4,376,437	3,527,646	4,786,622	4,885,885	2.1	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	755,790	243,203	775,199	1,187,199	53.1	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	742,851	405,030	591,530	675,736	14.2	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	1,498,641	648,233	1,366,729	1,862,935	36.3	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	2,877,796	2,879,413	3,419,893	3,022,950	11.6-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	43.00	43.00	43.00	43.00	.0	

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.

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

- (\$112,146) Defund one vacant Deputy Probation Officer III position in the Juvenile Division following an anticipated retirement, and cease services to one YCUSD elementary school
- (\$63,768) Defund one vacant Probation Aide position in the Adult Services division

- (\$50,151) Decrease due to a budgeting change to properly reflect 45% of the cost of a Deputy Probation Officer III position (Drug Court Officer) as being paid directly from the Mental Health Budget
- \$290,071 General salary and benefits adjustments

Services & Supplies

- \$38,175 Increase in Special Departmental Expense directly related to SB678 and GREAT program revenue

Other Charges

- \$28,356 Increase in payment to Mental Health for Substance Abuse Counselor services, funded with Justice Assistance Grant (JAG)-Probation Stimulus funds.
- (\$29,889) Decrease in Interfund Information Technology charges

Revenues

- \$360,000 Increase due to new Community Corrections Partnership Incentive Fund (CCPIF/SB 678) activities
- \$59,050 Increase in Youthful Offender Block Grant (YOBG) funds to offset reduced Vehicle License Fee (VLF) revenues for juvenile services

- \$30,000 New anticipated revenue from Juvenile Reentry Fund for Wards released from the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)
- \$60,000 Anticipated increase in Federal Title IV-E revenue for time spent working with youth at risk of foster care

Program Discussion

Adult Unit

The Adult Unit performed 951 Criminal Court investigations in 2010, and supervised, on average, 775 largely felony offenders, not including those with active warrants; with the ultimate goal of reducing offender risk and recidivism, while improving offender outcomes and public safety.

Intensive supervision and support of drug offenders is provided through specialized funding for Drug Court and Justice Assistance Grant Stimulus funds (JAG-Probation & OTP). Officers providing services via an Anti-Drug Abuse Grant in coordination with NET-5 are allocated within a budget overseen by the District Attorney. Federal stimulus funds support a second Deputy Probation Officer until February 28, 2012. Two officers are currently assigned to the Sutter-Yuba County Gang Task Force, carrying a caseload of 54 gang members and performing task force enforcement duties.

Community Corrections Performance Incentive Fund (CCPIF/SB678)

Probation services remain a less expensive and more effective solution to prison commitments for non-violent offenders; especially when current fixed costs to house a prison inmate are estimated at \$29,353 per year. The Department has been able to reduce the

number of probation revocations by at least 4% in 2010.

The Department will be able to expand the implementation 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. As a result, active caseload sizes will be reduced, allowing officer's to concentrate their efforts on harm-reduction and public safety, which in the end results in reduced recidivism and a healthier, more productive system overall. Improvements to the adult system have slowly evolved over the past two years and the reduction of prison commitments to date can be attributed to the dedication of staff and justice partners who were asked to adapt to a changing world with few resources.

Realignment of Supervision & Incarceration of Offenders

Included in the current State Budget proposal and accompanying trailer bills (AB 109 and SB 69) is the realignment of responsibility for supervision and housing of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offenders to local control. In return for State funds, locals would be responsible for supervising offenders who were previously subject to State parole supervision and for housing non-violent offenders who were previously housed within the State prison system. At the time of this writing, an agreement for funding these new local responsibilities has not been made by the legislature. Should adequate funding be found, this Department is prepared to work with local stakeholders to expand alternative sanctions to minimize the impact on the jail population and to develop an expanded array of services to meet the needs of this population, many of whom would be eligible and appropriate for community supervision.

Juvenile Unit

In 2010, the juvenile unit provided intake services for 723 juvenile referrals, including violations of probation, and supervised an average of 135 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 and River Valley High School.

Prevention and intervention services are provided with a truancy officer for Yuba City Unified School District School, and officers at Gray Avenue Middle School and King Avenue Elementary schools as it is believed that 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.

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

It is with reluctance that the Department must recommend the elimination of prevention services to King Avenue School due to County budget reductions.

Gang Risk Education & Training

In February 2011, the Department implemented the Gang Resistance Education And Training (GREAT) program with a Federal grant that will be extended to

December 2011. The grant paid for staff training and travel expenses and incentives for elementary and middle school students served by the program. Two Deputy Probation Officers, two Criminal Investigators and one Yuba City Police Officer are facilitating the program in ten schools. In FY 2011-12 the Department will offer GREAT services as time allows, but the opportunity for prevention services will be limited with this proposed budget.

Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)

Effective February 2011, AB 1628 has 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, counties are to be allocated \$15,000 per Ward per year for up to two years for support, care and community supervision. It is anticipated that two Wards will be released in 2011 and two sometime after January 2012. An additional \$115,000 will be received for Wards who are detained in juvenile facilities (not jails) after committing a violation of their supervision conditions. Whether these funds will cover the cost of board and care is still subject to dispute.

Included in the proposed FY 2011-12 State Budget public safety realignment package is the restructuring of the Department of Juvenile Justice institution to only accept Juvenile Court commitments and housing of juveniles tried as adults, if the county contracts with DJJ for these services. Should the legislature provide funding to effect this change, counties will need to determine whether to use realignment funds to house these youth locally or to pay the State to house them. This Department will have to review this issue in more depth with Yuba County to determine the best course of action.

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. Each of these sources is increasingly at risk.

JJCPA and JPCF funds are directly linked to VLF revenues deposited into the Local Safety and Protection Account created in the State's budget in FY 2009-10. Authority for these fees ends June 30, 2011, absent further action by the State Legislature. This would have a devastating impact on the services provided by the Department and its employees.

Through coordinated local efforts, systems change and the development of new programs with the use of a variety of revenues, Sutter County can clearly show evidence of reduced out of home placements and 50% fewer minors on probation from twelve years ago. The juvenile division and the population it serves has fully benefited from the implementation of evidenced 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. The Department is especially concerned that youth with mental health and developmental disorders will enter the probation system as other funding sources diminish. Should the Department continue to keep the Juvenile Hall and Camp population low, it will be

recommended that fund balances be used to keep vulnerable probation programs in place.

The past decade of progressive, broad-based and outcome oriented juvenile services is at significant risk due to decreasing revenues and the potential loss of VLF funding. Should the State and County 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.

Departmental Needs & Future Goals

In order to adequately carry out the mission of the Department to support existing and new responsibilities for the supervision, care and treatment of juvenile and adult offenders, the Department will need at least a base level of funding and staffing. If State funds are realigned, the Department will need to have funds specifically identified to continue systems reform, with the continued implementation of evidenced-based practices and the expansion of support services for offenders. The Department has proven its ability to improve outcomes for offenders and looks forward to the opportunity to continue on this path with new and expanded programs in collaboration with local stakeholders.

Given current fiscal restraints, the continued request for reorganization of the Department, including the reclassification of the Administrative Services Officer and the addition of the Senior Probation Officer class, is once again reserved for a future date. Should vast realignment of State offender services occur, the Department will likely bring forward a request to reorganize the Department.

Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$4,885,885. The General Fund provides 61.9% of the financing for this budget unit and is reduced by \$396,943 (11.6%) compared to FY 2010-11.

CCPIF/SB 678 provides financial incentives to counties who are able to reduce probation revocation rates with increased local services via evidenced based practices. The Department has been able to reduce the number of probation revocations by at least 4% in 2010, which will result in an estimated \$360,000 in new revenue. As a result, the Department will continue the Substance Abuse Services efforts developed with federal stimulus funds in FY 2010-11, in coordination with Mental Health staff. The CCPIF/SB 678 funds will be utilized as follows:

- \$107,362 Transfer of Deputy Probation Officer III from General Fund and JAG-Probation and Offender Treatment Program (OTP) to SB678 activities
- \$109,714 Transfer Deputy Probation Officer III from General Fund funded Gang Task Force, leaving only one Deputy Probation Officer in the Gang Task Force program
- \$35,802 Transfer Deputy Probation Officer III from the Anti-Drug Abuse Budget (2-302) when Federal Stimulus funds end February 28, 2012. The officer will move into a position that has been unfunded since FY 2009-10.
- \$20,298 will be utilized for an Extra Help part-time Probation Aide position
- \$86,824 will cover costs related to substance abuse counseling, residential

drug treatment and Special
Departmental Expenses

prevention services to enable further
reductions in prison commitment rates.

The intended use of these funds as outlined in this budget, will need to be reviewed by a Community Corrections Partnership (1230 (b) (1) PC) to be convened by the Chief Probation Officer. These funds and accompanying transfers of current staff to new SB678 programs/services have been key to the Department's ability to reduce County General Fund costs. The related transfers result in the reduction of services in enforcement positions via transfer of one officer from the Gang Task Force effective July 1, 2011 and one officer in the Anti-Drug Abuse program effective February 28, 2012.

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

Unfortunately, it is recommended that prevention services be eliminated from King Avenue School to meet the requested reduction of General Fund unreimbursed costs. The related position is fully funded by the General Fund and is not able to draw revenue from other sources.

The loss of VLF funds could result in a reduction of an estimated \$387,088 and the potential for lost programs and a reduction of staff. YOBG funds have been used to offset JJCPA program costs as VLF revenues have been significantly reduced, however YOBG funds would not be able to cover the loss of all VLF revenue.

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

Further reductions to the Probation Department budget are not recommended. To implement SB678 and increase revenue received through this program, current personnel are needed to provide ongoing

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY					
DEPT HEAD: MARK R VAN DEN HEUVEL UNIT: PUBLIC DEFENDER			FUND: TRIAL COURT		0014 2-106
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11
EXPENDITURES					
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	128,155	109,061	132,021	136,450	3.4
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	556,120	454,952	567,400	504,800	11.0-
OTHER CHARGES	6,224	12,963	18,231	7,326	59.8-
* GROSS BUDGET	690,499	576,976	717,652	648,576	9.6-
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	690,499	576,976	717,652	648,576	9.6-
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	8,573	7,643	7,200	7,500	4.2
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	8,573	7,643	7,200	7,500	4.2
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	681,926	569,333	710,452	641,076	9.8-
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. Cases 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 local private facilities. The Public Defender’s Office is appointed on Contempt matters involving the Family Support Division, 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

- (\$62,600) Total decrease in Services & Supplies due primarily to a \$60,800 reduction in Professional & Specialized Services due to a reduction in contract attorney costs and investigative costs

Other Charges

- (\$10,905) Total decrease in Other Charges due primarily to a \$10,726 reduction in Information Technology charges

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 local private facilities.

The Public Defender's Office contracts with 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 benefits that pertain to the Public Defender and Interfund Information Technology expenses, 93% of the Public Defender's services and supplies budget 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 \$648,576. The General Fund provides 98.8% of the financing for this budget unit and is decreased by \$69,376 (9.8%) compared to FY 2010-11.

In an effort to reduce overall costs yet 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 recommended that the Services and Supplies portion of the budget be reduced as follows:

- Criminal Jury Witness fees: The FY 2010-11 budget amount of \$2,000 is reduced to \$1,000.
- Professional & Specialized Services: The FY 2010-11 budget amount of \$530,000 is reduced to \$469,200. Because of a reduction in misdemeanor cases, the Deputy Misdemeanor Attorney's salary will be reduced from \$5,000 to \$4,500 per month. The Deputy Juvenile Attorney position will be reduced from \$3,500 to \$2,500 per month and/or the position would be consolidated for one attorney to handle all juvenile cases at a rate of \$5,000 per month. Further, the investigative costs will be reduced from \$75,000 to \$60,000 annually.
- Juvenile Dependent/Physician: The FY 2010-11 budget amount of \$7,800 will be reduced to \$7,000.

Though the Superior Court is ordering in some cases, as a condition of probation, the 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 generated in FY 2011-12.

The Sutter County Public Defender's Office has been able to collect payment for services rendered to those who have been involuntarily held at private psychiatric centers. The Department projects receiving reimbursement revenues totaling \$7,500 for FY 2011-12.

Additional reductions are not recommended at this time. Further cuts would directly impact the number of Deputy Public Defenders available to represent defendants. This would result in services becoming unavailable for court appointed defendants and a strong possibility of having experienced attorneys unwilling to work for a reduced wage with an increase in appointments.

Another possible consequence of a further reduction would be the unavailability of Deputy Public Defenders from the Public Defender's Office. This would likely result in the utilization of court-appointed attorneys who would charge much higher rates of reimbursement than that of Deputy Public Defenders under contract. Costs to the County could greatly increase in this circumstance.

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY					
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF INMATE WELFARE	FUND: SHERIFF INMATE WELFARE			0184 0-184
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11
EXPENDITURES					
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	83,319	70,870	87,772	90,608	3.2
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	183,878	109,838	168,600	168,650	.0
OTHER CHARGES	1,074	0	50	50	.0
* GROSS BUDGET	268,271	180,708	256,422	259,308	1.1
* NET BUDGET	268,271	180,708	256,422	259,308	1.1
APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINGENCY	0	0	211,068	258,949	22.7
INCREASES IN RESERVES	0	0	0	0	.0
* TOTAL BUDGET	268,271	180,708	467,490	518,257	10.9
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	319,031	169,580	284,500	284,500	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
GENERAL REVENUES	2,551	2,607	1,800	1,800	.0
CANCELLATION P/Y DESIGNATIONS	0	0	100,204	0	100.0-
UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE 7/1	27,676	181,190	80,986	231,957	186.4
TOTAL AVAILABLE FINANCING	349,258	353,377	467,490	518,257	10.9
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	80,987-	172,669-	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 2011-12.

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 \$518,257, which is an increase of \$50,767 compared to FY 2010-11. The General Fund does not provide any financing for this budget unit.

The majority of the increase in the budget, \$47,881, is due to an increase in the Appropriation for Contingency. Budgeted operational costs have increased by \$2,886.

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

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not currently include any reserves or designations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF-COMMUNICATIONS	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 1-600	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	1,645,605	1,459,251	1,969,571	1,842,145	6.5-	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	162,782	166,642	191,342	177,997	7.0-	
OTHER CHARGES	753,963	537,356	924,495	735,740	20.4-	
CAPITAL ASSETS	35,236	218,769	97,015	103,059	6.2	
* GROSS BUDGET	2,597,586	2,382,018	3,182,423	2,858,941	10.2-	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	66,000-	0	53,199-	***	
* NET BUDGET	2,597,586	2,316,018	3,182,423	2,805,742	11.8-	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	147,011	200,617	190,086	282,218	48.5	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	4,790	939	7,200	7,200	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	151,801	201,556	197,286	289,418	46.7	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	2,445,785	2,114,462	2,985,137	2,516,324	15.7-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	25.00	25.00	24.00	24.00	.0	

Purpose

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

Services & Supplies

- (\$17,800) Decrease in software license and maintenance costs

Major Budget Changes

Salaries & Benefits

- (\$56,734) Defund one currently vacant Criminal Records Technician position
- (\$69,845) Defund one currently vacant Supervising Public Safety Dispatcher position
- (\$60,902) Defund one currently vacant Public Safety Dispatcher position

Other Charges

- (\$188,755) General decreases in Other Charges accounts primarily related to a decrease in Interfund Information Technology charges

Capital Assets

- \$49,860 Replacement of one aging vehicle, including computer and modem, paid out of Sheriff's Assessment Fees special revenue fund (0-225)

Revenues

- \$118,096 Increase in Sheriff Assessment Fees (0-225) revenue transferred in to pay for a replacement vehicle, including computer and modem, and the salary and benefits of one Sheriff's Legal Specialist position

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 Department 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.

Due to the defunding of one Criminal Records Technician position, the Records Unit will now be staffed with two Criminal Records Technicians as opposed to three. 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 \$2,805,742 and is decreased by \$376,681 (11.8%). The General Fund provides approximately 59% of the financing for the Sheriff's Department and is reduced in the Communications budget by \$515,971 (an estimated 22.7%) compared to FY 2010-11.

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. As these revenues increase, the required contribution from the General Fund decreases.

The Sheriff has agreed to fund a Sheriff's Legal Specialist position from the Sheriff's Assessment Fees (0-225) special revenue fund for one year. This reduces the General Fund contribution for this position to \$0.

The decision to defund one vacant Public Safety Dispatcher position and one vacant Public Safety Dispatch Supervisor position will impact the operations of the Communications Unit and will have a significant impact in the Sheriff

Department's ability to provide service to the community.

The State of California recommends Sutter County's Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) have a minimum staffing level of fifteen dispatchers to cover three working stations 24 hours per day. The positions are based on a formula using the number of 911 calls the Sheriff's Department receives in a year. Grant funding offsets General Fund money used to upgrade the 911 equipment every five years. The inability to meet the minimum staffing recommendations may present a challenge in competing for future State grants. In addition, the possibility of an increase in liability to the County is a concern.

Defunding and leaving vacant one Criminal Records Technician position will negatively impact the level of service internally and to the public. Increased wait times for services including record retrieval, fingerprinting and permit issuance should be expected.

The one requested vehicle, funded by Sheriff's Assessment Fees (0-225) funds, will replace an aging vehicle with a projected usage of over 115,000 miles during FY 2011-12.

Further reductions to this budget unit are not recommended. Additional cuts would likely result in severe cuts to services and the inability for the Sheriff to properly staff the Communications Center, which plays a vital role in ensuring the safety of Sutter County residents.

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF'S COURT BAILIFFS	FUND: TRIAL COURT			0014 2-103	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	498,777	432,826	535,494	523,238	2.3-	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	7,902	6,402	9,400	8,100	13.8-	
OTHER CHARGES	785	601	731	592	19.0-	
* GROSS BUDGET	507,464	439,829	545,625	531,930	2.5-	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	507,464	439,829	545,625	531,930	2.5-	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	499,301	363,599	545,625	531,930	2.5-	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	499,301	363,599	545,625	531,930	2.5-	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	8,163	76,230	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 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.

Major Budget Changes

Salaries & Benefits

- (\$12,256) General salary and benefits adjustments

Program Discussion

The Sheriff's Court Bailiffs unit provides security services for courtrooms in the Sutter County Superior Court.

Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$531,930, which is a decrease of \$13,695 compared to FY 2010-11. The General Fund does not provide any financing for this budget unit. The Sutter County Superior Court, which is funded by the State, reimburses the Sheriff's Department for security services pursuant to an existing contract.

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF-CORONER	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-201	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	4,904,785	4,016,076	5,373,184	4,856,443	9.6-	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	588,138	347,486	441,767	380,345	13.9-	
OTHER CHARGES	556,781	340,942	596,947	560,862	6.0-	
CAPITAL ASSETS	97,944	25,905	314,365	47,492	84.9-	
* GROSS BUDGET	6,147,648	4,730,409	6,726,263	5,845,142	13.1-	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	127,015-	110,526-	184,057-	0	100.0-	
* NET BUDGET	6,020,633	4,619,883	6,542,206	5,845,142	10.7-	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	591,024	384,529	653,049	755,395	15.7	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	50,744	78,033	36,400	27,400	24.7-	
GENERAL REVENUES	42	0	0	0	.0	
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES	7,192	336	0	0	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	649,002	462,898	689,449	782,795	13.5	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	5,371,631	4,156,985	5,852,757	5,062,347	13.5-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	50.50	51.50	51.50	49.50	3.9-	

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.

- (\$102,743) Defund and leave vacant one Deputy Sheriff position that is anticipated to be vacant at June 30, 2011
- (\$145,957) Eliminate two additional filled Deputy Sheriff positions
- (\$151,333) Salary savings due to anticipated mid-year retirements

Major Budget Changes

Salaries & Benefits

- (\$112,381) Defund and leave vacant one currently vacant Patrol Lieutenant position
- (\$79,123) Defund and leave vacant one currently vacant Deputy Sheriff position

Services & Supplies

- (\$61,422) Major reduction in security equipment in addition to general services and supplies adjustments

Capital Assets

- (\$266,873) Overall reduction in Capital Assets due primarily to deferring replacement patrol vehicle purchases
- \$25,440 Purchase of four computers, hardware and modems for current patrol vehicles
- \$22,052 Purchase of four digital video cameras for current patrol vehicles

Revenues

- \$93,346 Increase in revenue primarily related to COPS funding and Secretary position for NET-5

Program Discussion

The Sheriff’s Department patrols approximately 604 square miles of unincorporated Sutter County and 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 two local mortuaries.

In 2008, the Board of Supervisors authorized and funded the creation of the Sutter County Gang Task Force (GTF) to

help fight increasing gang-related crime. Two new Deputy Sheriff positions and other Probation Department and District Attorney Department personnel were added to the GTF at that time. In the months preceding the GTF, there had been significant gang violence, weapon possession and drug activity, including three homicides and numerous shootings.

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 were held up due to the addition of the shoot house but are now on track to be completed by June 30, 2011. 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.

Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$5,845,142, which is a decrease of \$697,064 (10.7%). The General Fund provides approximately 59% of the financing for the Sheriff’s Department and is reduced in the Sheriff-Coroner budget by \$886,759 (an estimated 20.1%) compared to FY 2010-11.

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.

In FY 2010-11, three Deputy Sheriff positions were left vacant and unfunded. It is recommended that these positions remain vacant and unfunded for FY 2011-12 as well. In addition, the following personnel changes are recommended for FY 2011-12:

- Defund and leave vacant one currently vacant Lieutenant position
- Defund four additional Deputy Sheriff positions, two of which are currently vacant

No further staffing reductions are recommended for FY 2011-12.

If the Sheriff's Department were required to reduce the Sheriff-Coroner budget unit by twenty percent, the resulting cuts would put staffing levels 33% below those of 30 years ago when the County population was approximately 55,000. The current public safety staffing level is already 11% below that of 1982. To illustrate, the following were the staffing levels for the Sheriff's Department budget in 1982, not including administrative staff:

1 Sheriff
2 Assistant Sheriffs
2 Captains (Patrol/Detective)
5 Patrol Sergeants
6 Detective-Sergeants
1 Detective Sergeant-Net-5
35 Patrol Deputies
52 Total Public Safety Positions

Currently, the Sheriff's Department level of staffing, not including five administrative staff positions, is:

1 Sheriff
1 Undersheriff
1 Captain
3 Lieutenants (2 Patrol- 1 Detective)

4.5 Patrol Sergeants
1 Detective Sergeant
5 Deputy Detectives
2 Narcotics Agents (Deputy Level - One paid with grant funds)
2 Gang Task Force Agents (Deputy Level)
26 Patrol Deputies
46.5 Total Public Safety Positions

Since FY 2010-11, one Lieutenant and four Deputy Sheriff positions (two Detectives and two Patrol) in the above list have been held vacant.

Impacts of Further Reductions

Further reductions to the Sheriff-Coroner budget unit are not recommended at this time. In comparison to the recommended budget, the following staffing level would be the likely result of a full twenty percent reduction to the General Fund contribution to the Sheriff-Coroner budget unit:

1 Sheriff
1 Undersheriff
1 Captain
0 Lieutenants
4 Patrol Sergeants
1 Detective Sergeant
3 Deputy Detectives
1 Narcotics Agent (Deputy Level)
23 Patrol Deputies
35 Total Public Safety Positions

Reaching this level of a reduction would require the elimination of one Lieutenant from the Patrol Unit and the reduction in rank of one Lieutenant to the rank of Sergeant; reduction in rank of one Sergeant from the Detective Unit and two Sergeants from the Patrol Unit to Deputy Sheriff and the elimination (and lay-off) of thirteen Deputy Sheriff positions. These reductions would be in addition to the four Deputy Sheriff positions that are currently vacant.

The overall effect of these further reductions in staffing would be extremely detrimental to the public in that Sheriff's services would be drastically reduced or eliminated.

With these further staffing reductions, Deputy Sheriffs would no longer be able to conduct preventative patrol for large portions of the County.

Minor violations of law, known as "cold calls," such as a petty theft without suspects/leads, may result in citizens being directed to file a report by mail or on the Sheriff's website through the tip line.

The detective unit would be reduced to such a level that only serious violent crimes or crimes of sexual assault would be investigated. All other felonies would be handled by the patrol unit on a case by case basis.

With these further reductions in staffing, the Sheriff's Office participation in the Gang Task Force would not be possible. This would have the potential to cause great detriment in the investigation of gang-related crimes and would severely impact the Sutter County Sheriff's Office's ability to solve serious crimes. In 2010 and 2011, Sutter County Deputies assigned to the gang task force were instrumental in solving two homicides and numerous gang-related violent crimes.

A reduction in mid-level administrative staff would require much of their duties to be re-directed between the Sergeants and the Captains. This would create a twofold problem: 1) the Sergeants would be unable to effectively supervise personnel because they would be burdened with additional administrative duties and 2) the Captains responsible for the development and implementation of long term goals and

plans, in addition to the review and update of policy based on changes in public policy and case law, would be encumbered with those duties previously performed by administrative staff. The overall effect would be the degradation of service to the public and a stagnation of the Department as a whole.

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: NET 5 SHERIFF	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-202	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
OTHER CHARGES	33,341	25,728	35,678	39,582	10.9	
* GROSS BUDGET	33,341	25,728	35,678	39,582	10.9	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	33,341	25,728	35,678	39,582	10.9	
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	33,341	25,728	35,678	39,582	10.9	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	.00	.00	.00	.00	.0	

Purpose

Narcotic Enforcement Team (NET-5) is a task force composed of the Yuba City Police Department, the Sheriff’s Departments of Yuba and Sutter Counties, and the California Department of Justice aimed at combating the use, manufacture and sale of illegal drugs.

Marysville Police Department will abstain from sharing in other operating costs. Their 25% local share is split among the remaining three partners to enable the continued operation of Net-5. One detective position working in gang enforcement is under the direction of the Net 5 commander.

Major Budget Changes

There are no major budget changes for FY 2011-12.

Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$39,582. The recommended budget reflects the County’s share of cost for the Net-5 task force and is funded 100% by the General Fund.

Program Discussion

The name Net-5 hails back to when the Marysville Police Department fully participated in this task force. In FY 2011-12, they will contribute one officer whose salary and benefits will be covered by a grant from Yuba County. As in the past,

The State pays for rent, telephones, cleaning service, alarm system, and undercover funds. Each of the three local agencies pays 33% of other costs. This budget unit finances Sutter County’s share of NET-5 costs. These costs comprise two items: the salary and benefits of a secretary and the operations budget of the NET-5 unit.

The Net-5 secretary position, previously provided by the City of Marysville, is now provided by the Sheriff's Department. This will generate revenue from the other participating agencies for the Sheriff-Coroner budget unit (2-201).

Reductions to this budget unit are not recommended. NET-5 plays an integral role in the regional effort to halt the spread of drug-related criminal activity.

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

E X E C U T I V E S U M M A R Y					
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF BOAT PATROL	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-205
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11
EXPENDITURES					
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	239,130	188,279	261,353	247,699	5.2-
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	13,511	7,516	17,618	13,368	24.1-
OTHER CHARGES	31,456	15,339	49,571	46,594	6.0-
CAPITAL ASSETS	20,011	0	0	0	.0
* GROSS BUDGET	304,108	211,134	328,542	307,661	6.4-
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0
* NET BUDGET	304,108	211,134	328,542	307,661	6.4-
OTHER REVENUES					
USER PAY REVENUES	0	0	0	0	.0
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	249,298	214,749	214,800	214,800	.0
GENERAL REVENUES	22,638	18,189	29,530	22,637	23.3-
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	271,936	232,938	244,330	237,437	2.8-
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	32,172	21,804-	84,212	70,224	16.6-
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	.0

Purpose

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

Major Budget Changes

Salaries & Benefits

- (\$13,654) Decrease in salaries and benefits reflecting a vacant position that is now budgeted at a lower cost

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 \$307,661, which is a decrease of \$20,881 (6.4%) compared to FY 2010-11. The General Fund provides approximately 59% of the financing for the Sheriff's Department, including 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. Thus, any expenditure increases beyond the allocation and collected boat taxes would become a County burden.

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 necessarily reduce Boat Patrol staffing.

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: SHERIFF LIVE OAK CONTRACT	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY	0015 2-208			
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	927,704	785,825	987,579	1,029,239	4.2	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	17,339	13,786	17,692	16,542	6.5-	
OTHER CHARGES	96,286	44,125	124,025	107,085	13.7-	
* GROSS BUDGET	1,041,329	843,736	1,129,296	1,152,866	2.1	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	1,041,329	843,736	1,129,296	1,152,866	2.1	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	28	68	0	0	.0	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	825,648	660,271	933,111	927,758	.6-	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	825,676	660,339	933,111	927,758	.6-	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	215,653	183,397	196,185	225,108	14.7	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	.0	

Purpose

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

Major Budget Changes

Salaries & Benefits

- \$41,660 General salary and benefits adjustments

Revenues

- (\$5,353) Reduced contract revenue resulting from lower costs

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 \$1,152,866, which is an increase of \$23,570 compared to FY 2010-11. The General Fund cost is increased by \$28,923 (14.7%) compared to FY 2010-11.

Most 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 city-county 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 necessarily 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 Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: J. PAUL PARKER	UNIT: COUNTY JAIL	FUND: PUBLIC SAFETY			0015 2-301	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	4,412,317	3,701,917	4,476,460	4,561,894	1.9	
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	770,672	627,598	950,376	795,948	16.2-	
OTHER CHARGES	1,865,827	33,420	2,107,584	2,113,439	.3	
* GROSS BUDGET	7,048,816	4,362,935	7,534,420	7,471,281	.8-	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	7,048,816	4,362,935	7,534,420	7,471,281	.8-	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	186,328	223,079	190,900	183,241	4.0-	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	94,017	78,789	51,370	53,170	3.5	
GENERAL REVENUES	18,995	0	0	14,000	***	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	299,340	301,868	242,270	250,411	3.4	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	6,749,476	4,061,067	7,292,150	7,220,870	1.0-	
ALLOCATED POSITIONS	53.00	52.00	52.00	51.00	1.9-	

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

- (\$49,268) Elimination of one filled Food Service Worker position
- \$46,231 Increase in Other Pay due to projected retirements
- \$39,203 General salary and benefits adjustments

Services & Supplies

- (\$61,700) Decrease in Food expense based on recent experience

- (\$28,700) Decrease in Household Expense based on recent experience
- (\$64,028) General decreases in remaining services and supplies accounts to achieve additional budget reductions

Program Discussion

Current Status

The Jail budget is currently operating with three vacant Correctional Officer positions. This leaves a staff of 40 Correctional Officers in the jail and an average jail population of approximately 200 inmates. As the jail is divided into four shifts, under perfect conditions there is a maximum of one Correctional Officer per 20 inmates at any given time. This does not take into consideration officers off due to injury, sickness, vacation, holidays or training, therefore there is currently closer to one Correctional Officer per 27 inmates.

Ongoing Project(s)

The County is in the process of upgrading the minimum security facility so a greater number of serious offenders can be housed. This project will assist in mitigating the logistics of inmate classification due to the facility having three large dormitory-style areas.

Possible Revenues

Through AB 109, signed on April 4, 2011 by Governor Brown, the State of California is planning on Realigning, or shifting, a large number of inmates from state prisons to county jails. Under this plan, sentenced felons convicted of crimes not deemed to be of a sexual, violent or serious nature will serve sentences in county jails rather than in State prison. If the State moves forward

with this Realignment program as planned, it is possible the jail would realize some revenue for housing previously held State prisoners.

The daily rate that the County would be reimbursed by the State is unknown at this time, however the current jail rate for State parolee housing is approximately \$71 per day, per inmate. It is not feasible at this time to accurately forecast how many Realignment inmates would be transitioned to County custody in FY 2011-12. However, an average of 15 Realigned inmates for the full fiscal year would result in revenue, at the current daily jail rate, of \$388,725 (15 inmates at \$71 per day for 365 days per year). This is, of course, dependent upon the State following through with the planned reimbursements.

Goals

During FY 2011-12, the Sheriff's goal is to complete the hardening of the Minimum Security building to prepare for the proposed increase in inmates from the State.

Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$7,471,281, which is a decrease of \$63,139 (1%). The General Fund provides approximately 59% of the financing for the Sheriff's Department and is reduced in the Jail budget by \$186,212 (an estimated 3.3%) compared to FY 2010-11.

One Food Service Worker position, which is currently filled, is recommended for elimination. The total cost reduction is offset by a minor increase related to purchasing premade food items. No further reductions in positions are recommended.

The implementation of a full 20% budget reduction scenario would likely result in the additional elimination of at least eight currently filled Correctional Officer positions. The Sheriff agreed to defund and hold vacant three positions in FY 2010-11. The elimination of eight additional positions would equate to a 26% reduction in Correctional Officers over the past two years. Such an elimination of staff would put the jail out of compliance with Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) minimum standards.

When the maximum security unit was completed in 1999, CSA (formerly the Board of Corrections) required that it be staffed with 11 correctional officers. At that time, the Sheriff negotiated an increase of only seven correctional officers, which were added in FY 1998-99.

Therefore, additional reductions would necessitate closing a portion of the jail, and movement to alternate forms of sentencing or early release of identified population groups. Being out of CSA compliance in regards to staffing may affect the County's ability to compete for future funding for capital projects, including jail expansion.

Maintaining adequate staffing levels will be critical in implementation of the State Realignment plan to shift prisoners from State prisons to county jails over the next 24 months. This will undoubtedly increase the jail population and necessitate the early release of some inmates serving lesser sentences.

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

County Administrative Office *Stephanie J. Larsen, County Administrative Officer*
Trial Court Funding (2-109)

E X E C U T I V E S U M M A R Y						
DEPT HEAD: STEPHANIE J LARSEN	UNIT: TRIAL COURT FUNDING	FUND: TRIAL COURT			0014 2-109	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
OTHER CHARGES	860,255	936,338	887,063	961,887	8.4	
* GROSS BUDGET	860,255	936,338	887,063	961,887	8.4	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	860,255	936,338	887,063	961,887	8.4	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	108,371	80,482	114,500	153,500	34.1	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	715,873	489,556	746,020	650,050	12.9-	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	824,244	570,038	860,520	803,550	6.6-	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	36,011	366,300	26,543	158,337	496.5	
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

Other Charges

- \$79,824 Increase to Court Fine & Forfeiture account to more accurately reflect the anticipated share of fee and fine revenue due to the State

Revenues

- \$39,000 Increase in fee-based User Pay Revenues due primarily to the addition of revenue account previously budgeted in the General Revenues 1-209 budget unit
- (\$95,970) Decrease in fine-based Governmental Revenues based on projected receipts

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

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

Trial Court Funding (2-109)

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 to the State (called the “Court Facilities Payment”) 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 2011-12, a budget of \$120,000 is 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 the past three fiscal years. Unfortunately, this trend continued throughout FY 2010-11, resulting in a greater recommended budgeted unreimbursed cost for FY 2011-12.

New Courthouse

The State has long recognized the need to update and expand Sutter County’s court facilities to meet modern security and operational standards, and current court caseloads. Sutter County is currently 12th on a statewide priority list for construction of new court facilities, and the State has begun to acquire land for the new Sutter County Courthouse.

On April 8, 2011, the State Public Works Board approved an agreement to acquire 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. In return for acquiring the parcel from the County, the State will return its equity interest in Courthouse East to the County and provide a cash payment to the County of \$335,000.

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 is anticipated to begin in February 2013 with construction to be completed by August 2014.

The Sutter County Administrative Office has led negotiations with the Administrative Office of the Courts, with significant input

from the Sheriff's Office, Public Works, Community Services, and County Counsel.

Recommended Budget

This budget is recommended at \$961,887. The General Fund provides 16.5% of the financing for this budget unit. This represents an increase of \$131,794 as compared to FY 2010-11.

Increased expenses related to State mandated costs, coupled with continued declines in court related fines and fees have resulted in an increase in unreimbursed cost for this budget unit. Additionally, a practice to budget for mandated payment of court related fine and fee revenue shared with the State is being implemented to increase the accuracy of budgeted costs.

The SB21 Recorder revenue account has been moved from the General Revenues 1-209 budget unit into Trial Court Funding budget unit to more accurately reflect revenue received from court related fees and fines. This also simplifies the calculation of the Court Fine & Forfeiture maintenance-of-effort payment to the State, which is calculated and paid at year-end by the Auditor-Controller's office.

Use of Reserves/Designations

This budget unit does not include any reserves or designations.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY						
DEPT HEAD: STEPHANIE J LARSEN	UNIT: SUPERIOR COURT	FUND: TRIAL COURT			0014 2-112	
	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 2009-10	ACTUAL EXPENDITURE 4-30-11	ADOPTED BUDGET 2010-11	CAO RECOMMEND 2011-12	% CHANGE OVER 2010-11	
EXPENDITURES						
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	572,700	484,926	491,900	559,975	13.8	
OTHER CHARGES	2,474	1,284	1,500	1,860	24.0	
* GROSS BUDGET	575,174	486,210	493,400	561,835	13.9	
INTRAFUND TRANSFERS	0	0	0	0	.0	
* NET BUDGET	575,174	486,210	493,400	561,835	13.9	
OTHER REVENUES						
USER PAY REVENUES	102,438	75,813	106,520	88,050	17.3-	
GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES	5,366	3,264	6,000	4,000	33.3-	
GENERAL REVENUES	640-	0	0	0	.0	
TOTAL OTHER REVENUES	107,164	79,077	112,520	92,050	18.2-	
* UNREIMBURSED COSTS	468,010	407,133	380,880	469,785	23.3	
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.

Revenue

- (\$20,470) Decrease in User Pay and Governmental Revenues based on recent historical experience

Major Budget Changes

Services & Supplies

- \$28,255 Increase in Investigation expenses based on recent historical experience
- \$39,000 Increase in Professional & Specialized Services primarily related to interpreter costs

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

Recommended Budget

The recommended budget is \$561,835, which is an increase of \$68,435 (13.9%) over the FY 2010-11 adopted budget. This

increase is attributed to increased utilization of both investigation and interpreter services. The recommended unreimbursed cost of the budget unit has increased by \$88,905 over FY 2010-11.