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Department: Transportation and Public Works
Date: 4/9/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:

*Would like to see a vision and plan for maintenance efforts for each District. How do we approach the Fire and Flood damaged roads? Pothole program?*

Response:

*Staff will enter response here, additional pages will be attached as needed.*

Thank you for this inquiry and your interest in our maintenance efforts.

A. Below is a general overview of the structure of our maintenance division. Additionally, we have provided a general work description for the coming year.

1. **Maintenance Road Yards** – Sonoma County’s transportation system is maintained from four full-time road yards strategically located to balance workloads and efficiency in responding to service requests and emergencies; the four full-time yards are located in Cotati, Guerneville, Healdsburg and Sonoma. Two yards are operated seasonal to enhance emergency responses during winter time and inclement weather, one in Forestville and another one in Annapolis. The Annapolis Road Yard generally opens in November and closes sometime in April or May. The Forestville yard may be used year round for staging materials and is critical for operation during flood events. A map of the six Road Yards is included.

   Typical road maintenance activities during the year:
   - March/April – Pavement surface (pothole, cracks, etc.) repairs Countywide, vegetation management for sight distance and road clearance.
   - May/June – grind & pave Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) repairs, grader patch HMA repairs
   - July/August – Asphalt patch work, 2 weeks in each yard
   - September – road side ditch maintenance
   - October through February – all activities as weather allows, AC repair, ditching, mowing

2. **Culvert Crew** – Performs variety of drainage work including cleaning, inspecting and maintaining culverts throughout entire County

   Typical culvert maintenance activities during the year:
May through September – repair and replacement of larger-scale, environmentally permitted culverts, these projects range from one to three weeks in duration, we have 9 projects planned for this summer in Districts 1, 2, 4 and 5.
October through April – clean, inspect, maintain and plan culvert repair, and erosion control installations as needed.

3. **Bridge Crew** – Performs various maintenance activities on 328 bridges located throughout the County, viaducts, guardrail, curb, gutter and sidewalk, and bridge seasonal crossings. TPW currently installs and removes seasonal bridge crossings over the Russian River at the following locations: Asti, Korbel, and Vacation Beach in Districts 4 and 5.

   Typical schedule of focused bridge work:
   May/June – install seasonal crossings - The Asti seasonal crossing installation is changing this year due to a change in the Russian River at this location.
   October/November – remove seasonal crossings.
   July through September – bridge and viaduct repairs, this year’s viaduct repair is on Neeley Road in District 5, locations vary every year.
   December through April – various activities including guardrail maintenance, curb and gutter, sidewalk, and bridge maintenance.

4. **Sign Crew** – Activities include maintenance and repair of all County traffic signs, pavement striping and markings, responding to variety of signing and striping service requests.

   Typical schedule of focused signing, striping, and markings work:
   May through October – striping and markings, 4 weeks in each road yard
   November through April – variety of activities listed above

B. Fire and Flood Damaged Roads

Roads within the 2019 Flood areas have been addressed in two ways. First, TPW has performed emergency roadway openings where possible, by clearing debris from landslides. This work has been completed where possible. Second, roads with minor damage are currently being repaired. Roads with significant damage from slip outs require permanent repair that needs geotechnical and engineering design. These permanent repair projects are included in a List of Projects submitted to both CalOES and FEMA for reimbursement. These projects will be repaired over a longer period of time, in the next 3-5 years. In all cases, the Department follows FEMA and CalOES procedures to address roadway repairs. The projects are in Districts 1, 2, 4 and 5.

Roads within the 2017 Fire areas are similarly addressed in two ways. Initially after the fires, TPW performed emergency roadway opening activities. This work was completed in late 2017. Secondly, roads damaged by the Private Property Debris Removal (PPDR) program were included in a list submitted to CalOES and FEMA. Unfortunately, at this time, this damage has not been deemed reimbursable by the agencies.

Damaged roads from trenching by utilities and the rebuild effort within urban subdivisions are included in a new proposed one-time program named ‘OnePave’ that will be brought to the Board in August. The program will propose to collect in-lieu fees for paving trench repairs from the various...
utility agencies. These fees, together with County funding from the Pavement Preservation Program, will be used to pave these roads once, at the completion of the utility work. This program applies to District 4. Other districts roadways did not meet the criteria of fire damage with multiple underground utilities.

Repair of the damaged roads can be considered for inclusion in future Pavement Preservation Programs.

C. Pothole repairs continues to be a priority for the department. The department, in conjunction with County Counsel and Risk Management, is actively reviewing procedures for pothole repairs and are currently in the process of preparing a pothole Procedures and Priority Plan.

The department welcomes pothole repair requests through ‘So Co Report It’, TPW’s website and phone application for use by the public and district offices to request road repairs. Additionally, the department uses software called Lucity to track and respond to service requests for pothole repairs. Requests for maintenance activities are sent to the Foreman of each Road Yard to triage and address. The reporting of service requests and progress is documented for each road yard and this does not directly match up with Supervisorial Districts.

The department is currently working with the CAO to identify process improvements.

D. Currently the Roads fund has $19.7M before anticipated expenditures, revenues, and operating transfers, with an anticipated ending balance of $1.6M (uncommitted at this time and pending approval of projects to be used as match) this fiscal year. General Fund contributions for PPP and maintenance are encumbered until project expenditures occur. Any funds committed by the Board (GF) or by county ordinance (such as the Aggregate Resource Management [ARM] fee) are preserved in subsidiary accounts within the Road Fund. While overall fund balance may appear to be high, funds may be restricted by Gas Tax, Tribal, and RMRA (SB1) limitations, and/or otherwise committed to projects.
Note: Shaded regions are for illustrative purposes only, and do not indicate jurisdiction of any kind. Road maintenance assignments pertain only to the roads themselves, as indicated by the color-coded line features.
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Inquiry Number: 02

Department: Transportation and Public Works
Date: 04/09/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:
How do we approach repairing fire and flood damaged roads with a one-touch approach?

Response:
Staff will enter response here, additional pages will be attached as needed.

Roads within the 2019 Flood areas have been addressed in two ways. First, TPW has performed emergency roadway openings where possible, by clearing debris from landslides. This work has been completed where possible. Second, roads with minor damage are currently being repaired. Roads with significant damage from slip outs require permanent repair that needs geotechnical and engineering design. These permanent repair projects are included in a List of Projects submitted to both CalOES and FEMA for reimbursement. These projects will be repaired over a longer period of time, in the next 3-5 years. In all cases, the Department follows FEMA and CalOES procedures to address roadway repairs. The projects are in Districts 1, 2, 4 and 5.

Roads within the 2017 Fire areas are similarly addressed in two ways. Initially after the fires, TPW performed emergency roadway opening activities. This work was completed in late 2017. Secondly, roads damaged by the Private Property Debris Removal (PPDR) program were included in a list submitted to CalOES and FEMA. Unfortunately, at this time, this damage has not been deemed reimbursable by the agencies.

Damaged roads from trenching by utilities and the rebuild effort within urban subdivisions are included in a new proposed one-time program named ‘OnePave’ that will be brought to the Board in August. The program will propose to collect in-lieu fees for paving trench repairs from the various utility agencies. These fees, together with County funding from the Pavement Preservation Program, will be used to pave these roads once, at the completion of the utility work. This program applies to District 4. Other districts roadways did not meet the criteria of fire damage with multiple underground utilities.

Repair of the damaged roads can be considered for inclusion in future Pavement Preservation Programs.
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Request/Question:
Please unpack the details of the Maintenance of Effort – how much is at risk? What $ count toward the MOE, how are we allocated?

Response:
The Maintenance of Effort (MOE) was put into place to ensure counties adhere to a share of cost in support of regulatory work done by licensed agricultural staff within the County. Agricultural programs are defined by the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) and authorized by the Food and Agricultural Code (FAC). Local ordinances such as Vineyard and Orchard Site Development Ordinance (VESCO) or Cannabis are not included in agricultural code programs. In short, the MOE is based on the average of the preceding five-years of net spending in qualified agricultural programs.

Unclaimed Gas Tax (UGT) disbursement is based on a pool of funds that changes from year to year. It is also based on the percentage of net agricultural code program expenditures in comparison to what other counties spend toward their MOE for the same period.

Unclaimed Gas Tax
UGT is a revenue source that is funded by excise taxes collected on motor vehicle fuels and deposited in the Motor Vehicle Fuel Account (MVFA) in the Transportation Tax Fund. Section 8352.5 of the Revenue and Taxation Code requires fuel taxes attributable to gas used for off-highway purposes (i.e., tractors working in fields) be transferred from the MVFA to CDFA. The Food and Agricultural Code (FAC) Section 224 identifies how the MVFA funds are to be disbursed.

Maintenance of Effort
FAC Section 224.5(g) mandates a MOE to ensure Counties’ continued share of cost for regulatory activities authorized by the FAC and performed by Agricultural Commissioner staff. Failure to meet MOE could result in the funds allocated under FAC Section 224.5(g) being withheld.

In order to be eligible for the transfer (of funds) specified in subdivision (g) of Section 224, counties must meet all of the following criteria, as determined by the Secretary of Food and Agriculture:
1) Currently employ or contract with a licensed agricultural commissioner.
2) Submit annual agricultural expenditure reports (Annual Financial Statement) to CDFA in a timely manner.
3) Maintain county general fund support for agricultural commissioner services at least equal to the average amount expended for the five preceding fiscal years.

As part of the Annual Financial Statement, historical information is provided that includes the net county expenditure, total agricultural expenditures, and total agricultural revenues for each fiscal years for a 15-year period. Agricultural expenditures are defined as expenditures on CDFA approved programs. Only the preceding five years count toward the MOE.

The average net agricultural expenditure for the past six years is $1.5 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>General Fund Contribution</th>
<th>Net Ag Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-2013</td>
<td>$1,293,127</td>
<td>$972,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-2014</td>
<td>$1,457,363</td>
<td>$1,818,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-2015</td>
<td>$1,436,408</td>
<td>$1,895,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-2016</td>
<td>$1,867,723</td>
<td>$1,557,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016-2017</td>
<td>$2,113,287</td>
<td>$1,568,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017-2018</td>
<td>$2,174,882</td>
<td>$1,134,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Much is at Risk?

UGT that is disbursed based on the MOE averages between $0.37 – $0.48 cents on the dollar. The amount varies because the disbursement calculation is based on the percentage of agricultural spending by each county in comparison with what other counties spend and the excise taxes collected in the previous year. The disbursement received in April 2019 was $0.48 cents on the dollar or $684,000. Had the department met the MOE for the same period, the UGT disbursement would have been $890,000.

The average amount received for the past six years is $661,000.

Timing

The timing of when it is known whether the department met the MOE and when the UGT revenue is received makes it difficult to adjust budgeted expenditures within the same fiscal year. Below is a chronological summary of this year’s timing related to UGT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/01/17 – 06/30/18</td>
<td>Base fiscal year for UGT funds received in April 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2018</td>
<td>AWM submits Annual Financial Statement to CDFA for FY 2017-18. At this time, it has been determined whether the MOE was met based on net County spending in agricultural programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15/2019</td>
<td>UGT disbursement received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2019-20**

AWM needs more staff resources to assign work in UGT eligible programs in order to meet MOE while meeting other existing contractual obligations, most of which pay 125% of cost. A program change request in the amount of $184,899 for the allocation of an additional Agricultural Biologist for work exclusively in UGT eligible programs has been submitted. The salary and benefit cost for that position, along with related costs, would contribute toward MOE.

**Estimated MOE Requirement for FY 2018-19 and Anticipated Shortfall**

It is important to note that the MOE five-year average for FY 2018-19 will be increasing because the low year from FY 2012-13 will be dropping off (see attached Analysis of County General Fund Maintenance of Effort). The five-year MOE average for FY 2018-19 will be $1,595,212, an increase of $32,389 over the prior fiscal year. The FY 2017-18 failed to meet the MOE by $428,073. Adding the increase in the MOE level and an additional $80,000 in revenue for agricultural programs due to increased gas tax revenue brings the projected shortfall for FY 2018-19 to $540,462. While we anticipate that we will not meet MOE for FY 2018-19, we can’t determine what the actual amount below average will be until August 2019, after close of the fiscal year. We saw an unanticipated reduction in our Cost Plan beginning in FY 2017-18 of approximately $298,000. This was due to County Counsel costs not being allocated to our department. We expect this error to begin to correct in FY 2019-20. However, due to creating a separate budget unit for our Land Stewardship Division in FY 2018-19, the Cost Plan will not necessarily return to what it was previous to FY 2017-18. As a result, this is a variable that is somewhat unpredictable at this time. CDFA has been alerted that we do not expect to meet the MOE level in FY 2018-19, but are seeking to address the issue in the FY 2019-20 budget.

**Estimated FY 2019-20 Shortfall and Proposed Solutions**

Based on the estimated eligible spending above, the MOE for FY 2019-20 is expected to decline to approximately $1.44 million. This would require an increase in eligible spending of $388,000 to meet the target. A portion of that will be met by the changes to the Cost Plan allocation issue referenced above, which should increase eligible expenditures by an estimated $174,543. This leaves a shortfall of approximately $213,457.

The Department has requested an Agricultural Biologist position strictly for meeting MOE, which would increase MOE eligible spending by $184,899. The Agricultural Commissioner is confident that the addition of the Agricultural Biologist position will show CDFA that we are making progress in meeting MOE, even if the full gap is not covered in FY 2019-20. Since the CDFA is aware of the Cost Plan issue, we believe they will be satisfied with forward progress on agricultural spending until the Cost Plan issue is settled.
For purposes of meeting MOE, it is crucial to avoid extreme swings in General Fund support because MOE is always based on the average of the prior five years agricultural code programs spending. We have been in discussions with the County Administrator’s Office on the feasibility of reserve fund options.

**Attachments:**
- Annual Financial Statement FY 2017/2018 with definitions
- Analysis of County General Fund Maintenance of Effort
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Inquiry Number: ___04_____

Dept: Health/Human/Homeless Functional
Date: 04/09/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request/Question:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a chart showing how much GF comparable counties put into Health and Human.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:

This chart represents the General Fund portion of the listed County budgets for Fiscal Year 2018-2019. The “General Fund” column represents the amount of general fund specifically contributed to Health and Human Service Departments per Supervisor Zane’s request. The General Fund reported for Health Services is the baseline General Fund contribution and does not include any Behavioral Health restoration funding provided during the FY 2018-19 Budget Hearings. This information was compiled by Tina Rivera, Finance Director for the Human Services Department from County budget documents posted online.

Benchmark Counties listed at the top of the chart include comparable counties by population size, suburban vs. urban environments, and location.

Additional Counties of interest listed at the bottom of the chart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>County General Fund Budget</th>
<th>Department Structure</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>General Fund Contribution</th>
<th>Percentage of General Fund</th>
<th>FTES</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Counties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>310,171,536</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>253,582,705</td>
<td>8,983,669</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>543.39</td>
<td>503,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>343,037,856</td>
<td>26,556,958</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stanislaus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>211,715,525</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>958</td>
<td>555,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Rev. &amp; Ent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>414,500,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds used to fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/ Human Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>677,100,000</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>616,174,428</td>
<td>24,265,241</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
<td>2281</td>
<td>446,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>266,289,436</td>
<td>11,435,274</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer Combined Agency</td>
<td>524,797,937</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>221,232,794.00</td>
<td>30,518,696</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>389,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>522,988,377</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>114,673,773</td>
<td>27,327,414</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>280,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>123,457,871</td>
<td>11,777,475</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>898,196,701</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>745,700,000</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td>758,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>404,700,000</td>
<td>22,700,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1376.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano Combined Agency</td>
<td>208,900,000</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>322,293,275</td>
<td>28,772,300</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1295.25</td>
<td>439,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Combined Agency</td>
<td>341,013,030</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>318,487,707</td>
<td>52,612,280</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>703.62</td>
<td>263,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>545,312,721</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>175,013,263</td>
<td>9,946,049</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>618.2</td>
<td>276,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>155,586,135</td>
<td>17,147,163</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>536.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>250,320,700</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>401,485,000</td>
<td>23,939,700</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1733.76</td>
<td>453,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined functional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare Combined Agency</td>
<td>790,039,705</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>465,261,601</td>
<td>16,658,464</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
<td>2069.5</td>
<td>475,834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** Stanislaus County funds its Health and Human Service Departments with Special Revenue and Enterprise Funds. This funding strategy allows the County to allocate available General Funds on other County priorities such as Public Safety. This funding strategy also allows the County to appropriately fund its Health and Social Service Programs creating future sustainability as well as opportunities for growth and program expansion. Budgets within the Special revenue funds are supported by $754.8M in department revenue, the use of $30.4M in fund balance, and a $17.7M General Fund contribution. The Enterprise Funds include Landfill fees, Inmate Commissary Fees, Public Works Transit Fees, and HSA Clinic & Ancillary Services.

**Additional Counties of Interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>County General Fund Budget</th>
<th>Department Structure</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>General Fund Contribution</th>
<th>Percentage of General Fund</th>
<th>FTES</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino Combined Agency</td>
<td>188,399,421</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>133,972,183</td>
<td>8,251,459</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>631.8</td>
<td>88,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Combined Agency</td>
<td>4,699,500,000</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>2,104,934,555</td>
<td>111,756,835</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>640.5</td>
<td>3,337,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa Combined Agency</td>
<td>209,408,674</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>120,860,117</td>
<td>14,528,763</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>480.85</td>
<td>140,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa Combined Agency</td>
<td>1,693,941,066</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>447,330,828</td>
<td>49,974,064</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>381.1</td>
<td>1,147,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>723,100,000</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>866,615,274</td>
<td>143,013,437</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1,589.3</td>
<td>1,660,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>1,060,936,877</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>882,444,234</td>
<td>153,326,848</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2089.2</td>
<td>884,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>5,511,633,982</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>1,631,116,236</td>
<td>508,151,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>686.17</td>
<td>864,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>1,227,057,596</td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>3,074,588,262</td>
<td>227,399,686</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>793.7</td>
<td>1,397,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Benchmark Counties:
- those closest to Sonoma County in population; with a population of more than 250,000 but less than 750,000
- all include both suburban and rural environments & same urban growth
- none contain a city with more than 300,000 in population
- six are coastal or Bay Area Counties
Request/Question:
What are reserves for the Safety net departments?

Response:
The following is a list of the Safety Net Departments fund balances. Fund balances represent the net cash after all revenues have been collected and all expenses have been paid. Reserves isolate the portion of fund balance that is available for appropriation to the next budget cycle. Reserves reported by the Safety Net Departments is “$0.00” as the reserves of fund balance are either resources currently earmarked or there exists restrictions on spending these reserves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT ACRONYM</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FUND BALANCE</th>
<th>RESERVE AVAILABLE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSD</td>
<td>Human Services Department</td>
<td>$19,560,071</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8.6M of the $19.5M is fully restricted to programs, trusts, and Capital Expenditures projects; $3M is already earmarked for DHS Bail-Out. Remaining $7.9M balance is restricted to 1991 Realignment guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Health Services</td>
<td>$37,206,989</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30M already earmarked; $7.5M in 1991 Realignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCSS</td>
<td>Department of Child Support Services</td>
<td>$23,764</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>All restricted to programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Community Development Commission</td>
<td>$93,784,340</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$71.1M in Loans Receivable, $9.2M in Real Estate assets, and $13.5M restricted to program and/or awarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBATION</td>
<td>Probation Department</td>
<td>$23,885,614</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22M used-restricted by funding source; $1.4M earmarked for Equipment Replacement Reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERIFF</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Department</td>
<td>$10,766,273</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>All restricted to programs &amp; trusts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>$6,050,829</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>All restricted to programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>$34,405</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>All restricted to programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY COUNSEL</td>
<td>County Counsel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>No separate fund accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Information Systems Department</td>
<td>$6,715,549</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>All restricted to Capital Expenditures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Department:** Health and Human Function  
**Date:** 04/10/2019  
**Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:**

**Request/Question:**

*What are the efficiencies of a combined agency? Need to explore this, could we reduce overhead on delivery of services. Please identify all comparable counties that have health and human services combined (“superagencies”).*

**Response:**

Providing expected efficiencies of a combined agency would entail a detailed and thorough analysis. Such an analysis would require additional time and resources in order to properly capture any potential benefits of merging these departments. For the purposes of providing some summary insight, please see the highlights below.

**Comparable Counties (by population) that have Health & Human Services Combined (Superagencies):**

- Placer County
- Marin County
- Tulare County
- Solano County
- San Diego (larger county)
- Contra Costa (larger county)
- Sacramento (larger county)

**Possible efficiencies of a Combined Agency:**

- Sharing of specialized personnel
- Possible cost savings
- Streamlined services
- Integrated & shared overhead services
- Increased service delivery
- “One-stop shopping” for community residents
- Elimination of duplicated services
- Shared expenses
- Purchasing pools

**Possible Challenges of a Combined Agency:**

- Difficult transition due to structure
- May mean forfeiting federal funds (integrity of department structure must be maintained to ensure funding compliance)
- Potential impacts on staff morale due to layoffs and other consequences
- Larger agency may not reflect community interests
- Logistical challenges (space requirements)
- Rise in cost as service areas broaden geographically
- Imbalances within divisions due to leadership
- Too many layers creating ineffective communication
- Additional bureaucracy – typically an agency Director is added as oversight to Health & Human Service Directors
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Inquiry Number: __07_____

Department: Department of Health Services
Date: 04/10/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:
Folks should look for HEAP funding for Board and Care.

Response:
The State of California vested each county’s Continuum of Care governing body with making local funding decisions for Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP). In Sonoma County, the Home Sonoma County Leadership Council is the governing body. HEAP funds are subject to a procurement process that, at the time that this inquiry was made, was nearly complete. Redirecting these funds to fund a program that did not apply under the established process would violate CDC and County procurement rules.

The FY 2019-2020 Consolidated Homeless Services Funding Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), which included HEAP funds was issued on January 8, 2018 by CDC as Lead Agency for Home Sonoma County. The Leadership Council finalized recommendations for funding awards on April 17, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Available Amount</th>
<th>Eligible uses</th>
<th>Authority for Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP)</td>
<td>$11,505,737</td>
<td>Wide range of interventions for literally homeless persons – outreach, shelter, rapid re-housing, some homelessness prevention activities, permanent supportive housing, capital development.</td>
<td>Home Sonoma County Leadership Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On April 30, 2019 your Board authorized the CDC Executive Director to execute contracts with the awarded providers.
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Inquiry Number: 08

Department: Department of Health Services
Date: 04/10/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:
Need to get a comprehensive list of priorities/needs on this to get to our state level representatives beyond the CSAC view.

Response:
Staff will enter response here, additional pages will be attached as needed.

The following outlines areas of advocacy that could help support DHS’s programs:

1. Forgiveness of OIG Audit Repayment
   Note: Recent letter to Senator McGuire requesting the Legislature reconsider how to handle the $180.6 million overpayment identified by the OIG in its August 2018 report. The State can support counties already struggling to address mental health care needs for the Medi-Cal population by absorbing the overpayment liability.

2. Medi-Cal Reimbursement for peer respite service providers
   S15. Certification of Mental Health Peer Providers
   Action: Support legislation that would:
   • Advance peer support programs for mental health treatment services; and
   • Require Peer Providers to annually sign confidentiality statements consistent with the DHCS requirement for Mental Health Professionals (MHPs).

3. Funding for administrative costs for Mental Health Plan (MHP) operations, increase 15% cap on administration.
   S4. Improved Access to Behavioral (Mental) Health Services and Mental Health Parity
   Action: Sponsor or support legislative efforts that would:
   • Increase access to mental health services within Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs) and Rural Health Centers (RHCs) to improve their ability to provide care and be reimbursed for both medical and behavioral (mental) health services to Medi-Cal beneficiaries on the same day, in the same location;
   • Advocate for the integration of behavioral health into the broader health care system and a balance between state expectations and local authority for Medi-Cal Specialty Mental Health Services and the Mental Health Services Act;
   • Advocate for potential recoupment of erroneous mental health billing and transparency at county level;
• Advocate for increased funding for the Crisis Counseling Assistance and Training Program (CCP) to allow the County of Sonoma to provide community-based outreach and crisis counseling services to survivors of the Sonoma County Complex Wildfires post disaster;
• Increase availability of inpatient psychiatric beds; and
• Provide for a Medi-Cal benefit for dementia.

4. Stop IHSS redirect
   S20. In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS)
   Action: Continue to monitor legislative efforts that provide sustaining wages to IHSS workers while limiting the County’s obligation to increase local funding

5. Funding for new capital projects for BH that includes funding for the operating costs associated with these new projects.
   S14. Inpatient Psychiatric Services
   Action: Support efforts/legislation that would:
   • Provide adequate funding for capital costs associated with the building and modernization of psychiatric inpatient facilities; and
   • Support plan amendment to allow for reimbursement in IMDs.

6. CSU increase the reimbursement for longer stays at minimum 72 hour hold (S150 hold)
   S13. CSU flexibility and increased access to Psychiatric Hospital Beds
   Action: Support legislation that would expand the number of hours of crisis stabilization services that are reimbursable from 20 hours to 72 hours.
   Action: Support efforts/legislation that would:
   • Provide adequate funding for capital costs associated with the building and modernization of psychiatric inpatient facilities; and
   • Support plan amendment to allow for reimbursement in IMDs.

7. Administrative funding to implement Drug Medi-Cal Organized Delivery System (DMC-ODS)
   S16. Prevent and Reduce Prescription Drug Abuse and Misuse
   Action: Support legislation that would:
   • Require pharmacists to counsel patients on the proper storage and disposal of opioids and better enable health providers to prescribe abuse-deterrent formulation (ADF) opioids;
   • Allow pharmacies to accept unused and expired prescription medications and make drug companies responsible for the cost of disposing unused portions of their products;
   • Strengthen funding, access and use of the CURES database;
   • Promote links between the CURES, State (CDPH/DHCS) mortality data, and EHR systems; and
   • Support statewide expansion of safe medication disposal programs.

S8. Distribution of Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) Treatment State Discretionary Funding
   Action: Support legislation that provides a base level (minimum $1.00 per capita) of state discretionary funding to all counties for local alcohol and other drug treatment programs to be used for various eligible populations as determined by each county.

8. Additional funding to support emergency preparedness capabilities
   S1. Emergency and Disaster Preparedness, Response, and Recovery
   Action: Sponsor or support legislation that would:
   • Advocate for additional funding for emergency operations planning, exercises to validate the planning process, trainings, and equipment;
   • Advocate for the prioritization of disaster prevention and response projects such as forest management, secondary points of access and disaster monitoring systems;
• Seek funding for emergency planning specifically addressing the safety of seniors, children, non-English speakers, and individuals with access and functional needs;
• Advocate for the allocation of available funds toward local recovery and resiliency efforts;
• Increase access to funding for local jurisdictions for disaster-related damages and assistance; and
• Advocate for regulatory changes to encourage full recovery.

9. Additional funding for disease control
   S12. Communicable Disease Control
   Action: Support legislative and regulatory efforts to:
   • Address public health laboratory workforce shortages including the availability of training programs; and
   • Support funding for disease response, control, and research including laboratory identification, vector control, and treatment/management of infected individuals that does not come at the expense of other public health programs.
   • Increase child and adult immunization rates and improve tracking of immunization rates;
   • Improve insurance coverage of treatment for communicable diseases;
   • Amend California law so that certain samples must be sent to the local public health laboratory regardless of whether a laboratory had to perform a culture;

10. Improved oversight of the MHP from DHCS
    S15. Certification of Mental Health Peer Providers
    Action: Support legislation that would:
    • Advance peer support programs for mental health treatment services; and
    • Require Peer Providers to annually sign confidentiality statements consistent with the DHCS requirement for Mental Health Professionals (MHPs).

11. Funding to address individuals with cognitive impairments such as dementia and traumatic brain injury.
    The State does not have a Medi-Cal benefit for services for this population and they are falling through the cracks.
    G8. Service Delivery System and Funding for Individuals with Cognitive Disorders
    Action: Support legislation or budget language that identifies new resources to fund services, including long-term care services for individuals with cognitive disorders.

12. Funding for data integration projects that support whole person care coordination.
    S16. Prevent and Reduce Prescription Drug Abuse and Misuse
    • Strengthen funding, access and use of the CURES database;
    • Promote links between the CURES, State (CDPH/DHCS) mortality data, and EHR systems; and
    • Support statewide expansion of safe medication disposal programs.

13. Funding to support home visiting programs for seniors.
    F7. Evidence-based Home Visiting (Note: specific to Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood. Will need to amend to expand to seniors)
    Action: Support legislation which seeks to develop the means to leverage public and private dollars to substantially expand evidence-based home visiting programs across the State.
    S22. Aging Services Long Term Care
    Action: Support legislative and budgetary efforts to reduce fragmentation within the long term care delivery system and adequately fund a system of care for seniors in California.
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Inquiry Number: 09

Department: Department of Health Services
Date: 04/10/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:
Wants to know more about R&R funding, where that is going.

Response:
Please see the FY 2019-2020 Budget: Reinvestment and Revitalization Funds budget hearing memo, Tab 7 for details.
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Request/Question:
What is the optimal level of staffing between centralized services and departments? Wants to search out what the best level is, and how do internal service rates affect the choices made?

Response:
The County Administrator’s Office has submitted a Program Change Request for internal services review to evaluate potential efficiencies of centralized vs. decentralized services (e.g., payroll, HR, information systems). The Program Change Request also includes funding for a study that would look at the potential efficiencies of a superagency combining Health and Human Services, and whether CDC homeless services should be included under the superagency, the Health department or continue to be under a separate agency. Please refer to Tab 9 of the Budget Hearing Binder for additional information.
In FY2018-19, the Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Treasurer-Tax Collector (ACTTC) shifted 4 FTEs, or approximately 65% of Internal Audit productive hours, to the Disaster Finance Team. Internal Audit placed risk-based auditing on hold due to this resource shift. Prior to the 2017 Sonoma Complex Fires, the FY2018-19 Internal Audit plan included risk-based audits of the County-wide budget process and the ACTTC General Accounting Division, as well as follow-up audits of the Refuse Franchise Fee, Credit Card Compliance, and Payroll.

In FY2019-20, the ACTTC will continue to support the County-wide Disaster Finance function with approximately 0.5 FTE, which will give Internal Audit capacity to again focus on risk-based auditing.

The FY2019-20 Internal Audit recommended budget effectively includes a reduction of 2 accountant-auditor positions in the form of salary savings for a position in long-term leave status and a realignment of up to 1 FTE within the ACTTC office to continue to meet mandated responsibilities. As a result, we anticipate Internal Audit will only complete one major risk-based audit in FY2019-20, which will be an audit of ACTTC General Accounting Division, as well as follow-up risk-based audits of the Refuse Franchise Fee, Credit Card Compliance, and Payroll. The ACTTC is also in the process of implementing a Fraud, Waste and Abuse Hotline program, in collaboration with several other stakeholder departments, which will be administered by Internal Audit.

Prior to 2017, the risk-based audit plan included two major audits per year. Major risk-based audits that will continue to be postponed to future years include the County-wide budget process, procurement, and human resources and benefits. Postponing these audits increases the County’s exposure to fraud, errors, and inefficiencies in these very high-risk areas.

In addition to risk-based audits, the Internal Audit division completes several mandated, program, and financial audits each year.
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Inquiry Number: __12_____

Department: ACTTC
Date: 04/10/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

**Request/Question:**

*Where are we in the property tax collection?/Assessment?*

**Response:**

It's our understanding this inquiry is related to FY2019-20 property tax revenue projections and fire-impacted parcels.

General Fund property tax revenues are budgeted to increase 4% in FY2019-20 over budgeted FY2018-19 amounts. The secured tax roll for FY2019-20 will include properties that were destroyed in the 2017 wildfires that were completed by the January 1, 2019 lien date adjusted to include CPI for missing years (approximately 85 properties). Value on new construction that was partial completed as of the lien date will also be included. Example, if a building is 50% completed as of January 1, 2019, the Assessor will restore 50% of the Base Year Value of structure previously removed from the secured roll in 2017-18.

Additionally, the Assessor will process supplemental assessments for completed construction to capture the portion of tax years for which completed construction was not included on the secured tax roll. Supplemental assessments may take up to 2 years to complete and the ACTTC will issue supplemental tax bills upon completion of the assessment process.
**Request/Question:**

*TOT collection numbers? What is the impact of the scrape?*

**Response:**

**Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) Collection Numbers**

The TOT budget for FY 18-19 is $20,025,470. Staff estimates actual TOT collections will be $22,060,000, which is 10.2% over budget. The recommended TOT budget for FY 19-20 is $22,294,074, which is 11.3% higher than the FY 18-19 recommended budget. This includes $5,573,518 of funding directed to the General Fund, $11,147,037 to the Community Investment Fund, and $5,573,518 of Measure L funding. All ongoing revenue is currently programmed in the FY 2019-20 Recommended budget, based on prior Board direction.

**TOT Scrape Impact**

The County of Sonoma has a contract with a vendor (Harmari) to assist with short-term rental compliance including TOT collections. The “TOT data scrape” or “scrape” refers to Harmari’s process of searching online short-term rental platforms to identify eligible stays in unincorporated Sonoma County for which the operator has not remitted or has under-remitted TOT.

In order to comply with the terms of the Airbnb Voluntary Collection Agreement (VCA) the ACTTC has completed filtering the scrape data to remove any operators currently listed with Airbnb and/or already registered with our office as an active TOT operator. Based on that process, there are 46 potential scofflaw operators that are not registered with estimated unpaid TOT of $64,000 in the last year. Additionally, there are approximately 150 operator associated with existing TOT certificates with estimated unpaid TOT of $40,000 in the last year.

ACTTC staff is in the process of contacting these operators to bring them into compliance, and determine their actual TOT liability and re-payment terms as appropriate.

Please note that the above amounts are conservative due to the vendor’s method for identifying taxable short-term rental activity and quantifying unpaid TOT. ACTTC staff will actively pursue TOT collections from identified operators and continue to work with the vendor to improve the scrape process and data received.
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**Inquiry Number:** __14____

**Department:** Human Resources  
**Date:** 04/10/2019  
**Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:**

**Request/Question:**

*Do we need to increase our recruitment staff based on the high cost of living, etc? Maybe a small increase could help us recruit and retain employees better; encouraged CAO to return with information on what the need is.*

**Response:**

The HR department needs more resources for its Recruitment and Classification Unit to: 1) improve recruitment timelines and, 2) conduct more effective recruitment strategies to reach the passive job seeker. The County’s ability to recruit candidates from out of the area, particularly specialized professions and general management has proven to be more difficult post-fire and with the cost of living trend. Financial resources to implement a recruitment branding campaign and have effective ongoing marketing efforts will greatly improve the visibility of the County as an employer of choice. Additional staffing will also improve the HR Department’s recruitment timeline so departments can fill positions faster, thereby mitigating workload shifts to employees when position vacancies exist. Employee retention improves when workloads are consistent and reasonable.

The challenges:

**Recruitment Timelines.** On average, it takes 45 days from receiving requisition to referral of candidates to departments; equally, it takes departments approximately 50 days to complete the selection and have an employee start employment. An additional HR Analyst position could help reduce this timeline, on average.

The trend of positions in the Recruitment and Classification Unit has decreased while the trend in workload has grown substantially, specifically the recruitment and classification workload. Refer to charts on Exhibits A-D. There is also an ongoing body of work that exists and is difficult to quantify (e.g. position change requests, staffing reductions and lay off administration, county/labor issues related to employment, classification, and Civil Service Rules). In order to keep up with the ongoing, increased trend in demand for services, the department will explore options for additional resources, and will work with the County Administrator’s Office to bring a request to the Board if merited. Maintaining an acceptable service level for this Unit supports the success of all County departments and contributes to improved labor relations, County productivity and effectiveness, and employee retention.
Possible source of revenue to support increase staffing:

- Recover costs for HR services provided to Sonoma Water (Agency). While the County Cost Plan includes and allocates HR Services provided to the Agency within the plan, there is no mechanism to actually recover these costs. This creates an unfair burden to the General Fund in that approximately $219,000 annually is not recovered from the Agency for HR services. Recovery of these costs could provide sufficient funding for 1.0 FTE Human Resources Analyst ($190,000) and at least .5 FTE Senior Office Assistant ($100,000). The recommendation is to coordinate an appropriate cost recovery process with the Agency, ACTTC and County Counsel to include these costs as part of an interagency service agreement for HR to receive the appropriate funds from the Agency.

Human Resources requests support to seek revenue from Sonoma Water for FY 19/20 in the amount of approximately $219,000 and an additional $70,000 in general fund to hire 1.0 HR Analyst and add back 1.0 Senior Office Assistant.

Recruitment Marketing. The Human Resources Department does not have any funds for strategic and proactive County-wide recruitment strategies. Currently, Human Resources only places advertising specific to actual job openings with the advertising plan (specific funds) approved by and funded by the hiring department. The Department does not have any budgeted resources to pursue modern and strategic recruitment branding to promote the County as an employer of choice.

Human Resources believes that one-time funds in the amount of $75,000 could substantially improve the ability to market and recruit job candidates.
*Note regarding position allocations: The Recruitment and Classification Unit has subsidized positions (yellow) in which the cost of the position is reimbursed. Currently, Human Services pays for 1.0 and Department of Health Services pays for .5 FTE HR Analysts. These allocations are evaluated and at risk each budget cycle as these departments review their budgets. (Sonoma Water reduced their 1.0 FTE in FY 16/17.) This structure also creates management challenges in flexibly assigning work given these positions must be dedicated to the departments that are subsidizing them.
Exhibit B

Recruitment/Classification Unit
Workload History - Recruitments
and Class Studies

![Graph showing recruitment and class studies history from 2007-08 to 2019-20.]
Exhibit C

Recruitment/Classification Unit
Workload History - Job Applications

# Job Applications Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>21,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>19,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>15,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>25,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>29,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>25,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>24,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>21,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>19,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>17,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>18,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>20,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request/Question:

If the Board allocated additional funding to the recruitment and retention division of Human Resources, how would the funds be utilized?

Response:

See Response to Inquiry #14.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Inquiry Number: 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gorin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department: General Services – Veterans Facilities
Date: 05/15/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:
*Wants to see utilization of various halls. Could we shift to 3-4 really good rather than many low quality?*

Response:

**Utilization Data**
The County owns seven Veterans Buildings. The facilities are used by Veteran Service Organizations for business meetings, memorials, and patriotic events. The facilities are also used for community events, private parties, and serve various functions in the event of a disaster. Utilization data for FY 16-17, FY 17-18, and FY 18-19 through 3/31/19 is provided below.

- General Services performs routine maintenance services at six of the seven buildings. The Sebastopol Veterans Memorial Building is maintained by the Center for the Arts under a Use Agreement.
- The General Services department supports event management services at four of the Veterans Memorial Buildings: Petaluma, Guerneville, Cotati and Sonoma. The Sonoma County Fairgrounds manages events at the Santa Rosa Veterans Memorial Building.
- The tables below illustrate use data, total revenues, operating and capital expenditures by building for the past three years (FY 18-19 through 3/31/19).

**FY 18-19 (thru March 31, 2019)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/Location</th>
<th>Vet Events (no fee)</th>
<th>Paid Events</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Operating and Capital Expenditures</th>
<th>Net Gain/(Loss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$79,421</td>
<td>$357,575</td>
<td>($342,149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerneville</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$37,346</td>
<td>$240,655</td>
<td>($203,309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$21,135</td>
<td>$47,088</td>
<td>($25,953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$48,918</td>
<td>$644,302</td>
<td>($595,384)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/Location</td>
<td>Vet Events (no fee)</td>
<td>Paid Events</td>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>Total Operating and Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>Net Gain/(Loss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$150,951**</td>
<td>$357,573</td>
<td>($206,622)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerneville</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$37,181</td>
<td>$215,071</td>
<td>($177,890)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$38,445**</td>
<td>$84,328</td>
<td>($45,883)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$121,717</td>
<td>$321,246</td>
<td>($199,529)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa*</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$54,529**</td>
<td>$2,082,241***</td>
<td>($2,027,712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$153,042</td>
<td>($153,042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$11,185</td>
<td>$4,035</td>
<td>$7,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Third party provider manages the day-to-day events and operations of the facilities.

**Revenues reflect $72,033 to help offset increased costs from assuming management of facilities as follows: Petaluma $13,378, Cotati $4,126 and Santa Rosa $54,529.

***Santa Rosa capital expenditure includes new roof, seismic upgrade, and ADA compliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/Location</th>
<th>Vet Events (no fee)</th>
<th>Paid Events</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Operating and Capital Expenditures</th>
<th>Net Gain/(Loss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma*</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$43,769</td>
<td>$179,683</td>
<td>($135,914)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerneville</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$42,591</td>
<td>$197,764</td>
<td>($155,173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$11,559</td>
<td>$37,563</td>
<td>($26,004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$92,461</td>
<td>$332,347</td>
<td>($239,886)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa*</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>$1,599</td>
<td>$355,058</td>
<td>($353,459)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale**</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$2,571</td>
<td>$239,976</td>
<td>($237,405)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol**</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$10,372</td>
<td>395,046</td>
<td>($384,674)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*General Services resumed management of Petaluma, Cotati and Santa Rosa from the third party provider, UCCR, effective 1/16/17; and contracted with the Fairgrounds to manage the Santa Rosa Veterans Building. **Third party provider manages the day-to-day events and operations of the facilities.

**Building Considerations**

- **Logistical/Administrative considerations** – It is legally and administratively possible to close Veterans Buildings should the Board direct staff to do so.
  - Closing under-utilized buildings, such as Cotati, would offer the opportunity to surplus the property and consolidate staff resources into fewer locations. If the Board direction were to sell a particular property, staff anticipate it would take approximately nine months.
  - Staff do not recommend closing buildings without an immediate plan for further disposition based upon the County’s experience with vandalism at vacant buildings and given the cost of mothballing and securing the property.
  - It is likely that any plan to close specific buildings would be met with considerable opposition from Veterans service organizations. Therefore, clear public direction must come directly from the Board before any such work should be undertaken.

- **Legal considerations** – per County Counsel, the law allows for closure if certain conditions are met.
  - Any particular closure would require case-by-case analysis and legal concerns could accompany certain closure scenarios.
  - Should your Board want further legal opinion in this regard, County Counsel should be given further direction to provide an updated written opinion.

For More Information:
https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/General-Services/Administration/Veterans-Memorial-Buildings/
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Inquiry Number: 17

Department: General Services
Date: 05/__/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:

_Worried about use of Amazon Prime - what about local vendors, packaging, etc.?_

Response:

- **Amazon Business Account vs. Amazon Prime individual accounts**
  - A unified All-County Amazon Business account replaces the existing widespread use of individual Amazon Prime memberships (173 separate private accounts using Cal-Cards) for purchases.
  - Amazon Business account provides a legal, compliant alternative option, but it is not promoted over existing local vendors or agreed suppliers.
  - An Amazon Business account provides the County with business-only pricing, quantity discounts, and deep analytics into our buying behavior and future needs. Amazon Business prices are on average 8-12% cheaper than on individual accounts. Therefore the County could have saved approximately $20,000 on the $202,000 spent on Amazon purchases last year.
  - When the Sonoma Complex fires hit, Amazon Prime was the only vendor with the scale, infrastructure, and supply chain to deliver crucial supplies such as N95 masks in quantities needed, within two days.

- **Impact on local vendors/Sonoma community**
  - The County currently has a “local business preference” that is used in the formal solicitation process.
  - Amazon.com relies on local sellers to enhance their total offerings.
    - There are currently 1,055 Sonoma County sellers offering goods and services on the platform.
    - For Business Prime users ($3,500 annual membership), guided buying can restrict unauthorized categories, directing purchasers to proper alternate vendor, and choose specific categories such as local vendors, environmentally...
certified, women/minority-owned, etc., allowing for added control to County purchasing decisions.

- **Additional packaging/environmental waste**
  - By having one unified Amazon Business account, multiple purchases from different (physically nearby) departments are more likely to be grouped, thereby generating less packaging than many individual orders.
  - Packaging: There is no evidence that Amazon Business deliveries generate more relative waste than Staples or any other approved Sonoma County supplier.
  - Amazon’s Packaging Statement: “Over the past 10 years, our sustainable packaging initiatives have eliminated more than 244,000 tons of packaging materials, avoiding 500 million shipping boxes. Our programs have reduced packaging waste by 16%, avoiding 305 million shipping boxes in 2017 alone.”
  - The County’s Green Purchasing Policy, which includes environmental considerations along with other factors such as price, performance, etc., is in line with Amazon’s stated commitment to energy efficiency, green buildings, renewable energy and worker well-being.

**Examples:**
Amazon Business search for “office chair” - notice can be a warning or a prohibition.

![Company restricted warning example](https://officefurnitureworld.com/)
Amazon Business preferences set to “Sonoma County sellers” only.
For More information:

Amazon Business Guided Buying feature: [https://www.amazon.com/guidedbuying](https://www.amazon.com/guidedbuying)

Amazon’s commitment to sustainability question bank: [https://www.amazon.com/qb](https://www.amazon.com/qb)
Request/Question:
Provide information on deferred maintenance vs. new construction. Provide information on the advantages or disadvantages of investing in demolition of certain buildings at the Chanate campus.

Response:

Deferred Maintenance vs. New Construction
On May 8, 2018 staff provided your Board a detailed report (see attached) comparing the cost of addressing the existing County Center campus deferred maintenance versus the cost of a new building. Following the comprehensive, industry-standard Facilities Condition Assessment performed by VFA Associates in 2014, staff have found:

- The County has not adequately funded maintenance since 2007; the County Government Center’s deferred maintenance backlog has increased to $258 million.
- One maintenance catch-up scenario (of several) indicated that an annual investment of $25.3 million per year for twenty years would be necessary.
- Additional maintenance funding needed to stave off shortened service life-cycles of recent renovations.
- Does not address safety, security, code deficiencies, or lack of space.
- Replacement (like-for-like) cost alone = $636 million, or $1,351/sq. ft.
- Extensive investigation leads staff to recommend new construction as the most effective, strategic, long-term solution.
  - New code-compliant buildings with 50-year lifespan will save energy, use space wisely, have improved security, and can meet/anticipate modern workplace needs.
  - Consolidating County administrative functions would make approx. 29 valuable acres available for mixed use office, retail, and housing development.

In 2017, Kitchell estimated cost for a 500,000 square foot single building concept at $349.9 million; they estimated cost for multi-building concept phased over time at $375.5 million.
### Summary of Solutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STATUS QUO</th>
<th>CATCH-UP ON DEFERRED MAINTENANCE</th>
<th>NEW CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>LEASE EXISTING BUILDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROS</strong></td>
<td>• Maintains current funding levels</td>
<td>• Addresses deferred maintenance</td>
<td>• Completely new, code-compliant, buildings with a 50 year life span</td>
<td>• Move in directly into existing buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhanced public convenience with one-door service model</td>
<td>• Saves on move costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Streamlined operations of administrative services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Energy conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Efficient workspace standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use lands to generate revenue and property tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONS</strong></td>
<td>• Does not address deferred maintenance, code deficiencies, safety, security or lack of space</td>
<td>• Does not address safety, security, code deficiencies or lack of space</td>
<td>• Exceeds current funding level</td>
<td>• No large Class “A” Office space is available in the County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prone to systems failure which impacts service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Exceeds current funding levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESIGN CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES</strong></td>
<td>• Constrained by existing footprint and one story construction</td>
<td>• Constrained by existing footprint and one story construction</td>
<td>• Opportunity for more efficient land use</td>
<td>• Need to work within existing supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inefficient land use</td>
<td>• Inefficient land use</td>
<td>• Opportunity for housing and commercial development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Currently 318,272 square feet of existing administration buildings: need is 500,000 square feet</td>
<td>• Currently 318,272 square feet of existing administration buildings: need is 500,000 square feet</td>
<td>• Opportunity for more efficient service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 500,000 square feet of new office space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For More Information:

### Pros/Cons of Chanate Demolition

As the Board directed, the County is in the process of selling the property as surplus. At this point, any consideration of selective demolition is premature.

Prior studies conducted in 2014 estimated cost to demolish only the former hospital building at $6 million. Cost escalation and increased hazardous materials exposure risks have increased that estimate to over $12 million.
In general, any condition that increases costs or risks will lower the market value of the property. Current zoning, deteriorated condition of some buildings, and unknown fault lines contribute to low market value.

Staff recommend continuing through the initial phase of the surplus process, and then re-evaluating whether to proceed into the next phase with private sale. Depending upon market conditions there may be interested private buyers who would offer a fair price as-is. Alternatively, it may become evident that actions should be taken to reduce the perceived costs and risks associated with zoning, building condition and seismic fault lines.
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Inquiry Number: __19______

Department: Information Systems Department
Date: 04/10/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:
Interested in sinking funds on devices, how do we repay?

Response:
Information Systems Department (ISD) manages two types of sinking funds, typically referred to as Accumulated Capital Outlay Funds (ACOs) in the County’s financial structure.

Infrastructure Replacement –
The first type of ACO funds support the future replacement of Information Systems managed infrastructure. We administer the Information Technology Infrastructure ACO fund, Communications Infrastructure ACO fund, and Records/Mail Infrastructure ACO fund. The first two funds listed are rate supported, with yearly contributions calculated using the acquisition value and useful life of managed assets and collected through rates charged for services. Information Technology Infrastructure contributions are included in the per PC cost allocation to clients and Communications System Infrastructure contributions are included in the communications rates. The Records/Mail ACO is solely funded through Board budget action as ISD has no rates for these services that can collect for asset replacement.

\[
\frac{\text{Asset Acquisition Value}}{\text{Useful life (years)}} = \text{Yearly Contribution for Replacement}
\]

Device Modernization Program –
The second type of ACO funds administered by ISD are for the use of our internal and external clients. Client owned technology, such as desktops, laptops, client-owned servers, and printers represent a large investment. The County has recognized that timely replacement not only supports productivity but also prevents outdated, manufacturer unsupported hardware, firmware, and software from introducing vulnerabilities into the County’s network. To assist clients in smoothing their replacement costs, ISD allows clients to voluntarily participate in our Device Modernization Program to contribute toward future replacement of their equipment. ISD provides the replacement tracking, accounting, budgeting, and reporting related to these replacements. ISD works with clients early in each fiscal year to determine technology needs, make recommendations, place orders, and schedule imaging and installation.

In this case, the acquisition value is added to projected software and labor costs to provide a full replacement cost. The full replacement cost and useful life are used to calculate yearly contributions for future replacement.

\[
\text{Acquisition Cost + Software Cost + Labor} = \text{Replacement Cost} \\
\frac{\text{Replacement Cost}}{\text{Useful life (years)}} = \text{Yearly Contribution for Replacement}
\]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Inquiry Number: <strong>20</strong>__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gorin</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department: Information Systems Department
Date: 04/10/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:

What are we pursuing HMGP for and how do we safeguard our data/systems?

Response:

We have completed a subapplication for a Data Center Generator (DR-4344 Project #0509), this generator will mitigate risks associated with a prolonged loss of power, ensuring that critical functions and essential services, including critical emergency response and public safety systems are available. Estimated costs is $622,180 (Federal Share $466,635 & County Share $155,545).

- **Status:** This subapplication has been approved by California Department of Emergency Services (CALOES), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) review pending.

We have submitted Notice of Intent (NOI) for critical facilities (e.g. County of Sonoma Data Center) for power and Internet redundancy and wireless/cellular communications hardening. The following NOI’s have been submitted under DR-4407:

- **Critical Facility Power Retrofit:** Increase resiliency and mitigate risks associated with loss of power including 911, computer-aided dispatch, communications and the operation of the data center. Estimated cost is $100,000 (Federal Share $75,000 & County Share $25,000)

- **Hardening of Wireless Communication Infrastructure:** Installation of wireless communication amplifiers and repeaters on the County Campus to mitigate wireless communication impactions due to loss of carriers and to ensure communication needs are met for Federal/State/Local agencies during an emergency. Estimated cost is $300,000 (Federal Share $225,000 & County Share $75,000)

- **Critical Facility Redundant Internet Feed:** Provide redundant internet connectivity that increases resiliency and mitigates risks including public safety and emergency response functions in the event of primary internet service failure to the data center. Estimated cost is $100,000 (Federal Share $75,000 & County Share $25,000)

- **Critical Facility Redundant Power Feed:** The data center is a designated critical facility and is recommended to have a redundant power source. The objective is to install a power feed from a separate power grid to mitigate potential loss of power from primary power source. Estimated cost is $300,000 (Federal Share $225,000 & County Share $75,000)
We have implemented several approaches to safeguard our data/systems:

- Entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with County of Alameda for data center space, installed equipment which protects data and system backup’s offsite, and implemented daily replication.
- Establishing connections to cloud providers and implemented daily replication of critical datasets.
- Accelerated purchases for server hardware and software at Alameda to enable shorter recovery times for enterprise and departmental systems.
- Continued to virtualize servers to facilitate recovery at an alternate site or cloud provider.
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Request/Question:
Board needs a good overview of the costs/workload of conservatorships and public guardian programs.

Response:
Staff will enter response here, additional pages will be attached as needed.

Overview:

The Law Office of the Public Defender handles three types of Conservatorships. The three types are LPS (Under the Lanterman, Petris, Short Act), Probate, and Limited Conservatorships. By statute, the court must appoint counsel in all LPS and Limited Conservatorship matters and in all Probate Conservatorships wherein special powers are being requested, i.e. dementia medication and/or locked perimeter facility.

LPS conservatorships are based upon mental illness wherein the conservatee is gravely disabled due to a diagnosed mental health illness. Probate Conservatorships are based on a TBI (Traumatic Brian Injury) or Alzheimer Dementia. Limited Conservatorships are those where the client has a developmental disability that makes him/her gravely disabled. Many, if not most, parents in Sonoma County with a developmentally disabled child, such as those with a qualified autism spectrum disorder or Down’s syndrome, will need a Limited Conservatorship when that child approaches the age of 18. This is the only practical vehicle to continue to make medical, financial, social and other legal decisions on behalf of the proposed Limited Conservatee.

All conservatorships are based on the definition of grave disability where it is determined that the client cannot provide for the basics of life such as food, clothing, shelter and medical needs, without the intervention of a conservatorship. Most of the Limited Conservatorship clients are represented by and/or obtaining services from Regional Centers, i.e. Northbay Regional Center. Our clients at the Sonoma Developmental Center are on Limited Conservatorships. The remaining Limited Conservatees are in the community at Board and Care facilities, private placement, locked facilities or with their families.

LPS and Limited Conservatees are often placed in facilities outside of Sonoma County. Several Conservatees are placed as far as Riverside and Compton. This makes it necessary for the Deputy Public Defender (DPD) to travel to facilities all over the state. Most travel is to the Modesto/Stockton...
area, as most of the larger locked facilities are located in that jurisdiction. The court has ordered the DPD to travel to these facilities to interview clients in person, even when telephone contact is available. In LPS Conservatorship cases, the client is entitled to a jury trial each year when a new Petition is filed. Limited and Probate Conservatee’s are entitled to a jury trial when there is an objection to the Petition. Limited and Probate Conservatees are also entitled to a jury trial to terminate an existing conservatorship if they are no longer gravely disabled.

In all three types of conservatorship, the Law Office of the Public Defender advocates for the least restrictive placements. Many LPS and Probate Conservatees are placed in locked perimeter facilities throughout California. Others are in Board and Care facilities or private placements. Currently we have approximately 190 LPS clients most of whom are up for renewal and the filing of new petitions on an annual basis.

Probate and Limited Conservatees are life appointments to the Public Defender’s Office and no new petition is filed or required annually. However, these can be akin to family law cases in that significant litigation can occur years or decades after the initial appointment of the case. For example, a divorced mom and dad co-conservators might disagree about where the Conservatee is placed. This can result in the consultation with and appointment of experts, civil discovery proceedings such as depositions, motions to compel and for sanctions, etc., all resulting in significant time spent by the DPD in working a given case and researching applicable law.

The number of Probate Conservatorship clients vary at any given time. There are currently 1092 active Probate and Limited Conservatees. Most Probate clients have private conservators who are family members or private fiduciaries, with very few represented by the County Guardian. It is believed that the County Conservator/Guardian has approximately 50 Probate clients, whom they represent as fiduciaries. Most Probate clients are elderly and have a shortened life span and often do not survive beyond 10 years of the Conservatorship. The County Guardian/Conservator does not represent Limited Conservatees as fiduciaries.

On each Probate appointment, a full investigation and report by the Public Defender must be conducted. This includes reviewing multiple documents, doctor capacity declarations, as well as interviewing neighbors, care providers, family members, social workers, etc. A written report is then prepared for the court as a response and recommendation to the Petition for Probate Conservatorship of both the estate and the person.

Initial annual accountings are conducted by the Conservator (through their attorney) as to assets and liabilities, change of placements, sale of assets, or other issues involving the person and the estate of the Conservatee. These are required to be reviewed by the Public Defender as to each Conservatee on a bi-annual basis, thereafter.

There are two attorneys from the Public Defender’s Office assigned to handle conservatorship cases. One is a DPDIV and the other is the Department Head. The assigned DPDIV has many other assignments and duties, and of course, the Department Head has significant duties, as well. The workload for conservatorship cases is difficult to decipher, but can be as little as 40 total hours per week and as much as 60 total hours per week, depending on the complexity of the appointment, type of conservatorship and the need for protracted litigation.
The Department Head and DPD are in contact with clients, private fiduciaries, care providers, medical professionals, the County Conservator/Guardian, and/or other family members daily and/or weekly at a minimum. If not in trial, the Probate Calendar is one day per week. The LPS/Limited Conservatorship calendar is also one day per week, if not in trial. The costs to the county for conservatorship representation is in time and work conducted by the Law Office of the Public Defender. By statute, every person that handles a conservatorship matter must engage in a minimum of three hours per year of continuing legal education specific to conservatorship cases. Proof must be lodged with the court annually.

If the Law Office of The Public Defender could no longer accept appointments on conservatorship cases, private counsel would have to be appointed by the court (in lieu of the Public Defender). It is estimated and believed that more time would be spent handling the cases, investigations would not be as thorough, there would be less expertise and experience, there would be less consistency in representation, there would be more delays in processing the cases, and the cost to the county would be exorbitant. The court awards a minimum of $275.00 per hour for court appointed counsel ($385.00 per hour for more experienced attorneys) plus all costs associated with the representation. The County would be responsible for this cost and the service to the clients would not be as expertly handled.

On the other hand, the Law Office of the Public Defender provides these services at a rate that is vastly a better value to the County than the alternative, because the costs are absorbed which essentially is no cost at all. History has also shown this to be the case as was evidenced in the Harvey Rose Report when the county was forced to contract for two attorneys to fill a courtroom left vacant by Public Defender cuts. It was determined at that time that it costs $212,000 more annually to hire outside counsel than it costs to employ two full time benefitted and salaried DPD’s. Furthermore, many experienced private attorneys have turned down court appointment due to the complexity of representation. The Law Office of the Public Defender welcomes any level of complexity or representation.

There is not a dedicated allocated position in the Public Defender Office for a Conservatorship attorney. The office has absorbed the workload that has increased exponentially over the years due to the increase in mental health cases, as well as an aging population. Most Public Defender Offices in the state do not handle conservatorship matters and the County contracts with private entities at a much greater cost. Public Defenders specialize in criminal law. Representing persons in Conservatorship matters requires special legal knowledge in civil litigation, family law, financial/accounting law, probate/wills/trusts, and other areas of law which requires specialization.

If the Law Office of the Public Defender has any reduction in its current budget, unfortunately this is the first level of representation where the office would declare unavailability. There is little doubt that the cost to the County for private attorney appointment or contract would well exceed any cuts the Public Defender faces. The office prides itself on the excellent representation of this vulnerable group of clients. The Presiding Judge of the Courts has agreed and that he would gladly confirm that the attorneys in the Law Office of the Public Defender are far superior, high performing and quality based in representing this vulnerable group, more than any other private attorney could be.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gorin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inquiry Number:** __22____

**Department:** District Attorney  
**Date:** 04/10/2019  
**Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:**

**Request/Question:**

*Wants more detail on position reductions and what this specifically would mean for wait times, etc.*

**Response:**

Position reductions will include attorneys, investigators, advocates and support staff. The office has already been reorganized due to the expected loss of funding that was used for extra help staff. As a result, specialty units have been disbanded. This means that the narcotics cases are no longer handled by lawyers who work directly with detectives and confidential informants so that large scale dealers can be brought to justice. Additionally, the gang unit was disbanded so that the other attorney assignments could be filled. We will no longer have prosecutors working specifically on gang prosecution, but rather these cases will be handled by our felony prosecution team. As the staff continues to be downsized, we will evaluate which cases we will no longer be able to prosecute due to shortages. Additionally, the time needed to review cases for filing will be significantly longer, the ability to connect with victims regularly will be hampered, and the disposition of cases will be considerably longer due to staff shortages throughout the office.

As presented to the Board in March, the number of crime reports received is constant. The number of co-defendant cases is up, which adds to the complexity of the task. Additionally, we are handling cases involving defendants who travel here from out of state to commit violent crimes, so must work with other law enforcement agencies. Further, the county is seeking to address the homeless issue in part by using the criminal justice system. There are no resources to process this population effectively, particularly given the increase in the number of mental health cases coming into the system.

The Family Justice Center has been operating without an executive director since February. While thus far able to apply for grants and work with the non-profit board, the center can not continue without an onsite director and supporting staff.

A review of the presentation to the Board in March will remind all of the efforts undertaken to find alternative funding for our mission. At a time when we have finally achieved staffing that enables us to properly serve the public, the proposed cuts will put the community at risk. The equity adjustments will disproportionately impact this office and justice will not be served.
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**Inquiry Number:** _23 & 24_

**Department:** District Attorney  
**Date:** 04/10/2019  
**Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:**

**Request/Question:**

List all grants obtained by the District Attorney over the last couple years. Wants to see a list of the grants that have been received, including but not exclusive to family justice center.

### Sonoma County District Attorney Current FY 18-19 Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Agency / Program Name</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Grant Dates</th>
<th>Moz.</th>
<th>Funded Positions</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Train. Travel</th>
<th>Op Exp</th>
<th>Audit Costs</th>
<th>FY 2019/20 Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **California Victim Compensation Board** | $149,028 | 7/1/2018 - 6/30/2019 | 12 | Victim Claims Supervisor - 3 FTE  
Victim Claims Specialists 2 FTE | $4,010 | | | | New Grant Approved |
| **Restitution** | $75,586 | 7/1/2018 - 6/30/2019 | 12 | Legal Assistant - 1.5 FTE | $164 | | | | New Grant Approved |
| **CalDEFS Victim/Witness Assistance** | $76,570 | 10/1/2018 - 9/30/2019 | 12 | Victim Advocates 5 FTE | $15,297 | | $6,455 | | Application in progress |
| **Mass Victimization Advocacy** | $100,000 | 10/1/2018 - 9/30/2019 | 12 | Senior Victim Advocate - 5 FTE | | | | | Grant Ends 3/30/19 - New grant uncertain |
| **County Victim Services Program** | $152,433 | 1/1/2019 - 12/31/2019 | 12 | Coordinator (Administration Aid) - 1 FTE  
Grants Coordinator - 1 FTE | $224,935 | | $20,000 | $33,635 | | |
| **Innovative Response to Marginalized Victims** | $174,582 | 1/1/2019 - 12/31/2019 | 12 | Senior Victim Advocate - 5 FTE  
Victim Services Director - 1 FTE | $12,531 | | $75,129 | $12,724 | | |
| **Violence Against Women's Vertical Prosecution Program** | $205,541 | 1/1/2019 - 6/30/2019 | 12 | Prosecutor - 8 FTE | | | | | New grant application submitted - pending decision |
| **Family Justice Center Program** | $143,283 | 1/1/2019 - 6/30/2020 | 12 | Coordinator (Administration Aid) - 2 FTE  
Secretary - 1 FTE | $255,403 | | $12,777 | | Grant ends: 12/31/2020 |
| **Office of Traffic** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Vertical DUI Prosecution Program** | $134,035 | 1/1/2018 - 6/30/2019 | 12 | Prosecutor - 10 FTE | | | | | Grant Application submitted - pending decision |
| **CA Department of Insurance** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Workers' Compensation Fraud** | $101,215 | 1/1/2019 - 6/30/2019 | 12 | Prosecutor - 15 FTE  
Investigator - 2 FTE | | | | $18,400 | | |
| **US Department of Justice** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant** | $47,000 | 7/1/2019 | 2 | N/A | $47,003 | | | | BOS for approval by 6/4/19 |
| **Growing Criminal Justice Response Grant Program** | $750,000 | 1/1/2019 - 6/30/2019 | 36 | N/A | $176,000 | $10,000 | $30,000 | | Grant Application submitted - pending decision |
| **Crime Victim Assistance Grant** | $656,000 | 10/1/2019 | 12 | (Administrator Aid) - 80 FTE | $145,845 | $10,520 | $24,645 | | | |
| **Polyvictimization** | | | | | | | | | |
The District Attorney’s Office currently has 14 grants it manages from 7 federal and state agencies. A summary of each grant is below.

1. The **California Victim Compensation Board** (VCB) contract funds the majority of our Victim Compensation Unit who process claims for the County of Sonoma. Staff have the authority to make eligibility determinations and reimburse victims of crime for their crime-related losses. They conduct all information verification, recommend determination to the state and process all billing once a claim is approved. They reimburse millions of dollars to crime victims each year.

2. The VCB Restitution contract funds one of our two restitution specialists who focus on VCB-related claims ordered and collected from defendants. She works directly with attorneys and the Superior Court to secure new restitution orders and to modify existing restitution orders to VCB. She monitors VCB’s computer system by processing victim applications and associating claims related to criminal cases in the County of Sonoma. She is also responsible for communicating with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and Sonoma County Probation to ensure collection accounts are set up properly for each restitution order and serves as resource for this office and the Sonoma County Adult and Juvenile Probation on all restitution issues, statutes, and case law.

3. The **Victim/Witness Assistance Program** funds the majority of the advocates who provide mandatory and optional services to victims of crime to include resource, referral, crisis counseling, criminal justice information, court accompaniment, preparation of VCB claims, assisting with Victim Impact Statements and restitution paperwork. Our Domestic Violence team attends Domestic Violence Court daily, provides Victim Status Forms to court staff and prepares Criminal Protective Orders. This grant includes funds for training and outreach and also funded the purchase of our comfort dog, Miranda. Funds have included special projects; updating our meeting and kids’ room, annual training, obtaining promotional supplies, and the printing of funding Victim Services brochures and our Law Enforcement brochure.

4. The **Mass Victimization Advocacy Program** covers outreach and training such as the recently attended Mass Casualty Summit in San Francisco. We have established Memoranda of Understanding with nine bay area counties and have purchased go-bags for each advocate and Miranda for use during an incident as well as clothing and promotional supplies. The goal is to establish clear protocols and build relationships to respond to an incident either in Sonoma County or a neighboring county efficiently.

5. The **County Victim Services Program** funds the Homeless Outreach Team (HOT). This team provides resources to homeless victims of crime through outreach with the Homeless Outreach Services Team and at specific sites throughout the county including The Living Room, Vet Connect, Homeless Service Center, etc. Additionally, funds are allocated for vouchers which include food, gas, taxi, county and city bus passes, clothing, care kits, short-term motel stay as well as mileage for the team. HOT is part of Coordinated Entry for longer term housing and receives numerous referrals from the advocates and other county and community agencies.

6. The **Innovative Response to Marginalized Victims Program** funds are directed to Foster Youth through collaboration with Social Advocates for Youth (SAY). Our services focus on a caseload
from Family, Youth and Children of dependent minors providing Victim Compensation claims thought the VCB for therapy through coordination with Child Protective Service social workers. SAY focuses all services on foster youth providing direct services through their shelter and therapy program. Teams meet regularly to enhance services to foster youth and conduct training and outreach.

7. The purpose of the Violence Against Women Vertical Prosecution Program is to improve conviction rates and minimize victim trauma. Under true vertical prosecution, one attorney and one victim advocate work collaboratively to handle these cases from beginning to end. The program funds an experienced vertical prosecutor handling domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking cases. The required match is met through one dedicated bilingual advocate providing services to these victims regardless of charges being filed or not. This unit handles these difficult and often lengthy cases meeting clients at the Family Justice Center Sonoma County (FJCSC) where this team is housed.

8. The Family Justice Center Program grant is to improve capabilities for established Family Justice Centers. In response to the recognition that family violence cases require coordinated services, Sonoma established the FJCSC to co-locate community services and law enforcement on a single site to deliver comprehensive services to victims of family violence. FJCSC has become the keystone in this community’s response to violent crimes against women and families, becoming the basis for Sonoma’s Next Generation Integrated Services Delivery Model. The award provides funds to support several community-based organizations (CBO) who provide staff at the FJCSC location and the development of services to specific remote outlying areas of our county.

9. This program provides funding for a prosecutor to be solely dedicated to the Vertical Prosecution of Driving Under the Influence crimes. The vertical prosecution method of handling cases is resource intensive and allows prosecutors to handle each case throughout each step of the criminal process. Being involved in the full continuum of each case improves prosecutorial efforts and outcomes. The attorneys also partner with local law enforcement to provide community education and outreach in an effort to reduce the incidents of driving under the influence. These attorneys attend training each year and help provide training to local law enforcement on the detection and investigation of suspected DUI offenders. They participate in local law enforcement checkpoints and share information with peers and law enforcement personnel throughout the county and across the state allowing them to build their knowledge base and educate other jurisdictions. With specialized prosecutors and better trained law enforcement, offenders are held fully accountable for their conduct.

10. Due to Workers’ Compensation Insurance Fraud, employers struggle to pay insurance premiums and may see unsustainable increases, and injured workers feel more pressure as the benefits to which they are entitled come under attack. Ultimately, citizens are forced to pay higher prices for goods and services if fraud is not contained. Therefore, the District Attorney’s Office and Department of Insurance work together to identify, investigate, and prosecute those who break the law.

11. Automobile Insurance Fraud includes staged traffic collisions, which put the public at risk by creating dangerous conditions on the roadways, faulty repairs made by body shops which place unsafe vehicles on the streets, and filing fraudulent claims which ultimately results in higher
premiums for all citizens. In collaboration with the Department of Insurance, we work to identify, investigate, and prosecute those who commit insurance fraud.

12. The Bureau of Justice Assistance Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) was established in 2005 to provide state and local governments with flexibility to prioritize and place justice funds where they are needed most. Sonoma County rotates this award annually among the 4 justice agencies (Sheriff, Probation, District Attorney and Public Defender) and has received this grant for 13 years. Allocations are determined based on state population, crime data, and violent crime data from FBI Uniform Crime Reports. The DA office is requesting BOS approval on 6/4/19 for the current grant funding of $47,103. If approved, will fund the much needed redesign/remodel of the District Attorney front reception to improve safety, security and ergonomics.

13. The Improving Criminal Justice Responses award is to strengthen existing victim services provided at the FJCSC and to expand outreach and capacity. All funding is directed toward the community based organizations, travel/training and operating expenses. Through this program integrated services for the growing number of victims of family and community violence are provided. Services are enhanced to reach the underserved individuals with limited or no English language proficiency and victims of sexual assault to overcome the barriers to providing services. Two CBO-contracted bilingual Navigators direct and support the increasing victim population. Key nonprofit, nongovernmental victim service organizations involved in the development and direct implementation of this project include: Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Santa Rosa, Council on Aging, Legal Aid of Sonoma County, Verity, and YWCA of Sonoma County.

14. The Polyvictimization Grant is a demonstration initiative involving six Family Justice Centers across the nation. This initiative has sought to identify clientele at our center that have experienced polyvictimization, and discover traditional and alternative healing methods to interrupt the cycle of victimization. Polyvictimization is defined as having experienced multiple types of victimization in multiple settings at the hands of multiple perpetrators. Between the six sites and our national technical assistance provider, Alliance for Hope, we have developed and implemented an assessment tool that measures polyvictimization and provides data for us at the local level. As a result of the funding, we have brought on additional services at the FJCSC where we have found 91% of our clients experienced polyvictimization.
The Sheriff’s Office explained that all contracts for police services to other jurisdictions are full cost recovery with the exception of a 5% discount on administrative overhead. Please include the amount of subsidy being provided to each jurisdiction and the timing for the next cycle of negotiations so that the Board can decide whether to eliminate or revise the subsidy.

Response:

For FY 19-20, the value of the 5% administrative overhead discount is $77,791 for the Town of Windsor and $48,073 for the City of Sonoma, for a total of $125,864.

On May 21, 2019, the Board will be asked to approve amendments to extend the terms of the current Agreements with both Sonoma and Windsor for one additional year through June 30, 2020. The amendments preserve all terms and conditions of the existing Agreement including the 5% discount. The Sheriff’s Office negotiated with both jurisdictions to extend the existing Agreements with the same terms for one year in order to provide both the County and the Town and City the time to evaluate the benefits and costs associated with entering into long term agreements for the provision of law enforcement services. The one year extensions will allow the Town and City the time necessary to develop a solicitation process, the Board to provide policy direction, the Sheriff’s Office to prepare a proposal, and for negotiations to take place. If new long term agreements for either, or both, jurisdictions are pursued, the Board should expect to see these in the spring of 2020 for a July 1, 2020 implementation.

Given the nature of the services provided and the significant financial and human investment involved, it is necessary to provide at six months advance notice if either the County or the contracting jurisdictions want to terminate our law enforcement services relationship. In anticipation of processes which will be taking place in the upcoming fiscal year and to be prepared to enter into future contract negotiations with Sonoma County cities, the Sheriff will be seeking Board of Supervisors policy direction on applying a five percent (5%) reduction to the indirect cost applied to future long term law enforcement service contracts at the May 21st Board meeting.

Law enforcement service contracts benefit the community by providing consistent, coordinated, and seamless law enforcement services across the unincorporated and incorporated areas of the County.
Additional Background Information

The 5% indirect cost reduction was originally approved by the Board of Supervisors on June 27th 1995. The discount was first applied to the Town of Windsor as an amendment to the original Agreement and was affirmed each year by the Board until 2008 when a new 10 year agreement was brought to the Board. This new 10-year Agreement was approved by the Board on May 6, 2008, included the %5 adjustment and delegated authority to the Sheriff and did not require the annual service plan and budget to come before the Board each year.

For the City of Sonoma, the 5% indirect cost reduction was approved by the Board of Supervisors on April 20, 2004 as part of the original 5 year Law Enforcement Services Agreement. It was also included in the subsequent 10 year Agreement which the Board approved on June 23, 2009.

CAO Note: As part of FY 2019-20 budget hearings, the Board will be asked to approve a new financial policy that requires all shared service contracts with other political jurisdictions include full cost recovery for any portion of services provided by the County. This full cost recovery policy would include recovery of full future retirement costs of County employees who act as employees for the other jurisdiction, unless otherwise directed by the Board of Supervisors. Any contract being brought to the Board that does not achieve full cost recovery should be accompanied by specific information regarding the level of subsidy being provided and a justification. This new policy would apply to any new law enforcement support contracts executed with cities starting in FY 2020-21, but would not apply to the one-year agreement extensions with Windsor and Sonoma for FY 2019-20 that are being presented to the Board for approval on 06/04/2019.
FY 2019-20 Budget Workshop Board Inquiry Form

Request/Question:
How are you doing on lateral recruitments for deputies?

Response:
The Sheriff’s Office has had one continuous lateral recruitment for the deputy sheriff job class this fiscal year. From this recruitment we have hired 9 lateral deputy sheriff II’s thus far. For FY 18-19 we have hired a total 18 deputy sheriffs including the 9 lateral candidates. During this same time period we have had 23 sworn separations.

Additional Information
Our intensive hiring efforts include:
- Running continuous recruitments for our hardest to fill positions including deputy sheriff, correctional deputy, and dispatchers.
- Increasing the number of background investigators by adding extra help staff and re-assigning operational staff to the Personnel Unit on an on-loan basis.
- Completed a comprehensive recruitment branding effort “Make the Right Call” and launched a new recruitment website.
- Increased outreach and advertising, particularly to underrepresented groups.

To-date in this current fiscal year we have hired a total of 59 new full-time employees.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Inquiry Number: <strong>27</strong>____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gorin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department: Sheriff’s Office
Date: 04/10/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:
What does it cost the Sheriff to have 60 hours per month per correctional officer of mandatory overtime in the jail?

Response:
Based on the FY 19-20 salary and benefits, mandatory overtime of 60 hours a month per available correctional deputy will cost approximately $580,000 per month, or nearly $7 million annually.

In order to truly bring mandatory overtime down for the long term, the Sheriff’s Office needs to be allocated funding to restore the correctional deputy relief positions eliminated in the FY 09-10 budget as a result of reductions and add additional staffing to bring the Sheriff’s Office staff to inmate ratio in line with other like counties. To accomplish this, an over-hiring strategy will need to be developed to prevent positions from being vacant for extended periods and to work towards overall increases in correctional deputy staffing. The over-hiring strategy will also allow the Sheriff to recruit and train new correctional deputies before positions become vacant.

The correctional deputy job class is an entry-level position, which generates significant turnover. Over the past three fiscal years, turnover has averaged 9.4% or approximately 19 positions per year. Due to the recruitment challenges and on-the-job training required for new correctional deputies, it can take over six to nine months to hire and fully train a correctional deputy. It is estimated that over hiring will cost approximately $15,000 per month, per position.

Relief positions cover vacant shifts created by sick leave, injuries, vacation, comp time, other leaves, and vacant allocations. Based solely on the three-year history of sick and injured correctional deputies, the Sheriff estimates 15 relief positions (estimated annual cost of $2,741,940) would be needed to begin reducing mandatory overtime requirements for correctional deputies. This number will need to be re-evaluated and refined once existing vacant allocations are filled and once the number of staff needed for the new Behavioral Health Housing Unit is determined. The Sheriff’s Office will be working on a comprehensive correctional deputy staffing analysis in FY 19-20 to determine the true need.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Inquiry Number: <strong>28</strong>__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gorin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department: Probation Department
Date: 04/10/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:
Can the Probation department clarify the impact to public safety of reducing the number of adult probation officers? What is “moderate” risk and does the population that would be impacted include felons?

Response:
In order to meet General Fund budget targets, the Probation Department is eliminating 3.0 FTE filled Probation Officer II/III positions in the Adult Services Division. These positions are the Department’s top priority for restoration on the Add-Back list submitted to the County Administrators Office (PRC ID # 27011000-PC01).

Increases in caseload size would significantly diminish the time officers have to spend on each case. Very limited face-to-face contacts would occur with these offenders. Instead of specialized supervision (typically with caseload ratios of 1:65) these offenders would be placed on general supervision caseloads of between 150 and 200 individuals per probation officer. Probation officers would be forced to monitor these individuals through telephonic or mailed in monthly reports. Officers’ ability to respond to victim, community and offender needs in a timely manner would be limited. Public safety would be compromised by this action.

“Moderate risk” describes Probation’s risk-based level of supervision provided to those on probation, mandatory supervision and Post Release Community Supervision status. This population is at a moderate risk to reoffend while on a grant of probation supervision. Moderate risk means about 25% of them are expected to commit a new felony while on supervision, unless supervision and interventions are provided to assist offenders in staying out of trouble. The majority of our overall supervision population are convicted of a felony offense, few have misdemeanor convictions only.

Adult Probation Officers assigned to the Court/Investigations unit would have increased workloads. The officers assigned to the five felony sentencing courtrooms would no longer be available to attend court sessions, as they would be needed to produce reports. The officer assigned to the Early Case Resolution Courtroom (ECR) would no longer be able to attend court as they would be needed to produce reports. Delays in providing reports to the Court would cause defendants to remain in custody (jail) for longer periods of time pending sentencing.
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Inquiry Number: __29_____

Department: Clerk Recorder Assessor
Date: 04/10/2019
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

Request/Question:
What if we didn’t defend appeals? Can we get more data on assessment appeals? Amounts, how much time we spend on it, etc.;

Response:
The following data (see attached page 2) was taken from all outstanding appeals as of 4/01/2019.

This might be an example of losses for a point in time. The filings have not been heavy for the last several years, as the Assessor and the Clerk of the Assessment Appeals Board (COB) have been proactively working these items throughout the year to eliminate backlogs. If time and resources were severely affected in this area and particularly in the Assessor’s Office since they spend most of the time on appeals stipulations and hearing preparation, then losses on the appeals applications would certainly take place in future fiscal years. If the number of appeals submitted to the COB increase significantly due to a downturn in the real estate market, then losses in value could be higher than the example attached, which would take value off the taxable roll values and eventually out of the county General Fund. During the heights of the economic recession, many filing years were above 2,000 applications per year, including 2009, which had in excess of 3,500 applications in a single year.

This example of two years’ worth of appeals for 2016 and 2017 represents a potential loss to the tax rolls of $2.2 Billion in assessed value. These years had a total filing of 1,053 appeals for those two years combined. In contrast, during heavier appeal application filings, 2011 and 2012 filings amounted to a much higher number at 3,969, which is almost four times what is given in the example. So, losses to the tax roll could amount to approximately $8 Billion if appeals were not defended.

Estimated resource time that is spent on appeals are broken down by classification and percentage of time for an average year:

Clerks (5): 2%
Appraiser Aides (5): 25%
Appraisers (18): 15%
Auditor-Appraisers (6): 15%
Supervisors (7): 15%
Managers (3): 8%
Value Entry Specialists (3): 6%

Cost of Resources: $908,205

Hearing Binder 11-75

FY 2019-20 Budget Workshop Inquiry Form
Impacts resulting from reductions in the Assessor’s Office 2019-20 recommended budget and included on the Department’s Addback list include:

- The Chief of Assessment Standards manages the mass appraisal process and data uploads for decline in value properties, ensures accurate and complete work is produced, as well as manages the Board of Equalization survey. If this position is cut that work would fall to the Chief Appraiser and other management and supervisory staff who would be required to take time from the defense of appeals in order to manage the increased workload.
- The three time limited Appraisers are focusing on appraisals related to fire rebuilding. If these positions are cut, permanent Appraisers would have to reduce time spent on researching and defending appeals to take up the increased workload related to the rebuilding.
- Three time limited support staff, consisting of an Assessment Process Specialist and two Appraiser Aides, are intended to support the Appraisers, and focus on the work related to fire rebuilding. Eliminating funding for these positions would also require permanent staff to reduce work for appeals to deal with the increased workload related to the fire rebuilding effort.
- Additionally, if the Clerk-Recorder-Assessor Specialist II who provides customer service and answers the phone is deleted, it would require the other Clerk-Recorder-Assessor Specialist IIs and support staff to spend time providing customer service work instead of supporting the appeals process and workload.
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**Board Member**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gorin</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inquiry Number: **__30_____  

**Department: **Department of Emergency Management  

**Date:** 04/10/2019  

**Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:**

---

**Request/Question:**

Could we delay any hires in order to have Emergency Management be part of any cuts? What would they be and what would impacts be of this for preparedness?

---

**Response:**

*Staff will enter response here, additional pages will be attached as needed.*

In order to achieve a savings of 5% of General Fund Revenue supporting the department ($122,914) for the FY19/20 budget, the Department can delay hiring for three positions:

1. **Emergency Alert & Warning Coordinator ($12,911/month)** 3 months = $38,733  
   Impacts: delay assessment/implementation of new A&W technologies (incl. sirens, new SoCoAlert system).

2. **Assistant Emergency Services Coordinator ($12,911/month)** 3 months = $38,733  
   Impacts: delay revision of the County’s Emergency Operations plan, delay some community evacuation planning, Director remains on Staff Duty Officer rotation through fire season.

3. **Public Information Specialist ($14,701/month)** 3 months = $44,103  
   Impacts: some delay in rolling out Community Engagement program - especially via social media. PIO not effectively available for fire season response.

The department is not planning to implement the delay and is actively recruiting for one recently vacated position. The current recruitment could be used to fill the new position vacancies immediately following the budget hearings.
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Inquiry Number: __31______

Department: CAO/O&B  
Date: 04/10/2019  
Page(s) of Budget Book/PowerPoint:

**Request/Question:**

> Which departments are planning to undertake some form of community survey during FY 19-20? For those departments that are planning to conduct survey, what is the purpose of the survey and can we consolidate multiple surveys into one countywide survey in order to save time, money and inconvenience for the public?

**Response:**

The Community and Government Affairs Management team surveyed Public Information Officers in departments to assess plans for community surveys in FY 2019-20. The table below indicates the intended surveys by department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF SURVEY</th>
<th>ESTIMATED DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Services</td>
<td>Seeking public sentiment comment about county government center, delivery locations, systems, etc.</td>
<td>Nov-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Public Works</td>
<td>Public Opinion Research; Customer Satisfaction; NPS.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Administrator</td>
<td>CAO will engage polling consultant for Fire Services ballot measure.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Administrator</td>
<td>Annual or biannual community satisfaction survey to determine residents perception of government services.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Administrator</td>
<td>CGAM is planning to discuss with consultant the possibility of a Community Engagement Survey.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Emergency Management</td>
<td>May want to engage residents in a community preparedness survey.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Office of Law Enforcement Review and Outreach</td>
<td>May want to engage residents in a community perception survey.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health Services</td>
<td>DHS does not anticipate conducting any surveys. Although they are planning to engage a consultant to gather public input about a possible ballot measure.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request/Question:
Please identify all capital replacement funds that are held within department budgets. For each fund, identify the purpose and the current fund balance. Please identify all reserves that are held in departmental budgets. For all reserves, identify the purpose, and the current fund balance.

Response: