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Budget Hearings

Monday, June 11, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 AM</td>
<td><strong>Budget Overview</strong> CEO &amp; Budget Director (Chandra Wallar &amp; Tom Alvarez)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 AM</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 AM</td>
<td><strong>Departmental Budgets (15 minutes each)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Policy and Executive (Chandra Wallar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Executive Office Policy and Executive (Chandra Wallar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Counsel Policy and Executive (Dennis Marshall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 AM</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 PM</td>
<td><strong>Departmental Budgets (continued) (15 minutes each)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courts Law and Justice (Gary Blair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Attorney Law and Justice (Joyce Dudley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Defender Law and Justice (Rai Montes de Oca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 PM</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td><strong>Departmental Budgets (continued) (20 minutes each)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Public Safety (Michael Dyer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probation Public Safety (Beverly Taylor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheriff Public Safety (William Brown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 PM</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td><strong>Departmental Budgets (continued) (15 minutes each)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Coop Ext. Community Resources &amp; Public Facilities (Cathleen Fisher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Services Community Resources &amp; Public Facilities (Herman Parker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development Community Resources &amp; Public Facilities (Glenn Russell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Works Community Resources &amp; Public Facilities (Scott McGolpin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wednesday, June 13, 2012

9:00 AM  Public Comment
9:15 AM  Departmental Budgets (continued) (15 minutes each)
  Alcohol, Drug, & Mental Health Services .......... Health and Public Assistance (Ann Detrick)
  Child Support Services ......................... Health and Public Assistance (Carrie Topliffe)
  Public Health ............................................. Health and Public Assistance (Takashi Wada)
  First Five .................................................. Health and Public Assistance (Pat Wheatley)
  Social Services .............................................. Health and Public Assistance (Kathy Gallagher)
10:30 AM  Public Comment
10:45 AM  Break
11:00 AM  Departmental Budgets (continued) (15 minutes each)
  Auditor-Controller .............................................................. Support Services (Bob Geis)
  Clerk-Recorder-Assessor ................................................ Support Services (Joe Holland)
  Treasurer-Tax Collector-Public Admin ......................... Support Services (Harry Hagen)
  General Services ............................................................ Support Services (Bob Nisbet)
12:00 PM  Public Comment
12:15 PM  Lunch
1:15 PM  General County Programs
  General County Programs/RDA Successor Agency (15 minutes) ...............(Tom Alvarez)
  Outside Organizations and Non-County Agencies Requests (3 minutes each)
2:30 PM  General Revenues ............................................................. Section C - Summary Information
2:45 PM  Public Comment
3:00 PM  Break
3:15 PM  Proposed Budget Hearing Summary .......... County Executive Officer (Chandra Wallar)
3:30 PM  Preliminary Board Deliberations

Friday, June 15, 2012

9:00 AM  Public Comment
9:15 AM  Board Deliberations and Decision Making
  Consider the approval of the 2012-13 Proposed Budget including Final Budget Adjustments,
  renewal of ongoing grants, renewal of ongoing contracts, and direction regarding the Adoption of
  Final Budget by Reference.

Adjournment
### 2012-13 Board Inquiry Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry No.</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>BOS</th>
<th>Assigned to:</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Approved Date</th>
<th>Distributed</th>
<th>Web</th>
<th>Bio Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>06/05/12</td>
<td>Amount of carryover &amp; previously unanticipated revenue.</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Alvarez</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>Goldenrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>06/05/12</td>
<td>Actual FTEs on 3SL 360</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Christiansson</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>06/05/12</td>
<td>Labor Concessions for FY 2013/14</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Alvarez</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>06/05/12</td>
<td>Why are we accepting contractor increases?</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Alvarez</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>06/05/12</td>
<td>SOAR Training to assist high risk adults -- how much did we spend and what is the outcome?</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>06/05/12</td>
<td>Percentage of undocumented children receiving health insurance provided by SB County taxpayers?</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Christiansson</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/07/12</td>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>06/05/12</td>
<td>Items #2, #3-Reducing homeless contracts by 32% -- Can you or can't you transfer MHSA - if so what programs may be cut?</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>06/05/12</td>
<td>Human Services Commission-if it's only one FTE, how can we claim it costs us $200K to administer the contracts? Isn't this a collateral assignment for one of our employees?</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>06/05/12</td>
<td>Veteran's Services-Full restoration costs if we keep 3 offices open. Can one employee cover 2 locations?</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>06/06/12</td>
<td>List of restorations</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>06/06/12</td>
<td>Shift of Cost allocation revenue</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Jayasinghe</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>06/06/12</td>
<td>Retirement Fund Refund</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Jayasinghe</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>06/06/12</td>
<td>PowerPoint’s Baseline FTEs</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Jayasinghe</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>06/06/12</td>
<td>Guadalupe Dunes Staffing</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>06/07/12</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>06/08/09</td>
<td>CEO Clerk of the Board</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>06/08/09</td>
<td>Ag Commissioner Fees</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>CEO Clerk of the Board Staffing</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>CSD-Parks-HCD positions</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>06/08/12</td>
<td>Electronic Health Record revenues</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>06/09/12</td>
<td>TTC -Volunteers for Veteran's Services</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/10/12</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>06/10/12</td>
<td>AB 109 Realignment Funding</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>06/10/12</td>
<td>AB 109 Contracting of services</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>06/10/12</td>
<td>Long Range Planning reductions</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/10/12</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>06/10/12</td>
<td>Oil Production</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>06/10/12</td>
<td>Use of Space and leased space costs</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/10/12</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>CSD Library</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>$28.1 Designated for Future use</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>Cost of landscaping contracts</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>Revenue from increasing TOT</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>GF in Scanner Program</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>Property Tax to Fire from RDA dissolution</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>Goldenrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>06/11/12</td>
<td>SEIU 620 Letter Response</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/12/12</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>Assessor Staffing</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Jayasinghe</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>Goldenrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>06/13/12</td>
<td>Warming Centers</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>Goldenrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>Warming Shelters</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Myung</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>Goldenrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>General County Revenue update</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Alvarez</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>06/15/12</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>Robert Brown Engineers</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Jayasinghe</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/14/12</td>
<td>6/15/2012</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>6/14/2012</td>
<td>Cost per FTE with retirement and health ins. Contrib.</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Morgantini</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>06/15/12</td>
<td>06/15/12</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total No. of Board Inquiry Forms Received | 40 |
| Total No. In Progress | 0  |
| Total No. Pending Approval | 0  |
| Total No. Items Withdrawn | 0  |
| Total No. of Board Inquiry Forms Completed | 40 |
Board Inquiry Form

Board Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbajal</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Date: 6/5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr</td>
<td>Page(s) of Budget Book:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavagnino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inquiry Number: 01

Request/Question:
Amount of carryover and any other previously unanticipated revenue

Response Prepared by: Tom Alvarez, Richard Morgantini, John Jayasinghe

Response:
The General Fund had a projected net positive variance at March 31, 2012. To assess potential carry over amounts we are showing below those departments with projected year end favorable variances of more than $100,000. Due to the "rough nature" of this evaluation we utilized a $100,000 threshold to allow for subsequent changes. The balances below were based on the 3rd Quarter projection. We then added a column showing planned usage of one-time funds in FY2012-13 to determine any potential excess funds. Departments shown as negative are drawing on prior years fund balances or have final budget adjustments in progress to transfer anticipated savings into fund balance for FY 12-13 use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Estimated 6/30/12 over $100K</th>
<th>Projected Use in FY 12-13</th>
<th>Estimated balance at 6/30/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>011 -- Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 -- County Executive Office</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013 -- County Counsel</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021 -- District Attorney</td>
<td>565,431</td>
<td>411,534</td>
<td>153,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022 -- Probation</td>
<td>316,823</td>
<td>922,365</td>
<td>(605,542)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023 -- Public Defender</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031 -- Fire</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032 -- Sheriff</td>
<td>509,205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041 -- Public Health</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051 -- Agricultural Commissioner/W&amp;M</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052 -- Parks</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053 -- Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>107,203</td>
<td>93,450</td>
<td>13,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054 -- Public Works</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055 -- Housing/Community Development</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057 -- Community Services</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>061 -- Auditor-Controller</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062 -- Clerk-Recorder-Assessor</td>
<td>&lt; $100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063 -- General Services</td>
<td>295,647</td>
<td>253,900</td>
<td>41,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064 -- Human Resources</td>
<td>270,553</td>
<td></td>
<td>270,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065 -- Treasurer-Tax Collector-</td>
<td>241,909</td>
<td>322,769</td>
<td>(80,860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page Two
Prob. will designate $3M to cover the shortfall:
Prob. FBA #1

See Page Two
See Page Two
See Page Two

01 Board Inquiry Form - Amount of carry over & revenue 6-14-12.doc
Request/Question:
Amount of carryover and any other previously unanticipated revenue

Response:
Some of the departments from the prior page may be impacted by potential restorations and we therefore wanted to perform a more thorough and current review to identify any available funds that may exist within these Departments. We also included any relevant prior year carry-forward balances. We believe the results below to be more current/accurate than those from the Q3 review (page 1) based on Final Budget Adjustments and Budget Revision Requests in progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proj. Year End Balance 6/30/12</th>
<th>Proj. Use of One Time Funds FY 2012/13</th>
<th>Proj. Balance at 6/30/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>1,093,915</td>
<td>(411,534)</td>
<td>682,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>364,394</td>
<td>(322,769)</td>
<td>41,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>665,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>1,879,724</td>
<td>(1,284,698)</td>
<td>595,026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Board Inquiry Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Name</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Filled</th>
<th>Job Class If Filled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive Office</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMHS</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Coop Ext</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0 Supervising Mapping/GIS Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 Planner I/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 Building Permit Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0 Maintenance Plumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 Mechanic/Welder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 Water &amp; Sewage Plant Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 Park Ranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk-Recorder-Assessor</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer-Tax Collector*</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0 Financial Office Professional I/II/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A Full-time Administrative Office Professional will retire in September, at which time the position will remain vacant for the remainder of the fiscal year.
Request/Question:
How much are we setting aside from labor concessions in 2013-14

Response Prepared by: Tom Alvarez

Response:
As per D-193 General Fund Key Discretionary Fund Balance components Detail. Salary and Benefits reduction designation 6/30/2013 project balance is $6,155,374.
### Request/Question:

Why are we accepting any increases from our contractors?
- Social Services Martha Yepez 7.7% increase
- UCSB - Public works 10% increase
- PHD Matrix Medical 20% bump ($41K)?

### Response:

**DSS:** Regarding the Contractor on Payroll Martha Yepez, the increase recognizes that she is tasked with working late hours and weekends to stage and coordinate events. She is the only full-time staff person for the Family Resource Center in Cuyama and provides emergency transportation, makes emergency food deliveries, etc. Many of the families served live on remote ranches outside of the town of Cuyama. The county share of her contract increase is $738 annually, as 86.4% of her compensation is paid through various grants.

**PW:** At the time of budget preparation UCSB had not finalized their budget to run the Community Hazardous Waste Collection Center Program. As such, PW staff submitted a request for the full amount allowed under the ongoing contract mechanism (10% increase for a total of $618,240). UCSB has finalized their budget and the actual amount the County will pay for their services for FY 12-13 will be $608,164 (an increase of 8.2%).

**PHD:** The FY11-12 amount for Matrix Medical is $205,000 and the FY 12-13 amount is projected to be $246,000. The agreement went into effect in September of 2011; therefore, the FY 2011-12 amount of $205,000 reflects only a 10 month agreement, while the FY 2012-13 amount of $246,000 reflects a 12 month agreement.
Board Inquiry Form

Request/Question:
The SOAR training to assist high risk adults in applying for SSI - How much did we spend & what has been the outcome? I've been told we spent $800K for very few returns.

Response Prepared by: Ann Detrick, ADMHS

MHSA INNOVATION PROGRAM: There are two major components of the Innovation program:

SOAR Training: ADMHS has adopted a national, evidenced based approach to applying for benefits, called SOAR (SSI/SSDI Outreach, Access & Recovery).
• 99 individuals have been trained this fiscal year: 46 were ADMHS attendees and 53 were attendees from other organizations (e.g., Sheriff’s Department; Department of Social Services; Public Health; Social Security Administration; CBOs, including homeless services providers; Representatives of Bringing Our Community Home and Common Ground; and Santa Barbara City Housing Authority Regarding services).

Services:
• Within ADMHS Crisis and Recovery Emergency Services (CARES) North and South sites, Innovation provides treatment, case management, medication management, peer support and assistance along with the benefit application process. There is also a half-time jail homeless discharge planner funded through the Innovation program.
• 120 clients have received treatment, case management, medication management and peer recovery support in the past year through CARES.
• A total of $979,555 in costs is projected for the Innovation program this year, of which $780,064 is for staff costs. The majority of the funds cover essential treatment services to uninsured persons while the staff helps them obtain disability/health benefits.
This is helping to reduce significant indigent care costs in ADMHS Core Mental Health Fund 44.
• 69 applications have been prepared and submitted to Social Security Administration (SSI). Of these:
  ° 32 applications were approved.
  ° 27 applications were denied.
  ° 10 applications have been submitted and are pending approval/denial.
• Upon obtaining benefits, ADMHS received Medi-Cal revenue for the services provided to these individuals, and the individuals receive monthly Social Security Income (SSI) payments which support housing and other key living costs.

Cost benefits/offsets: For all clients served in the program, the per capita service cost this year has been $8,163. The total Medi-Cal revenue generated for the 32 clients to date has been $336,386, with an average per client revenue of $10,512: ($336,386 divided by 32 clients). Of this $10,512 per client, ADMHS must pay approximately one-half or $5256 in matching dollars. Therefore, the net per capita cost to ADMHS for each client is $2,907 ($8,163 per service per client less $5,256 in Federal revenue). Net cost savings for ADMHS for the 32 clients is $168,192 for all clients. The Federal revenue is expected to grow in the coming years as individuals to continue to receive Medi-Cal services from the Department.

The per capita SSI benefit is $10,248 per year. Together, the net Medi-Cal revenue savings and SSI benefit per client is approximately $15,504 per year ($5,256 plus $10,248). The total net service and SSI benefit for 32 clients is $496,128. This total revenue benefits the County as well as individuals, by providing a cost offset to mental health care and potential housing for persons. Further, the revenue reduces the risks/costs to individuals/community of homelessness. There will also be a reduction in the cost to the County of indigent physical health care.
Board Inquiry Form

Inquiry Number: 06

Board Member
Carbajal
Wolf
Farr
Gray
Lavagnino X

Department: General County Programs
Date: 6/8/2012

Page(s) of Budget Book:

Request/ Question:
What is the percentage of undocumented children receiving health insurance provided by SB county taxpayers?

Response Prepared by: Tara Dooley, Program Manager, Children's Health Initiative of Santa Barbara

Response:
1) All of the children enrolled in Healthy Kids do not qualify for Medi-Cal or Healthy Families.
2) Of the 943 children enrolled in Healthy Kids, 886 or 94% are undocumented citizens.
3) Of the 943 enrolled children,
   a) 764 or 81% of the children come from families with incomes at or below 150% Federal Poverty Level (FPL) which means that their families make up to $34,574 for a family of four;
   b) 98 or 10% of the children come from families with incomes at or below 200% FPL (between $34,575 and $46,100 for a family of four); and
   c) 81 or 9% of the children come from families with incomes at or below 300% of FPL (between $69,150 and $69,150 for a family of four).

Additionally, 391 or 39% of the children enrolled in Healthy Kids Santa Barbara reside in Santa Maria zip codes. Most of the children enrolled in Healthy Kids are from families that work in the agricultural or service industries.
Response:

ADMHS has consulted with County Counsel about the $125K Core Mental Health Fund 44 homeless services shortfall and whether Mental Health Service Act (MHSA) Fund 48, particularly Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) Resources will cover the shortfall. County Counsel has advised that there is no supplantation issue involved with moving these Fund 44 homeless services to MHSA. In the meantime, County Counsel and our ADMHS contracts and program staff have been independently reviewing several of the current homeless contracts and reviewing how their services fall within the MHSA guidelines, particularly PEI. From County Counsel's review, ADMHS is advised that the if homeless shelter case management programs were to be moved to the MHSA fund, the current contracts would need to be scrutinized and modified, as appropriate, to assure they fall within MHSA guidelines.

Accordingly, ADMHS will carry our further work with County Counsel to review the contracts and determine any needed modifications before rendering a decision about the appropriateness of the move of homeless services to MHSA. After any needed modifications, should ADMHS and County Counsel then be agreement that one or more homeless contracts could be moved to MHSA, ADMHS’ next step would be to bring the proposal to move homeless funding from Fund 44 to 48 to the Mental Health Commission when they consider the ADMHS FY12-13 MHSA Annual Plan Update, which will be in the late summer or early fall, 2012.
Human Service Commission - If its only one FTE, how can we claim it costs us $200K to administer the contracts? Isn't this a collateral assignment for one of our employees?

Response Prepared by: Herman Parker, CSD Director

Response:

In FY 11-12, the Human Services Commission budget totaled $1,200,000. The Service Level Impact form projected staff and administrative costs at $200,000 and the distribution to outside organizations and grants to be $1,000,000. In reviewing the actual projected cost for FY 2011-12, the staffing costs are currently projected to be $121,279. The budget also includes $5,221 of services & supplies and motor pool charges of $1,500, bringing the total cost of administration to $128,000. Thus, the Service Level Impact sheet allocation of staff and administrative costs was overstated based on the most recent projection and should be $128,000, not $200,000.

In FY 11-12, the department is projecting to distribute $1,072,000 in grants to a variety of organizations though the Human Services Commission.

One final point of clarification, the $121,000 of staff time is not one staff but an allocation of several staff and management personnel that support the administration of the approximately 50 individual programs supported with these funds.
Board Inquiry Form

Inquiry Number: 09

Board Member
Carbajal
Wolf
Farr
Gray
Lavagnino X

Department: TTC
Date: 06-05-12

Page(s) of Budget Book: Service Level Impacts

Request/Question:
Veterans Services: If we want to keep all 3 offices open, what is the full restoration costs - can one employee cover 2 locations?

Response Prepared by: Harry Hagen, TTC

Response:
The Santa Barbara Office would cost $73K for eight months of operations, because department has one-time fund balance to fund four months of operations in FY 2012-13. The Lompoc Office would cost $106K annually. The full cost to restore both offices totals $179k to have 3 Veteran's Services Offices and no administrative staff in FY 2012-13. Further detail will be provided in the TTC budget presentation.

For the current fiscal year the Treasurer Tax Collector's (TTC) office has had two employees covering three offices but can't handle the volume of work. The TTC doesn't believe that it's feasible with the demand that exists for one employee to cover two offices.
Request/ Question:

Please provide a list or chart of all budget restoration or new allocation requests.

Response Prepared by: Richard Morgantini

Response:

Budget Restoration and new allocation requests are on Attachment A in the Budget Hearing Binders and will be updated as needed for final review and action by the Board during the final day of the Budget Hearings.
Request/Question:
D-154 and D-158 reference and discuss the impact of the shifting of the "cost allocation revenue" to "General Fund General Revenue"—what is the reasoning and impact of described change.

Response Prepared by: John Jayasinghe, MPA, CEO Fiscal & Policy Analyst, 805-568-2246

Response:
On 2/21/2012 the Board transferred Cost Allocation Plan (CAP) revenue in the amount of $9.1 million from the General Fund central service departments to General Revenues of the General Fund. The central service departments (CEO, County Counsel, Parks, Auditor-Controller, General Services, Human Resources, Treasurer-Tax Collector) receive Cost Allocation Plan (CAP) Revenue for services provided to county departments in Special Revenue Funds. This revenue can fluctuate significantly dependent on whether the requesting department is a general fund department or special revenue fund. Further, there is a two year lag in the allocation of these revenues and thus hard to relate to current services and needs. This revision will budget the CAP revenue in the General Fund - General Revenues, in order to mitigate these fluctuations in these departments.

The total cost plan revenue transfers are reflected within the FY 2012-13 Recommended and FY 2013-14 Proposed Budgets and are displayed on page C-5. This revenue account fluctuates significantly within an individual central service department budget from year to year. This change will smooth out the fluctuation in these departmental revenues by replacing it with a fixed General Fund Contribution displayed by department on page C-4.

FY 2012-13 Recommended and FY 2013-14 Proposed Budget Glossary
Page G-4
COST ALLOCATION - A methodology for identifying and allocating overhead (indirect) costs incurred by central services departments to direct program costs. This process provides a method for distributing the costs of shared services, such as administration, human resources, IT, and utilities, to revenue generating programs. The Cost Allocation Plan (CAP) is used to determine the allocation methodology. The CAP is developed annually and reviewed biennially by the Board.
# Board Inquiry Form

**Inquiry Number:** 12  
**Department:** AC  
**Date:** 6/6/12  
**Page(s) of Budget Book:** D-155 under Payroll heading, second bullet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbajal</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavagnino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Request/Question:

Please explain "retirement fund refunds"

## Response Prepared by:
Theo Fallati, CPA CPFO, Assistant Auditor-Controller

## Response:

These refunds are typically returning miscalculated contributions that members have made to the retirement system. They mainly occur because of a date discrepancy in either the retirement system's records or the County records. Date discrepancies are mostly related to hire dates and reciprocity dates with other systems. The amounts are generally small amounts and relatively infrequent in nature.
**Request/ Question:** In reviewing the PowerPoint's in the Budget binder, it would be helpful if the “baseline” used to reference # and % of FTE decrease was consistent across Departments. Different years are used for different departments. In the case of Sheriff’s Department, the amounts are “xxx” so are incomplete.

**Response:**

In many cases, the "baseline" year may vary by department as several departments delayed staff reductions based on available fund balance or one-time funds, while others had to cut immediately. Thus, the department will attempt to describe the change from the peak period, whichever year that may be.

The department has corrected the slide to eliminate the "xxx" as shown below.

(Since FY2007-08, Sheriff’s Office reduced by 74.5 FTE, or over 10% of the allocated positions. Sworn staff reduced by 15%)
Board Inquiry Form

Request/Question:
What would be the total costs associated with adding staffing levels to enable the coastal county park of Rancho Guadalupe Dunes to be open on a full time basis?

Response Prepared by: Herman Parker, CSD Director & Andrew Myung, CEO Analyst

Response:
The total cost of restoring this service level would be $23,000. The department would fund the additional days of operations with the use of extra-help park rangers (approximately 1,440 hours of staff time).
Request/Question:
Page D-128 states that providing library services county-wide is $3.1M, however, the cost of providing library services administration is $2.7M. What is included in the $3.1M figure?

Response Prepared by: Herman Parker

Response:
The cost for providing library services county-wide is $2.7M. The $3.1M reference includes additional $400,000 for tenant improvements at the Orcutt Library. The $3.1M figure includes: $2.55M for county libraries, $170,000 for Goleta Library services, and $400,000 for tenant improvements at the Orcutt Library.
Request/Question:

Page VI and Page D-4 do not reflect the Clerk of the Board department. This should be included as a direct link to BOS.

Response: The CEO also serves as the Clerk of the Board and is shown as a direct link to the Board. Previous overall proposed operational plans organizational charts (vi) did not identify the Clerk of the Board. Org chart on page D-23 could include COB in future plans.
Board Inquiry Form

Inquiry Number 17

Department: Ag Commissioner  Date: 6/8/12

Request/Question:
What is impact of Board’s recent actions re: scanner and inspection fees? (Not mentioned in accomplishments or 12-13 changes.)

Reported By: Cathy Fisher, Richard Morgantini

Response: The Board adopted the fees on 4/10/12 after the proposed budget was prepared. First bills were mailed in May and are due in 60 days. Approximately 1650 invoices were mailed out versus prior year’s total of 620.

No new staff has been hired to fill the positions. Once the majority of the fees are collected estimated to be $400,000 in FY 2012-13 (fees due by July 21st) the department will submit to the Board early in the fiscal year a Budget Revision Request to adjust the budget as per the Board’s adoption of the new plan on April 10, 2012.

The proposed expenditures will align with the revenue so that the anticipated budget gap for FY 13/14 is not increased.

Details of the changes to the County Weights and Measures ordinance can be found with the Agenda packet, item A-11, for the April 10, 2012 meeting.
Board Inquiry Form

Inquiry Number: 18

Department: CEO              Date: 6/8/12

Request/Question:

FTE table reflects loss of 1 more FTE to Clerk of the Board.

What services will be impacted? (Pg D-27 does not discuss impacts while SLI does; shouldn’t the impact also be noted in the budget?)

Reported By: CEO

Response: Position currently vacant approximately 6 months, remaining staff has assumed duties therefore no additional impacts.
Request/Question:

Please provide detailed “org chart” showing positions that were eliminated, and positions added? Include overall cost savings with consolidation.

Response Prepared by: Tom Alvarez, Dennis Bozanich, et al

Response: Organization charts from 2011 Board Hearing are attached for reference. The second column of the table below provides a reference point back to the 2011 Organization charts provided to the Board.

The chart below indicates that almost all suggested position eliminations occurred as planned - one Office Professional was retained. The savings subtotal is $485K. The Board restored funding for Grant Manager at 2011 Budget Hearings with one time General Fund. Additionally, actual salaries for established positions were $70K higher than the plan. Net savings were $262K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Reference to Org Chart</th>
<th>Action to be Taken</th>
<th>Action Taken Y N</th>
<th>Original Estimate</th>
<th>Change from Orig. Plan</th>
<th>Net Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eliminate Parks Director</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$(207,000)</td>
<td>$(207,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eliminate HCD Director</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$(240,000)</td>
<td>$(240,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Establish Community Services Director position</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Establish Deputy Director HCD position</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eliminate Parks Business Manager</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$(140,000)</td>
<td>$(140,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eliminate HCD Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$(140,000)</td>
<td>$(140,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Establish Community Services Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eliminate a Administrative Office Professional (one position) and consolidate Admin functions</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(90,000)</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Establish Cost Analyst/Accountant position (Parks)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Eliminate Housing specialist Funded</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$(112,000)</td>
<td>$(112,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eliminate Parks Deputy Director</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$(142,000)</td>
<td>$(142,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eliminate Grants Program Manager from Public Health Department</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$(144,000)</td>
<td>$(144,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(575,000)</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$(485,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Establish Grants Program Manager in CSD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(261,590)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Original calculation showed savings of $144,000 from the elimination of a Grant Program Manager; however, funding of this position was restored in FY 2011-12 for administration of the Human Services Commission programs.
1. Consolidation of Parks & HCD Director for CSD Director
2. Consolidate Parks Business Manager & HCD CFO to CSD CFO
3. Consolidation of administrative staff from HCD & Parks & eliminate one AOP
4. Add Cost Analyst
5. Add/Delete funded vacant Housing Specialist for Assistant Department Leader/HCD Deputy Director

FY 2011-12 = 74 FTEs
Current FY 10/11
Parks Department
Structure

Parks Director

1

Administrative Professional

Deputy Director

North County Operations Mgr.

Field Personnel

44 FTES

Middle County Operations Mgr.

Field Personnel

South County Operations Mgr.

Field Personnel

AOP III

AOP III - R

2

Civil Engineer III

Business Specialist

CIP Project Manager

Arts Commission

Planner III

Visual Arts Coordinator

Extra help not shown

61 FTEs

Visual Arts Coordinator

Planner III

Civil Engineer III

Business Specialist

CIP Project Manager

Arts Commission

Extra help not shown

61 FTEs
Request/Question:
“Fewer patients are being seen since transition to the EHR system….this is a loss of $4.1 million.” Is this a onetime occurrence?
How can we increase utilization of County clinics?

Response:
The chart on page C 25 of the Budget Book is a composite of many patient service funding streams. It includes Federally Qualified Health Center Medi-Cal for the Public Health Department, as well as, Drug Medi-Cal and other types of fee for service revenues received by both the Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Department and the Public Health Department. The combined revenue reduction from all combined revenue streams represented on the chart is $4.1 Million. It is indicated that one of the primary drivers of the revenue decrease of $4.1 Million from the FY 11-12 adopted budget to the FY12-13 recommended budget is the productivity loss by staff during and after the implementation of the Public Health Department’s electronic medical record. That amount accounts for $1.6 Million of the $4.1 Million or approximately 40%. The rest of the decrease (or approximately $2.5 Million/approximately 60%) is due to lowering ADMHS MediCal revenues for In-Patient and Out-Patient services to bring them in line with projected service levels.

The Public Health Department is working very closely with staff to assist them in adapting to the new technology and productivity levels are continuing to increase, particularly in our most recent clinic implementations. With each clinic that has converted to the electronic system, the department has “lessons learned” and best practices that are used to continue to ease the transition for the staff and minimize any interruption of clinic workflow.

The department is also analyzing its clinic and patient utilization on a system-wide basis and is looking at ways to reach more patients by changing its service mix (i.e. provide more pediatrics) and possibly expanding hours (to provide more access after working hours).

Dr. Wada will speak more to this last point during his budget presentation while on the FY 2013-14 Preparing for the Future slides.
# Board Inquiry Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbajal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavagnino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inquiry Number:** 21  
**Department:** TTC  
**Date:** 06/09/12

**Request/Question:** Can volunteers be certified and be able to assist Veterans to access services under the direction of a County Veteran’s Services Professional

**Response Prepared by:** Harry Hagen

**Response:**

No, for an individual to be accredited under a county vet service officer you have to be an employee working a minimum of 1000 hours. This is in the federal regulations. However, volunteers can perform those functions as part of a veteran’s organization such as the American Legion or Veteran’s of Foreign Wars.

To be accredited a person needs to be sponsored. In the federal regulations, veterans’ service organizations can file claims. The American Legion could qualify a volunteer who wanted to help veterans. The service organization would then be responsible when audited. Many of County clients start out this way.
Board Inquiry Form

Request/Question:
Regarding AB109 realignment funds does the state have specific guidelines as to how the money must be spent. Is there a specific staffing requirement?

Response Prepared by: Beverly Taylor

Response:
Guidelines are established in 1230.1(D) PC – Consistent with local needs and resources, the plan may include recommendations to maximize the effective investment of criminal justice resources in evidence-based correctional sanctions and programs, including but not limited to day reporting centers, drug courts, residential multiservice centers, MH treatment programs, electronic and GPS monitoring programs, victim restitution programs, counseling programs, community service programs, educational programs and work training programs. 1230.1 PC also establishes the role of the Executive Committee of the Community Corrections Partnership to approve the county’s plan for realignment and present the plan to the Board of Supervisors. It further states the plan shall be deemed accepted by the county Board of Supervisors unless the board rejects the plan by a vote of four-fifths of the board, in which case the plan goes back to the CCP for further consideration.

SB County’s realignment plan for FY 12-13 was accepted by the board on May 22, 2012. There is not a specific staffing requirement, however, SB county's plan incorporates generally accepted minimum staffing ratios.
Request/Question:
Could some of the AB109 service/tasks be done by contracting or by general labor groups (non public safety) in order to create a savings due to lower cost of retirement benefits?

Response Prepared by: Beverly Taylor

Response:
Yes. The Probation is already contracting with a number of Community Based Organizations for substance abuse, dual diagnosis, and cognitive behavior treatments. FY 2011-12 year’s contracts total $565,000; with up to $1.7 million anticipated in FY 12-13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th></th>
<th>Department: Planning &amp; Dev.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Date: 6/10/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbajal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavagnino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Request/ Question:**
Is the proposed reduction in Long Range Planning just for RDA related staff positions or is it an overall reduction in Long Range Planning Staff?

**Response Prepared by:** Glenn Russell

**Response:**
The proposed reduction of two positions in Long Range Planning is an overall reduction in Long Range Planning staff. The reduction of three staff positions due to the dissolution of the RDA is separate from the proposed reductions in Long Range Planning.
Request/Question:
What can the County do to increase the amount of production and development?

Response Prepared by: Glenn Russell

Response:
The County cannot directly cause an increase in the amount of oil production and development. The demand for oil development and production permits is driven by the cost of oil. Currently, the County is experiencing an increase in the number of oil production permit applications likely due to the increase in the market cost of oil.

Delays in the permitting of oil production projects can occur due to requirements of the Endangered Species Act, the CEQA process, and appeals.
Board Inquiry Form

Request/Question:
Do we have a current "use of space" study so that we are assured that all of the space owned by the county is fully used and that the County is not leasing unnecessary space?

Response Prepared by: General Services

Response:
The County’s formal Space Utilization Report is a 5-year document. The current version is 2006 through 2011 and is out of date. The 2012 through 2017 update will be completed by the end of the calendar year. An objective of this updated document will be to account for vacant space and propose solutions to consolidate departments, eliminate unused space, and move departments out of leased space into County-owned space where feasible.

Please reference the first bullet point under the heading “Capital Projects” on Page D-173 of the budget which states:

Complete the revised Space Policy and Update the 2006-2011 Space Utilization Study with the goal of completing the 2012-2017 versions by the end of 2012. The revised document will include a new section on County leases and a goal to reduce leased space by 10% and County-owned building by 5%.
Board Inquiry Form

Inquiry number: 27

Department: CSD (Library/Administration) Date: 6/11/12

Request/Question:
Please clarify and/or reconcile Library allocations amount:
1. Pg D-128 notes “3.1 million for 17 libraries”;
2. Pg D-130 lists: 2.7 million for “Library administration”
3. Table provided to me by CFO Bierman indicates $2.5 general fund for county library system last year and recommended for this year. Why is there a discrepancy b/w this amount and $2.7 million on page D 130?
4. Pg D 130 also reflects 4 FTE for Administration which really seems to reflect Administration in the new CSD and not specific to libraries. Why is this allocation part of the library program?

Response:

Items 1-3:
The proposed allocation for library services county-wide is $2.7M. The $3.1M reference includes $400,000 for tenant improvements at the Orcutt Library. The $3.1M figure includes: $2.55M for county libraries (GFC), $170,000 for Goleta Library services (CSA 3), and $400,000 for tenant improvements at the Orcutt Library from various sources, primarily development fees.

Item 4:
The 4.0 FTE reflected under Libraries & Administration on Pg D 130 is related to administration of the entire Community Services Department, not to Libraries. This includes a CSD Director, a CSD Chief Financial Officer, a CSD Cost Analyst and a CSD Administrative Office Professional. All funds go directly towards library services as a “pass-through” and libraries are not charged for CSD administration.
**Response:**

**What projects were completed last year for General Services (FY 2011-12)?**

1. Replacement of the HVAC at SM Social Services: $660,000
2. Design / Bid Courthouse Air Handler Retrofit: $113,000
   (Money designated for FY 12/13 for construction phase): $243,000
3. Repair / Partial roof replace at SM Sheriff Sub-Station: $77,000
4. New Emergency Generator for FS # 11: $17,000
5. New flooring for DVS Shelter: $3,900

**What projects are anticipated to be completed this year in General Services (FY 2012-13)?**

Current planned projects for FY 12/13 are:

1. SB Social Services Bld. HVAC Replacement: $700,000***
2. Dump Road Paving Repair: $65,000
3. ADMHS SB Shower Replacement: $50,000
4. Calle Real Campus Parking lot Patch: $70,000
5. SB Court House Phase 3 Engineering: $95,000
6. Betteravia Bld. Probation HVAC & Controls: $200,000
7. Betteravia Bld. # C Deck Repair: $20,000

***This project may not be completed in FY 2012-13, but may carry over into FY 2013-14.

There is a prioritized list of all General Services deferred maintenance projects that comprise the $30 million backlog of projects.

Deferred maintenance dollars are periodically carried over from one fiscal year to the next in both the Community Services Department and the General Service Department because design and construction of large or multi-phased projects sometimes take longer than a single year.

There is a general carryover in the Deferred Maintenance Designation to provide funding for future deferred maintenance projects in both the General Services Department and the Community Services Department.
Request/Question: [see pg D-193]

1. What projects were completed last year?
2. What projects are anticipated to be completed this year in Parks and GS?
   Is there a list that prioritizes the deferred maintenance for county infrastructure/buildings/parks.
3. Why was there a carryover of funds in this account?

Reported By: Community Services Department (Page 2 of response)

Response:
Completed Projects for Community Services Department (FY 2011-12):
There were no projects completed last year utilizing deferred maintenance funds due to Auditor-Controller freezing access to Parks’ deferred maintenance account.

Anticipated Completion in Parks (FY 2012-13):
   1. Goleta Beach Lift Station

Deferred maintenance list is in place with updates and prioritization in process.

Deferred maintenance dollars are periodically carried over from one fiscal year to the next in both the Community Services Department and the General Service Department because design and construction of large or multi-phased projects sometimes take longer than a single year.

There is a general carryover in the Deferred Maintenance Designation to provide funding for future deferred maintenance projects in both the General Services Department and the Community Services Department.
**Board Inquiry Form**

**Board Member**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carbajal</th>
<th>Department: CEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Date: 6/11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavagnino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Request/Question:**

What is included in $28M of future use shown on the budget at a glance slide?

**Response Prepared by:** Andrew Myung, CEO Fiscal & Policy Analyst

**Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase to Nonspendables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase to Restricted Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase to Committed Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase to Retained Earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases to Residual Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28,008,314.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase to Nonspendables:** This fund balance classification includes amounts that cannot be spent because they are either not in spendable form or legally or contractually required to be maintained intact.

**Increase to Restricted Fund Balance:** This represents a temporary "set-aside" of funds, subject to externally enforceable legal restrictions. Sometimes, these funds have both an increase and a corresponding decrease in the same fiscal year. If a project crosses fiscal years, funds are then "rolled over" into the following fiscal year to be drawn as necessary. Approximately $7.7M is for capital projects; approximately $3.7M is restricted for Health & Public Assistance Programs and $1.9M in various other programs throughout the County.

**Increase to Committed Fund Balance:** This represents a temporary "set-aside" of funds, at the Board’s discretion. Sometimes, these funds have both an increase and a corresponding decrease in the same fiscal year. The majority of these increases were to meet Board budget principles to fund facilities maintenance ($2.8M), roads ($0.5M), new jail operations ($2.0M), contingency ($0.5M) and capital outlay ($0.5M) and Health Care Programs ($3.5) and various other ($0.6M). Nearly all of these funds have planned uses in FY 12-13.

**Increase to Retained Earnings:** This represents operations in enterprise and internal service fund activity, specifically the result of operations for County Unemployment Insurance to meet liability reserve requirements ($0.2M).

**Increases to Residual Fund Balance:** Residual classification for fund balance includes all amounts not contained in the other classifications. This entry represents budgeted payment against booked liability in the Mental Health Fund ($4.1M). There is a final budget adjustment in place to reduce this amount to $3.2M per Board actions on 5/15/12.
Request/ Question:
Can the landscape maintenance contract be re-negotiated with the contractors, or bid to reduce the cost of the landscape maintenance contract?

Response Prepared by: Community Services Department

Response:
The Community Services Department works with two separate contractors to provide landscape maintenance services at County facilities. The contract with All Weather Landscaping is for approximately $60,000. The contract with Cicilio Landscaping is $90,000. These current contracts provide for mowing of turf weekly and trimming of shrubs monthly. Community Services Department staff had discussions with the existing landscape contractors to inform them of the potential funding impacts. The proposed service level impacts will reduce funding to both of these contractors by 50%. In staff discussions, both landscape contractors agreed to continue to provide services to our County facilities. However, mowing of turf would occur every other week and trimming of shrubs would occur every other month, which represents a 50% reduction from the current level of service. The current contractors are willing to continue service at this level. Staff is preparing to re-bid these contracts to ensure the County is receiving the best possible service.
Board Inquiry Form

Inquiry Number: 31

Board Member
Carbajal
Wolf X
Farr
Gray
Lavagnino

Department: CEO
Date: 6/11/12

Page(s) of Budget Book:

Request/Question:
What would the revenue increase be if we increased the Transient Occupancy Tax?

Response Prepared by: Tom Alvarez

Response:
The analysis below was prepared in November 2011 and can be updated; however, we wanted to respond as quickly as possible.

The impact in FY 2012-13 from changing the TOT rate from 10% to 12% was estimated to be between $1.2 million to $1.4 million, after netting out impact of Goleta Neutrality.

Using the actual data from FY 2010-11 and backing out the Goleta portion (expires 6/30/12) the increase attributable to increasing TOT from 10% to 12% would be $1,127,037. The FY 2011-12 Q1 TOT increases from the prior year were 22.8% July, 14.5% August and 13.7% for September. The FY2010-11 increase in TOT revenue over FY2009-10 revenue was 15.7%. If we assume an increase of 15% in FY 2011-12, the impact of the 2% increase in the rate would be approximately $1.3 million. We can estimate the impact for FY 2012-13 as $1.2 million to $1.4 million, depending on the growth in FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13.
Request/ Question:
What is the GF contribution to the current scanner and device program? Could the new fees be used to replace this GF and make it available to the pesticide inspection program

Response Prepared by: Cathy Fisher

Response:
The GF contribution toward the scanner and device programs in FY 11-12 is $372,000. The GF contribution after the new fees are implemented and appropriated is anticipated to be $150,000. This leaves approximately $220,000 available for a different Agriculture department use. The department planned to use these savings to mitigate their FY 13-14 expected budget gap of $201,000. It should be noted the gap was due in great part to retirement cost increases which will be less based on SBCERS action on rate of return on investments. The cost of biologist position is $89,000.
Request/ Question:
With dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency, the Fire Department will receive increased property tax revenue of $290K. What does the department plan for this unanticipated revenue?

Response Prepared by: Michael W. Dyer

Response:
Restoring Engine 11 in Goleta is the highest priority for the use of any unanticipated savings or revenues for the Fire Department. The ongoing Local 2046 Firefighters concession discussions could yield enough savings, when combined with the FY 11/12 unanticipated RDA distribution and expenditure savings, to fund not only Engine 11 but also the bulk of the 4th firefighter post position at Station 22 in Orcutt. The department would like to utilize the monies to keep resources in place until concessions are finalized. The Local 2046 Firefighter's Union has also deferred raises until August 1, 2012, pending negotiations. The $290K in RDA property tax, along with CalFIRE revenues and departmental savings of $375K will keep the department at current staffing levels until 10/14/2012.
Request/ Question:
What are the impacts and costs of the proposed staffing reductions in the Community Services Department and how will operations be maintained?

Response Prepared by: Herman Parker CSD

Response:
• Water/Sewer Plant Operator (93,000):
The department will provide needed plant operation support using existing staff. The CSD will identify and train existing staff to supplement oversight and supervision of plant operations for the two days that the Chief Plant Operator is off duty. Public Health has verified that CSD can operate with a part time “Operator in Training” to cover the remaining two days of operation. The department has no contract for sewer plant oversight currently. In the past, the department has hired contractors to install new equipment as needed, and will continue this practice as worn equipment needs replacement. Laguna Sanitation does have qualified staff to work at the water sewer treatment plant and they have assisted by providing staff support in the past.

• Mechanic Welder (70,400):
The staff cost of the Mechanic Welder is $70,400. The department has anticipated approximately $35,000 for emergency welding and repair support as needed. This is anticipated to result in a savings of approximately $35,400 annually. Existing staff will assist with minor repairs to park equipment as needed.

• Plumbers ($145,300 or $73,000 ea.):
The department has budgeted $40,000 to provide emergency plumbing repair services at parks throughout the county. This will result in slower response times to plumbing needs. This action is projected to save approximately $100,000 per year.
Request/Question:
What is a conservative estimate of adding one more Assessor on Property Taxes, to the General Fund and all other funds?

Response Prepared by: Joe Holland

Response:
There is no estimate of increased Property Tax Revenues as a result of adding one more Appraiser. Our Professional Appraisal Staff is down from 34 to 27 positions and office professionals are down 5 positions from 22 to 17 since FY 07-08. This has resulted in spreading the increased work items (up over 30%) amongst fewer staff (work items per staff up over 60%) potentially resulting in reduced quality of appraisal work and hence lower assessments. Replacing one of the 7 vacant Appraisal positions will help mitigate this, but the impact on property tax revenues cannot be specially quantified.

For example our assessment appeals workload has increased significantly, and many more of the appeals are now for time consuming commercial/industrial properties. There is currently 1,056 cases at $4.8B under appeal. The applicants want the value reduced to $2.2B - so there is $2.6B in assessed value at risk. We are currently able to retain 89% of this "at risk" assessed value. With continued staffing cuts it is unlikely we will be able to continue this rate of retention. Adding one appraiser position will help us with this situation.

This same example could be applied to everything we do: property transfers, new construction, Section 51 reductions, Business Property Audits, Williamson Act assessments, etc.
Board Inquiry Form

Board Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carbajal</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavagnino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department: Community Services Department
Date: 6/13/12
Page(s) of Budget Book:

Request/Question:
Are the warming centers part of the proposed $45,000 cut to shelters as depicted on the Service Level Impact (SLI)? Are the warming centers funded this year?

Response Prepared by: Sharon Friedrichsen

Response:
The warming centers are not part of the proposed $45,000 reduction to shelters listed on the Service Level Impact Report.

In Fiscal Year 2011-12, Community Services Department (CSD) provided $33,830 ($25,000 of General Fund and $8,830 of Human Services funds) to the Unitarian Society to act as the fiscal agent for the Warming Centers. This amount funds a portion of the Unitarian Society’s program coordinator, director, and other staffing costs to operate the warming centers between November 1st and April 30th only based upon weather conditions. The warming centers are located in Isla Vista, Santa Barbara, Lompoc and Santa Maria. For the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Recommended Budget, the proposed funding to the warming centers includes $25,000 of General Fund, but no Human Services funding as the proposed budget does not include any Human Services funding.

The Unitarian Society is requesting $30,000 to continue operations in FY 2012-13. In addition, the Unitarian Society is requesting another $20,000 to fund new warming centers in Carpinteria and Goleta per the attached report.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 12, 2012

TO: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

FROM: Nancy Edmundson, Director of Administration, Rev. Julia Hamilton, Assistant Minister
Unitarian Society of Santa Barbara, Fiscal Agent Freedom Warming Centers

RE: 2011-2012 Santa Barbara County Freedom Warming Centers Report
and 2012-2013 Request for General Funds $50,000

This report outlines our general operations for the 2011-2012 year, and includes budget projections for the 2012-2012 year with a request for Santa Barbara County general funds.

The Unitarian Society of Santa Barbara, on behalf of the many Santa Barbara County faith communities and volunteers who have advocated or worked on building the Freedom Warming Center project over the past 3 years, thanks you once again for your support and funding provided to Warming Center operations in the amount of $65,000 in 2011-2012 ($25,000 general support and $45,000 for emergency Lompoc response) and $51,781 general fund support in 2010-2011. This money, this winter, reduced suffering and potential hypothermic health complications and death in many, many lives across the county. In addition, the SB County general fund support did assist in enlisting the financial support of some City jurisdictions as well as private donors in the county for the 2011-2012 year and for upcoming years.

We are requesting a minimum of $30,000 to continue operations in 2012-2013. However, we have been in conversation with organizations in Goleta and Carpinteria about potential Warming Center sites. To fund operations including these new municipalities, we would need to increase our general fund support to $50,000. This would present a cost-effective way for the County to provide services across the region.

A Typical Night...

On Thursday, January 19th, 67 men and women slept on the floor of The Unitarian Society, curled up on mats. 15 people slept at the Korean Methodist Church in Isla Vista, and another 10 on cots at New Life Christian in Lompoc. They arrived at 6pm, and would be out the door at 6am. The temperature had dropped into the low 30's for the fourth day in a row, and the Freedom Warming Centers were open yet again. The Lompoc site was still scrambling to respond to the sudden closing of the Bridgehouse shelter. A rainstorm would come through later in the week, drenching the Central Coast and keeping the Warming Centers open for 8 days at a stretch. During this time, Doctors Without Walls served 13 people; people who would likely have ended up in the emergency room, or worse, if the shelter had not been open.
Across town, Casa Esperanza had its 100 emergency beds filled to capacity, as did the Rescue Mission, where women slept on the floor of the chapel when the beds ran out. The Salvation Army, which normally only accepts longer-term residents, served ten people this winter on an emergency basis, reserving those beds for people who can demonstrate sobriety. Good Samaritan, our partner in Santa Maria, provides emergency beds for Warming Center guests who would not qualify for their regular shelter program.

The Warming Centers are a last resort. Sobriety is not a requirement – the only thing we ask is that guests remain calm and respectful. For many of our guests, a traditional shelter is just not an option. On any given night, we may have up to five people in wheelchairs. There is nothing glamorous about sharing a bathroom with fifty other people, or sleeping on the floor among dozens, or getting up at 5:30am and going back out into the cold rain. But at least the Centers are warm, dry, safe, and you are treated like a fellow human being. Guests who are not able to find shelter in our warming centers will eventually find shelter in business doorways, our emergency rooms, our jails, or in worse case scenarios that we have already experienced, they will not seek or find shelter and risk death and suffering due to hypothermia.

The Freedom Warming Centers are a critical piece of the picture for homeless individuals in Santa Barbara County. Casa Esperanza, the Rescue Mission, Good Samaritan and the Salvation Army each provide arms of support for those without homes, but the Warming Centers are there for those who cannot manage to stay anywhere else, either because other shelters are full or because they do not yet have the ability to qualify. As Restorative Policing Officer Kell Hove likes to say, you never give up on someone – it may be the 15th time you reach out that something changes. Eventually, our guests may be able to find a way into a more supportive environment, but only if they survive long enough to do so. Until that change happens, our basic human duty is to prevent unnecessary death and suffering from exposure.

**Freedom Warming Centers, by the numbers:**

- 2,858 guests served, Countywide, between November 15, 2011 and April 15, 2012
- 35 nights (50 nights in Lompoc)
- 65% increase in number of people served
- 77 guests seen by Doctors Without Walls
- 11 host sites across the County
- 2 part-time paid Coordinators, a pool of 17 on-call overnight staff (south county) and 9 on-call overnight staff (north county though Good Samaritan Shelter)
Program Development

This year, as we come upon the end of the Warming Center’s third active season, we have made great strides in improving both the day-to-day operations of the Freedom Warming Center program as well as increasing our partnerships with a broad group of faith communities and community organizations. Supporting organizations include:

The Good Samaritan Shelter in Santa Maria, The New Life Academy Christian Church in Lompoc, the Korean United Methodist Church, St. Michael’s, and the Student Religious Co-Op in Isla Vista, The Unitarian Society, Trinity Episcopal Church, First United Methodist Church, First Presbyterian Church, The Santa Barbara Jewish Federation, Unity Church, First Congregational Church in Santa Barbara, the PEO United Methodist Women’s Alumni, and the Santa Barbara Friends Meeting, and Goleta Neighbors Without Homes congregation collective.

We work with Doctors Without Walls, a volunteer street-medicine team who provides basic medical care and evaluation to our guests, and with EasyLift, a van service that provides wheelchair accessible rides to our guests who cannot walk to our host sites.

We have convened an Advisory Board comprised of clergy and lay leaders from our congregational partners, local activists and community partners. This Board has supported the work of the Unitarian Society in determining policies, identifying areas for growth, and building relationships with new congregations and organizations.

Most importantly, we hired two part-time, seasonal Coordinators who oversaw the day-to-day operations and site management, supported grant writing, improved communication and outreach, clarified center operations and documentation, trained, scheduled and supervised on-call staff and monitored the weather. We also have a pool of 26 county wide on-call overnight staff. Almost all of the paid staff of the Warming Centers have personal experiences of homelessness that have motivated them to do this work.

Volunteers from each host site provided hospitality and support, making sure that the guests were welcomed and comfortable. The generous host congregations made many adjustments to their own schedules to be available and flexible to the needs of the Centers. At the Unitarian Society alone over 75 volunteers supported in the warming center operations in addition to the involvement of our youth groups and children's religious education program.

Crisis in Lompoc

In mid-January, the existing Lompoc shelter closed on short notice. The Warming Centers responded quickly, filling the gap and staying open every night until a suitable alternative situation could be arranged. We provided a critical emergency response that gave the County time to negotiate a complex situation without leaving anyone out in the cold.

Because they are organized as on-call emergency shelters, the Warming Centers are able to respond quickly and flexibly to the unexpected, whether that means a long spell of severe weather or an unforeseen local situation. The Centers are also aware of the different needs found in North and South County, and make every effort to adjust in ways that serve our areas of coverage best.
Looking Forward

The Unitarian Society is developing a three-year plan for the Warming Centers to ensure that this program will be here for as long as it is needed. We have begun preliminary conversations with Social Venture Partners and the Fund for SB to assist us in this important time of organizational maturation. We will continue to stay in close communication with the other agencies and people serving the homeless here in the County. We can do our part most effectively in the context of the larger whole.

It is vital the Warming Centers remain a public/private/nonprofit partnership. Our public funding plays a vital role in attracting and maintaining support from private donors and foundations. It also keeps us in close collaboration with the civic agencies that work on the issue of homelessness, allowing us to direct our work in ways that complement but do not duplicate other efforts. Without any one of these three “legs of the stool”, we would not be able survive. The Unitarian Society cannot do this alone!

Looking at the dramatic increase in guests served this past year, we have come to the realization that our emergency Warming Center bed capacity in the city of Santa Barbara and Isla Vista may have been reached. Religious congregations with facilities that are appropriate in location and space are not infinite, and if the guest count continues to grow, we will not be able to shelter them all. We have never turned anyone away, but if cuts to other shelters and agencies have the impact we fear, meaning that more people are left to fall through the cracks, that day might come.

However, we will continue to work to build capacity for our volunteer hospitality teams and fundraising efforts within the wider faith community. With the potential that the Common Ground/BOCH merger brings for new volunteer coordination, we see that the Warming Centers have a key role to play in connecting volunteers with meaningful service.

Warming Center Reporting Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hosting Sites</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Guests</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>2858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # nights (excepting Lompoc)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests: North County</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests: South County</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. # guests per night</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per guest</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Operations</td>
<td>$64,608</td>
<td>$109,624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are pleased to report that our average cost per bed night is relatively unchanged at $38, and recognize that this represents a significantly less amount of money than an emergency room visit or the cost of a night in county jail.
2011-2012 Budget Report and 2012-2013 Plans: Funding was secured from the cities of Santa Barbara and Goleta to supplement the county funding for current year operations. In addition, 2011-2012 CDBG and HSC funding was received from the County of SB and the city of Santa Barbara. Additional funds were sought from Santa Maria, SB County, CDBG, but were not granted for 2011-2012 or 2012-2013.

The proposed minimum budget for 2012-2013 is based on 40 service nights with minimal expansion of center sites or number of beds. Operation dates are extended to November 15 through April 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 nights</td>
<td>40 nights</td>
<td>40 nights</td>
<td>40 nights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Staff</td>
<td>$25,653</td>
<td>$34,100</td>
<td>$34,100</td>
<td>$34,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Call Center Staff</td>
<td>$70,721</td>
<td>$57,480</td>
<td>$57,480</td>
<td>$57,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$2,891</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration fee</td>
<td>$5,220</td>
<td>$10,183</td>
<td>$10,183</td>
<td>$10,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$4,755</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$384</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense</strong></td>
<td><strong>$109,624</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112,013</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112,013</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112,013</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revenue scenario below reflects how $30,000 in SB County 2012-2013 general funds would be utilized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County General Public Funding Support $30,000</td>
<td>35 nights</td>
<td>40 nights</td>
<td>40 nights</td>
<td>40 nights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SB</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SB</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$4,675</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>$2,274</td>
<td>$7,726</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SB CDBG</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County HS</td>
<td>$8,350</td>
<td>$8,350</td>
<td>$8,350</td>
<td>$8,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for Santa Barbara</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Fundraising Reserve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Private Fundraising &amp;Foundation Support</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$26,762</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$109,624</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112,013</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>$84,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue/Expenses</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$(19,663)</td>
<td>$(28,013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The revenue scenario two, below, reflects the plan should the $30,000 additional general funds not be approved by the County Board of Supervisors. The fundraising reserve would be expended fully in 2012-2013 and operations would cease for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. In addition, in 2012-2013 centers would cease when funds exhausted with the likelihood that the centers would not activate 40 nights unless additional funds are found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO County General Public Funding Support</td>
<td>35 nights (Lompoc 50)</td>
<td>40 nights</td>
<td>no operations</td>
<td>no operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SB</td>
<td>$ 65,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SB</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
<td>$4,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>$ 2,274</td>
<td>$7,736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SB CDBG</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County HS</td>
<td>$ 8,350</td>
<td>$8,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Fundraising Reserve</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Fundraising</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Foundation Gift</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$109,624</td>
<td>$110,741</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue/Expenses</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goleta and Carpinteria:** Formative conversations have begun with congregations and organizations in the cities of Goleta and Carpinteria about potential Warming Center sites and volunteer support. We project the cost of operating an additional center in another city area would be approximately $22,000 per site. We are requesting an additional $20,000 in County general funds to be used toward establishing warming centers in these communities and to facilitate our fundraising from those jurisdictions and additional private donors.
Request/Question:
Please clarify the Service Level Impact #2 concerning “shelter services”. Were any of these funds or other Community Service Department funds, allocated to “warming shelters”?

Response Prepared by: Sharon Friedrichsen

Response:

The Fiscal Year 2012-13 Recommended Budget proposes a service level reduction of $45,000 (13%) to these shelter services. The Community Services Department will provide General Fund support of $300,000 to the three regional shelters (Santa Barbara, Lompoc and Santa Maria) in FY 2012-13. The allocation is based upon bed nights as depicted in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency-Location</th>
<th>Allocation Percent (based on bed nights)</th>
<th>ADOPTED FY 11-12 Budget</th>
<th>PROPOSED FY 12-13 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridgehouse-Lompoc</td>
<td>11.70%</td>
<td>40,413</td>
<td>35,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa Esperanza-Santa Barbara</td>
<td>48.70%</td>
<td>168,216</td>
<td>146,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Samaritan-Santa Maria</td>
<td>39.60%</td>
<td>136,784</td>
<td>118,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$345,413</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The warming centers are not part of the proposed $45,000 reduction to shelters listed on the Service Level Impact Report. For the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Recommended Budget, the proposed funding to the warming centers includes $25,000 of General Fund, but no Human Services funding as the proposed budget does not include any Human Services funding. See Board Inquiry Form #36 for further clarification.
Board Inquiry Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Inquiry Number: 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbajal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavagnino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department: CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date: 6/14/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page(s) of Budget Book:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Request/Question:**

Please provide up to date information on General County Revenue. We discussed this yesterday and the information provided in the power point appears the same as what is in the budget book. I asked for updated information on TOT, sales tax, etc. that is a “best guess” scenario of the actual 11-12 budget revenues.

**Response Prepared by:** Tom Alvarez (data provided by the Auditor-Controller)

**Response:**

The 3rd Quarter Budget and Financial Update predicted year end General Revenues of approximately $209.5 million, resulting in a projected favorable variance of $1.6 million. This variance was before the new tax distribution from RDA dissolution.

The Auditor-Controller updated the General Revenue projection using the most recent actual information and now projects year end General Revenues of $209.1 million, resulting in a favorable variance of approximately $1.2 million before the new tax distribution from RDA dissolution.

The new tax distribution from RDA dissolution is $2.3 million, for a combined favorable General Revenue variance of $3.5 million.

**Key Individual Accounts:**

- Secured Property Tax   + $ 72,000
- Property Tax In-Lieu of VLF  + $ 33,000
- Retail Sales Tax         + $ 301,000
- TOT                       + $ 644,000

The offsetting negative variance was in property tax penalty collections.
Request/ Question:
In FY 2011-12 what was Robert Brown Engineers paid $300,000 for and how was it funded?

Response Prepared by: Glenn S. Russell, PhD., RPA

Response:
The $300,000 contract with Robert Brown Engineers is for the inspection of offshore oil operations. This ongoing contract is 100% paid for by permit revenues. There is no General Fund.
Board Inquiry Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbajal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavagnino X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inquiry Number: 40

Department: CEO
Date: 6/14/12
Page(s) of Budget Book: X

Request/Question:
What is the average cost per FTE with Retirement & Health Insurance Benefits Identified?

Response Prepared by: Tom Alvarez, Richard Morgantini

Response:
See attached graph that displays the average cost per FTE with County retirement and health insurance benefit cost components indentified.
Average Cost/Employee with Retirement and Health Ins.

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Department Director(s) Chandra L. Wallar, County Executive Officer
Contact Info: Tom Alvarez, Budget Director (568-3432)
SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2012-13 Recommended Operating Plan and Budget

County Counsel Concurrence
As to form: Yes

Auditor-Controller Concurrence
As to form: Yes

**Recommended Actions:**

It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Approve final budget adjustments to the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Recommended Budget;
2. Delegate authority to the County Executive Officer to execute ongoing grants and contracts included in the Recommended Budget;
3. Authorize the County Executive Officer to approve ongoing contracts where amounts are up to 10% more or less than indicated amounts, or up to $5,000 more or less than indicated amounts on contracts under $50,000, without returning to the Board for approval; and
4. Adopt the Resolution of the Board of Supervisors entitled In the Matter of Adopting the Budget for Fiscal Year 2012-13

**Summary Text:**

The Fiscal Year 2012-13 Recommended Operating Plan and Budget is hereby submitted to the Board of Supervisors. The information in this letter, attachments, and hearing binder is provided to enable the Board to adopt a Fiscal Year 2012-13 operating plan and budget on June 15, 2012. Budget hearings are scheduled for the week of June 11-15, 2012 and if necessary, may be continued into the week of June 18-22, 2012.
Background:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget at a Glance</th>
<th>Actual FY 10-11</th>
<th>Adopted FY 11-12</th>
<th>Recommended FY 12-13</th>
<th>Proposed FY 13-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$743.7</td>
<td>$749.1</td>
<td>$745.7</td>
<td>$741.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Financing Sources</td>
<td>$144.7</td>
<td>$116.8</td>
<td>$82.4</td>
<td>$86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$888.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$865.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$828.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$828.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$766.5</td>
<td>$825.0</td>
<td>$800.1</td>
<td>$800.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated for Future Use</td>
<td>$113.4</td>
<td>$40.9</td>
<td>$28.0</td>
<td>$27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Uses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$879.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$865.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$828.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$828.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing FTEs</td>
<td>3,911.7</td>
<td>3,713.7</td>
<td>3,801.4</td>
<td>3,797.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fiscal Year 2012-13 recommended expenditures budget for all funds totals $800.1 million, a decrease of $24.9 million from Fiscal Year 2011-12 adopted expenditures budget. The recommended budget includes $28.0 million designated for future use. This brings total uses to $828.1 million for Fiscal Year 2012-13.

The proposed budget is balanced with Fiscal Year 2012-13 revenues of $745.7 million and prior year revenues that had been set aside for future use of $82.4 million, for a total source of funds of $828.1 million. The decrease in total Fiscal Year 2012-13 revenues of $3.4 million from the FY 2011-12 adopted of $749.1 is primarily attributed to reduced charges for services, offset by an increase in discretionary property tax revenue, miscellaneous revenue and Federal and State Revenue.

Staffing levels in the Recommended FY 2012-13 Operating Plan and Budget are 3,801.4 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions. This is an increase of 87.7 FTE compared with 3,713.7 FTE in the FY 2011-12 Adopted budget. The increase in recommended FTEs is primarily in Public Safety department personnel related to AB109-State Criminal Justice Realignment and in the Health and Public Assistance departments based on available Federal and State Funding.

Final Budget Adjustments

As is the case each year, events have occurred since the Recommended Budget was prepared which prompts staff to recommend adjustments to various appropriations and revenues. The recommended adjustments fall into two main categories listed here and detailed in Attachment A:

1. Re-budgeting appropriations included in the Fiscal Year 2011-12 budget, but not spent during the fiscal year, and moved to a designation via a Budget Revision during Fiscal Year 2011-12 for use in Fiscal Year 2012-13.

2. Other recommended changes adjust General Fund and non-General Fund budgets.

Attachment A is a list of all final budget adjustments recommended for approval by the Board.
Ongoing Grants and Contracts
The County has numerous ongoing grants and contracts that are renewed each year with the funding and expenditures approved by the Board during the annual budget hearings. The execution then becomes ministerial and can be delegated to the County Executive Officer, who will verify their inclusion in the Adopted Budget and sign for the County, thus reducing the number of administrative agenda items that come before the Board during the year. The Board has customarily delegated this authority to include grants and contracts where amounts are up to 10% more or less than indicated amounts, and approval of changes up to $5,000 from the Board approved amounts on contracts less than $50,000. This process has proven to be an efficient and responsive way for the agencies involved and to comply with the Board’s policy direction.

The grants to be included in this year’s delegation are identified in Attachment B. The contracts to be included in this year’s delegation are identified in Attachment C. The contract list could include part-year contracts that would have been for the same amount as the prior year if the request had been to renew them for a full year. For example, a contractor was paid $100,000 for a full year’s work last year but the proposed contract is for $50,000 for 6 months work in Fiscal Year 2012-13.

Budget Resolution
The Resolution of the Board of Supervisors follows as Attachment D. Note the resolution allows the County Executive Officer, under limited circumstances, to approve changes to appropriations for previously approved equipment purchases.

Mandates and Service Levels
Board approval of these proposed changes (final budget adjustments and ongoing grants and contracts) during budget hearings is discretionary. The budget hearings, recommended budget and the budget resolution are subject to the Government Code of the State of California Chapter 1, Division 3, Title 3, Articles 3 and 4.

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:
Approval of these recommendations adopts the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Recommended Budget (with any modifications determined by the Board) and authorizes the County Executive Officer and/or the County Auditor-Controller to take necessary related fiscal action.

Attachments:
A- Final Budget Adjustments
B- Ongoing Grants
C- Ongoing Contracts
D- Resolution of the Board of Supervisors

Authored by:
Richard Morgantini, CEO Fiscal and Policy Analyst, 568-3551

Cc: Department Directors
Assistant County Executive Officers
Fiscal and Policy Analysts
TO: Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara as the Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency

FROM: Department Director(s)  Chandra L. Wallar, County Executive Officer  
Contact Info: Tom Alvarez, Budget Director (568-3432)

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2012-13 Recommended Budget for the County of Santa Barbara as Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency

County Counsel Concurrence
As to form: Yes

Auditor-Controller Concurrence
As to form: Yes

Recommended Actions:
It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors:

a) Adopt the Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara as the Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency, entitled In The Matter Of Adopting The Budget For Fiscal Year 2012-13 For The County Of Santa Barbara As Successor Agency To The Former County Of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency.

Summary Text:
As modified by the California Supreme Court, the ABX 1 26 amendments to California Redevelopment Law dissolved all redevelopment agencies in California on February 1, 2012. Through California Health and Safety Code Section 34173(d)(1), the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara decided that the County of Santa Barbara would become the “Successor Agency” to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency.

As drafted, the County of Santa Barbara Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Operating Plan – Recommended Budget included the budget of the County of Santa Barbara as Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency.
After County Staff distributed the Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Operating Plan – Recommended Budget, however, the California Committee on Municipal Accounting ("CCMA") published a “white paper" titled “Accounting and Financial Reporting for Dissolution of California Redevelopment Agencies.” Summarized, CCMA’s white paper states that funds maintained by Successor Agencies for the activities of former redevelopment agencies should be treated as private-purpose trust funds, which cannot be used to support programs or activities outside of the “wind down” of former redevelopment agencies that is required by Health and Safety Code Section 34177.

County Staff believes that CCMA’s “private-purpose trust fund” framework will be followed in audits of funds maintained by Successor Agencies. We therefore recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt a separate budget resolution for the County of Santa Barbara as Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency:

- Adopting a separate budget resolution now for the Successor Agency would provide a clearer picture of the private-purpose trust fund structure and segregate it from the County’s budget; and

- Approval of the recommended action would authorize spending funds distributed from the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund for the Successor Agency’s administrative budget and other enforceable obligations shown on Recognized Obligation Payment Schedules; but

- Those Recognized Obligation Payment Schedules would still be subject to approval of the Oversight Board that was established by Section 34179 of the ABX 1 26 amendments.

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:
Approval of this recommendation adopts the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Recommended Budget for the County of Santa Barbara as Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency (with any modifications determined by the Board) and authorizes the County Executive Officer and/or the County Auditor-Controller to take necessary related fiscal action. As allowed under Health and Safety Code Section 34176(a), the County elected to retain the housing assets and functions previously performed by the former redevelopment agency. The assets and activities for the Successor Agency Housing Fund after the date of dissolution continue to be reported in the County’s governmental fund financial statements. Those housing funds are included separately within the Recommended Budget for the County of Santa Barbara.

Attachments:
1) Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Supervisors as Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency

Authored by:
Michael Ghizzoni, Chief Assistant County Counsel, 568-3377
Theo Fallati, CPA, Assistant Auditor-Controller, 568-2102
John Jayasinghe, MPA, CEO Fiscal & Policy Analyst, 568-2246

Cc: Renee Bahl, Assistant County Executive Officer
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS
SUCCESSION AGENCY TO THE FORMER COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

IN THE MATTER OF ADOPTING THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012-13 FOR
THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA AS SUCCESSION AGENCY TO THE
FORMER COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

RESOLUTION NO. 12-

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of
California, has been meeting from time to time and holding public hearings at such meetings
for the discussion and consideration of the recommended budget for the 2012-13 fiscal year
for the County of Santa Barbara as Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara
Redevelopment Agency, all pursuant to notice and the provisions of law, said public hearings
having commenced on June 11, 2012, and concluded on June 15, 2012, pursuant to the
requirements of Sections 29080 through 29092 of the Government Code of the State of
California; and

WHEREAS, said Board of Supervisors has met pursuant to such published notice
and heard all members of the general public and officials present regarding the matters
aforesaid and has considered, made and settled all revisions of, deductions from, and
increases or additions to the recommended budget which it deems advisable; and

WHEREAS, the housing funds of the former County of Santa Barbara
Redevelopment Agency are included in the separate Recommended Budget of the County of
Santa Barbara; and

WHEREAS, the record is in final form in the possession of the Santa Barbara County
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and Auditor-Controller, which meets requirements set
forth in Government Code Section 29089, and the public hearing on said budget being now
finally closed, and the meetings thereon finally concluded;
NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, as the Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency, that said budget as so increased, modified, revised and finally settled shall be, and the same hereby is adopted as the budget for the 2012-13 fiscal year for the County of Santa Barbara as Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency whose affairs are financed and under the supervision of the Board of Supervisors; and that said budget document presently consists of the 2012-13 Recommended Budget, the record for the Budget Hearings, and the summaries and decisions of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors in making final budget adjustments which are incorporated herein and made a part of this resolution as though set forth in full pursuant to Government Code Section 29090.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Auditor-Controller, in compiling the Final Budget, is authorized to make ministerial budget changes and to transfer appropriations to or from designated fund balances and contingencies of Successor Agency funds governed by the Board of Supervisors to balance the budget for the County of Santa Barbara as Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Auditor-Controller is authorized to make adjustments to the final budget of the County of Santa Barbara as Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency throughout fiscal year 2012-13 for line item accounts 3381 Unrealized Gain/Loss on Investments and 9897 Unrealized Gains to properly record changes in the fair value of investments.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Auditor-Controller is authorized to make adjustments to the final budget of the County of Santa Barbara as Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency throughout fiscal year 2012-13 for line item account 3380 Interest Income and various fund balance accounts in order to
properly record fund balance increases in operating funds due to interest income in the underlying agency fund.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Auditor-Controller and County Executive Officer are authorized to make any adjustments to the final budget of the County of Santa Barbara as Successor Agency to the former County of Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency for fiscal year 2012-13 in order to comply with any Governmental Accounting Standards Board Pronouncements or to conform the budget to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED by reference in accordance with Government Code Section 29090 by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, this fifteenth day of June 2012 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:                        Doreen Farr, Chair
Chandra L. Wallar             Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

BY: __________________________

APPROVED AS TO FORM:           APPROVED AS TO ACCOUNTING FORM
Dennis Marshall               Robert W. Geis, CPA
County Counsel                Auditor-Controller

BY: __________________________  BY: __________________________
County Counsel                Auditor-Controller
## Attachment A - Revised 6-15-12

09 Final Budget Adjustments Summary - All Depts (2012-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept / Adj. #</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>GFC</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Executive Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>203,291</td>
<td>203,291</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment recognizes one-time grant revenue in the Office of Emergency Management (OEM) revenue, restores one Emergency Manager position and establishes allocations for OEM projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,116,000</td>
<td>1,116,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment recognizes revenue from the 2010 and 2011 Homeland Security grants ($646,000 and $470,000) and establishes appropriations for add'l helicopter video equip. $646,000, training $100,000, generators $155,000, and SBPD fencing $215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment shifts budgeted extra help salaries to regular salaries in the amount of $16,000 and increases the County of Santa Barbara Television (CSBTV) Manager position from .625 FTE to .75 FTE. There is no additional cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(Addendum) This adjustment uses Contingency fund balance to increase appropriations for the Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services (ADMHS) consultant services in the amount of $250,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,569,291</td>
<td>1,569,291</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Attorney</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>156,386</td>
<td>156,386</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Add 1 FTE Deputy District Attorney assigned to Treatment Court under the AB109 Realignment plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,057,164</td>
<td>3,057,164</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(Addendum) This adjustment increases FY 2012-13 Public Safety Realignment Act funded expenditures in the Probation Department to match the amounts in the expenditure plan approved by the Board on May 22, 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,790,196</td>
<td>6,895,098 (4,895,098)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(Addendum) This adjustment reflects the 5/22/12 BOS direction to transfer General Fund property taxes to the Fire Department in lieu of General Fund Contribution and for Fire to transfer $1M to the Sheriff's Dept for Aviation services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Attachment A

**09 Final Budget Adjustments Summary-All Depts (2012-13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept / Adj. #</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>GFC</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>97,014</td>
<td>97,014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(Addendum) This adjustment implements the CERS (CA Electronic Reporting System) grant from Cal/EPA (California Environmental Protection Agency) to establish an electronic hazardous materials reporting system in compliance with State mandates (AB2286).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept Totals</strong></td>
<td>11,887,210</td>
<td>6,992,112</td>
<td>(4,895,098)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheriff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>289,500</td>
<td>289,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment restores the Gang Team from the proposed Service Level Impacts reductions utilizing funds rolled over from FY2011-12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>308,668</td>
<td>308,668</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment restores two detective positions from the proposed Service Level Impact reductions utilizing funds rolled over from FY2011-12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>686,530</td>
<td>686,530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment restores the Narcotics team to its full compliment from the proposed reduction of 4 FTE as noted in the Service Level Impact form utilizing funds rolled over from FY2011-12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,702,357</td>
<td>1,702,357</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment raises the budget for the Sheriff's portion of AB 109 revenue and expense$1,853,909 from $1,799,318 to $3,653,227 per the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council report to the BOS on 5-22-12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(Addendum) This adjustment Replaces $1,000,000 in GFC with a transfer from the Fire District as a contribution to the Consolidated Aviation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept Totals</strong></td>
<td>3,987,055</td>
<td>2,987,055</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>501,212</td>
<td>501,212</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment will establish budget utilizing Tobacco Settlement Funds for an audit settlement for Animal Services SB90 Animal Adoption State mandate for FY 2006-2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment will move $125,000 of a previously Board-approved release of fund balance for the Santa Barbara Health Center Chiller Project to FY 12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept Totals</strong></td>
<td>626,212</td>
<td>626,212</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment A
### 09 Final Budget Adjustments Summary-All Depts (2012-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept / Adj. #</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>GFC</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol, Drug &amp; Mental Health Svcs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(900,117)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment decreases the transfer-in from the General Fund Audit Exceptions committed fund balance by $900,117 to accurately reflect expected payments against booked grant/audit settlement liability in the Mental Health Fund 0044.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>645,703</td>
<td>645,703</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(Addendum) This adjustment shifts 4.0 FTEs from the Revenue Management program in Mental Health Fund to the IT Needs program in MHSA Fund. It also restores $474,661 in Homeless and Indigent services listed on the ADMHS Service Level Impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Totals</td>
<td>(254,414)</td>
<td>645,703</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(133,170)</td>
<td>(133,170)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment reduces the building permitting and inspection program by 1.4 FTE to reflect current declining workload trends. Offsetting revenue is also reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,739</td>
<td>8,739</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment will replace use of departmental funds with General Fund Contingency to cover 35% of a Redevelopment Agency position for monitoring of other successor agencies in the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transfer $82,000 from Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund (CREF) and increase appropriation for Gaviota Coast Rural Regional Plan ($42,000) and the Santa Claus Lane Beach Access ($40,000) within Planning &amp; Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(Addendum) This adjustment will rebudget FY 2011-12 financing of $25,000 for a regulatory audit and best practices study for onshore oil and gas operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Totals</td>
<td>89,569</td>
<td>89,569</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment increases capital appropriations for the completion of the Phase 3A Liner Project at the Taiguas Landfill from Solid Waste Fund. Final bid award was $575K higher than engineer's estimate due to fuel and construction cost increases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Attachment A

## 09 Final Budget Adjustments Summary-All Depts (2012-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept / Adj. #</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>GFC</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Works</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>217,741</td>
<td>217,741</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment funds a Real Property Agent position with Flood Control funds and Resource Recovery funds (via unfunding a vacant Heavy Equipment Operator position). Need based on increased work load and the time critical Mission Creek project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment releases Flood Control Fund Balance to increase Services and Supplies to enable Aerial Imagery Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment increases Capital Appropriations in the Santa Maria Flood Zone Fund for the design costs of the a) West Green Canyon Phase II Project $260,000 and b) the West Green Canyon 72 inch Pipe Extension $40,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,127,741</td>
<td>1,127,741</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auditor-Controller</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>85,777</td>
<td>85,777</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This budget adjustment reflects the critical need to add an Accountant-Auditor position in the Auditor-Controller Department to perform newly required property tax administration duties under the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Dissolution Act to be funded directly from the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Funds of the former RDAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerk-Recorder-Assessor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105,487</td>
<td>105,487</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment restores 1.0 appraiser FTE position in the Assessor Division to mitigate assessment service level impacts which could impact the assessed roll value. Reduction in staff resources decreases the completion rate of assessment work items and the number of hours dedicated to assessment appeals, potentially resulting in a lower enrolled roll value for property assessments which is the basis for property taxes to all tax receiving entities. This position also provides support to defend the County in assessment appeals thus preserving property tax revenues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment rebudgets capital equipment appropriations included in the FY 11-12 Budget as a result of project delays to complete property tax computer system project in FY 12-13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept / Adj. #</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>GFC</td>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>Positions</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk-Recorder-Assessor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Totals</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>125,487</td>
<td>105,487</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>198,214</td>
<td>198,214</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment will transfer fund balance from General Services Projects, (non-General Fund) to fund maintenance staff working on capital projects and avoid any further reductions in service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,067,168</td>
<td>1,067,168</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment will draw from retained earnings in the vehicle replacement enterprise fund to allow the Sheriff’s department to purchase two Jail Transportation busses per the BOS action on 4/10/12.  There is no new expenditure of General Fund in this transaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment will transfer $40,000 from the courthouse construction funds to the General Services department for the preparation of a historic structures report for the Santa Barbara Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Totals</td>
<td>1,305,382</td>
<td>1,305,382</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer-Tax Collector-Public Adm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>145,466</td>
<td>145,466</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment provides funding from Treasurer Tax Collector fund balance for one Financial Systems Analyst for the successful implementation of a new Property Tax billing system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General County Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment transfers $40,000 from the Courthouse Construction Fund, from prior year fees revenue, to General Services for the preparation of a historic structures report for the SB Courthouse (see General Services for the offsetting expenditure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(105,487)</td>
<td>(105,487)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment reduces the contribution to Contingency fund balance to fund the restoration of 1.0 appraiser position in the Assessor Division of the Clerk-Recorder-Assessor (CRA) Department (see CRA for the position restoration).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment A

### 09 Final Budget Adjustments Summary - All Depts (2012-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept / Adj. #</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>GFC</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General County</td>
<td>(900,117)</td>
<td>(900,117)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>This adjustment decreases the transfer out to ADMHS using the Audit Exceptions fund balance components accounts by $900,117 to more accurately reflect expected payments against booked grant/audit settlement liability in ADMHS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Totals</td>
<td>(900,117)</td>
<td>(1,005,604)</td>
<td>(105,487)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Revenues</td>
<td>(5,895,098)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,895,098</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(Addendum) This adjustment reduces property tax revenue, which will be transferred to the Fire Department per Board action on 5/22/12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCO RDA</td>
<td>(553,000)</td>
<td>(553,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(Addendum) This adjustment is necessary to eliminate the budget in the Redevelopment Agency Successor Agency Housing Fund. A separate adjustment is within Housing &amp; Community Development to create budget for Successor Agency housing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successor Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand Total   | 16,454,624  | 17,354,741 | 0    | 16   | 0         |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
## Ongoing Grants for Fiscal Year 2012-13

(Grouped by Department.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrantID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>208 - Victims of Violent Crimes Claims</td>
<td>Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>220,460</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 - Victim Witness Assistance Program</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Passed through: Governor's Office of Emergency Services</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>251,175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>251,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349 - State Quality Assurance and Revenue Recovery</td>
<td>Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>88,037</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468 - State Worker's Compensation</td>
<td>Department of Insurance</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109 - Underserved Victim Advocacy Outreach Program</td>
<td>California Emergency Management</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>99,384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99,384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District Attorney Total**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>949,056</td>
<td></td>
<td>949,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County of Santa Barbara, GMS
# Ongoing Grants for Fiscal Year 2012-13

(Grouped by Department.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrantID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept: Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225 - 12-13 Leaking Underground Fuel Tank (LUFT) State and Tribal Underground Storage Tanks Program</td>
<td>U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>691,358</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>691,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed through: State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>691,358</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>691,358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ongoing Grants for Fiscal Year 2012-13
(Grouped by Department.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrantID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept: Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1199 - Avoid the 12 DUI Campaign - Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed through: State of California Office of Traffic Safety</td>
<td>Sheriff Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ongoing Grants for Fiscal Year 2012-13

(Grupoed by Department.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrantID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept: Public Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>3,250,435</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,250,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed through: California Department of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 - Health Center Cluster (PHD Homeless pgm 1361)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES - CONSOLIDATED HEALTH CENTERS CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>623,398</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>623,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 - Grants to Provide Outpatient Early Intervention Services with Respect to HIV Disease (Ryan White Part C)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>355,524</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>355,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed through: California Department of Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 - Maternal and Child Health Services</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>880,000</td>
<td>525,540</td>
<td>1,405,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed through: California Department of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 - PH Emergency Preparedness Comprehensive Agreement</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>403,847</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>403,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed through: California Department of Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617 - NATIONAL BIOTERRORISM HOSPITAL PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>240,539</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed through: California Department of Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818 - Nutrition Network</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>294,782</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>294,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed through: California Department of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ongoing Grants for Fiscal Year 2012-13
(Grouped by Department.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrantID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>876 - Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES - MEDICAID CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>317,000</td>
<td>917,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>973 - HIV/AIDS MGA, AIDS Block Grant Funding (PHD Surveillance program 1452)</td>
<td>State Office of AIDS</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>36,655</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976 - HIV Care Formula Grants</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>243,006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>243,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>989 - Tobacco Health Education</td>
<td>California Department of Health Services</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204 - AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP)</td>
<td>State of California Department of Public Health</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>4,172</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207 - Cancer Detection Program (CDP) 1275</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>307,480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>307,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209 - Solid Waste Grant (Environmental Safety)</td>
<td>California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1211 - Beach Monitoring and Notification Program Development Grants Beach Act (non-AB411)</td>
<td>U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Health Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrantID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,712,854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>842,540</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,555,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ongoing Grants for Fiscal Year 2012-13

### (Grouped by Department.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant ID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 - Supportive Housing Program</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT Passed through: Direct</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>115,315</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 - Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness (PATH)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES Passed through: California Department of Mental Health</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>59,195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 - Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES Passed through: California Department of Mental Health</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>197,442</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>197,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574 - Medical Assistance Program</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES - MEDICAID CLUSTER Passed through: California Department of Mental Health</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1,376,342</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,376,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123 - Santa Barbara ADMHS Bridges to Recovery (B2R)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES Passed through: California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>453,985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>453,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1124 - Clean &amp; Sober Drug Court (CSDC)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES Passed through: California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>400,455</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1125 - Children Affected by Meth (CAM)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES Passed through: California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>471,455</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>471,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239 - Block Grants for Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES Passed through: California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>626,463</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>626,463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ongoing Grants for Fiscal Year 2012-13

(Grouped by Department.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrantID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1240 - Block Grants for Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1,879,387</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,879,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed through: California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Alcohol, Drug, & Mental Health Svcs Total                                       |                                                                        |              | 5,580,039  | 0          | 5,580,039 |
# Ongoing Grants for Fiscal Year 2012-13

(Grouped by Department.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant ID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept: Agricultural Commissioner/W&amp;M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>968 - Plant and Animal Disease, Pest Control, and Animal Care</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>269,050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>269,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed through: California Department of Food and Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208 - (SOD) Plant and Animal Disease, Pest Control, and Animal Care</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>6,160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed through: California Department of Food and Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Commissioner/W&amp;M Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>275,210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275,210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ongoing Grants for Fiscal Year 2012-13

(Gruped by Department.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant ID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>425 - 863002 N Jonata Park Rd At Zaca Creek BR 51C-226</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431 - 862032 Floridale Ave Ab No. 51C-006 BRLSZD-5951(060)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460 - 863018 Jalama Road Bridge No. 51C-13 BRLS-5951(022)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628 - ER-4200(006), 862258 Jalama Rd., PM 4.40 (3T23)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1,336,803</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,336,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731 - 863033 Refugio Road Improvements</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842 - 863035 Hollister Avenue Widening</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>256,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>256,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ongoing Grants for Fiscal Year 2012-13
(Grouped by Department.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrantID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>844 - 862275 San Marcos Road Bridge 51C-002</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>199,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847 - 862278 Jalama Road Bridge 51C-017</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>487,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>487,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850 - 862279 Hollister Ave. Bridge 51C-018</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>853,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>853,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851 - 862274 Cathedral Oaks Bridge 51C-001</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>825,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068 - 830408 Rincon Hill Bridge 51C-039 Siesmic Retrofit</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072 - 862319 Sandspit Road Bridge 51C-158</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1132 - 862328 Kinevan Road Bridge HBP grant</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>222,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ongoing Grants for Fiscal Year 2012-13
(Grupoed by Department.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrantID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1133 - 862330 Fernald Point Bridge HBP Grant</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134 - 862339 Foothill Road Low Water Crossing Replacement HBP Grant</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140 - 862336 Temp-Minor Bridge Rehab HPB Grant</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION CLUSTER</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Public Works Total | 5,881,603 | 0 | 5,881,603 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrantID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Passed through: California Secretary of State

<p>| Clerk-Recorder-Assessor Total                                                |              |              | 71,535     | 0          | 71,535 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant ID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1051 - Lmp Vet Memorial Bldg/PL 111-8 (8694)</td>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>207,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Services Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant ID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>207,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant ID and Title</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Grant Amt.</th>
<th>Match Amt.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,402,405</td>
<td>842,540</td>
<td>22,244,945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grouped by:** Dept  **Sorted by:** Grant ID

**Report Criteria:** Dept: All Departments
## Ongoing Contracts for Fiscal Year 2012-13

### Revenue Contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Contract #/Title</th>
<th>11-12 Amount</th>
<th>12-13 Amount</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Service Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Dept. of Alcohol &amp; Drug Programs</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>21,534,918</td>
<td>21,534,918</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>NNA and DMC Revenue Agreement (Three-Year Agreement)</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Headway</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>33,650</td>
<td>33,650</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>DUI Fees Revenue</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Goldner Counseling Group</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>PC1000 Services</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Buellton</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>6,756</td>
<td>7,454</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>Mobile Crisis Revenue FY 12-15 (Three-Year Agreement)</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carpintera</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>5,994</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>Mobile Crisis Revenue FY 12-15 (Three-Year Agreement)</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Guadalupe</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>Mobile Crisis Revenue FY 12-15 (Three-Year Agreement)</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lompoc</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>54,971</td>
<td>60,644</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>Mobile Crisis Revenue FY 12-15 (Three-Year Agreement)</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>157,245</td>
<td>173,471</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>Mobile Crisis Revenue FY 12-15 (Three-Year Agreement)</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Maria</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>93,959</td>
<td>103,654</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>Mobile Crisis Revenue FY 12-15 (Three-Year Agreement)</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solvang</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>5,994</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>Mobile Crisis Revenue FY 12-15 (Three-Year Agreement)</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>PC1000 Revenue</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zona Seca, Inc.</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>PC1000/DUI Revenue</td>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,948,310</td>
<td>21,981,742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Buellton</td>
<td>10-00575</td>
<td>29,970</td>
<td>31,469</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Animal Control Field and Shelter Services</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>09-00471</td>
<td>197,688</td>
<td>207,572</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Animal Control Field and Shelter Services</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Guadalupe</td>
<td>09-00471</td>
<td>41,097</td>
<td>43,152</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Animal Control Field and Shelter Services</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lompoc</td>
<td>09-00684</td>
<td>242,707</td>
<td>254,842</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Animal Control Field and Shelter Services</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>10-00575</td>
<td>274,401</td>
<td>288,121</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Animal Control Field and Shelter Services</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Maria</td>
<td>09-00684</td>
<td>518,830</td>
<td>544,772</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Animal Control Field and Shelter Services</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ynez Tribal Business Council</td>
<td>09-00471</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Animal Control Field and Shelter Services</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solvang</td>
<td>09-00471</td>
<td>34,903</td>
<td>36,648</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Animal Control Field and Shelter Services</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,341,218</td>
<td>1,408,279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contractors on Payroll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Contract #/Title</th>
<th>11-12 Amount</th>
<th>12-13 Amount</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Service Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajor, George</td>
<td>EID 3317</td>
<td>46,700</td>
<td>46,700</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, MD, Edward</td>
<td>EID 11361</td>
<td>91,520</td>
<td>91,520</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Bob</td>
<td>BC 05-012</td>
<td>68,640</td>
<td>68,640</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsberg, MD, Harold</td>
<td>EID 9024</td>
<td>45,760</td>
<td>45,800</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy, MD, Lawrence</td>
<td>EID 11007</td>
<td>239,200</td>
<td>239,200</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litten, Daniel</td>
<td>BC 06-102</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>505,120</td>
<td>505,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Counsel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, Diane</td>
<td>08-00587</td>
<td>28,837</td>
<td>28,837</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Paralegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,837</td>
<td>28,837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paredes, Jessica</td>
<td></td>
<td>67,925</td>
<td>67,925</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Coordinator for Sexual Assault Response Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67,925</td>
<td>67,925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleher, Kyle</td>
<td>BC 10-109</td>
<td>70,103</td>
<td>63,763</td>
<td>-9.0%</td>
<td>EMS, Disaster Cache Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart, Brian</td>
<td>BC 11-077</td>
<td>41,437</td>
<td>43,164</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>AMR EPCR IT Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111,540</td>
<td>106,927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yepez, Martha</td>
<td>BC 11-001</td>
<td>70,103</td>
<td>75,529</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>New Cuyama Family Resource Center coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70,103</td>
<td>75,529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Expenditure Contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Contract #/Title</th>
<th>11-12 Amount</th>
<th>12-13 Amount</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Service Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural Commissioner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents of the University of CA (UCCE)</td>
<td>BC 12-061</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Youth program and agricultural advisory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegis Medical Systems</td>
<td>BC 10-028</td>
<td>1,675,000</td>
<td>1,720,000</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>DMC Narcotic Treatment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Vista del Mar Hospital</td>
<td>BC 11-011</td>
<td>1,186,250</td>
<td>1,186,250</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Acute Inpatient Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Mental Health</td>
<td>10-70188</td>
<td>163,679</td>
<td>184,182</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>State hospital bed purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa Pacifica</td>
<td>BC 10-026</td>
<td>3,750,422</td>
<td>3,703,803</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>Children's Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Valley Substance Abuse Treatment Center</td>
<td>BC 12-016</td>
<td>333,120</td>
<td>329,120</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>Alcohol and Drug Treatment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Commission</td>
<td>BC 12-015</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Alcohol and Drug Assessment/Referral for SAMHSA grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Centers of the Central Coast</td>
<td>BC 11-010</td>
<td>463,112</td>
<td>463,112</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Mental Health Prevention and Intervention Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse</td>
<td>BC 10-021</td>
<td>104,750</td>
<td>104,750</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Children's Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse</td>
<td>BC 12-047</td>
<td>1,384,875</td>
<td>1,441,590</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>Alcohol and Drug Treatment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestwood Behavioral Health Center, Inc.</td>
<td>BC 12-017</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Institute for Mental Disease Services for Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Guest Home</td>
<td>BC 11-082</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Adult Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Service Agency</td>
<td>BC 10-034</td>
<td>117,270</td>
<td>117,270</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>ADP Prevention Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim Healthcare Services, Inc.</td>
<td>BC 12-023</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Temporary Nurses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Doctor Associates</td>
<td>BC 11-062</td>
<td>284,160</td>
<td>284,160</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Locum Tenens Temporary Physician Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Association in Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>BC 09-012</td>
<td>591,718</td>
<td>591,718</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Adult Mental Health Services in South County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Systems, Inc.</td>
<td>BC 10-023</td>
<td>478,698</td>
<td>467,640</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>Children/Transition-Aged Youth Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathpoint</td>
<td>BC 12-027</td>
<td>1,118,478</td>
<td>1,073,532</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>Adult Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PharMerica</td>
<td>BC 11-016</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Pharmacy Services for PHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>BC 09-013</td>
<td>886,135</td>
<td>886,135</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Adult Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary Psychiatric</td>
<td>BC 11-075</td>
<td>120,686</td>
<td>122,730</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Alcohol and Drug Co-Occurring Treatment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevents Santa Barbara Neighborhood Clinics</td>
<td>BC 11-015</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Mental Health Prevention and Intervention Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria Valley Youth &amp; Family Center</td>
<td>BC 10-037</td>
<td>232,440</td>
<td>237,660</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>Alcohol and Drug Treatment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Vista Rehabilitation Center</td>
<td>BC 12-014</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Institute for Mental Disease Services for Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylmar Health &amp; Rehabilitation Center</td>
<td>BC 12-018</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Institute for Mental Disease Services for Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecare Corporation</td>
<td>BC 12-028</td>
<td>2,632,890</td>
<td>2,676,424</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Adult Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions Mental Health Association</td>
<td>BC 11-012</td>
<td>2,518,980</td>
<td>2,518,980</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Adult Mental Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zona Seca</td>
<td>BC 10-038</td>
<td>340,090</td>
<td>340,090</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Substance Abuse Treatment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,594,752</td>
<td>20,641,147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerk-Recorder-Assessor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFM Associates</td>
<td>BC 10-004</td>
<td>214,000</td>
<td>214,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Lease/maint of DFM recorder info &amp; imaging mgmt system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFM Associates</td>
<td>BC 09-007</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Lease/maint of DFM elections info mgmt system (EIMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Half International, dba Office Team</td>
<td>BC 08-089</td>
<td></td>
<td>388,000</td>
<td>388,000</td>
<td>Election Temporary Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court Special Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Defense Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>South County Conflict Defense Contract</td>
<td>803,406</td>
<td>803,406</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Defense Team</td>
<td>North County Conflict Defense Contract</td>
<td>869,586</td>
<td>869,586</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Legal services when the Public Defender conflicts out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,672,992</td>
<td>1,672,992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General County Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Regional Health Authority</td>
<td>BC 09-070</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Health Insurance for Children (CHI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brown Engineers</td>
<td>BC 11-024</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>Offshore Oil &amp; Gas Technical Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Contract #/Title</td>
<td>11-12 Amount</td>
<td>12-13 Amount</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Cleaners &amp; Laundry, Inc.</td>
<td>BC 12-032</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>Laundry services for Probation institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Commission of SB Co.</td>
<td>BC 12-033</td>
<td>167,500</td>
<td>167,500</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Services to Youth Offender Block Grant youths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Commission of SB Co.</td>
<td>BC 12-030</td>
<td>237,615</td>
<td>237,615</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Meal service (lunch) to Santa Maria Juvenile Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTC Enterprises</td>
<td>BC 12-031</td>
<td>190,935</td>
<td>190,935</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Meal service (dinner) to Santa Maria Juvenile Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bines, Lawrence</td>
<td>BC 12-068</td>
<td>991,345</td>
<td>1,026,456</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>Physician Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Inpatient Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td>BC 09-117</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Hospitalist Coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix Medical Corporation (George Johnson, MD)</td>
<td>BC 12-067</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>246,000</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>Physician Services (2-year contract, 11-12 pro-rated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKesson Information Solutions</td>
<td>BC 04-204</td>
<td>249,333</td>
<td>259,167</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>Maint. upgrades &amp; processing svcs for patient info system (3-yr contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Pride Foundation</td>
<td>BC 04-039</td>
<td>112,650</td>
<td>112,650</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Ryan White Program - Part C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Pride Foundation</td>
<td>BC 10-092</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>HIV Care Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Cottage Hospital</td>
<td>BC 11-005</td>
<td>707,640</td>
<td>652,760</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
<td>Hospitalist and Outpatient Professional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Regional Health Authority</td>
<td>BC 12-066</td>
<td>180,465</td>
<td>164,072</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td>TS Hospital Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ServiceMaster of Goleta</td>
<td>BC 12-053</td>
<td>155,480</td>
<td>155,480</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Janitorial services for South County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest Diagnostics Laboratories (formerly Unilab)</td>
<td>BC 05-046</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Outside Referral Laboratory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Works</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS Construction Company</td>
<td>BC 12-043</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Maintenance of flood control facilities (time and material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob's Backhoe &amp; Trucking</td>
<td>BC 12-036</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Maintenance of flood control facilities (time and material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CallPortland Construction</td>
<td>BC 12-040</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Maintenance of flood control facilities (time and material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushman Contracting Corporation</td>
<td>BC 12-044</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Maintenance of flood control facilities (time and material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enviroscaping, Inc.</td>
<td>BC 12-019</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Revegetation and maintenance work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Construction Company</td>
<td>BC 12-035</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Maintenance of flood control facilities (time and material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lash Construction Company</td>
<td>BC 12-037</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Maintenance of flood control facilities (time and material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Labor Services</td>
<td>BC 12-050</td>
<td>413,322</td>
<td>413,322</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>On call casual labor services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papich Contracting Company, Inc.</td>
<td>BC 12-045</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Maintenance of flood control facilities (time and material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.W. Scott Company, Inc.</td>
<td>BC 12-038</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Maintenance of flood control facilities (time and material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw Contracting Corporation</td>
<td>BC 12-041</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Maintenance of flood control facilities (time and material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Construction Inc.</td>
<td>BC 12-042</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Maintenance of flood control facilities (time and material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra Contracting, Inc.</td>
<td>BC 12-039</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Maintenance of flood control facilities (time and material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Santa Barbara</td>
<td>BC 07-027</td>
<td>562,039</td>
<td>618,240</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>Household hazardous waste facility operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheriff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce S Thomas, Inc.</td>
<td>BC05-001</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Data processing consulting, design and development services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Association of Counties (CSAC)</td>
<td>BC 12-006</td>
<td>112,766</td>
<td>112,766</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>WCDS Agreement to manage CalWIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse Listening &amp; Mediations (CALM)</td>
<td>BC 11-006</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Targeted community based child abuse &amp; neglect prevention svcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse Listening &amp; Mediations (CALM)</td>
<td>BC 11-004</td>
<td>187,500</td>
<td>187,500</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>SafeCare Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Commission</td>
<td>BC 11-007</td>
<td>116,128</td>
<td>116,128</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Front Porch Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Commission</td>
<td>BC 11-053</td>
<td>172,500</td>
<td>172,500</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>SafeCare Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Commission</td>
<td>BC 12-005</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Enhanced Family Reunification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Care Network</td>
<td>BC 12-024</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Independent Living Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria Valley Youth &amp; Family Center</td>
<td>BC 11-043</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Targeted community based child abuse &amp; neglect prevention svcs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Contracts with cities for Mobile Crisis Revenue are for a 3-year period.
2. No specified contract amount. However, billing rates shall not exceed the contract rates.
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF ADOPTING THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012-13

RESOLUTION NO. 12-

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, has been meeting from time to time and holding public hearings at such meetings for the discussion and consideration of the recommended budget for the 2012-13 fiscal year, all pursuant to notice and the provisions of law, said public hearings having commenced on June 11, 2012, and concluded on June 15, 2012, pursuant to the requirements of Sections 29080 through 29092 of the Government Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, said Board of Supervisors has met pursuant to such published notice and heard all members of the general public and officials present regarding the matters aforesaid and has considered, made and settled all revisions of, deductions from, and increases or additions to the recommended budget which it deems advisable; and

WHEREAS, the record is in final form in the possession of the Santa Barbara County Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and Auditor-Controller, which meets requirements set forth in Government Code Section 29089, and the public hearing on said budget being now finally closed, and the meetings thereon finally concluded;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, that said budget as so increased, modified, revised and finally settled shall be, and the same hereby is adopted as the budget for the 2012-13 fiscal year for the County of Santa Barbara and all other entities whose affairs are financed and under the supervision of the Board of Supervisors; and that said budget document presently consists of the 2012-13 Recommended Budget, the record for the Budget
Hearings, and the summaries and decisions of the Santa Barbara County Board of
Supervisors in making final budget adjustments which are incorporated herein and made a
part of this resolution as though set forth in full pursuant to Government Code Section 29090.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Auditor-Controller in compiling the final
budget, is authorized to make adjustments required to balance interfund and intrafund
transfers, and to make adjustments in offsetting revenue/expenditure accounts to the extent
that there is no net overall change in the budget or no net change in General Fund
Contribution as adopted during budget hearings.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the County Executive Officer and the Auditor-
Controller are authorized to transfer appropriations to or from the Salary and Retirement
Offset account in order to make adjustments, if necessary, to the Salaries and Benefits
account of departmental budgets in accordance with any negotiated salary agreements or
retirement rate changes.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the County Executive Officer and the Auditor-
Controller are authorized to make final budget adjustments that transfer 2011-12
appropriations for fixed assets and other material purchases that have been ordered but not
received, by June 30, 2012 to the 2012-13 budget, subject to established criteria.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the County Executive Officer is authorized to
approve revisions to the 2012-13 budget that increase appropriations for approved fixed
assets because of price changes subsequent to the adoption of the budget in amounts up to ten
percent (10%) of the approved budget for the item.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the County Executive Officer is authorized to
approve revisions to the 2012-13 budget to allow purchase of equipment approved in the
budget as “Service and Supplies,” which are subject to reclassification as fixed assets due to
price changes which occur after the preparation of the budget, causing the item to meet the
capitalization threshold of $5,000 for equipment.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Auditor-Controller, in compiling the Final
Budget, is authorized to make ministerial budget changes and to transfer appropriations to or
from designated fund balances and contingencies to balance the budget for the various funds
governed by the Board of Supervisors.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the internal charges for services included in the
recommended budget and as increased, modified and revised, and finally settled, are hereby
adopted and incorporated into the financing of the Final Budget.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Auditor-Controller is authorized to make
adjustments to the final budget throughout fiscal year 2012-13 for line item accounts 3381
Unrealized Gain/Loss on Investments and 9897 Unrealized Gains to properly record changes
in the fair value of investments.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Auditor-Controller is authorized to make
adjustments to the final budget throughout fiscal year 2012-13 for line item account 3380
Interest Income and various fund balance accounts in order to properly record fund balance
increases in operating funds due to interest income in the underlying agency fund.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Auditor-Controller and County Executive
Officer are authorized to make any adjustments to the final budget for fiscal year 2012-13 in
order to comply with any Governmental Accounting Standards Board Pronouncements or to
conform the budget to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Auditor-Controller is hereby authorized to
make adjustments to the final budget for fiscal year 2012-13 to reflect the transfer of any
undesignated General Fund balance greater than $0 (zero) to the General Fund Strategic
Reserve. If the General Fund undesignated fund balance ends the fiscal year below $0 (zero) the difference will be taken from the General Fund Strategic Reserve.

**PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED** by reference in accordance with Government Code Section 29090 by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, this fifteenth day of June 2012 by the following vote:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSENT:**

__________________________

**ATTEST:** Doreen Farr, Chair
Chandra L. Wallar
Clerk of the Board

**BY:** ______________________

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**
Dennis Marshall
County Counsel

**APPROVED AS TO ACCOUNTING FORM:**
Robert W. Geis, CPA
Auditor-Controller

**BY:** ______________________
County Counsel

**BY:** ______________________
Auditor-Controller
Proposed FY 2012/13 Operating Plan

Preparation for Future Challenges

June 11, 2012
Fiscal Year 11/12

- A year of ongoing and unparalleled challenges
- Structural and long standing fiscal problems
- Need to identify and reduce/eliminate non-core discretionary services
- Difficult decisions between programs (mandated vs. long term value)
During these challenging times we have found innovative service solutions. As an example:

- Completed labor negotiations reducing future salary and benefits
- Implemented department consolidations
- Explored strategies for revenue enhancement
Fiscal Year 11/12 Accomplishments

- Conducted analysis of Fire department operations
- Combined Fire and Sheriff departments’ aviation programs
- Participated in dissolution of seven Redevelopment Agencies
- Aggressively pursued federal funding
Fiscal Year 12/13 Proposed Budget

- Prepared with input from all department directors
- Significant and severe service level impacts
- Balanced and reflects Board’s priorities (public safety, children and families, sustainable communities)
- Enhanced clarity, focus on outcomes, and future perspective
## Budget at a Glance

Balanced budget of $828.1M and staffing of 3,800 FTEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual FY 10-11</th>
<th>Adopted FY 11-12</th>
<th>Recommended FY 12-13</th>
<th>Proposed FY 13-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$743.7</td>
<td>$749.1</td>
<td>$745.7</td>
<td>$741.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Financing Sources</strong></td>
<td>$144.7</td>
<td>$116.8</td>
<td>$82.4</td>
<td>$86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources</strong></td>
<td>$888.4</td>
<td>$865.9</td>
<td>$828.1</td>
<td>$828.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$766.5</td>
<td>$825.0</td>
<td>$800.1</td>
<td>$800.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designated for Future Use</strong></td>
<td>$113.4</td>
<td>$40.9</td>
<td>$28.0</td>
<td>$27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Uses</strong></td>
<td>$879.9</td>
<td>$865.9</td>
<td>$828.1</td>
<td>$828.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing FTEs</strong></td>
<td>3,911.7</td>
<td>3,713.7</td>
<td>3,801.4</td>
<td>3,797.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closing the Budget Gap

- Employee concessions
  - Salary and benefit reductions (ongoing)
  - Furloughs (one-time)
  - New retirement tier (non-safety members)
- Department savings and fund balance
- Service level reductions
- State budget uncertainty
- RDA dissolutions
County’s Strategic Plan Update

- Workshops to identify County’s priorities
- Focus on ongoing vs. one-time solutions
- Managing/reducing workforce costs
- Defining core services
- Reducing deferred maintenance
- Raising new revenues
- Building financial reserves
Commitment to Public Safety

10 Year Comparison

FY02-03 Adopted
- Public Safety: 34%
- Law & Justice: 13%
- Policy & Executive: 6%
- General County Programs: 13%
- Support Services: 13%
- Community Resources & Public Facilities: 8%

FY12-13 Recommended
- Public Safety: 50%
- Law & Justice: 14%
- General County Programs: 4%
- Policy & Executive: 6%
- Community Resources & Public Facilities: 7%
- Support Services: 10%
- Health & Public Assistance: 9%
- Health & Public Assistance: 13%

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Commitment to Public Safety

Underfunding of Community Resources and Internal Support Services

- Deterioration of quality of life
- Significant risk of financial losses

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Investing in the Future

Investing strategically to meet future County needs:

- Fire Operations
- New North County Jail
- Deferred maintenance of County facilities
- Alcohol, Drug, Mental Health Services (ADMHS)
- Retirement
Summary

- Difficult program choices (mandated vs. long-term benefits)
- Continue to provide valued services
- Prepare for future challenges
- Address structural deficit/eliminate one-time funding solutions
- Enhance ongoing revenues and set aside reserves
- Predicting $18M - $20M budget gap in FY 13-14
Santa Barbara County

Recommended Operational Plan Fiscal Years 2012-13 & 2013-14

Preparing for Future Challenges
Hearing Schedule

- Hearings begin Monday, June 11, 2012
- Continue on Wednesday, June 13 and Friday, June 15
- Hearings start at 9 am each day
Budget Hearing Materials

Budget Binder Tab Number:

1. Budget Hearing Schedule
2. Board Inquiry Forms
3. Board Letter
4-7. Final Budget Adj., Ongoing Grant/Contracts, Resolution
8. Budget Overview – CEO
9-29. Department Presentations
30. General County Programs & Outside Agencies
31. Expected Service Level Impacts
FY 2012-13
Recommended Budget
Development Process
Budget Development Process

- November 2011 – Fiscal Outlook Report
- December 2011 – Budget Policies and Review of Budget Adoption Process
- April 2012 – Fiscal Outlook Update
- April 2012 – Potential Service Level Impacts
Budget Development Policies

- Accountability / Transparency
- Balanced Budget / Fiscal Stability
- Policy-Based Budgeting
- Service Levels
- Essential Infrastructure
- Future New Jail Operations
- Program Increase Requests
- Continuous Improvement and Innovation Strategies
- Reserves
Balancing Current Needs with Future Risks

- Expenditures: Continue to rise faster than revenues; primarily employee benefit costs
- Revenues: Modest growth in General Revenues
- Significant use of one-time funds for ongoing services (structural imbalance)
- State budget challenges loom
• Several years of service level reductions
• Additional Funding Needs:
  – North County Jail
  – Fire Operations
  – ADMHS
  – Deferred Capital Maintenance
  – Retirement
Changes After Publication of the Budget

• Retirement costs in 13/14 will decrease from current proposed budget

• RDA Dissolution will result in additional General Fund and Fire District $’s

• Property Tax Assessed Value may be lower than previously thought
Recommended FY 2012-13 Operating Budget

Budget Summary
FY12/13 Recommended Budget Summary

Strategies to Balance

- Continued use of one-time funds to balance = $16.1M
- Reduce expenditures; Service Level Impacts (SLI’s) total $10.9M
- FY12/13 Concession savings; $15.0M Gross, $9.1M Net
## FY12/13: Gap
(Source: Fiscal Outlook Update, April 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem:</th>
<th>Offset Gross</th>
<th>Offset Rev/Exp</th>
<th>Offset Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$ (10.7)</td>
<td>$ 4.2</td>
<td>$ (6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta Neutrality</td>
<td>(2.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Use of One-Time</td>
<td>(18.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Problem to solve</strong></td>
<td>$ (31.5)</td>
<td>$ 4.2</td>
<td>$ (27.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solutions:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased General Revenues</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>(5.9)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Solutions</strong></td>
<td>$ 18.3</td>
<td>$ (5.9)</td>
<td>$ 12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total of Previous GAP           | $ (13.2)     | $ (1.7)        | $ (15.0)   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous GAP</td>
<td>$(15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jail, set-aside</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Budget Input, Rev. &amp; Exp.</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Gap w/all Budget Changes</td>
<td>(27.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Cuts (Service Level Impacts)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of One-time funds</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed Solutions</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 12/13 Budget Summary

### $828.1 Million Balanced Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual FY 10-11</th>
<th>Adopted FY 11-12</th>
<th>Recommended FY 12-13</th>
<th>Proposed FY 13-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$743.7</td>
<td>$749.1</td>
<td>$745.7</td>
<td>$741.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Financing Sources</td>
<td>$144.7</td>
<td>$116.8</td>
<td>$82.4</td>
<td>$86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$888.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$865.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$828.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$828.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$766.5</td>
<td>$825.0</td>
<td>$800.1</td>
<td>$800.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated for Future Use</td>
<td>$113.4</td>
<td>$40.9</td>
<td>$28.0</td>
<td>$27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Uses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$879.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$865.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$828.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$828.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing FTEs</td>
<td>3,911.7</td>
<td>3,713.7</td>
<td>3,801.4</td>
<td>3,797.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan**

Preparing for Future Challenges
Use of One-Time Funds

FY 2012-13 Recommended Budget

Ongoing
$784M
98%

One-time
$16.1M
2%

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Revenues by Source

- Charges for Services: 25%
- Use of Money and Property: 1%
- Taxes: 29%
- Licenses, Permits and Franchises: 2%
- Federal and State Revenue: 36%
- Misc Revenue: 5%
- Fines, Forfeitures, and Penalties: 1%
Total Expenditures by Function

FY 02-03 Adopted
- Support Services: 11%
- Community Resources & Public Facilities: 20%
- General County Programs: 4%
- Public Safety: 22%
- Policy & Executive: 1%
- Health & Public Assistance: 36%
- Law & Justice: 6%

FY 12-13 Recommended
- Support Services: 9%
- Community Resources & Public Facilities: 19%
- General County Programs: 1%
- Public Safety: 26%
- Policy & Executive: 2%
- Law & Justice: 5%
- Health & Public Assistance: 38%
General Fund Contribution
10 Year Comparison

FY 02-03 Adopted
- Public Safety: 34%
- Law & Justice: 13%
- Policy & Executive: 6%
- Health & Public Assistance: 13%
- Community Resources & Public Facilities: 8%
- Support Services: 13%

FY 12-13 Recommended
- Public Safety: 50%
- Community Resources & Public Facilities: 7%
- Support Services: 10%
- General County Programs: 4%
- Policy & Executive: 6%
- Law & Justice: 14%
- General Fund Contribution: 13%

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Average Cost per FTE with Retirement

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Average Cost of County Employee Safety Departments vs. Non-Safety Departments

Cost in Thousands

- 07-08:
  - Non-Public Safety Dept.: $91,600
  - Public Safety Dept.: $110,900
- 08-09:
  - Non-Public Safety Dept.: $100,300
  - Public Safety Dept.: $119,900
- 09-10:
  - Non-Public Safety Dept.: $103,300
  - Public Safety Dept.: $120,300
- 10-11:
  - Non-Public Safety Dept.: $110,700
  - Public Safety Dept.: $131,800
- 11-12:
  - Non-Public Safety Dept.: $119,000
  - Public Safety Dept.: $147,000
- 12-13 Rec.:
  - Non-Public Safety Dept.: $113,600
  - Public Safety Dept.: $148,000

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Average Cost of County Employee by Functional Area

FY 2012-13 Recommended Budget

Salaries and Benefits per FTE (in thousands)

Policy & Executive: $146.9
Law & Justice: $148.6
Public Safety: $148.0
Health & Public Assistance: $105.8
Community Resources & Public Facilities: $111.0
Support Services: $124.7

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
## Key General Fund Discretionary Fund Balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$405,405</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$905,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>98,465</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>598,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>1,712,039</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(500,000)</td>
<td>1,212,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary &amp; Benefits Reductions</td>
<td>6,155,374</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,155,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>1,883,588</td>
<td>2,855,220</td>
<td>(2,000,000)</td>
<td>2,738,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Exceptions</td>
<td>3,913,929</td>
<td>(4,116,821)</td>
<td>(202,892)</td>
<td>(202,892)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jail Operations</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Restoration</td>
<td>183,494</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>183,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>1,291,421</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,791,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Reserve</td>
<td>21,827,244</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,827,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,470,959</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,355,220</strong></td>
<td><strong>($6,616,821)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,209,358</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$405,405</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$905,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>1,712,039</td>
<td>(500,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,212,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary &amp; Benefits Reductions</td>
<td>6,155,374</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,155,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>1,883,588</td>
<td>2,855,220</td>
<td>(2,000,000)</td>
<td>2,738,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Exceptions</td>
<td>3,216,704</td>
<td>(3,216,704)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jail Operations</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Restoration</td>
<td>183,494</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>183,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>1,291,421</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>(301,497)</td>
<td>1,489,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Reserve</td>
<td>21,827,244</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,827,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$37,675,269</td>
<td>$6,355,220</td>
<td>($6,018,201)</td>
<td>$38,012,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic Reserve Balance

Target Level = 8% of GF Operating Revenue = $31.2M

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Recommendations

To Adopt FY 2012-13 Budget
Recommendations

1. Approve final budget adjustments to the FY 2012-13 Recommended Budget, including Attachment E budget balancing adjustments

2. Delegate authority to the County Executive Officer to execute ongoing grants and contracts (including library and advertising contracts) included in the Recommended Budget

3. Authorize the County Executive Officer to approve ongoing contracts where amounts are up to 10% more or less than indicated amounts, or up to $5,000 more or less than indicated amounts on contracts under $50,000, without returning to the Board for approval
Recommendations

4. Adopt the Resolution of the Board of Supervisors entitled In the Matter of Adopting the Budget for FY 2012-13

5. By separate resolution, adopt the Successor Agency to the former Redevelopment Agency budget for FY 2012-13
• ABx1 26 Redevelopment Clean Up and RDA Asset Disposition

• AB 1585 (Atkins and Dickinson and Hill and John A. Pérez and Mitchell and Perea and Torres) Redevelopment

• SB 986 (Dutton) Redevelopment: Bond proceeds

• League of California Cities Draft Amendments to DOF Trailer Bill
2012 The Governor’s May Budget Revision

- $15.7 Billion Deficit
- November Statewide Ballot Initiative
- Trigger Cuts
- Next Steps
Impacts to the County:

- 2011 Public Safety Realignment
- Probation Charges
- Agriculture
- Health and Human Services
  - Medi-Cal
  - Cal WORKS
  - In Home Support Services (IHSS)
  - Mental Health Services
Fiscal Year 12/13
Proposed Budget Hearings

- Testimony from all department directors
- Public speaker comments
- Ongoing and unparalleled changes
- Difficult years ahead
- Need for additional program reductions possible due to state budget shortfalls

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Fiscal Year 12/13 Proposed Budget

- Proposed budget = $828M; $25M less expenditures than FY2011/12
- Proposed staffing = 3801 FTEs; 550 FTE less than FY2007/08
- Balanced and reflects Board’s priorities
- Reduces/eliminates many non-mandated services

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Commitment to Public Safety

10 Year Comparison

FY02-03 Adopted
- Public Safety: 34%
- Law & Justice: 13%
- Policy & Executive: 6%
- Support Services: 13%
- General County Programs: 13%
- Community Resources & Public Facilities: 8%

FY12-13 Recommended
- Public Safety: 50%
- Community Resources & Public Facilities: 7%
- Support Services: 10%
- General County Programs: 4%
- Policy & Executive: 6%
- Law & Justice: 14%
- Health & Public Assistance: 9%
- Community Resources & Public Facilities: 8%

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Commitment to Public Safety

Underfunding of Community Resources and internal Support Services:

- Deterioration of quality of life
- Significant risk of financial losses
Closing the Budget Gap

- $9M ongoing program reductions
- $16M one-time solutions
- Continue to seek efficiencies
- If additional funding becomes available recommend used to reduce one-time funding
- Employee concessions $15M
  - Salary and benefit reductions (ongoing)
  - Furloughs (one-time)
  - New retirement tier (non-safety members)
Closing the Budget Gap

- Negotiate public safety employee concessions
- Ongoing revenue solutions
- FY2013-14 budget gap estimated at $18M-$20M
- Uncertainty related to State budget shortfalls
Summary

➢ “Cutting away some bone”
➢ Careful consideration and balancing of program reductions
➢ Prepare for future challenges
➢ Need for significant policy decisions and difficult program prioritization
County Executive Office

• Total Budget
  – Operating: $10.7 M
  – Capital: $30,000

• General Fund Contribution
  – $7.7 M (72% of total)

• Budget FTE
  – 46.9
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• Initiated Budget Clarity Project with the Auditor-Controller
• Influenced state and federal legislation to advance the Board of Supervisors’ adopted 2012 legislative platform
• Established North County Jail operations funding strategy
• Coordinated review of Fire Department to assess its ability to meet county’s needs
• Developed joint aviation program between Sheriff and Fire which enhanced effectiveness of the program and reduced total cost
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• Further strengthened Emergency Public Information in cooperation with the Emergency Public Information Communicator (EPIC) group

• Negotiated concessions with labor organizations which included agreements to implement a new retirement tier for the future general member workforce

• Provided ongoing leadership in the dissolution of the County Redevelopment Agency
FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts

• Eliminate 1 Emergency Manager in Emergency Management

• Eliminate 1 Administrative Office Professional in the Clerk of the Board

• Eliminate 1 Fiscal & Policy Analyst in Budget & Research
$376k projected budget gap in FY 2013-14

Create a long-term plan for a structurally-balanced budget

Update the Strategic Plan

Enhance coordination of the County response to homeless issues
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

• Continue to identify and propose revenue enhancements

• Lead review and implementation of Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services (ADMHS) Request for Proposals recommendations

• Ensure emergency preparedness via ongoing training and exercises
County Counsel

- **Total Budget**
  - Operating: $7.2M
  - Capital: $0

- **General Fund Contribution**
  - $2.3M (32% of total)

- **Budget FTE = 37.7**
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Litigated return of $4.8 million of mental health funds
- Supported County negotiators: new lower retirement tiers
- Outlined compliance with complex RDA amendments
- Rice Ranch open space, Goleta Valley Community Plan, Santa Barbara Ranch, Las Varas, Cavaletto Tree Farm
- Financings: $60M TRAN, $26M solar, $12M Montecito Ret.
- 34 Risk-funded cases: dismissal, trial or settlement
- Prevailed in $1M bail bond forfeiture litigation: on appeal
• Budget Gap for FY 2013/14 is $215,000

• Close legal support: “problem prevention” & solutions

• Support improved defensibility of County contracts

• Provide high quality litigation representation:
  ■ Minimize costs by maximizing “in-house” defense
  ■ Defend against denial of mental health charges

• Continue legal support for wind down of former RDAs

• Draft ordinances: Inclusionary Housing, Wineries
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Court Special Services

- Total Budget
  - Operating: $15.8 million
  - Capital: $0

- General Fund Contribution
  - $8.5 million (53% of total)

- Budget FTE
  - 0
## COURT SPECIAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total County Budget</td>
<td>$15,824,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE State–(GC 77201.1(b)(1))</td>
<td>$ 6,764,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE State–(GC 77201.1 (b)(2))</td>
<td>$ 3,117,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE State- (GC 77205)</td>
<td>$ 650,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total to the State per Statute</td>
<td>$10,533,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual for County Programs</td>
<td>$ 5,291,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• Collected $9.0 million in delinquent fees and fines.

• Assumed responsibility for the collection of all Public Defender court ordered debt, increasing collections for the Public Defender 40% over the previous year.

• Implemented the Infraction Amnesty Program.

• Continued a cost recovery process through which the County received reimbursement revenue of $1.2 million.

• Negotiated a conflict defense contract to freeze pricing at the FY 2009-10 level through FY 2011-2012 for the South County Courts.

• Recruited a Civil Grand Jury to review the governmental operations throughout Santa Barbara County.
FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts

- There were no service level impacts for Court Special Services in FY 2012-2013. All programs in Court Special Services are mandated by law.
Changes are anticipated but the impacts cannot be estimated or projected at this time due to uncertain economic times.

We will continue to improve processes, look for efficiencies and reduce cost.
District Attorney

• Total Budget
  - Operating: $18.2 million
  - Capital: $30,000

• General Fund Contribution
  - $12.3 million (64% of total)

• Budget FTE
  - 118.9
• Successful case prosecution and investigation
  ➢ First Internet Crimes Against Children case
  ➢ First investigation of attempted purchase of a firearm by a convicted felon

• Elder Death Review Team reinstated
  ➢ Examined cases to determine whether criminal conduct was involved

• Volunteer Attorney Externship Program
  ➢ Provided additional resources at no expense to the County
  ➢ 5 program graduates now employed in DA or County Counsel Offices across the state

• AB 109 Realignment
  ➢ Trained all staff on new policies and procedures
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• **Sexual Assault Response Team**
  - Received accreditation from National Children’s Alliance

• **Community presentations throughout the County**
  - Staff presented in excess of 500 hours to schools and community groups

• **Administered 11 state and federal grants**
  - $1.5 million in revenue
FY 12-13 Proposed Budget

• No Service Level Impacts

• One-time funding of $411,534 budgeted to maintain existing service levels

• Carryover one-time funds from savings achieved in current fiscal year
 FY 13-14
Preparation for the Future

- Projected Budget Shortfall of $884,273
- $1.1 million in expenditure increases due to Salary and Benefit costs
- Service Level Impacts anticipated unless additional revenue is identified
- Proactive mitigation of shortfall
  - Misdemeanor diversion program
  - Seeking additional grant revenue
  - One-time savings from FY 2012-13
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Public Defender

• Total Budget
  – Operating: $9.8M
  – Capital: $0

• General Fund Contribution
  – $6.8M (69.7% of total)

• Budget FTE
  – 61.3 (70.2 in FY 10-11)
  – 12.7% Decrease
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

THE PUBLIC DEFENDER’S OFFICE APPEARED FOR CLIENTS IN OVER 22,000 MATTERS

• Continue to represent appointed clients in every case:
  – 72% of “new” felony cases
  – 59% of “new” misdemeanor cases
  – 1,300 clients in our treatment courts
  – 321 clients in conservatorship and probate proceedings
• Increased attorney fee collections by 90%
• Collaboratively worked to reduce “jail bed” days
FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts

- Last year’s reduction of support staff increased the workload on our remaining staff

- Our ability to cover all of our cases is impacted whenever anyone is absent – resulting in continuances that affect the courts, district attorney and clients

**Support Staff/Attorney Ratios**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTEs</th>
<th>FY 10-11</th>
<th>FY 12-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investigator/Attorney Ratios**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTEs</th>
<th>FY 10-11</th>
<th>FY 12-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed budget for FY 2013-14 includes a projected General Fund gap of $260,000.

At least 3.0 FTE positions eliminated.

Increased workload and cost due to AB 109.

Case management system.
Fire

• Total Budget
  – Operating: $52.8M
  – Capital: $0.1M

• General Fund Contribution
  – $4.9M (9% of total Fire budget)

• Budget FTE
  – 245.0 (285.3 in FY 2009-10, a reduction of 14%)
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Automatic Vehicle Locator/Mobile Data Computer Project
- Paramedic Services at UCSB
- Fire Department Organizational Review and Deployment Study
- Los Padres Private Land Annexation & Property Tax Transfer
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Career Development Guide
- Santa Maria Air Tanker Base
- Fallen Firefighter Memorial
- Hazardous Materials Program Cost Recovery
FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts

• Gap = $2.3M
• Shut Down Engine 11 in Goleta (9 positions – Cost to restore $1.8M)
• Unstaff 4\textsuperscript{th} Firefighter Post Position at Station 22 in Orcutt (3 Posns; $468K)
• Reduce Paramedic Engineer to Firefighter at Station 51 in Unincorporated Lompoc ($52K)
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FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

- Continued Reduction of Engine 11 and 4th Firefighter Post at Station 22
- $3.3M Gap Projected
  - Retirement Rates
  - Salary Increases and Benefits Cost Increases
- Potential Impact = Station Closures
Probation Department

- Total Budget
  - Operating: $46.2 M
  - Capital: $0
- General Fund Contribution
  - $25.0 M (53% of total)
- Budget FTE
  - 343.1
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• 87% (392 of 450) of juvenile probationers exited probation without a new sustained felony while on probation

• 97% of approximately 156 juvenile probationers committed to Los Prietos Boys Camp and Academy graduated from the program

• Implemented the Los Prietos Business Center vocational training program
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Developed and implemented the 2011 Public Safety Realignment Act Plan
- Completed the Business Process Improvement (BPI) project with the Adult Division and completed the process for reviewing and updating all previous BPI documents
- 97% (2,375 of 2,500) of adult probationers exited probation without being convicted of a new felony while on probation
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Facilitated the transfer of data to Probation’s interim collection system
- Referred $1.6 M of delinquent account balances to the Franchise Tax Board Court Ordered Debt (FTBCOD) Program resulting in the collection of otherwise uncollectable accounts
• Eliminate 1 School Based DPO due to loss of State funding to the Santa Barbara County Education Office
• Eliminate 1 School Based DPO in January due to ending of Safe Schools Healthy Students grant
• Prudent management of FY 2011-12 increase to ongoing revenues mitigated service level impacts in FY 2012-13
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

- Operational costs are anticipated to increase by $2.7 M resulting in a budget gap
- Department wide statistical and business process analysis to appropriately allocate staff and identify reductions
  - Completed revalidation of the Santa Barbara Asset and Risk Assessment (SBARA) Initial Screening Tool
  - Diverted 645 youth from the Juvenile Hall to the Alternative Detention Program (ADP)
  - Implemented the Reentry Drug Court and reentry services at the Probation Report and Resource Centers (PRRCs)
- Review previous service level reduction proposals
Santa Barbara Sheriff’s Office
Proposed Budget 2012-13

Keeping the Peace Since 1850
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Sheriff’s Office

- **Total Budget**
  - Operating: $112.7M
  - Capital: $54,000
- **General Fund Contribution**
  - $69.8M (59% of Sheriff’s Budget)
- **Budget FTE**
  - 624.9
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FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• Calendar Year 2011:
  • 122,912 Calls for Service
  • 22,093 Reports
  • 9,474 Arrests
  • 49,238 - 911 calls
  • 16,167 inmate bookings

• Awarded $60 million AB 900 Phase II grant for a new North County Jail with an additional $20 million additional funding anticipated.

• Implemented AB109 State Criminal Justice Realignment by collaborating with the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP).
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• Completed security upgrades to the Medium Secure Facility (MSF).

• Eradicated nearly 60,000 marijuana plants from 17 illegal grow sites (estimated value of $120 million).

• Provided dignitary protection for the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge during historic Royal Visit to the Santa Barbara area.

• Sheriff Volunteers contributed over 14,000 hours.
FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts

- Gang Enforcement Team eliminated (2.0 FTE).
- Narcotics Bureau reduced by 50% (4.0 FTE).
- Criminal Investigation Division reduced by 2 detectives assigned to the unincorporated areas (2.0 FTE).

Santa Maria Jail reduced to a 7 night a week operation, causing hardships for the Sheriff’s Office and other local agencies in booking arrestees (9.0 FTE).

- The Courts will lose 4 bailiffs, reducing the number of Deputy Sheriffs available for the courtrooms (4.0 FTE).

(Since FY2007-08, Sheriff’s Office reduced by 74.5 FTE, or over 10% of the allocated positions. Sworn staff reduced by 15%)
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

• Security control systems of the Main Jail, Inmate Reception Center and the Medium Security Facility.

• “Guardian 3”, multi-mission capable UH-1H helicopter funded through private donations.

• Santa Barbara County Air Support Unit, a combined aviation program between the County Fire Department and the Sheriff’s Office.
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FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

- In-Car Video System for all patrol vehicles.
- Exploring utilizing a private vendor for food services in Custody Operations.
- Sewer upgrade and kitchen remodel project in the County Main Jail.
- Windows 7 and MS Office 2010 upgrade.
FY 2012-13
Sheriff - Funded Restorations

- Shift Salary & Benefit Savings from FY2011-12 to FY2012-13 via Final Budget Adjustments (FBAs)
  - FBA #1
    - Retain Gang Team (2.0 FTE) - $289,500
  - FBA #2
    - Retain Detective positions (2.0 FTE) - $308,668
  - FBA #3
    - Retain Narcotics Team (4.0 FTE) - $686,530

- Total Restorations – $1,284,698 for 8.0 FTE
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Public Safety Realignment Act Budget (AB 109) Approved by Board on May 22, 2012

Sheriff’s Office AB 109 Budget increased from $1,799,318 (18.0 FTE) in Recommended to $3,653,227 (22.0 FTE)

FBA #4
- Funds an additional 4.0 FTE in positions and increases Services & Supplies budget - $1,853,908
The Sheriff’s Office requests the following restorations:

- Funding for one-half of fiscal year:
  - 3.0 FTE Custody Deputy for Main Jail Staffing
  - 1.0 FTE Sheriff Deputy for Court Services
- Total: $227,064
Agriculture/Weights & Measures

- Total Budget
  - Operating: $3.7 Million
  - Capital: $0
- General Fund Contribution
  - $1.36 Million (37% of total)
- Budget FTE
  - 27 FTE (24% decrease since 06/07)
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- **Increased Pesticide Enforcement Inspections**
  - 75% increase for field fumigations
  - 87% increase for structural fumigations
  - 58% increase for field worker safety inspections

- **Japanese Dodder Eradication Project**

- **Multiple Outreach, Training, and Education Events**

- **Fund U.C. Cooperative Extension**
  - Farm Advisors
  - 4-H programs
  - Master Gardener program
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FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts

- Eliminate an Agriculture Biologist position
- Reduced pesticide use enforcement inspections
  - 40%
- Fewer inspections of quarantine shipments
  - 20%
- Reduce U.C. Extension Contract
  - $27,000
- Implement a New Price Scanner Program
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

- Loss of negotiated union concessions/increased benefit costs
  - Projected budget gap of $201,000
- Continued cuts in State and Federal funding
  - $100,000 reduction
- New Light Brown Apple Moth contract
- Fund U.C. Cooperative Extension
- 2012 Farm Bill
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Community Services

• Total Budget
  - Operating: $17.9 M
  - Capital: $2.6 M

• General Fund Contribution
  - $6.2 M (25% of total)

• Budget FTE
  - 89.8 (Permanent FTE of 63.8. This represents a 28% reduction since FY 2004-2005)
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• New cabins and yurts at Cachuma Lake and Jalama Beach.

• Re-opened road at Guadalupe Dunes

• Developed a Countywide Cultural Arts Enrichment Grant program.

• Provided funding to five affordable housing projects which will result in 192 housing units.

• Awarded $.2M in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding for various community infrastructure programs.
FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts

- Elimination of funding for Human Services program
- Reduces General Fund Contributions to shelter providers by 13% or $45K
- Elimination of General Fund Contributions of $200K to local conference and visitor bureaus
- Eliminate 2 Park Ranger positions and 4 maintenance workers positions
- Reduce building landscape maintenance contract services by 51% or $75k
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

- $285K budget gap projected in FY 2013-2014
- Uncertainty of state and federal grant revenues
- Increasing Salaries and Benefits of $365K
- Continue to explore new opportunities to increase revenues through grants and partnerships
Planning and Development

Total 2012/13 Budget
Operating: $15.1 million
Capital: $0

General Fund Contribution
$3.7 million (24.5% of total budget)
44% reduction in last 5 years

Budget FTE
87 (Elimination of 8.5 FTE)
41% reduction in last 5 years
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Updated County Zoning Regulations
- New Regulations on Fracking
- Increased public input and access to information
- Initiation of the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan
- Summerland Community Plan Update environmental review
- Adoption of the Mobilehome Park Closure Ordinance
- Adoption of the Medical Marijuana Storefront Dispensary ban
FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts

Long Range Planning Division reduced two FTE
Reduces progress on the Long Range Planning work program.

Public counters reduced by one half FTE
Responsiveness to the public and counter hours are reduced.

Planning permitting reduced by two FTE
Lower permit activity requires staff reduction.

Administrative Support reduced nearly two FTE
Reductions in financial management, Information Technology and Geographic Information System staffing

Redevelopment Agency Dissolved, three FTE
State mandate required dissolution
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$694,000 budget gap projected in FY 2013-14

Reduced one-time revenues and increases in costs
- Completion of grant funded projects
- Expiring labor concessions
- Increased retirement and health benefits cost

Opportunities and Impacts
- Identify and pursue additional grant funding
- Ensure permit fees reflect service costs
- Additional service level reductions
Public Works

• **Total Budget**
  – Operating: $85.6 M
  – Capital: $24.1 M

• **General Fund Contribution**
  – $2.7 M (2.2% of total)

• **Budget FTE**
  – 281.5 (18% decrease since 2007)
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Competitively-bid waste hauling franchise agreements saving ratepayers over $2.4 M annually
- Secured funding for the final phase of the Santa Maria River Levee repairs
- Completed Laguna Sanitation 1MW Solar Project which will pay 80% of annual power costs
- Designed and constructed $9.8 M of Transportation projects in 2011
- Provided cost savings to the General Fund of $1.6 million in FY 11-12 and will provide $10.6 million total savings over 8 years
- Completed Board re-districting process mapping requirements
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Balance Expenditures to Available Revenues

• Economic Downturn Impacts:
  • Development Review
  • Disaster Recovery
  • Surveyors’ Office

• Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
  2005 Storm audit ($200k to $1.7 million)

• Decreasing Pavement Condition Index (PCI) and Increasing Unfunded Need (over $250 million)
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

Projected Staffing Cost Increase: $1.7 M

• Service Level Reductions
• Revenue & Rate Increases
• Staffing Adjustments

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Services

- Total ADMHS Budget
  - Operating: $68.4M
  - Capital: $105,000
- General Fund Contribution
  - $3.0M (4.39% of total budget)
- Budgeted FTE
  - 295.2
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Enhanced revenue management and real-time operations changes, based on weekly revenue/expense tracking tools
- Assessed/modified rates quarterly for $17M in mental health contracts to minimize future paybacks to State
- Saved $80K annually by consolidating Lompoc Child and Adult Clinics
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Maintained regulatory compliance at Psychiatric Health Facility (PHF) via comprehensive quality assurance program
- Reduced travel costs and increased productivity through videoconferencing
- Leveraged Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) funds to create 30 housing units for approximately 48 individuals
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• Increased public awareness and access by redesigning ADMHS website
• Received CSAC award for Consumer/Family Peer Training and Intern/Staff roles
• Improved cultural competence efforts through focus groups with bilingual/bicultural clients
 FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• Expanded outreach for individuals at risk through Assertive Community Treatment Outreach and Engagement project
• Provided co-occurring mental health and substance abuse services through Federal SAMHSA grants
• Increased alcohol abuse prevention capacity through State grant
FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts

- $217K (32%) reduction in core mental health funding to homeless contracts
- $496K (38%) reduction in out-of-county acute psychiatric inpatient capacity
- $181K (19%) reduction in out-of-county long-term psychiatric inpatient capacity
- $203K (3%) reduction in Psychiatric Health Facility costs
# FY 2012-13 Updated Service Level Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
<th>Revised 6/13/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in core mental health funding to homeless contracts</td>
<td>$217K (32%)</td>
<td>$125K (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in out-of-county acute psychiatric inpatient capacity</td>
<td>$496K (38%)</td>
<td>$216K (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in out-of-county long-term psychiatric inpatient capacity</td>
<td>$181K (19%)</td>
<td>$121K (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Psychiatric Health Facility Costs</td>
<td>$203K (3%)</td>
<td>$160K (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,097M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$622K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed D-Pages budget assumes no increase in mental health funding

- Use of remaining $4.0M in MHSA reserves
- Budget gap of $4.4M will remain
  - $1.9M: increase in Salaries & Benefits costs: Retirement, health benefits, expiration of wage concessions
  - $0.1M: increase in Services & Supplies costs
  - $1.5M: decline in available MHSA funds
  - $0.9M: decrease in General Fund Contribution
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

- RFP: Opportunity to continue building on system improvements
- FY12-13 State Realignment changes
- Federal Affordable Care Act (Health Reform) effective January 2014 expands coverage
Child Support Services

• Total Budget
  – Operating: $9.5M
  – Capital: $ -0-

• General Fund Contribution
  – No General Fund

• Budget FTE
  – 82.8 FTE (down from 123.6 in 2003)
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Increased performance and exceeded State goals
  - Paternity - 100%
  - Order Establishment - 89%
  - Current Support - 59%
  - Arrears Support - 64%
  - Cost Effectiveness - $2.89
- $27M in child support collections
  - $22.1M to families
  - $4.9 M for government recoupment
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Updated Five-Year Strategic Plan
- Technology enhancements, including “Single Sign-on” system
  - Secure sign on to all applications at log-on
- Developed Process Improvement Team
  - Identify & analyze tasks, processes and procedures to gain efficiencies
- Established specialized team
  - Analyze & update program reports
FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts

- No significant service level impacts for upcoming year
- Department operating at 2/3 staffing level from 2003
- Adjustments made to meet/exceed performance goals
  - Process improvement initiatives
  - Technology enhancements & training
  - Organizational changes
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

• Minimize effect of increased costs on service level delivery
  • Ongoing process improvement initiatives
  • Customer service initiatives
    • Help customers utilize self-service tools
  • Timely communication
    • Outbound dialing, cell phones, text messaging
• Manage 15,000 cases in caseload
• Collect and distribute $28.6 million
Public Health Department

• Total Budget
  – Operating: $79.7M
  – Capital: $347,578

• General Fund Contribution
  – $6.95M (8.0% of total)

• Budget FTE
  – 483.3
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Implemented significant technology improvements:
  - Electronic Health Record (EHR)
  - e-prescribing
  - Pharmacy system replacement
  - Practice Management System upgrade
- Participated in Patient-Centered Medical Home demonstration projects
- Implemented Diabetes Initiative
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• Established disaster medical supply caches
• Implemented electronic patient care record (ePCR) for 911 medical responders
• Increased animal license sales
• Obtained PH Lab equipment for expedited influenza and TB testing
• Expanded hours for emergency death certificates
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• Secured funding, developed architectural plans and accepted bid for Lompoc animal shelter renovation
• Initiated a Breastfeeding Peer Counselor Program
• Achieved National Children’s Alliance Accreditation for the Sexual Assault Response Team (SART)
FY 2012-13 Proposed Efficiency and Business Decision Impacts

- Medical Records - efficiencies related to EHR
  - $426,740 savings, 5.2 FTE reduction
- Data Entry - efficiencies related to EHR
  - $168,408 savings, 2.0 FTE reduction
- SB Radiology - eliminate program due to decreased demand for services and aging equipment
  - $237,545 reduction, 3.0 FTE
- Santa Maria Women’s Clinic – assessing various options due to declining revenue
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

• Mitigate budget gap
• Evaluate impact of health care reform
• Expand Health Care Centers’ hours and services
• Continue EHR development – patient portal, remote provider access, health information exchange
• Continue participation in Patient Centered Medical Home (PCMH) demonstration projects
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

• Increase to increase patient cash collections at time of service
• Implement fitness promotion and obesity prevention plan
• Complete renovation of Lompoc Animal Shelter
• Enhance PH emergency response through countywide earthquake exercise
First 5 Santa Barbara County

• Total Budget
  – Operating: $5.1M
  – Capital: None

• General Fund Contribution
  – None

• Budget FTE
  – 14
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FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

Funding and Leveraging
• Established a Public/Private Partnership of funders, school districts and key stakeholders known as “THRIVE”
• Leveraged First 5 dollars and expertise to receive State and foundation grants to improve early care and education in our county

Evaluation & Accountability
• Conducted a comprehensive, results-based evaluation of all projects funded by First 5 with UCSB
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

Technical Assistance & Training
• Supported 57 childcare centers and 40 family child care homes to improve quality leading to national accreditation

Convener/Partner
• Developed a system to significantly increase developmental screenings to identify special needs
FY 2012-13
Potential Service Level Impacts

- Secured 4 year funding through California’s “Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant” developing quality rating for childcare in the County.

- Implemented the Commission’s long-term Fiscal Plan to utilize the First 5 Strategic Reserve established to improve sustainability of programs funded by First 5.
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

Funding and Leveraging

• Build a strong infrastructure to expand and sustain “THRIVE” focusing on school readiness and success in high need communities

• Evaluation & Accountability

• Work collaboratively with school districts to better integrate data systems in order to track long-term outcomes for children
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FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

Technical Assistance & Training

• Increase First 5 funded agency knowledge, strategies and skills to improve quality and access to services

Convener/Partner

• Oversee and facilitate a consortia of early care and education providers in implementing “Race to the Top” in the County
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Preparing for Future Challenges
Dept. of Social Services

- Total Budget
  - Operating: $142.5 Million
  - Capital: $0
- General Fund Contribution
  - $9.2 Million (6% of total)
- Budget FTE
  - 645.6
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

Accomplishments in Serving the Community

• Provided benefit assistance to over 41,725 families (35% increase over FY06/07)
• Determined eligibility for more than 50,000 families (34% increase over FY 06/07)
• Assisted over 27,000 job seekers at our Workforce Resource Centers
Accomplishments in Operational Efficiencies

• Enhanced Staff Development by employing two new modes of training; On-Line and Distance Learning. This will reduce both time and travel costs

• Utilized available technology to increase client access and efficiencies through numerous on-line enhancements.
• Katie A Lawsuit expands Mental Health Services to Children in Foster Care
  – Requires increased collaboration and increases the level of needed DSS resources to provide case management, service delivery and foster care assistance

• AB 12 extends the age of Foster Care Support from 18 to age 21.
  – This increases social worker workload as well as the cost of foster care assistance payments and supported services which is funded with realignment and County General funds
FY 2012-13 Proposed Service Level Impacts

• SB 734 – Jeopardizes the operations of our Workforce Resource Centers
  – Reduces County discretion in allocating funds to operations and training
  – Santa Barbara Workforce Resource Center could be at risk of closing

• 2011 Social Services Realignment - Uncertainties Remain
  – Level of funding may not be sufficient to cover costs previously funded by the State. This will be devastating to Child Welfare and Adult Protective Services
  – Increased mandates are proposed as part of realignment
FY 2012-13 Proposed Service Level Impacts

Caseload vs Staffing
Percentage Increase Since FY 08-09

*Legislated program changes reduced number of eligible families, highest growth was 12% from FY 08-09 to FY 10-11
Many of the January proposals remain unchanged in the May Revise, however some are revised or new.

- CalWORKs: Proposed restructuring will affect 75% of our current caseload (3,800 families) due to time on aid being cut in half and deep cuts to their grant amount (at least 27%)

- IHSS: Across the board cut of 7% in service hours (-97,000 hours) to all 2,800 recipients. Also, benefit reductions to recipients in shared living arrangements affecting 1,600 IHSS recipients, averaging a 36 hour reduction monthly per recipient.

- Child Care: County block grant is proposed with administration of programs shifting from education agencies to social service agencies. Proposes significant reductions in eligibility and reimbursement rates.
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

DSS BUDGET TIMELINE

• DSS Adopted budget is preliminary since final budget is determined by State Allocations

• Service level impacts are dependent upon final State Budget allocations

• Allocations received up to 90 days after passage of State Budget

• We will be returning in January with a revised budget

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
- Proposed Budget Assumes Necessary Funding To Meet Mandated Levels of Service
  - FY 12-13 Required Local Match = $24.0M
  - FY 13-14 Required Local Match = $25.2M
  - $25.2M Includes:
    - $11.6M - General Fund Contribution
    - $8.4M - Realignment Revenue
    - $1.0M - Other Misc Revenue
    - $4.2M - Budget Gap
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

• Budget Gap of $4.2M Remains
  – Includes:
    – Net Increase In Expenditures: $1.8M
      » +$2.2M: Increase Costs for Retirement, Health Benefits and Workers Compensation
      » -$0.4M: Decrease in Cash Assistance Payments and Non-Labor costs
    – Net Decrease in Revenues: $2.4
      » +$2.5M: Increase in General Fund Contribution
      » +$0.8M: Increase in Federal and State Revenue
      » -$5.5M: Depletion of One-Time Reserves
• Total Budget
  - Operating: $7.7 M
  - Capital: $10,000

• General Fund Contribution
  - $6.1 M (80% of total)

• Budget FTE
  - 45.3 Down from 57.9 in 2007-2008 – 22% Reduction
Application Development Division:
• Added functionality to the County's Financial Information Network (FIN Web) for Budget Revision Request processing that added clarity and uniformity to budget revisions through automation of a county-wide labor intensive manual process.

Systems Division:
• Assisted the Parks department to complete a reservation and cashiering system.
• Working to implement a new property tax system (three-year project).
• A virtual server infrastructure was implemented to host the various system components, data conversion in progress and system enhancements by vendor under way.
• Modifying and enhancing the budget system and development tools for both the operating budget and capital budget (two-year project).
• Initiated the planning for replacement of our 15-year old employee time capture system.
• Maintaining 65 financial and accounting applications.
Property Tax Division:
• Working to dissolve the seven County redevelopment agencies and setup systems and processes to account for and distribute property taxes to the affected taxing agencies of each former RDA.

Internal Audit Division:
• Updated the County’s cash handling policies and procedures.
• Performed cash handling audits at County departments.
• Developed a County fraud policy that was approved by the BOS.
• Completed various audits of departments and agencies throughout the County.

Financial Reporting Division:
• Budget Clarity Project will transform the County’s proposed and final budget documents into a new format to provide clarity and ease of use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There are no staffing changes from FY 2011-12 adopted to FY 2012-13 recommended. The recommended staffing level only maintains the same reduced service level as the prior year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deterioration of our ability to provide financial accounting advice and support to departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opens the department and the County to unforeseen errors, potential late payments, penalties, audit exceptions, breakdown in controls, fraud investigation and follow-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The department requests as part of these final budget hearings an additional Accountant-Auditor position in the Property Tax Division for the required duties resulting from the dissolution of the RDA’s. Funding will be reimbursement from Statutory Property Tax Trust Accounts related to the dissolutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The FY 2013-14 proposed expenditures reflect a $362,000 increase over the FY 2012-13 recommended budget, may force additional staffing reductions and is primarily the result of:
- $222,000 increase in retirement contributions,
- $56,000 increase in health, worker compensation and unemployment insurance premiums,
- $51,000 increase in salaries and,
- a $33,000 increase in services and supplies costs.

We will continue to improve processes, look for efficiencies and reduce cost.
Clerk-Recorder-Assessor

Total Budget
- Operating: $15.0 M
- Capital: $196,000

General Fund Contribution
$8.7 M (54% of total)

Budget FTEs
91.8 (reduced from 118 in FY 07-08)
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

Clerk-Recorder Division:
• Completed legally required SSN truncation on all documents from 1980 to 1996.
• Increased the number of electronic recording customers from 20 percent to over 25 percent, creating greater operating efficiencies.
• Updated Clerk-Recorder fees to ensure full cost recovery.

Elections Divisions:
• Successfully conducted the June 2012 Presidential & Statewide Primary Election.
• Completed the redistricting process.
• Consolidated the number of precincts from 318 to 259.
• Implemented an on-line sample ballot option.

Assessor Division:
• Completed 95% of 15,000 property sales, transfers and new construction events.
• Resolved and closed 385 property assessment appeal cases, retaining 87% of the roll value at risk.
• Lowered values on approximately 23,500 parcels per the requirements of Section 51.
Fiscal Year 2012-13
Potential Service Level Impacts

Clerk-Recorder Division:
Longer customer service lines, increase in number of days to mail back recorded documents, increase in number of days to process vital record copy requests, reduced hours at the Lompoc Branch Office.

Elections Division:
Reduction in hours available for candidate filing in Santa Maria and the Lompoc branch offices.

Assessor Service Level Impact Resulting from decreasing staffing resources:
Significant reduction in the assessment value due to decreased hours available for work on appeals and reduction in the number of assessment work items completed, potentially resulting in a lower assessed roll value which is the basis for property taxes to all tax receiving entities for funding of public services.

We have submitted a Budget Restoration to mitigate potential negative impacts

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
Preparing for Future Challenges
Fiscal Year 12-13
Assessor Restoration Request

• Assessor Division has been reduced by roughly 11 FTEs from 64 FTE’s in 07-08 to 53 FTE’s in 12-13, a reduction of roughly 20%.

• Since 07-08, Assessor workload has grown from 30K to 40K assessable events, increasing workload per FTE from roughly 450 to 750.

• The Department has submitted a restoration request of $105K to restore 1 Appraiser for FY 12-13. The restoration will help mitigate potential losses of $3M to $10M in property tax revenues to County Agencies.
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

• $1.6M Budget Gap as a result of:
  • Loss of $1.1 million of one-time sources of funding used in 2012-13 to fund on-going operation costs, which were used to compensate for significant revenue reductions (for example PTAFs have gone from $2.8M in FY 07-08 to an est $1.9M in FY 12-13) over the last several years and increasing salary and retirement costs.

• **Service Level Impact of the $1.6M Gap:**
  Critical in funding adequate assessment level of services to create and preserve the County’s property tax roll, which is the basis for property taxes to all tax receiving entities for funding of public services.
• Total Budget
  – Operating: $6.1M
  – Capital: $800K

• General Fund Contribution
  – $2.7M (44% of total)

• Budget FTE
  – 37.8 (reduced 29% from 51.5 in Fiscal Year 2006-07)
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

- Completed major redesign of property tax website
- Issued Qualified Energy Conservation Bonds, Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes, and refunded 2001 COPs saving $1.6M
- Processed 1,542 veterans claims which resulted in $9.1 million of benefits realized in the County
FY 2012-13 Potential Service Level Impacts

• Eliminate Protective Pay Program by 2 FTE
  • $176,175

• Reduce Veterans’ Services Program by 1 FTE (50% of staffing) in November 2012
  • $73,175 – Santa Barbara (8 months)
  • $105,407 – Lompoc (FY 11-12 reduction)
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

- Budget gap - $187K
- Continue to participate in all areas of the property tax conversion project (Manatron); including data conversion, system interfaces, functional design and user testing.
General Services

• Total Budget
  – Operating: $65.2 Million
    – Internal Service Funds: $42 m
    – GFC + Other Sources: $23.2 m
  – Capital: $8.8 Million

• General Fund Contribution
  – $7.6 Million

• Budget FTE
  – 121.0 (29% decrease compared to FY 2003-04)
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• Switched telephone service vendors for a savings of approximately $1 million over the next three years.

• Contracted the processing of all workers’ compensation claims for a salary savings of approximately $1 million over the next 10 years.

• Provided support for all information and communication technologies during the construction and move into the new Emergency Operations Center.

• Completed installation of a one megawatt solar project on the Calle Real Campus.

• Completed construction of three major building projects:
  - EOC ($7.9 m)
  - Santa Maria Court Clerks building ($5.2 m)
  - Public Defender Remodel ($5.8m)
FY 2012-13
Potential Service Level Impacts

• The Department will maintain the same level of service in FY 2012-13, but will require one-time sources of $354,000
• Deferred Maintenance Funding = $ 1.5 m
• Deferred maintenance backlog = $30 m (approx.)

Benchmark #1: The Department has one maintenance worker per 69,000 sq. ft. as compared to the accepted standard of one per 50,000 sq. ft.

Benchmark #2: Spend 1% annually on Preventive Maintenance and Corrective Maintenance of the replacement cost of the building. County spends 0.6% (assumes replacement cost of $350/square foot)
FY 2013-14
Preparring for the Future

$479,000 budget gap projected in FY 2013-14

- Expiring labor concession
- Increased retirement and health benefits costs
- No one-time source available

Opportunities and Impacts

- Identify other funding
- Additional service level reductions
- Increase deferred maintenance backlog

Santa Barbara County Recommended Operational Plan
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**General County Programs**

- **Total Budget**
  - Operating: $1.4M
  - Capital: $0

- **General Fund Contribution**
  - $7.8M (Funds: $1.4M above + $6.4M of Committed Funds)

- **Budget FTE**
  - 0 FTE
FY 2011-12 Accomplishments

• Began setting aside funding for future jail operations

• Maintained the existing level of funding of $1 million to provide health insurance to uninsured children in Santa Barbara County

• Working with the City of Santa Maria and using development fees, began remodel efforts at the Orcutt Library
No Budget Impacts, changes include:

• First 5 moving into its own department

• Library funding moving to Community Services Department

• Increase jail funding to $2M; cumulative set-aside $3M

• Impact of RDA dissolution developing but unknown at this time; will have positive impact on General Fund
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

• Increase north county jail operational funding to $3.3M; cumulative $6.3M

• Impact of RDA expected to result in a positive contribution to the General Fund

• Fund necessary capital/infrastructure projects based on identified needs, priorities and available resources

• New Strategic Plan; may result in additional funding needs (committed funds)
FY 2013-14
Preparing for the Future

• Retain a portion of FY 2011-12 concession savings for anticipated FY 2013-14 funding needs

• Continue to build the County’s Strategic Reserve
FY 2012-13
Successor Agency-Former RDA

• Page D-194 displays the Former RDA’s Successor Agency activities, including affordable housing fund.

• New California Committee on Municipal Accounting guidance says to treat Successor Agency funds as “private-purpose trust funds.”

  • Future audits will likely follow that approach.

  • Successor Agency’s separate budget follows that approach.

  • Former County RDA’s housing fund in County budget.
Action Items:

• For administrative efficiency, we recommend transferring, effective July 1, 2012, the Former RDA Housing Fund and activities from the CEO’s office to CSD, Housing and Community Development Division.

• If transfer is approved direct the preparation of a Final Budget Adjustment to transfer the Housing Fund to CSD and adjust the Recommended Budget to reflect the most current information available.
### General County Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual FY 10-11</th>
<th>Adopted FY 11-12</th>
<th>Recommended FY 12-13</th>
<th>Proposed FY 13-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund Revenue Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Taxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$173,212,708</td>
<td>$172,434,000</td>
<td>$175,043,000</td>
<td>$177,793,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sales Tax</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
<td>7,096,000</td>
<td>7,451,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Occupancy Tax</td>
<td>6,977,000</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>7,120,000</td>
<td>7,618,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Transfer Tax</td>
<td>2,300,576</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle In Lieu</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>189,990,284</td>
<td>189,434,000</td>
<td>191,944,000</td>
<td>195,757,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Discretionary Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchises</td>
<td>2,641,070</td>
<td>2,794,000</td>
<td>2,715,000</td>
<td>2,769,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,372,199</td>
<td>1,010,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners Property Tax Relief</td>
<td>878,026</td>
<td>862,000</td>
<td>849,000</td>
<td>849,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Lands Apportionment</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Taxes</td>
<td>1,740,080</td>
<td>1,625,000</td>
<td>1,625,000</td>
<td>1,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Allocation Services</td>
<td>1,213,769</td>
<td>979,213</td>
<td>8,101,077</td>
<td>8,101,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>360,608.87</td>
<td>326,789</td>
<td>462,924</td>
<td>465,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>8,205,753</td>
<td>7,597,002</td>
<td>14,753,001</td>
<td>14,809,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Discretionary Revenue</strong></td>
<td>198,196,037</td>
<td>197,031,002</td>
<td>206,697,001</td>
<td>210,567,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Financing Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Prior Fund Balance</td>
<td>535,845</td>
<td>4,212,273</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28,370,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Sources</strong></td>
<td>$198,731,882</td>
<td>$201,243,275</td>
<td>$206,697,001</td>
<td>$238,937,152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 21, 2012—sent via email

Members of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors
Santa Barbara County Administration Building
105 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

RE: 2012-13 Funding for all Conference & Visitors Bureaus and the Film Commission

Dear Honorable Supervisors Carbajal, Wolf, Farr, Gray and Lavignino;

You have extraordinarily difficult choices to make given the County's overall shortfall in revenues again this budget cycle—yet I was dismayed to see the following statement in the recent 2012-13 budget recommendations packet:

Page 12: Community Services: eliminate conference and visitor bureaus and Film Commission funding
http://www.countyofsbc.org/ceo/budget.aspx?id=38712

These County-wide visitor promotion agencies such as the Santa Barbara Conference & Visitors Bureau, Santa Ynez Valley Visitors Association, Los Alamos Valley Visitors Association; Chambers of Commerce and County Film Commission are pro-actively engaged in supporting one of the largest revenue generating industries in our county—tourism and hospitality businesses.

As a marketing professional, independent business owner AND resident of Santa Barbara County since 1985, I recommend that you strongly support the tourism industry that generates MORE business and infuses MORE money for the County in both retail sales taxes and in bed tax revenues. No other industry in the County provides TWO revenue streams to the County general fund.

Tourism marketing programs are VITAL in maintaining our County's profile as a desirable visitor destination and continuing the economic recovery so critical to our area.

I strongly urge you NOT to eliminate any funding to any tourism promotion agencies. Please continue your 2011-12 level of funding support of all conference and visitors bureaus and the Film Commission in 2012-13. Thank you for your utmost consideration.

Sincerely,
Laura Kath
President

CC: Chandra Waller, CEO, Santa Barbara County
Casa Esperanza Homeless Center

offering hope and help every day!

Board of Directors

Rev. Mark Asman
President

Sue Adams
Barbara Allen
Dennis Baker, MD
Denny Bacon
John Dixon
Roger Darling
Ron Fox
Larry Hulse
Lois Jovanovic, MD
Denise McDonald, RN
Mark Manion
Nadine McFarland
Juliana Minsky
Robert Pearson
David Peri
Marilyn Rickard Schafer
Lady Leslie Ridley-Tree
Richard Ring
Ken Williams

Sharon Friedrichsen, Deputy Director
Santa Barbara County Community Services Department
105 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA. 93101

Dear Ms. Friedrichsen:

This is our formal letter of request for County funding through the non-profit, not budgeted grant request process through the Board of Supervisors.

Request: Casa Esperanza and Good Samaritan, Inc., in collaboration and partnership seek $127,960 to fund case management staffing and administrative costs associated with providing rapid re-housing services to the homeless across Santa Barbara County.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Case Manager</td>
<td>$ 49,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Case Manager</td>
<td>$ 49,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Costs</td>
<td>$ 28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$127,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Program: For the last three years, Casa Esperanza and Good Samaritan successfully provided rapid re-housing services to homeless people across the entire County. Revenue was secured through ARA funding via HUD, through the City of Santa Barbara, the City of Santa Maria and the County of Santa Barbara.

Across the nation, and here in Santa Barbara County, rapid re-housing has proven to be an enormous success. Through rapid re-housing homeless people who have secured jobs, social security or other government benefits and have a proven means of supporting themselves, are given cash grants directly to landlords, covering the cost of security deposits and first month’s rental assistance.

Over the past 31 months, 2,337 people and 986 households accessed these funds and moved from homelessness to permanent housing.

When a homeless person secures revenue, it can take anywhere from two to six months for them to save enough money to secure permanent housing. This creates significant continuous exposure to homelessness and creates a significant backlog in our shelter system. When this backlog occurs, many homeless people who have jobs enter the motel trap, and can never save the money needed to secure permanent housing. Rapid re-housing funding has been a vital
solution to this problem. Absent this program, the number of homeless people on our streets county-side would be far worse than it is today. Research shows that at least 80% of all those housed under HPRP remain housed after one year.

**Our Crisis:** The rapid re-housing program was funded through the federal stimulus program. Funding for this program comes to an end in August, 2012. The only identified source of funding to replace this program was the Emergency Shelter Grant program, and only $45,000.

**Solution:** Tenant-Based Rental Assistance is available through the HUD HOME program. Working with the cities and the County we have been able to adjust this program to meet the needs of homeless people currently served by the rapid-re-housing program. Thus far we have secured the following for this year:

- City of Santa Maria for Good Samaritan
- City of Santa Barbara for Casa Esperanza
- County of Santa Barbara ESG for God Samaritan/Casa Esperanza Collaboration
- County of Santa Barbara HOME Program Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Maria for Good Samaritan</td>
<td>Up to $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara for Casa Esperanza</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Barbara ESG for God Samaritan/Casa Esperanza Collaboration</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Barbara HOME Program Funds</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$360,000

100% of these funds, however, must be spent exclusively on rental assistance. None of this money can be allocated for staffing or the costs of administering the funds—checks, accounting, grant management, record keeping.

One significant differences at this point between our adjusted HOME effort and the rapid re-housing program, is that each household must save and contribute 30% of the costs of rental assistance. The other difference is that under HPRP, ongoing grant assistance is available, but not often used, while under the HOME project, grants will be one-time only.

In order to utilize this secured funding, we must secure the funding to cover the cost of Case Management and administration. We have stretched to keep the cost of administration to just 6% of the program costs. It is our belief that some of the administrative costs can be covered through the new homeless services collaborative effort.

With the requested funding secured, we will have come as close as possible to keeping the successful rapid-re-housing program whole.

**Information:** Future federal funding for homeless life-line assistance will be based on our ability to reduce the length of shelter stays and is a requirement found in the HEARTH Act.

Our target population is low-income people who are currently homeless and meet HPRP guidelines for rapid re-housing. Each potential client fills out a complete intake form and provides proof of income, identification, etc. Each client must meet federal low-income guidelines. Each client works with the housing case manager and completes a budget. In order to qualify for funding, the budget must show that the client will be self-sufficient. If this threshold is not met, the client is not qualified for assistance.
Ongoing case management continues on an as-needed basis, with a minimum of monthly contact for six months. Recidivism rates are tracked at three, six and twelve month intervals, with a goal of at least 75% remaining housed after one year.

Based on history, we anticipate that the average grant will be approximately $1,000 and that approximately 360 households will be served county-wide. Some individuals will access less than $1,000, some families will access more than this amount.

This project is specifically designed to help two target populations, people who have jobs and can secure immediate housing and people with disabilities who have secured disability benefits. Hence, this project prevents chronic homelessness and also provides the necessary revenue to move a chronically homeless person immediately off the streets.

This program is highly regulated and monitored by City and County staff and HUD and together we have a successful track-record. Projected budgets, audits and agency/program information are currently on file with the County through CDBG/ESG/SHP and HPRP grants for both Casa Esperanza and Good Samaritan.

Casa Esperanza and Good Samaritan have received a grant from the Santa Barbara Foundation to develop a close affiliation and formal collaborative relationship. Casa Esperanza is currently the fiscal agent for Bringing Our Community Home. Good Samaritan is currently the fiscal agent for $95,000 in joint ESG funding. If this grant request is secured, we will work together with CSD to develop a specific plan for fiscal leadership for this grant that proves to be the most cost-effective.

Thank you for considering this very urgent request.

Sincerely,

Michael Foley
Executive Director

cc: Sylvia Barnard
Santa Barbara County
Human Services Fund

Santa Barbara County
Board of Supervisors
Budget Hearing

June 11, 2012

Presented by:
Christina Pizarro
HS Commissioner 1st District

Sourcing Community Strengths
Human Services Funds

Necessary for servicing our community

- Cliff funding, not general funds
- Affects the neediest throughout the County
- 35 Years of Public-Private partnership
- Strengthens the protective power of civic safety net
The Multiplier Effect

- **Multiplier Effect**
  - Non-Profits estimate that every $1 of HSF’s has $8 of impact

- **28% of Grantees lose mandated match**
  - Other government, HUD, MAA, Title IV-E

- **89% lose foundation & private funding**
  - Rigorous HSC vetting bolsters confidence

$1.2MILLION = NON-PROFIT LOSS OF $9.6 Million
Causal Loop of Human Services Funds

- Reduction in funding to social services
  + Increase in Demand for Services
  - Economic Downturn

+ Maintenance of HSC Funds
  - Strategic alignment of funding for Collective Impact

Community Services Funding
2011-12 Funding
Human Services Grants By Priorities

- Food: 29%
- Children & Families: 19%
- Mental Health: 18%
- Housing & Shelter: 16%
- Advocacy: 10%
- Seniors: 8%
Human Services Grants By Region

North County
$621,567
51%

South County
$592,433
49%
The loss of HSF will leave many of our most vulnerable:

- Hungry
- Sick
- Homeless

Direct relation to foreseeable cost burdens:

- Hospitalization/ER
- Law Enforcement/Public Safety
- Jail Crowding
Thank You
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Slides designed by Rubayi Srivastava
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept Priority</th>
<th>Dept #</th>
<th>Program Title (Total Prog Costs)</th>
<th>FY 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011-12 Estimated Budget</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 Status Quo Budget</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 reduction from Status Quo Bldt</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 Requested Budget</th>
<th>GFC FTE Impact</th>
<th>GFC Cost to Restore</th>
<th>Requested Action</th>
<th>Service Level Impact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>O12</td>
<td>Emergency Operations</td>
<td>647,316</td>
<td>634,171</td>
<td>633,152</td>
<td>(11,000)</td>
<td>581,157</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>580,157</td>
<td>Reduce Emergency Operations by 1 Emergency Manager</td>
<td>Elimination of this position will cause work to be distributed to remaining Emergency Operations staff. There will be a reduction to the Emergency Management Planning Grant (EPMG) of approximately $41k since this grant requires a 50% staffing match. The elimination of the Oil Spill Prevention and Recovery grant $5k and a reduction to the Nuclear Preparedness Planning grant $2.5k (a total loss of approx. $49.5k in funding) since there will not be enough staff to devote time to these activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>O12</td>
<td>Clerk of the Board</td>
<td>654,222</td>
<td>621,177</td>
<td>654,880</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>554,880</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Reduce Clerk of the Board by 1 Admin Office Professional</td>
<td>Elimination of this position will cause work to be distributed to remaining Clerk of the Board staff. This could delay response time to the public, Board of Supervisors, County Executive Office and other County departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>O31</td>
<td>Fire Station Operations &amp; Response</td>
<td>39,405,378</td>
<td>37,625,068</td>
<td>39,733,769</td>
<td>(2,310,000)</td>
<td>37,414,769</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>Shut down Engine 11 in Goleta. Reduces Post Positions from 6 to 3, a loss of 8 FTEs (2 Captain, 3 Engineer and 3 Firefighter positions).</td>
<td>Shutting down E-11 eliminates a crucial response resource in the Goleta area (including City of Goleta, UCSB, Highway 101, and major commercial, industrial and high density residential centers). T-11 is a regional resource, responding throughout the county. It would remain in operation. This reduction will result in longer response times and will reduce the regional sum of firefighters that arrive at larger incidents within a critical timeframe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>O31</td>
<td>Fire Station Operations &amp; Response</td>
<td>383,305</td>
<td>383,305</td>
<td>314,373</td>
<td>(289,932)</td>
<td>34,972</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>2,330,000</td>
<td>Eliminate Gang Team, consisting of one Deputy Sergeant and one Deputy</td>
<td>This action eliminates the sworn positions dedicated to the investigation and monitoring of gang activity in the County. The responsibilities of this team will now be borne by Patrol deputies in time and priority permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>O33</td>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>5,661,437</td>
<td>4,661,437</td>
<td>5,101,438</td>
<td>(540,000)</td>
<td>4,761,437</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>5,761,437</td>
<td>Reduce detective positions by two</td>
<td>This action reduces the number of detectives by two. This will result in a higher caseload for each remaining detective and the potential of slower closure times for active cases. Crimes will not get solved as quickly and possible not solved at all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Programmatic Budget Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept Priority</th>
<th>Dept #</th>
<th>Program Title (Total Prog Costs)</th>
<th>FY 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011-12 Estimated Budget</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 Status Quo Budget</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 reduction from Status Quo Bgt</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 Requested Budget</th>
<th>FTE Impact</th>
<th>GFC Cost to Restore</th>
<th>Requested Action</th>
<th>Service Level Impact Information</th>
<th>Service Level Impact as submitted by Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>032</td>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>2,219,982</td>
<td>2,219,982</td>
<td>1,826,406</td>
<td>(393,576)</td>
<td>1,139,926</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Reduce Narcotics team by one Sergeant and 3 detectives</td>
<td>This action cuts the Narcotics team in half, from two Sergeants and 6 detectives to one and three, respectively. the ability to investigate and eliminate narcotics activity will be significantly and adversely impacted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>032</td>
<td>Jail Operations</td>
<td>7,261,613</td>
<td>7,261,613</td>
<td>7,769,484</td>
<td>(507,871)</td>
<td>1,024,310</td>
<td>9 (9.0)</td>
<td>$1,024,310</td>
<td>Reduce Santa Maria Branch jail to 7 nights a week</td>
<td>The FY2012-13 Status Quo Budget funded a 24/7 facility at the Santa Maria Branch Jail. This reduces the service back down to the level adopted by the Board for FY2011-12. Impacts include partial booking services to the law agencies in the Santa Maria Valley and a less efficient custody operation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>032</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>6,998,697</td>
<td>7,111,455</td>
<td>6,709,269</td>
<td>(482,188)</td>
<td>428,168</td>
<td>4 (4.0)</td>
<td>$428,168</td>
<td>Reduce Court bailiffs by 4 Deputy Sheriffs</td>
<td>While Court Security Services are funded by the State, the Sheriff's Office always runs a deficit between revenues paid by the Courts and the cost to provide the services. For FY2011-12, the State began providing the funding for Court Security directly to the Sheriff. This reduction reduces bailiff services and reduces General Fund impact to zero.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheriff's Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td>$1,492,436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>Adult-Community Services</td>
<td>470,166</td>
<td>375,136</td>
<td>407,916</td>
<td>[130,533]</td>
<td>277,383</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$75,194</td>
<td>Reduce homeless-related contracts by 12.4%</td>
<td>ADHMS may be able to transfer some of the homeless-related contracts to the MHSF Fund (0048). This would necessitate either reducing other MHSAs programs by the same amount or using the very limited MHSR reserve amounts to cover the amount.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>MH - AB 2034 Adult Homeless Grant</td>
<td>264,195</td>
<td>270,195</td>
<td>270,195</td>
<td>(6,002)</td>
<td>183,733</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$49,462</td>
<td>Reduce homeless-related contracts by 12.4%</td>
<td>ADHMS may be able to transfer some of the homeless-related contracts to the MHSF Fund (0048). This would necessitate either reducing other MHSAs programs by the same amount or using the very limited MHSR reserve amounts to cover the amount.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>Adult-IMD Contracts</td>
<td>1,080,000</td>
<td>935,643</td>
<td>963,600</td>
<td>(184,000)</td>
<td>782,925</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$121,000</td>
<td>Reduce contracted Institution for Mental Disease (IMD) inpatient beds from 16 beds/day to 14 bed/day, on average.</td>
<td>ADHMS is proposing to offset increased inpatient system of care costs by reducing the out-of-county IMD inpatient beds. The impact will be patients staying longer in the PHF, which will increase the wait-time (over 24 hours) for people in acute psychiatric crisis at hospital emergency rooms and the jail. This will cause delay in approximately 122 people/year receiving the appropriate level of mental health treatment in an acute psychiatric facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>Adult–Hospital Placement</td>
<td>711,000</td>
<td>1,215,121</td>
<td>1,309,620</td>
<td>(496,500)</td>
<td>813,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$216,000</td>
<td>Reduce contracted acute psychiatric inpatient beds from 5 beds/day to 3.4 beds/day, on average.</td>
<td>ADHMS is proposing to offset increased inpatient system of care costs by reducing the out-of-county contracted acute inpatient beds. The impact will be increased wait-time (over 24 hours) for people in acute psychiatric crisis at hospital emergency rooms and the jail. This will cause delay in approximately 224 people/year receiving the appropriate level of mental health treatment in an acute psychiatric facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>Adult Acute Care - PHF</td>
<td>5,757,874</td>
<td>6,327,917</td>
<td>6,439,437</td>
<td>(201,591)</td>
<td>6,238,846</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>Reduce PHF Costs at mid-year.</td>
<td>County CBO has issued RFP for expert input on controlling PHF costs. While ADHMS does not yet have specific recommendations, the Dept. projects that savings in PHF costs can be achieved, effective mid-fiscal year, without quality impact or reduction in facility's 16- bed capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Level Impact Information

**Countywide**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept Priority</th>
<th>Dept #</th>
<th>Program Title (Total Prog Costs)</th>
<th>FY 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011-12 Estimated Budget</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 Status quo Budget</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 reduction from Status quo Bldgt</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 Requested Budget</th>
<th>FTE Impact</th>
<th>GFC Cost to Restore</th>
<th>Requested Action</th>
<th>Service Level Impact as submitted by Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>051 Total Agriculture &amp; Co. Extension</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>$115,922</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>523,196</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1,705,080</td>
<td>(241,201)</td>
<td>1,463,888</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>241,201</td>
<td>Reduce staff in Long Range Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>053</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1,771,404</td>
<td>1,770,000</td>
<td>1,625,975</td>
<td>(53,895)</td>
<td>1,572,080</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>53,895</td>
<td>Reduce IT support staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>053</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1,771,404</td>
<td>1,770,000</td>
<td>1,709,404</td>
<td>(137,324)</td>
<td>1,572,080</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>137,324</td>
<td>Reduce GIS staffing by 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>053</td>
<td>South Property and Permit Information</td>
<td>387,169</td>
<td>387,000</td>
<td>422,933</td>
<td>(54,871)</td>
<td>368,062</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>Reduce permitting and support at the public counter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>053</td>
<td>Permitting and Inspection</td>
<td>3,029,812</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>2,906,644</td>
<td>(241,833)</td>
<td>2,664,811</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
<td>Declining residential and commercial development activity has resulted in reduced planning permit applications. Longer wait times at the public counter will result in a back log of applications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>053</td>
<td>South Dev Rev Permitting</td>
<td>1,632,257</td>
<td>1,630,000</td>
<td>1,877,952</td>
<td>(246,772)</td>
<td>1,599,180</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>Reduce planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>053</td>
<td>Isla Vista Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td>572,897</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>(377,121)</td>
<td>(377,121)</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>Dissolution of the Isla Vista RDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053 Total Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>(11.4)</td>
<td>$482,420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,244,200</td>
<td>2,160,500</td>
<td>2,326,800</td>
<td>(174,400)</td>
<td>2,152,400</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>197,400</td>
<td>2 Ranger positions ($174K) Continued Closure of Guadalupe Dunes Park ($23K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Shelter Services GFC pass-through</td>
<td>345,400</td>
<td>345,400</td>
<td>345,400</td>
<td>(45,400)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>45,400</td>
<td>Reduce contribution to shelters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Budget Information</td>
<td>Service Level Impact Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept Priority</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dept #</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2011-12 Adopted Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2011-12 Estimated Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2012-13 Status Quo Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2012-13 reduction from Status Quo Bldgt</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2012-13 Requested Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>FTE Impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>GFC Cost to Restore</strong></td>
<td><strong>Requested Action</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service Level Impact as submitted by Departments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Human Services Commission</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>(1,200,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>$ 1,200,000</td>
<td>Eliminate Human Services General Fund Contribution one time funding from 2011-12 to non profit orgs for human services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Advertising Resources GFC pass through</td>
<td>195,600</td>
<td>195,600</td>
<td>195,600</td>
<td>(195,600)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 195,600</td>
<td>Eliminate General Fund Contributions to 14 regional conference and visitors bureaus &amp; all one-time contributions to SB Film Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>North &amp; South County Parks &amp; Open Spaces</td>
<td>4,836,400</td>
<td>4,582,700</td>
<td>4,673,700</td>
<td>(149,300)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,528,400</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>$ 145,300</td>
<td>Unfund 2 Maintenance Plumber positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>North County Parks &amp; Open Spaces</td>
<td>2,244,200</td>
<td>2,160,500</td>
<td>2,222,800</td>
<td>(70,400)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,152,400</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>$ 70,400</td>
<td>Unfund 1 Mechanic Welder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Mid County Parks &amp; Open Spaces</td>
<td>2,745,500</td>
<td>3,031,400</td>
<td>2,879,700</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,788,700</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>$ 93,000</td>
<td>Unfund 1 Water and Sewage Plant Operator position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Grants Administration</td>
<td>738,400</td>
<td>402,900</td>
<td>690,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(110,500)</td>
<td>580,200</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>$ 110,500</td>
<td>Unfund Housing Program Specialist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Mid County Parks &amp; Open Spaces</td>
<td>2,745,500</td>
<td>3,031,400</td>
<td>2,841,900</td>
<td>(53,200)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,788,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 55,200</td>
<td>Reduce Sheriff Deputy overtime post services at Cachuma and Jalama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>North &amp; South County Building Grounds</td>
<td>458,400</td>
<td>348,600</td>
<td>311,500</td>
<td>(74,700)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>236,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 74,700</td>
<td>Reduce landscape building maintenance contract services at County facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>County Service Area 3 (Unincorporated Goleta Valley)</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>625,400</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(35,000)</td>
<td>565,000</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>$ 35,000</td>
<td>Reduce County Service Area 3 (Unincorporated Goleta Valley) park services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**057 Total** | **Community Services** | **(8.0)** | **$ 2,222,500** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept Priority</th>
<th>Dept #</th>
<th>Program Title (Total Prog Costs)</th>
<th>FY 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011-12 Estimated Budget</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 Status Quo Budget</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 reduction from Status Quo Bgt</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 Requested Budget</th>
<th>FTE Impact</th>
<th>GFC Cost to Restore</th>
<th>Requested Action</th>
<th>Service Level Impact Information as submitted by Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>062</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>7,037,613</td>
<td>6,747,600</td>
<td>6,680,293</td>
<td>(126,069)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,554,224</td>
<td>$126,069</td>
<td>Reduce 1 Office Professional and 0.6 Appraiser (addendum) 1.0 restored via Final Budget Adjustment FTE positions impacting assessment work items completed by close of roll.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>062</td>
<td>Elections Administration</td>
<td>3,430,652</td>
<td>2,167,380</td>
<td>1,890,818</td>
<td>(134,980)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,755,838</td>
<td>$134,980</td>
<td>Reduce 2 Office Professional FTE positions decreasing service hours available for candidate filing in Santa Maria and service hours offered in Lompoc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>062</td>
<td>Clerk-Recorder</td>
<td>3,203,318</td>
<td>3,232,752</td>
<td>2,964,253</td>
<td>(76,490)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,896,763</td>
<td>$76,490</td>
<td>Reduce 1 Office Professional FT-position reducing service hours at the Lompoc Office and increase the number of days to mail back recorded documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>062</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>7,037,613</td>
<td>6,747,600</td>
<td>6,768,711</td>
<td>(319,974)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,448,737</td>
<td>$319,974</td>
<td>Eliminates the fund balance available for property tax system costs and creates one-time use of funds for ongoing Assessor operational costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>062</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>7,037,613</td>
<td>6,747,600</td>
<td>7,190,453</td>
<td>(741,716)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,448,737</td>
<td>$741,716</td>
<td>Eliminates the fund balance available for replacement and acquisition of new voting systems and creates one-time use of funds for ongoing Assessor operational costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 062 Total     | Clerk-Recorder-Assessor          | (4.0)                     | (76,490)                  | -                          | 6,448,737                   | (319,974)                            | -                          | $1,390,229            | 1,390,229        | Use of the fund balance from this departmental designation account (98767) to fund on-going Assessor operational costs will deplete the funding source available to the department for unanticipated costs of implementing the new Board approved property tax system for the Assessor and makes the General Fund liable for unanticipated costs. Additionally, use of this one-time source of funding to fund ongoing Assessor operational costs, which are necessary to avoid major property tax revenue loss, will create a cliff for the Assessor in FY 13-14. Use of the fund balance from this departmental designation account (9842) to fund on-going Assessor operational costs will significantly diminish the funding source available to the department for replacement of the existing outdated voting systems and makes the General Fund liable for any new voting system costs if Federal or State grants are not available or for any county match. Additionally, use of this one-time source of funding to fund ongoing Assessor operational costs, which are necessary to avoid major property tax revenue loss, will create a cliff for the Assessor in FY 13-14. |
### Programmatic Budget Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept Priority</th>
<th>Dept #</th>
<th>Program Title (Total Prog Costs)</th>
<th>FY 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011-12 Estimated Budget</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 Status-Quo Budget</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 reduction from Status Quo Bgdgt</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 Requested Budget</th>
<th>FTE Impact</th>
<th>GFC Cost to Restore</th>
<th>Requested Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>065</td>
<td>Veterans Services</td>
<td>172,024</td>
<td>207,349</td>
<td>210,425</td>
<td>(73,175)</td>
<td>137,250</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>$73,175</td>
<td>Refund 1 FTE beginning 11/1/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>065</td>
<td>Representative Payee</td>
<td>201,617</td>
<td>240,054</td>
<td>222,933</td>
<td>(176,175)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>$176,175</td>
<td>Remove Entire Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Service Level Impact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Level Impact as submitted by Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>065 Total Treasurer-Tax Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.7) $249,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand Total (Countywide)                          |
| (53.2) $8,904,929                                 |

The Veterans Services Program is not mandated. This program assists County Veterans in obtaining their benefits from the VA. TTC will reduce this program from two staff to one staff. The TTC is proposing to close the Santa Barbara & Lompoc Offices. This will affect all SB County Vets, including those returning from Iraq & Afghanistan. Waiting time for appointments will increase. Vets may need to apply to the VA directly, which is a complex & document intensive process.

The Representative Payee Trust Fund Program is not mandated. This program services clients who cannot manage their benefits due to mental illness. Eliminating this program would require the majority of the approximately 300 ProPay clients to retain alternative representatives to receive their benefits and pay their bills. Potential impacts could include increased homelessness, involuntary hospitalization, increased number of conservatorships and placement in IMD’s.