

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY

2010 JUL 26 AM 8:41



El Dorado County

James R. "Jack" Sweeney
Supervisor, District III

Date: July 26, 2010

To: Board of Supervisors

CC: Clerk of the Board

RE: Future Services vs. Budget

LATE DISTRIBUTION
DATE 7-26-10

Let's begin with what I believe is a quote but for which I do not have a source:
Government must only do for the people that which they cannot otherwise do for themselves!

Historically government has expanded its control over its constituency by mandating a service that was proposed by well meaning citizens or legislators suggesting such service was necessary for the well being of society. Some of these mandates came with new taxes or fees that would offset the cost of the service and some of such programs were required to be funded by the general fund of the providing agency.

In the good times we have enjoyed for probably the last forty years and especially the era from 1996 thru 2007 the need for such services versus the cost to or imposition on the rights of the citizenry has not been evaluated. It is now time for our Board to participate in an in depth examination of the process of providing services to our citizens and the revenues and expenses involved therewith.

I was pleased to read the memo from our CAO Gayle Erbe-Hamlin dated July 21, 2010 for our budget discussion on July 26, 2010. Following are important quotes from that memo that I believe emphasize my statement above: a) Our cost reductions have been for the most part across the board thus sustaining the percent of general fund distribution by functional group. b) There are departments that simply cannot get much smaller and still function. c) As we go through this process we will need to decide what we won't be able to provide any longer. d) We must clearly articulate to the organization and our citizens what services will no longer be available, what services will be reduced and what services still remain. e) The Chief Administrative Office will be discussing with departments their services and reviewing on a position by position basis their organizational chart. These are important statements and reach an excellent conclusion; however, I believe it will be important for the Board to be intimately involved in the review process to fully understand the services we intend to provide and which services are needed as we go forward.

To begin the process we need to have a list of programs being provided by each department with annotation as to whether they are required, mandated or simply nice to do. This list needs to show revenue sources and costs of programs.

Since we rarely look at programs on a comparative basis, I provide the following sample of programs we have discussed from time to time:

Note: Data and page number from the Proposed Budget for comparison purposes; therefore the data is not the same as the adopted version.

Dept/Prog	page	10/11 approp	NCC
Agriculture	263	1,519,391	498,779
Animal Cont	369	2,598,711	1,364,063
Dev Serv	279	5,797,049	3,003,786
Senior Care	413	5,193,812	714,569
Promotions	115	720,500	720,500

Note that by agreement of 2004 with the entities that helped pass the increased TOT, promotions was to receive 50% of TOT after cost of collection. See page 56 for amount of TOT \$1,601,020 less 10% is \$1,440,900 and ½ is \$720,450.

We spend more on animal control than agriculture and more net county cost on animal control than on agriculture, senior care, or promotions. Is this what we really want? We must get back to budget basics and get to the services we believe the people in our county want and are willing to fund. We need to have a lot of discussion on this issue; NOT JUST looking at how to continue the same as in the past with an adjusted budget!

Thank You for being responsible and responsive to our constituency!