



## Legislation Text

---

**File #:** 09-0507, **Version:** 1

---

Supervisor Nutting requesting the Board reconsider its' March 24, 2009 approval of the operating cost for each Supervisorial District budget in the amount of \$201,000 (Agenda File 09-0152); and requesting the Board schedule this item to be heard again with new information presented. On March 24, 2009, the Board of Supervisors voted, 4-1, to approve a per-District budget of \$201,000.

This concept was initially presented by Supervisor Sweeney in a February 3, 2009 memo to the Board of Supervisors citing his concern for the differences in costs and expenses between the District offices and particularly pointing out the salaries and benefits of two Supervisor's Assistants.

In a subsequent memo of February 27, 2009, Supervisor Sweeney recommended a target of \$194,000 for the 08-09 and 09-10 fiscal years with an additional travel expense allocation added to the Tahoe district of \$2,400.

The inadvertent and unexpected result of establishing a \$201,000 per district budget effectively penalized the Tahoe district and financially rewarded the four other Supervisorial Districts. This was not what I believe the board intended to achieve.

The Board of Supervisors heard a budget presentation by the Clerk of the Board on March 24, 2009. The Clerk and the CAO concurred, stating that the Board had already made the appropriate cuts to their budget, \$100,000, a 9.4% reduction. It was the Board's desire to also cut travel and expenses, with additional cuts made at the last minute to comply with Supervisor Sweeney's uniform district budget proposal and motion.

While the concept to implement uniform district expenditures is not an unreasonable concept, the result of the Board action was to restrict access and outreach for the District V office and their Lake Tahoe constituents, forcing a 30-day (unpaid) furlough upon the Supervisor's Assistant, and allocating over \$36,000 to the four other Supervisorial districts.

This action did not have the intended cost-cutting effect to the budget of the Board of Supervisors. And, the concept of a uniform per district budget should **not** be considered a budget-cutting strategy when only one district supervisor is severely affected and four others receive substantial increases.

I would contend that this was not as Supervisor Sweeney first proposed; a goal to reduce the Board budget, nor a method to best accommodate all constituents. I believe that this vote was made without the results being properly analyzed, including the cost-cutting alternatives that the board staff and Clerk of the Board would have recommended; information not available to the board at that time.

It would be appropriate to reconsider the Board of Supervisors' department budget to consider these and other issues of salaries and benefits for supervisors and staff, including, but not limited to;

- 1) A 5% salary reduction in Supervisors' salaries

- 2) Discussion of 56-hour Management Leave for Assistants
- 3) Maintain current levels of staff salaries and benefits, and continue to cut expenses while pursuing revenue recovery options.