

Approved 5/20/93

~~LANE COUNTY BUDGET COMMITTEE~~

~~May 18, 1993~~

Harris Hall Main

5:20 - 9:40 p.m.

BOOK 153 PAGE 0491

ACTION SUMMARY

Members Present:

Citizens: Laney (Chair), Bartel, Bell, Jones, Stewart

Commissioners: Cornacchia, Dumdi, Roberts, Rust (arrived after District Attorney discussion)

Staff: Van Vactor, Drivas, Garnick, Schulz (recorder)

Previous Action Summaries for May 10, 1993 and May 13, 1993 were approved as written.

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEWS

DISTRICT ATTORNEY

FUND 24

Discussion: Staff gave an overview of the 93/94 budget. Doug Harclerod reviewed the 3 programs, Criminal Prosecution, Victim Services, and Family Law, in the context of "What we're doing now" (in 92/93) versus "What we won't do" (in 93/94 if the proposed reductions are approved). A chart listing Activity Indicators, broken into felonies and misdemeanors, was discussed. The District Attorney's volume of work is way up. It was pointed out that 98% of felony charges do not go to trial. Doug Harclerod then reviewed the types of prosecutions that they will not be able to pursue as vigorously, including some thefts, forgeries, minor drug charges, game offenses, and minor weapons offenses.

Committee members asked clarifying questions regarding the inclusion of benefits in the FTE reductions proposed (answer: yes they are included), the definition of game offenses, and whether the reduction list was the District Attorney's list (answer: yes). A compliment was made to the department for their professionalism during the budget process and the Acting County Administrator commented that reductions could be delayed until August 1st in order to take what ever action the State takes into consideration.

Decision: Tentative approval of Fund 24: Vote 7 to 1 (Bell dissenting).

FUND 31

Discussion: Staff gave an overview of the 93/94 budget, indicating that it was a maintenance budget.

Decision: Tentative approval of Fund 31: Vote 8 to 0.

GENERAL

The tentative approval process was discussed and it was agreed that this process was acceptable as long as the Committee comes back to all of those items that members wish to readdress. (Currently staff and departments are making presentations so that Committee members have an understanding of the entire budget. Committee members are voting on "tentative" approval of proposed budgets, reductions, additions, and how certain less routine items will be handled, ex. fee increases in Waste Management.)

YOUTH SERVICES

Fund 24

Discussion: Staff gave an overview of the 93/94 budget. Steve Carmichael, with the help of overheads, reviewed several State and County statistics. Examples of statistics discussed were the growth in violent crime versus burglaries and the number of juvenile beds available versus adult beds.

Three staff members from Youth Services then discussed those types of cases that would no longer qualify for services if the reductions proposed in the 93/94 budget were approved.

Committee members asked clarifying questions regarding how Youth Services is doing currently at "saving" children (answer: most juveniles on probation do not end up in the adult system) and how many children will Youth Services "lose" with the proposed reductions.

Judge Aiken (Judge Hargreaves could not attend, but a letter from him was distributed) pointed out that when "prevention" is discussed with regards to Youth Services, the reference is to the adult system and not the juvenile system, and what a great tragedy that is. She also discussed a couple of examples of children in her court now, that illustrate the severe problems that many of the youth in our County face.

Committee members asked clarifying questions regarding whether additional staff would be helpful in light of the fact that we do not have any more bed space (answer: absolutely), whether the reduction list was the Director of Youth Services' list (answer: yes), whether the relatively

smaller reductions to this department were reflective of the County's priorities (answer: yes), and whether parents have to pay for the expenses incurred at Youth Services by their children (answer: no - in Steve's experience the cost of collection equals the dollars collected). This last question stimulated further discussion by the Committee and affected what the Committee voted on (see Decision).

Decision: The Committee moved and seconded that tentative approval of Youth Services' budget include an amendment that budget staff return in 3 months with an analysis of charging parents for the expenses incurred by their children while at Youth Services. Vote 8 to 1 (Roberts dissenting). Tentative approval of fund 24 with the amendment: 9 to 0.

LEVY
FUND 18

Discussion: Staff gave an overview of the 93/94 budget, including a reconciliation of the 92/93 revenues and expenses. The Acting County Administrator clarified that there are contingency funds built into the financial plan for the fund.

Committee members asked several clarifying questions regarding how funds for the Psychiatric Hospital were over-collected, what kind of controls were, or will be, in place to prevent this, whether this affected Public Safety's budget (answer: no), and whether someone would monitor this to make sure it did not happen again (answer: yes).

Decision: Tentative approval was deferred until the Public Safety budget was presented.

PUBLIC SAFETY
FUND 24

Discussion: Staff gave an overview of the 93/94 budget. The Acting County Administrator commented that he understood that the Sheriff had prepared a revised budget, but that he and the budget staff had not been provided a copy so there could be no analysis provided to the Budget Committee tonight.

Bob McManus reviewed Public Safety's revised budget using overheads and a handout. Statistics were presented, comparing Lane County to the other 3 most populace counties in Oregon, on the ratio of patrol deputies to rural population. Also reviewed were the variety of things that Public

Safety is asked to do (domestic disputes, traffic accident investigation, etc.) and that the State troopers are being cut back too.

Bob McManus then reviewed the reductions in the revised budget using organizational charts and the handout. Due to the complexity of the department's organization and an attempt to compare the revised budget to the original proposed, a fairly tangled discussion ensued.

The Committee members asked clarifying questions regarding how patrol worked in Veneta, Creswell and the surrounding areas and how much it cost (answer: in summary, the areas surrounding the communities receive a higher level of patrol service than they pay for), and how much Public Safety's revised budget reductions added up to (answer: ~\$800,000).

The Acting County Administrator restated that he would like a chance to review the revised budget before he comments. Committee members agreed that no action should be taken on the revised budget before the budget staff has a chance to analyze it. Further, they indicated that they want to move toward closure on all open items in budget on Thursday, the 20th, including Public Safety.

A Committee member asked for further analysis from Public Safety's office on a single dispatch system for 911 (how would it work, and how much money would it save or cost). The Sheriff responded that he thought it was a good exercise and would follow up.

A Committee member then commented that we were not doing anything for those economically hard hit communities like Oakridge, with regards to special services similar to those provided in Veneta and Creswell. After some discussion it was concluded that these services could perhaps be provided to Oakridge if they asked for it and would pay for it.

A Committee member then asked why more clerical people were not cut and the Sheriff explained how those cuts would have impacted services.

Decision: Tentative approval was deferred to the next meeting, Thursday, May 20th, due the Acting County Administrator and budget staff not having had a chance to review Public Safety's revised budget.

GENERAL

The Committee Chair asked, and the Committee members agreed, that the remainder of the agenda be deferred until the next meeting, Thursday, May 20th, due to the late hour.

Committee members addressed the public and let them know that their letters had been received and that no Levy programs were being cut.

Budget staff reviewed the packet material for next Thursday's meeting. The Acting County Administrator referred to the Furlough handout and discussed those parties that had been involved in its development and recommended that it go to the Reinventing Government Committee.

Next meeting: Thursday, May 20, 1993

ADJOURNED

9:40 p.m.

Schulz, 5/20/93
SUM51893