



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
220 NORTH MAIN STREET, P.O. BOX 8645
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48107-8645
(734)222-6850
FAX (734)222-6715

TO: Conan Smith, Chair
Ways & Means Committee

FROM: Robert E. Guenzel
County Administrator

DATE: June 3, 2009

SUBJECT: 2010/11 Recommended Budget Solutions Phase 1

BOARD ACTION REQUESTED:

It is requested that the Board of Commissioners approve the recommended budget solutions as phase 1 in development of a balanced biennial budget for the 2010/11 fiscal years; and authorizes the County Administrator to continue working with the organization to further develop additional long-term structural solutions with recommendations on these items to be brought to the Ways & Means Committee no later than September 16, 2009 as the 2010/11 Recommended Budget Phase 2.

BACKGROUND:

The news on the economic downturn is depressing – and unavoidable. Every indicator paints a gloomy spiral – from high unemployment and foreclosure rates to record declines in the stock market and property values. The impact is being felt nationwide and in many parts of the world. The State of Michigan is being hit harder and deeper than most. Washtenaw County is no different. For the first time since the creation of the property equalization system more than 50 years ago, the rate on taxable value has decreased from the prior year. These times are unprecedented and unpredictable; history is no longer a reliable indication of the future.

The economic downturn in the state of Michigan began years ago. State funding for local health programs began to fall off. Then, in 2004, State revenue sharing was postponed while a time shift was implemented in county property tax collections as a way to save the State money. During this time, Washtenaw County was fortunate to have a strong housing market resulting in high property tax revenue and housing related fees. The County general fund began providing dollars to important local programs - previously funded by the State - as a means to retain service delivery as much as possible. All the while, the County continued to realign systems and improve efficiencies, eliminating more than 130 positions from 2002 – 2005.

A conscious decision was made during the 2006/07 biennial budget to “stabilize the organization”. This was a time to regroup following previous reductions and to refocus on strategic planning and core operations. The County’s “Communities of Interest” – a way to think systematically about services from the perspective of the customer – were developed at this time. This approach was implemented in anticipation of a budget shortfall in 2008/09. However, the magnitude of that shortfall was not predicted.

The County developed its biennial budget for the 2008/09 fiscal years during 2007 with final adoption in November of that year. Much of the strategy for that budget was based on anticipated savings from ongoing union negotiations. More than \$10 million in total labor savings or cost containment became part of the budget planning process. These included salary concessions, reduced medical and retiree health care for new hires, and the proposed shift to a defined benefit retirement plan. It became clear shortly after adopting the budget that property tax revenues would decline at a much steeper rate than expected. County Administration responded and led the organization to a revised 2008 budget for Board of Commissioner approval in February, and the development of an amended 2009 budget in April of 2008.

In February 2009 the County presented its Financial State of the County as part of the 2010/11 budget development. This included an overview of the revenue already lost due to the continued State fiscal realities and housing market decline, as well as forecasts for the next four years. It was projected at that time that if the County continued spending at previous trends, the general fund would acquire an almost \$26 million deficit for 2011. Once again, County Administration began working with the organization and the Board of Commissioners to provide information and develop a strategy to address this serious budget imbalance.

More than ever before the leadership and engagement of the Board of Commissioners became a most critical factor in the budget development process. A series of information sessions was conducted with commissioners to help dissect the budget methodically and to secure guidance from commissioners on key policy considerations. These presentations included:

- Revenue Projections & Reform
- Mandated & Non-Mandated Services
- Community Needs & Major Expenditures
- Employee Compensation & Benefit Levels
- Outside Agency Allocation & Integrated Funding
- Support to Non General Fund Programs
- Creating Government Efficiency through Shared Services
- Cost Allocation Plan (CAP)
- Reserves

During this same time input was sought by numerous groups of stakeholders. The commissioners demonstrated their commitment and leadership to the community through many informational sessions with constituents, local units of government and the business sector. The Board and County Administration jointly held town hall sessions with nearly a third of the organization. Weekly updates were provided on the employee intranet, along with a targeted Budget Planning website that offered the opportunity to ask questions, add comments or ideas. Department Heads and the Labor Management Team increased their meetings from once to twice a month during this intense planning period. And an internal Strategy & Budget Group comprised of County Administration, Elected Officials and Department Heads convened weekly.

A framework including four major approaches to balance the budget was developed:

1. Maximizing Revenue Growth
2. Department Identified Expenditure Reductions
3. Employee Compensation & Benefit Modifications
4. Other Major Organizational Changes

DISCUSSION:

A multi-faceted approach was implemented to arrive at the recommended budget solutions. Parallel processes included work with the Board of Commissioners and Labor as stated above, as well as internal development of budget reduction scenarios with each County department and elected office. An overview of the process used in each major approach is outlined below, with specifics as to the recommendations that fall within each category.

1. Maximizing Revenue Opportunities Target \$3 – 5 Million

The County has limited authority in generating revenue. Property tax revenues are restricted by the State of Michigan to formula and the millage rate cannot be increased without voter approval. The County cannot issue an income or sales tax. Given the billion dollar budget deficit, state revenues are as uncertain as ever before. Nonetheless, there are means to maximize revenue opportunities within established guidelines, and program level fees are within the Board's authority in most cases.

Early in the process Administration requested that each Department Head and Elected Official undergo a strategic exercise to evaluate their operations and determine possible budget modifications. These were framed around "what-if" scenarios for a 5, 10, 15 and 20% reduction from the 2009 budget levels. The first priority within this exercise for the organization was to review opportunities for revenue generation in an attempt to preserve services and jobs.

Nearly all of the solutions in this category were included in the department scenarios. It was decided that a dollar made was equal to a dollar saved, as long as the department could demonstrate the likelihood of the revenue being collected. Budgeting an increase in revenue does come with more risk than implementing structural budget reductions. Every attempt has been made to minimize that risk and budget at a reasonable level. Below is a list of recommended revenue budget increases by department to assist with balancing the budget. In some cases, fee adjustments are necessary. These considerations and any other stipulations are provided for each recommendation.

Department – Revenue	Recommended Revenue Increase	Considerations
<i>14-A District Court:</i> Collections and programming enhancements	TBD as part of court lump-sum budget agreement	Degree of uncertainty with collections and program levels
<i>CSTS:</i> Maximize federal funding	\$2,176,484	Possibility of long-term service level reduction if federal funding levels are reduced
<i>ETCS:</i> Maximize outside funding	\$93,763	May be short-term savings
<i>Finance:</i> Allocation of staff time to copier fund	\$18,308	May increase per copier cost in the future although can be absorbed at this time
<i>Head Start:</i> Increased federal COLA funding	\$101,685	Expect to be sustainable

<i>Human Resources:</i> Pittsfield Township shared services contract	\$25,000	Based on current contractual agreement
<i>Information Technology:</i> Shared services with City of Ann Arbor	\$120,000	Based on current contractual agreement
<i>Office of Strategic Planning:</i> Brownfield revenues	\$13,000	Phase in with smaller amount in 2010
<i>Public Health / Environmental Health:</i> Maximize federal revenues; improved collection rate; fee increases; collaboration with Water Resources Commissioner for Stormwater services	\$412,495	Requires BOC adoption of fee increases including Food Safety and Cremation
<i>Sheriff's Office:</i> Civil Processing and accounting change for pay phone revenue	\$260,000	Moved civil processing in-house in 2009 with expectations of revenue growth; accounting shift of pay phone revenue from Tech Plan to Sheriff's general fund budget
<i>Treasurer:</i> Increased accommodations tax revenue due to BOC adoption of fee increase; distribution of interest from School Aid Fund; pursuit of other revenue growth opportunities	\$160,000	Economic volatility could alter long-term stability of new revenues
<i>Water Resources Commissioner:</i> Maximize reimbursement for Drain Inspectors; Cost sharing with City of Ann Arbor	\$111,856	Within eligible criteria and based on current contract arrangements
<i>WCHO</i> Maximize CAP payment to County	\$891,818	Possibility of long-term service level reduction if federal funding levels are reduced
Total Revenue Growth	\$4,384,409	

One non-departmental revenue growth opportunity is also recommended. The Board of Commissioners has the authority through Act 88 to approve an economic development millage of 0.0170 of a mill to be levied in December of each year starting in December of 2009 with the proceeds of such millage to be used for advertising the advantages of the county, to attract companies to the region grow jobs and reduce unemployment rates. SPARK currently has a budget of \$250,000 for advertising and marketing the county. If approved, the millage would generate approximately \$256,000 annually and would cost a homeowner \$1.70 for every \$100,000 of his/her home's taxable value. If approved, economic promotion of the county would continue and the general funds currently being allocated to economic development could be saved. At this time no action by the Board is requested, with anticipation of review and consideration during the summer months.

Revenue growth and reform must continue to be a strong focus as we move through these challenging times. Reform takes time and the engagement of multiple stakeholders is essential. The County is undertaking efforts to maximize its focus on outside revenue generation to help alleviate costs in the general fund. This may include new grants, maximizing available federal

and state support, and the pursuit of federal earmarks. However, these outside funding sources are also faced with challenges and uncertainties.

2. Department Identified Expenditure Reductions Target \$7 – 10 Million

In March 2009, Department Heads were asked to consider the four different scenarios for budget modifications as outlined above, including a 5, 10, 15 and 20% budget reduction. Under each scenario, department heads were asked to specify the types of cuts that they would advise, as well as the potential impact that each modification would have on service delivery. In addition, departments were to identify what impact any cut might have on the ability of another department or another agency to deliver a service.

Departments were given guidelines to help reach these targets, including the following principles that were to be applied in the order shown:

- Revenue Generation (see overview and recommended solutions shown above)
- Reducing the Cost of Doing Business
- Organizational Restructuring including Management to Staff Reductions
- Collaborations
- Service level Reductions in both Mandated and Non-Mandated Programs
- Elimination of Non-Mandated Programs

Departments were directed to submit only structural changes – one time reductions were not to be included in their submissions. Departments were also prohibited from using any modifications to employee compensation or benefit levels, including reduced work hours, from their expenditure reductions as these modifications were being considered in a parallel process. Each Department Head was expected to engage with staff to identify all options to generate revenues and reduce costs. The attempt was to preserve service levels and jobs where possible.

The baseline from which the reductions were to be made was calculated from the 2009 total expenditure budget net of the Cost Allocation Plan for all general fund departments, with the percentage reduction applied to the 2009 general fund appropriation for all non general fund programs. Using this methodology, if the full 20% reduction were applied to the organization, a total General Fund savings of \$12 million would result. However, this was a strategic exercise to identify options rather than imposing an across the board reduction. The total target for department expenditure reductions, established by Administration, was \$7-10 million. As shown above, over \$4 million in revenue growth resulted from this exercise as well.

County Administration, Budget and Human Resources met with departments to identify their base budget needs and to discuss these scenarios. The impact on staff, operations, organization and the community were weighed. The majority of opportunities identified by departments are being recommended to the Board of Commissioners for implementation. Some are not being recommended if the impact was deemed too severe, or not in alignment with the County's Guiding Principles.

The total amount of budget reductions recommended by Administration is \$6,766,259. These reductions are summarized below. When combined with recommended revenue growth, most Departments or County Office's are being recommended for a reduced general fund contribution of 10 – 20% from 2009 adopted levels. A few departments have reductions greater than this level due to opportunities within revenues, contractual arrangements or vacancies that currently

exist. A handful of departments are not being recommended for any reduction to preserve program and service delivery levels at this time.

A recommended reduction in the 14-A District Court lump-sum allocations is included in the amount of \$375,000 or 10% from the 2009 budget. At this time, it is recommended to also reduce the lump-sum allocation for the Trial Court although the amount is still to be determined. Discussions with the Trial Court and 14-A District Court are on-going at this time.

Part of the recommended department reductions includes the elimination of the Daybreak program within Children's Services as of January 1, 2010. Daybreak provides residential and intensive outpatient substance abuse treatment for adolescents involved with the Juvenile Court. The residential treatment program is one of only a handful for adolescents in Michigan. Youth requiring residential substance abuse treatment in the future may be placed in programs outside of Washtenaw County. In the future, youth requiring intensive outpatient treatment may be assigned to lower intensity treatment services in the community, and/or to other services provided by the court.

Department – Expenditure Reduction	Recommended Budget Decrease	FTE Reductions	Considerations
<i>14-A District Court:</i> Lump sum reduction	\$375,000	TBD	Some will be revenue growth
<i>Administration:</i> Elimination of Deputy County Administrator	\$205,439	1.0	
<i>Budget:</i> No reductions recommended at this time	\$0	0.0	Impact of economic volatility
<i>Building Services:</i> Still under consideration	\$0	0.2	County has offset shortfall through capital reserves past few years; recommendation on future of program still under consideration; FTE reduction is due to elimination of Customer Service Specialist position partially allocated to Building Services
<i>Children's Services</i> Eliminate Day Break program and vacant positions; transfer management of Outside Agency contracts to Office of Community Development; reduction in WATT	\$667,827	6.0	
<i>Clerk / Register of Deeds</i> Eliminate 1.0 position in Vital Records, 1.0 in Elections and 2.0 in ROD Operating budget adjustments	\$311,077	4.0	

<i>Community Development</i> No reductions recommended at this time; taking over management of Outside Agency contracts	\$0	0.0	
<i>Corporation Counsel:</i> Move Risk Management staff to Self Insurance fund	\$57,562	0.0	
<i>CSTS:</i> No Expenditure Reduction	\$0	0.0	Revenue Opportunities
<i>Emergency Management:</i> Outside funding for vehicle Operating budget adjustments	\$15,040	0.0	
<i>Equalization:</i> Operating budget adjustments	\$20,893	0.0	
<i>ETCS:</i> No Expenditure Reduction	\$0	0.0	Revenue Opportunities
<i>Facilities:</i> Reduction in operating costs within O&M and Fleet Reduction in 1/8 th Mill allocation	\$1,000,000	0.0	May not be sustainable beyond 2010/11
<i>Finance:</i> No Expenditure Reduction	\$0	0.0	Significant staff reductions over past years; also Revenue Opportunities
<i>Head Start:</i> Position elimination planned for 2010/11 grant fiscal year	\$100,000	1.0	Also Revenue Opportunities
<i>Human Resources:</i> Position eliminations Reductions in Professional Development program	\$250,305	2.0	Also Revenue Opportunities
<i>Information Technology:</i> Reduction in operating costs including maintenance contracts and Tech Plan appropriation	\$1,180,000	0.0	May not be sustainable beyond 2010/11; also Revenue Opportunities
<i>MSU Extension:</i> Elimination of CSS position Reduce operating budget	\$102,472	0.8	Employee currently working part-time will be reduced
<i>Office of Strategic Planning:</i> Elimination of Organizational Development Manager Reduction in contractual services	\$257,658	1.0	Also Revenue Opportunities
<i>Project Management:</i> No reductions recommended at this time	\$0	0.0	Focus on current infrastructure and community projects
<i>Prosecuting Attorney:</i> No reductions recommended at this time	\$0	0.0	Past reductions and comparables with other jurisdictions
<i>Public Defender:</i> Placement of 2.0 Legal Clerks on Hold Vacant (HV) with agreed continuation of 4.0 on HV	\$315,106	2.0	Previous positions placed on HV were not budgeted

<i>Public Health / Environmental Health:</i> Elimination of an executive health official position; Planned position eliminations as part of the 2009/10 state budget agreement	\$476,493	1.45 (with additional 3.3 reductions TBD)	Separate resolution will be forthcoming for adoption of 2009/10 budget and state agreement; general fund support may be altered once final state revenue is known; also see Revenue Opportunities
<i>Sheriff's Office:</i> Cost savings of \$500K incorporated into 2009 budget will be made structural Additional savings through renegotiations of Jail medical and food contracts Elimination of 1.0 Office Specialist within LAWNET and 1.0 management staff in Community Corrections	\$1,248,603	2.0	\$500K already incorporated into budget with commitment to make structural; Sheriff pursuing other cost savings measures than those quantified here; also see Revenue Opportunities
<i>Treasurer:</i> No expenditure reductions	\$0	0.0	See Revenue Opportunities
<i>Trial Court:</i> Lump sum reduction	TBD	TBD	Anticipated General Fund savings net of outside revenue still being pursued
<i>Veteran Affairs:</i> Shift expenditures to Veteran Relief Millage where eligible	\$18,227	0.0	
<i>Water Resources Commissioner:</i> Restructuring due to anticipated position vacancies Operating budget reductions	\$164,557	1.35	Also see Revenue Opportunities
<i>WCHO:</i> No expenditure reductions	\$0	0.0	See Revenue Opportunities
Total Department Reductions	\$6,766,259	22.8 with additional 3.3 planned in PH/EH	Additional FTE reductions may result from court lump-sum reductions

3. Employee Compensation & Benefit Modifications Target \$12 – 14 Million

Representing 60% of general fund expenditures, personal services (including salary and benefits) must be part of any comprehensive budget solution. Since early on in the process, all County employees were encouraged to suggest potential budget saving opportunities. Several of these ideas fell into the categories that are covered in union contracts and therefore subject to collective bargaining.

The Labor Management Team, comprised of representatives from both union leadership and County management, began meeting every other week ensuring ongoing dialogue. A compensation task force was convened by Human Resources and Budget to analyze the

situation and weigh the impact of any modifications to the organization and individual employees. This group brainstormed a list of approximately 70 options and compiled them into a list of eight categories as shown below. Each item was examined for potential consideration.

- Number of Positions
- Salaries & Work Hours
- Time Off Banks
- Benefits – Medical
- Benefits – Retirement
- Benefits – Retiree Health Care (VEBA)
- Benefits – Other
- Miscellaneous

All compensation considerations fall into two categories: union and non-union. The majority (81%) of County employees are unionized. Any modification to compensation or benefit levels for union employees will require changes to collective bargaining agreements. Contracts currently exist for the 2010 fiscal year in all cases, with a few extending through 2012. A request has been made to all bargaining units to have them enter into negotiations as soon as possible with the potential for letters of understanding to be reached to reduce costs. These negotiations are expected to take time and as a result, no modifications are budgeted at this time, but it is anticipated that they will be part of the final 2010/2011 budget solutions.

Non-union compensation considerations can be implemented by the Board of Commissioners at any time. The County has an interest in providing consistency and equity with all employee groups, although that is not always possible. It has been a difficult and necessary decision to recommend reductions of employee salaries and benefits. Such a decision has not been made lightly, but rather with an interest and focus on preserving services for the community, as well as jobs. Even with the recommended modifications, County employee salary and benefits will remain comparable to other like organizations.

As a result, the following recommendations are being made for all Non-Union (Group 32) employees. These items are included in a separate resolution for consideration by the Board:

Wages

- | | |
|----------|----------------------------------|
| 1/1/2010 | Cancel salary adjustment of 1 ½% |
| 7/1/2010 | Cancel salary adjustment of 1 ½% |
| 1/1/2010 | 3% Reduction in salary |
| 1/1/2011 | 2% Reduction in salary |

Cancellation of pay-for-performance for 2009, 2010 and 2011

Medical Benefits

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 1/1/2010 | Implement Blue Cross/Blue Shield Community Blue PPO 3 with the following parameters: <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ \$250 single / \$500 family deductible➤ 80%/20% co-insurance with \$1,000 single / \$2,000 annual maximums➤ \$20 Office Visits➤ \$20 Chiropractic Visits➤ Prescriptions - \$10 generic / \$40 brand name |
|----------|---|

1/1/2011 Medical premium sharing of \$50 per month (pre-tax)

The total wage and benefit modifications for non-union staff is \$2,358,045. The estimated wage & pay-for-performance savings have been calculated at \$1,905,499. The estimated benefit savings have been calculated at \$452,546. (NOTE: there is an initial 6-month delay in realizing medical cost savings for the initial year of implementation.)

4. Major Organizational Changes Target \$3 - \$7 Million

The process helped identify several major policy issues – items that were beyond the department scenarios or external to the responsibility of a particular department. Examples of these policy issues include items like departmental consolidation, the sale of property, and department elimination (or program elimination within a department that exceeds the 20% threshold).

Outside Agency Contributions

The County's commitment to the not-for-profit agencies generates a good deal of attention within the organization. Many of these agencies do work on the County's behalf, or perform strategic preventative measures. Others simply align with the core values of the organization in meeting needs of vulnerable populations, or for economic development efforts within the County. It has become clear that a balance between support to County operated services and "Outside Agencies" must be reached. As a result, it is recommended that nearly all discretionary agency contributions be reduced by 20%. Furthermore, it is recommended that some of the agency allocations be pooled into the integrated funding model presented to the Board by the City/County Office of Community Development (OCD) Director in April. This will allow for a competitive bidding process among agencies with a strong focus on aligned community outcomes.

In addition to the agencies referred to above, the Board of Commissioners adopted within the budget allocations for "Special Initiatives". Recommended modifications in this category include:

- Remove \$150K annual funding support for WALLY beginning in 2009
- Retain a \$200K allocation to Supportive Housing Initiative but maintain a reduced Housing Contingency Fund appropriation as a means to strategically fund these efforts
- Reduce the Eastern County Economic Development initiative from \$300K to \$100K annually beginning in 2010

A complete list of agency allocations is provided below, with the recommended budget modification and a proposal on which allocations to align with the Office of Community Development integrated funding model. A contractual agreement with the Humane Society exists requiring the contribution level to increase to \$500K beginning in 2010.

Category	Agency Name	2009 Budget	Administrator's Recommendation	% Reduction	Shift to Community Development
Dues / Membership	BOC Dues	10,399	10,399	-	No
Dues / Membership	MAC Dues	20,315	20,315	-	No
Dues / Membership	Humane Society	400,000	500,000	-	No
Dues / Membership	Huron Riv. Water Coun.	11,892	11,892	-	No
Dues / Membership	Riv. Raisin Watershed	8,233	8,233	-	No
Dues / Membership	SEMCOG	175,000	175,000	-	No
Dues / Membership	SEMCOG Water Quality	10,000	10,000	-	No
Human Services	Area Agency On Aging	23,712	23,712	-	No
Human Services	Blueprint for Aging	25,000	20,000	20%	No
Human Services	Supportive Housing Initiative	250,000	200,000	20%	No
Human Services	DHS Child Abuse Prevention	38,000	-	100%	No
Human Services	Dispute Resolution Center	30,000	24,000	20%	No
Human Services	Dom Viol Proj Saf Hou	120,000	96,000	20%	No
Human Services	Eviction Prevention	50,000	40,000	20%	No
Human Services	Fair Housing	50,000	40,000	20%	Yes
Human Services	Family Learning Institute	15,000	12,000	20%	No
Human Services	Food Systems Economic Partners	15,000	12,000	20%	No
Human Services	Human Services/CWB Funding	1,000,000	800,000	20%	Yes
Human Services	Legal Resource Center	5,000	4,000	20%	No
Human Services	Michigan Tenant Counseling	17,250	13,800	20%	Yes
Human Services	NAAPID	10,000	8,000	20%	No
Human Services	Neutral Zone	20,000	20,000	0%	No
Human Services	NEW Center	35,000	28,000	20%	No
Human Services	Project Grow	4,500	3,600	20%	No
Human Services	R.S.V.P Approp.	12,000	9,600	20%	No
Human Services	S.E.M. Legal Services	75,000	60,000	20%	No
Human Services	Shelter Association	200,000	160,000	20%	No
Human Services	Small Business Development Cen	10,000	8,000	20%	No
Human Services	Soil Conservation	30,000	30,000	-	No
Human Services	Success by Six	50,000	40,000	20%	No
Human Services	UATS Reserve	20,000	20,000	-	No
Human Services	United Way - 211	40,000	20,000	50%	No
Special Initiatives	Eastern County Economic Dev	300,000	100,000	67%	No
Special Initiatives	Eastern County Incubator	50,000	50,000	-	No
Special Initiatives	NS Commuter Rail	150,000	-	100%	No
Special Initiatives	Spark	200,000	200,000	-	No
	Total	3,481,301	2,778,551	20%	

The amounts shown above are preliminary. Every two years in alignment with the biennial budget County Administration requests applications of every agency as a basis for the contractual agreement for service provision. This will still be required for all agencies with contract oversight by County Administration. A competitive process will be managed within OCD for all others, with a specific process outlined in a separate resolution for Board of Commissioner consideration.

As outlined in the Revenue Growth category, it is recommended that the County issue a millage in accordance with Act 88 to offset the current SPARK contribution. County Administration is also in discussion with Parks & Recreation for the possible realignment of a few agency allocations shown above. Any use of Parks revenue would require approval by the Parks Commission and is therefore not recommended at this time. These efforts, if successful, will

further reduce the County's general fund contribution to outside agencies from the amounts shown above.

In total, it is recommended to reduce the Outside Agency contributions by 20%, or \$702,750, annually beginning in 2010.

Sheriff's Office Organizational Structure

Washtenaw County Sheriff Jerry L. Clayton took office on January 1, 2009. Under the leadership of the Sheriff and his executive team, an internal organizational review and transition has been underway. The Sheriff has been a significant partner with County Administration throughout the budget development process. Cost savings of almost \$1.5 million have been identified through revenue enhancements and expenditure reductions. In addition, the County has chosen to transfer responsibility for **Community Corrections** from the Trial Court to the Sheriff with an agreed upon reduction of a management position. The Sheriff has also agreed to assume management responsibility for the County's **Emergency Management** function (previously a separate department). The Sheriff's Office is analyzing and auditing all functions provided to identify additional cost savings where possible.

Sheriff's Office Police Services Contracts

The Board of Commissioners approved Police Services contracts for the 2010 fiscal year in the December of 2008. These retained the same service delivery and cost methodology, with a 2% price increase. It is recommended that a 4% price increase over the established 2010 price be implemented for the fiscal year 2011. This secures revenues for the biennial budget and allows time for the Sheriff to develop a long-term proposal on ways to better serve the community. A 4% price increase is anticipated to generate revenue of \$231,685 above the current budget projections.

Infrastructure

Reductions within the Technology Plan and 1/8th Mill building maintenance funding are shown above under the Department Reductions category. This includes more than \$2 million in reduced general fund support to the County's infrastructure (including operating costs) annually for the 2010/11 fiscal years. This will require a shift in focus to maintaining existing infrastructure rather than providing enhancements or performing discretionary projects. The development of the infrastructure budgets including proposed project lists will be completed this summer and will be incorporated into the 2010/11 Recommended Budget in the fall. This process will include a review of the long-term impact of these reductions and the sustainability of reductions beyond the 2010/11 fiscal years.

The County is near completion on a new courthouse within the City of Saline. This has been an incredible partnership with the County, 14-A District Court and local entity, and the facility is scheduled to open this year. It was originally approved by commissioners to begin generating revenue in the 2010 fiscal year to earmark for future expansion of this facility. It is recommended to place this effort on hold until the economic situation improves, or at such time the court is unable to meet its mandated serviceability level.

Items Still Under Consideration

The items below are not included as specific recommendations for June 3rd but will be explored during the summer and incorporated into the September 2010/11 Budget Recommendation as determined appropriate. The magnitude of reductions will be partially dependent on the level of savings realized within Employee Compensation & Benefits through negotiations with our Unions. It is also necessary to maintain options to balance the budget in the event that the economic reality and budget projections worsen.

- Further reductions in department serviceability levels
- Reductions in departments not significantly reduced in first round
- Building Inspection – Maximize revenue generation opportunities or eliminate whole program
- Children’s Services – Close Juvenile Detention requiring court to find alternative residence for youth
- Community Development – Reduce appropriation
- Head Start – Reduce or transfer responsibility of program to another entity
- Health Funding – Pursue possibilities to further maximize outside funding
- Health Integration – Pursue possibilities to restructure management and service delivery
- MSU Extension – Reduce or eliminate whole program
- Outside Agencies – Further reduce above the 20% recommendation
- Outside Agencies Special Initiatives – Reduce or eliminate
 - Housing Contingency
 - Supportive Housing Initiative
 - Eastern County Economic Development
- Professional Development – Evaluate needs of organization and options to reduce or contract out
- Regional Dispatch – Continue to pursue options to regionalize central dispatch
- Sheriff Police Services – Continue evaluation of cost of providing contract policing
- Sheriff Corrections – Evaluate options of jail expansion including delay or closing existing pod
- Soil Erosion – Seek additional reimbursement and/or raise permit fees
- Strategic Planning – Reduce or eliminate whole program
- Support Services Organizational Structure – Possible realignment of management structure
- VEBA – Continue evaluation of issuing debt to fund liability

Items Considered but Not Recommended At This Time

Several items have been analyzed over the past several months but are not recommended for inclusion in the 2010/11 budget at this time, although all budget options must remain on the table for further review in case the situation for implementation becomes appropriate.

- Real Estate: A comprehensive real estate review was completed through pro rate work performed by local real estate companies. Due to the impact of the real estate market, it is recommended that the County retain its current space allocations and continue to develop a long-term master plan. A specific review of the Juvenile Center at Platt Road was completed. It is known this facility in its current condition is a short-term solution for the court operations. This item will continue to be evaluation and is partially dependent on the timing for the 15th District Court exiting the downtown Ann Arbor courthouse.
- Cost Allocation Plan (CAP): It has been considered to shift some elements of the CAP to enterprise funds for direct allocation of services provided. This would be a significant accounting shift of the County's support functions and probably would not significantly increase the financial support to the general fund. In addition, the recommended budget solutions include some program CAP levels increasing to maximize outside funding.
- Health Integration: The County has a long-term vision of health integration – including public, physical and mental health components. The alignment of Public Health and Environmental Health is one step towards that end. Additional collaborations between CSTS and WCHO are being pursued. It is anticipated that further integration efforts will evolve over the next couple of years.
- Public Defense: Multiple approaches exist for meeting the required legal mandate of providing legal defense. The county chose many years ago to bring these services in-house through the county's Public Defender department. It is recommended the county retain this approach for numerous reasons including: labor agreements with our Public Defender's Association, level of quality service provided by existing staff, the community focus of the department and the ongoing discussion of the public defense structure within the State of Michigan.

Summary

The economic reality in the State of Michigan continues to evolve. The budget projections for the state worsen with each review. There are some signs of movement within the housing market; however, property values are still declining rapidly. Instability will continue as the auto industry continues to fight for survival.

Internally, the organization has worked diligently over the past six months to identify the best solutions to balance the budget while minimizing service delivery impact and securing jobs where possible. In some cases the situation was assisted by increased revenue opportunities. Nonetheless, most of the recommended budget solutions come down to very difficult decisions with regards to a reduction in the cost of doing business, service levels, and in a few cases whole programs. These reductions are not desirable, but they are necessary to rebalance the budget. They are made soberly, in the attempt to bring this organization back to long-term fiscal stability.

A large body of work has been completed and is represented within the attached recommendations. This could not have been possible without key partnerships throughout the organization including our Department Heads, Elected Officials, Courts and Unions. Unfortunately, the budget development process does not end here. This is the first phase of

budget solutions for the 2010/11 fiscal years. A recommended calendar for review of these items as well as development of the entire balanced budget is attached.

While the economic pressures continue and are likely to get worse, it is imperative for the County to work proactively where possible and lay out a long-term strategic plan. The desire for these recommendations, and those that will come to the Board in September with the comprehensive recommended balanced budget for 2010/11, is to find agreement on significant enough budget solutions to allow the organization to take time during the 2010 fiscal year to focus on strategic planning and prioritization of services. That full process will serve as the foundation for the 2012/13 budget, and beyond. The County must rely on its strengths and core values. Washtenaw County is a different organization. For nearly 15 years it has been committed to continuous improvement, adhering to a progressive set of Guiding Principles and philosophies that focus on positive community impact and employee development. It is this difference that has and will help us persevere through these difficult times.

IMPACT ON HUMAN RESOURCES:

It is recommended that a net 22.8 FTE be reduced at this time. At least 11.8 positions are anticipated to be vacant, with the possibility of more through retirements or attrition. Additional staff reductions may result once details of reductions within 14-A District Court and the Trial Court are known.

There are 28.6 positions on the grid slated for elimination or to be placed on hold/vacant. One (1) is AFSCME Unit JD; Five (5) are AFSCME Unit A; Eight (7.8fte) are AFSCME Unit B; Two (2) are 3052 Supervisors; Twelve (11.8fte) are Non-Union and one (1) is POAM-312.

There are five (4.8fte) new positions being created. Three (2.8fte) are in AFSCME Unit B; Two (2) positions are being created as non-union.

One (1) position is being removed from Hold/Vacant status in 3052.

There are five (5) positions that are TBD by 12/31/09. They may be filled and/or vacant. Three (3) are from AFSCME Unit B; one (1) is non-union and one (1) is from POAM-312.

IMPACT ON BUDGET:

Anticipated budget savings recommended at this time total \$14,443,148 and include:

Maximizing Revenue Growth	\$4,384,409
Department Identified Expenditure Reductions	\$6,766,259
Employee Compensation & Benefit Modifications	\$2,358,045
Major Organizational Changes – Outside Agencies	\$ 702,750
Major Organizational Changes – Police Services	\$ 231,685

IMPACT ON INDIRECT COSTS:

Cost reductions within support service departments should reduce the level of indirect costs for the organization, although on a two year lag. The largest potential impact of this will be through the proposed reductions in infrastructure for the 2010/11 fiscal years.

IMPACT ON OTHER COUNTY DEPARTMENTS OR OUTSIDE AGENCIES:

Most County departments and outside agencies are being impacted by the recommended budget modifications. An effort was made throughout the process to minimize the impact as much as possible, with a focus on retaining services and jobs.

CONFORMITY TO COUNTY POLICIES:

This action conforms with county policy.

ATTACHMENTS/APPENDICES:

Resolution

Executive Summary of Recommendations, Timeline and Items Still Under Consideration

Position Modifications Grid

Permanent Elimination of Hold Vacant Positions

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDED BUDGET SOLUTIONS AS THE FIRST PHASE OF MODIFICATIONS TO CREATE A BALANCED BUDGET FOR THE 2010/11 FISCAL YEARS AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THE ORGANIZATION AND UNIONS TO IDENTIFY ADDITIONAL LONG-TERM STRUCTURAL SOLUTIONS THAT WILL BALANCE THE 2010/11 BIENNIAL BUDGET TO BE BROUGHT TO THE WAYS & MEANS COMMITTEE NO LATER THAN SEPTEMBER 16, 2009 AS PHASE 2 OF THE 2010/11 RECOMMENDED BUDGET

WASHTENAW COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

June 3, 2009

WHEREAS, Washtenaw County has been impacted by the economic downturn affecting most entities within the State of Michigan and around the nation; and

WHEREAS, for the first time since the creation of the property equalization system more than 50 years ago, the rate on taxable value has decreased from the prior year; and

WHEREAS, estimated best case and worse case budget projections for the 2010/11 fiscal years were presented to the Board of Commissioners in February 2009 as part of the Financial State of the County based on revenue variability and an assumption that expenditures would continue growing at previous levels; and

WHEREAS, the Board instructed the County Administrator to take a conservative approach in revenue projections given the economic instability; and

WHEREAS, a projected structural budget deficit target of nearly \$26 million was established for the 2010/11 biennial budget cycle; and

WHEREAS, the leadership and engagement of the Board of Commissioners has been essential in the budget development process with a series of information sessions to help dissect the budget methodically and to secure guidance from commissioners on key policy considerations; and

WHEREAS, commissioners demonstrated their commitment and leadership to the community through many informational sessions with constituents, local units of government and the business sector; and

WHEREAS, County Administration sought engagement and input from the entire organization through Town Hall sessions and weekly updates on the County's intranet site; and

WHEREAS, the Department Heads Group and Labor Management Team began meeting twice a month with County Administration in an effort to stay informed and offer input; and

WHEREAS, an internal Strategy & Budget Group comprised of County Administration, Elected Officials and Department Heads convened weekly; and

WHEREAS, a multi-faceted approach was developed in response to the budget situation including four major strategic focus areas with target solutions including:

1. Maximizing Revenue Growth (\$3-5 million)
2. Department Identified Expenditure Reductions (\$7-10 million)

3. Employee Compensation & Benefit Modifications (\$12-14 million)
4. Other Major Organizational Changes (\$3-7 million); and

WHEREAS, the organization was asked to first identify revenue opportunities to assist with the principle of securing services and jobs where possible which resulted in \$4,384,409 in revenue growth solutions; and

WHEREAS, these revenue enhancements are predominately through maximizing outside revenue opportunities including federal Medicaid and stimulus funding; and

WHEREAS, revenue enhancements through the county's shared services efforts with local units of government as well as efforts to increase collections are also included; and

WHEREAS, fee adjustments are recommended within Public Health and Environmental Health, with details to be forthcoming in a future resolution with necessary regulation updates; and

WHEREAS, County Administration requested each Department Head and Elected Official complete a strategic exercise to evaluate their operations and determine possible structural budget modifications around scenarios for a 5, 10, 15 and 20% budget reduction from 2009 levels; and

WHEREAS, guidelines were included to help reach these target amounts, including the following six principles to be applied in the order shown:

- Revenue Generation
- Reducing the Cost of Doing Business
- Organizational Restructuring including Management to Staff Reductions
- Collaborations
- Service level Reductions in both Mandated and Non-Mandated Programs
- Elimination of Non-Mandated Programs; and

WHEREAS, the County's Department Heads and Elected Officials, with engagement by their staff, identified solutions that minimized the loss of services and jobs; and

WHEREAS, these scenarios were then reviewed with strategic recommendations being implemented based on the identified impact of such a modification on staff, the organization and the community; and

WHEREAS, a total budget reduction of \$11,150,668 is included from this exercise, including \$6,766,259 in expenditure reductions and \$4,384,409 in revenue growth solutions; and

WHEREAS, most departments are being recommended for a reduced general fund contribution of 10 – 20% from 2009 adopted levels; and

WHEREAS, a few departments have reductions greater than this level due to opportunities within revenues, contractual arrangements or vacancies that currently exist; and

WHEREAS, a handful of departments are not being recommended for significant reductions to preserve program levels at this time; and

WHEREAS, a net total of 22.8 FTE are included for elimination with the plan for an additional 3.3 FTE within Public Health / Environmental Health to be considered as part of their 2009/10 budget and the possible elimination of positions within the courts; and

WHEREAS, at least 11.8 of these positions are vacant; and

WHEREAS, the budget amounts include a target budget reduction within the 14-A District Court lump sum budget agreement of 10% or \$375,000 which is still being evaluated by the court to determine specifics for implementation; and

WHEREAS, a reduction in the Trial Court lump sum budget is still in negotiations with an amount to be determined; and

WHEREAS, it is recommended that the county close the Juvenile Day Break program effective January 1, 2010 which is a combined residential and day treatment program for youth brought before the court requiring substance abuse treatment; and

WHEREAS, an organizational restructuring is proposed to take place with a net reduction of 1.35 FTE within the Water Resources Commissioner's Office due to retirements and alignment of Department of Public Works and Soil Erosion; and

WHEREAS, a reduction in state revenue within Public Health and Environmental Health is anticipated but not specifically known at this time, and as such the general fund appropriation to these services may need to be revisited in September when the complete 2010/11 budget is presented; and

WHEREAS, reductions within the County's infrastructure allocations is included for the 2009 – 2011 fiscal years with a focus on maintaining existing infrastructure for the next few years with a comprehensive review to be completed during the summer and incorporated into the 2010/11 biennial budget as to the long-term impact and sustainability of such a reduction; and

WHEREAS, additional savings are recommended through major organizational changes that were beyond the department scenarios or were external to the responsibility of a particular departments; and

WHEREAS, the level of support to the not-for-profit agencies generates a good deal of attention and it is clear that a balance between internal operations and support for external operations must be reached; and

WHEREAS, the majority of agencies are included for an annual 20% reduction beginning in 2010, with the county's Human Services, Children's Well-Being, Fair Housing and Michigan Tenant Counseling allocations being shifted to the management of the Office of Community Development as is outlined in a separate resolution for Board consideration; and

WHEREAS, the reduction in Outside Agency allocations also includes Special Initiatives including the removal of fiscal support for the North South Commuter Rail initiative (WALLY) beginning in 2009, the reduction of the Eastern County Economic Development allocation from \$300K to \$100K, and the reduction of the Support Housing Initiative from \$250K to \$200K with the continuation of a reduced appropriation to the Housing Contingency Fund to continue to fund this initiative; and

WHEREAS, organizational restructurings include the shifting of Community Corrections and Emergency Management to the Sheriff's Office, with a commitment by the Sheriff to reduce one management position and explore other cost saving measures; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners previously extended the County's Police Services contracts for the 2010 fiscal year retaining the same service delivery and cost methodology at a 2% price increase and by way of this resolution extends the contracts through 2011 with a 4% price increase above the 2010 amounts; and

WHEREAS, the budget solutions contained within this resolution are a significant step in developing a balanced budget for the 2010/11 fiscal years although more solutions are still needed to be identified; and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator is continuing work with the organization and with the leadership of all of the county's bargaining units during the summer and will bring a final recommended budget for 2010/11 on September 16, 2009; and

WHEREAS, this matter has been reviewed by Corporation Counsel, the Finance Department, the Human Resources Department, the County Administrator's Office, the County's Strategy & Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes the County Administrator to implement the recommended budget solutions for the 2010/11 biennial budget, with an early implementation date to provide savings in the 2009 fiscal year, as outlined in the executive summary of recommendations attached hereto and made a part hereof.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Commissioners approves the reductions to the Outside Agency Allocations as attached hereto and made a part hereof.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Commissioners hereby approves the continuation of discussion with the Washtenaw County Trial Court and District Court in pursuit of an agreement on a lump-sum budget adjustment for the 2010/11 fiscal years.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Commissioners hereby approves the price increases for 2011 Police Services contracts of 4% above the 2010 adopted price and authorizes the County Administrator and Corporation Counsel to implement such contract amendments.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Commissioners hereby delays the plans for Saline Court Phase 2 capital construction project and authorizes all revenue collected within the District Court to remain in the General Fund until the fiscal situation improves or at such point in time the capital project is required to meet mandated service levels.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Commissioners directs the Administrator to continue pursuing additional possible structural solutions as outlined in the Executive Summary as attached, including negotiations with all bargaining units, to balance the 2010/11 budget, with the presentation of the 2010/11 Recommended Budget Phase 2 to be brought to the Ways & Means Committee on September 16, 2009.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Commissioners hereby approves the attached position modifications, with an effective date upon approval by the Board of Commissioners unless otherwise noted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Commissioners hereby approves the attached permanent elimination of position currently on hold vacant status.

2010/11 Budget Position Modifications – Phase 1

POSITION CONTROL NO.	POSITION TITLE	NOTE	EMPLOYEE GROUP	GRADE	CREATE	ELIMINATE	HOLD VACANT	REMOVE FROM HOLD VACANT
ADMINISTRATION								
3506-0003	Deputy County Administrator	b	32	35			1.0	
CHILDREN'S SERVICES								
1605-0031	Senior Account Clerk I/II	b	15	16			1.0	
2270-0001	Youth Counselor- Day Treatment	c	11	22			1.0	
2270-0002	Youth Counselor- Day Treatment	c	11	22			1.0	
2270-0003	Youth Counselor- Day Treatment	c	11	22			1.0	
2270-0005	Youth Counselor- Day Treatment	c	11	22			1.0	
2270-0006	Youth Counselor- Day Treatment	c	11	22			1.0	
7741-0001	Detention Supervisor	d	10	77				1.0
7743-0001	Day Break Supervisor	c,d	10	77			1.0	
CLERK/REGISTER OF DEEDS								
1519-XXXX	Record Management Specialist	c,h	12	15				1.0
1519-XXXX	Record Management Specialist	c,h	12	15				1.0
1519-XXXX	Record Management Specialist	c,h	12	15			1.0	
2523-0034	Administrative Coordinator	b	32	25				1.0
2757-0001	Sr Clerk/Reg Analyst I/II/III	b	32	27/28/29			1.0	
1811-0006	Sr Records Mgmt Specialist	b	12	18	1.0			
HUMAN RESOURCES								
2760-0001	Human Resources Assistant	b	32	27			1.0	
2941-XXXX	Human Resources Generalist I/II	c,h	32	29/30			1.0	
HEAD START								
0502-0002	Nutrition Assistant	a,b	32	5			0.8	
1634-0005	Cook- HeadStart	b	12	16			1.0	
2631-0001	HS Program Support Coordinator	g	32	26			1.0	
1130-0001	Nutrition Assistant	a,b	12	11	0.8			
1130-0002	Nutrition Assistant	b	12	11	1.0			
MSU EXTENSION								
1878-0011	Customer Service Specialist	b	12	18			0.8	
OFFICE of STRATEGIC PLANNING								
3249-0001	Organizational Development Manager	b	32	32			1.0	
PUBLIC DEFENDER								
1571-0013	Legal Clerk	e	12	15				1.0
1571-0016	Legal Clerk	e	12	15				1.0
PUBLIC/ENVIRON HEALTH								
3360-0001	Environmental Services Director	a	32	33			1.0	
3428-0001	Administrative Health Officer	b	32	34			1.0	
3451-0001	Health Officer	a	32	34	1.0			
SHERIFF								
2831-0001	CC Deputy Director	b	32	28			1.0	
5401-XXXX	Office Specialist	c,h	16	54			1.0	
WATER RESOURCES								
1878-0012	Customer Service Specialist	b, f	12	18			1.0	
3353-0001	Public Works Division Director	c	32	33			1.0	
7746-0001	GIS Supervisor	b	10	77			1.0	
2581-0001	Water Resources Service Coord.	b	32	25	1.0			

Notes:

- a- Reclassification
- b- Effective upon BOC approval
- c- Effective 12/31/09
- d- Transfer of Daybreak Supervisor
- e-Effective 9/1/09
- f-position shared w/EH
- g-contingent on Oral Health grant funding ending
- h-position TBD

2010/11 Hold Vacant Positions to be Permanently Eliminated

POSITION CONTROL NO.	POSITION TITLE	EMPLOYEE GROUP	GRADE	REMOVE FROM HOLD VACANT	ELIMINATE
<u>BUILDING INSPECTION</u>					
1872-0001	Senior Account Clerk II	12	18	1.0	1.0
2821-0002	Building Inspector	12	28	1.0	1.0
2821-0005	Building Inspector	12	28	1.0	1.0
2822-0002	Mechanical Inspector	12	28	1.0	1.0
2823-0001	Electrical Inspector	12	28	1.0	1.0
2825-0001	Plumbing Inspector	12	28	1.0	1.0
<u>CHILDREN'S SERVICES</u>					
2260-0019	Youth Counselor-Juv Detention	15	22	1.0	1.0
2260-0020	Youth Counselor-Juv Detention	15	22	1.0	1.0
<u>CSTS</u>					
1257-0001	Client Driver Attendant	12	12	1.0	1.0
1261-0011	CSTS Office Assistant	12	12	0.5	0.5
2110-0156	Mental Health Professional	11	21	0.5	0.5
2527-0020	Service Coordinator	11	25	0.25	0.25
<u>DISTRICT COURT (14A)</u>					
1742-0004	Dist Court Probation Coord	29	17	1.0	1.0
<u>ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH</u>					
1872-0002	Senior Account Clerk II	12	18	1.0	1.0
2264-0001	Solid Waste Prog. Specialist	11	22	1.0	1.0
2571-0011	Sanitarian	11	25	1.0	1.0
2571-0020	Sanitarian	11	25	1.0	1.0
2571-0021	Sanitarian	11	25	1.0	1.0
2571-0022	Sanitarian	11	25	1.0	1.0
2571-0023	Sanitarian	11	25	1.0	1.0
<u>ETCS</u>					
1123-0001	Nutrition Site Coordinator	12	11	0.53	0.53
1123-0002	Nutrition Site Coordinator	12	11	0.53	0.53
1123-0003	Nutrition Site Coordinator	12	11	0.40	0.40
1123-0004	Nutrition Site Coordinator	12	11	0.53	0.53
1619-0002	Weatherization Prog Specialist	12	16	1.0	1.0
2933-0001	Fiscal Coordinator	32	29	1.0	1.0
<u>ITS</u>					
2949-0002	GIS Developer I/II	11	29/30	1.0	1.0
2949-0003	GIS Developer I/II	11	29/30	1.0	1.0
3055-0001	Application Specialist I	11	30	1.0	1.0
3055-0002	Application Specialist I	11	30	1.0	1.0
3248-0005	Application Specialist II	11	32	1.0	1.0
<u>MSU EXTENSION</u>					
1870-0001	Customer Service Specialist	12	18	1.0	1.0
<u>OFFICE of STRATEGIC PLANNING</u>					
2347-0003	Assoc/Sr/Principal Planner	11	23/25/27	1.0	1.0
2347-0005	Assoc/Sr/Principal Planner	11	23/25/27	1.0	1.0
2744-0001	Energy Coordinator	32	27	1.0	1.0
3352-0001	Environmental Initiatives Director	32	33	1.0	1.0

2010/11 Hold Vacant Positions to be Permanently Eliminated (continued)

POSITION CONTROL NO.	POSITION TITLE	EMPLOYEE GROUP	GRADE	REMOVE FROM HOLD VACANT	ELIMINATE
<u>PUBLIC HEALTH</u>					
1201-0056	Clerk Typist II	12	12	1.0	1.0
1456-0005	Hearing/Vision Tech I/II	12	14/16	1.0	1.0
1461-0001	Enrollment & Eligibility Spec I/II	12	14/15	1.0	1.0
1735-0001	Maternal & Infant Team Leader	11	17	1.0	1.0
2624-0002	Accounting Coordinator	11	26	1.0	1.0
7740-0002	Health Services Supervisor	10	77	1.0	1.0
7838-0002	Nurse Supervisor	10	78	1.0	1.0
9934-0001	TB Consultant	32	N/A	1.0	1.0
<u>SHERIFF</u>					
5401-0009	Office Specialist	27	54	1.0	1.0
5401-0024	Office Specialist	27	54	1.0	1.0
5507-0018	Community Service Officer	27	55	1.0	1.0
5601-0065	Corrections Officer	27	56	1.0	1.0
5606-0004	Communication Operator	16	56	1.0	1.0
5701-0052	Deputy	16	57	1.0	1.0
<u>WATER RESOURCES</u>					
1575-0001	Drain Maintenance Laborer	12	15	1.0	1.0
1575-0002	Drain Maintenance Laborer	12	15	1.0	1.0
2345-0001	Soil Erosion Control Officer	11	23	1.0	1.0
<u>ZEEB ROAD SUPPORT SERVICES</u>					
1878-0008	Customer Service Specialist	12	18	1.0	1.0
2748-0001	Stormwater Permit Prgm Coord	11	27	1.0	1.0

2010/11 Outside Agency Allocations

Amounts shown are preliminary as it will be required for agencies to apply for funding and demonstrate the service delivery and community outcomes attained by these allocations; allocations shown with a Yes under "Shift to Community Development" are recommended to be managed through the competitive bid process through the Office of Community Development. In addition, it is being considered for the County to issue a millage in accordance with Act 88 to offset the current SPARK contribution. Discussions are underway with Parks & Recreation for the possible realignment of a few agency allocations which would require approval by the Parks Commission.

Category	Agency Name	2009 Budget	Administrator's Recommendation	% Reduction	Shift to Community Development
Dues / Membership	BOC Dues	10,399	10,399	-	No
Dues / Membership	MAC Dues	20,315	20,315	-	No
Dues / Membership	Humane Society	400,000	500,000	-	No
Dues / Membership	Huron Riv. Water Coun.	11,892	11,892	-	No
Dues / Membership	Riv. Raisin Watershed	8,233	8,233	-	No
Dues / Membership	SEMCOG	175,000	175,000	-	No
Dues / Membership	SEMCOG Water Quality	10,000	10,000	-	No
Human Services	Area Agency On Aging	23,712	23,712	-	No
Human Services	Blueprint for Aging	25,000	20,000	20%	No
Human Services	Supportive Housing Initiative	250,000	200,000	20%	No
Human Services	DHS Child Abuse Prevention	38,000	-	100%	No
Human Services	Dispute Resolution Center	30,000	24,000	20%	No
Human Services	Dom Viol Proj Saf Hou	120,000	96,000	20%	No
Human Services	Eviction Prevention	50,000	40,000	20%	No
Human Services	Fair Housing	50,000	40,000	20%	Yes
Human Services	Family Learning Institute	15,000	12,000	20%	No
Human Services	Food Systems Economic Partners	15,000	12,000	20%	No
Human Services	Human Services/CWB Funding	1,000,000	800,000	20%	Yes
Human Services	Legal Resource Center	5,000	4,000	20%	No
Human Services	Michigan Tenant Counseling	17,250	13,800	20%	Yes
Human Services	NAAPID	10,000	8,000	20%	No
Human Services	Neutral Zone	20,000	20,000	0%	No
Human Services	NEW Center	35,000	28,000	20%	No
Human Services	Project Grow	4,500	3,600	20%	No
Human Services	R.S.V.P Approp.	12,000	9,600	20%	No
Human Services	S.E.M. Legal Services	75,000	60,000	20%	No
Human Services	Shelter Association	200,000	160,000	20%	No
Human Services	Small Business Development Cen	10,000	8,000	20%	No
Human Services	Soil Conservation	30,000	30,000	-	No
Human Services	Success by Six	50,000	40,000	20%	No
Human Services	UATS Reserve	20,000	20,000	-	No
Human Services	United Way - 211	40,000	20,000	50%	No
Special Initiatives	Eastern County Economic Dev	300,000	100,000	67%	No
Special Initiatives	Eastern County Incubator	50,000	50,000	-	No
Special Initiatives	NS Commuter Rail	150,000	-	100%	No
Special Initiatives	Spark	200,000	200,000	-	No
	Total	3,481,301	2,778,551	20%	