

**COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA**

For the Agenda of:
June 9, 2009

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Chief Operations Office

Subject: Report Back – Mandates vs. Non-mandates

Supervisory
District: All

Contact: Sharon Dwight, Performance Measure Coordinator, 874-5229

Overview

During Budget Workshops, a request was made for specific program information to be provided and made available to Board Members at the Proposed Budget hearings. Included in that information is a listing of whether the programs are mandated or not and whether they have a mandated level of service.

Recommendation

Receive and file.

Measures/Evaluation

This process is expected to produce an updated and more detailed identification of the counties mandates, service levels required to meet the mandates and a useful organized reference document to be used in future budget decision making.

Fiscal Impact

Not applicable.

BACKGROUND

The County has been identifying mandates and discretionary functions/programs for many years but has had difficulty when trying to identify a specific level of service that meets mandates. In 1997 an analysis was done by County Counsel, relying on budget information provided by departments that evaluated whether certain programs were mandates, practical mandates or discretion. To the extent that programs were identified as mandates, few were identified as having mandated service levels. Since then a few programs have been reanalyzed and some new programs have been analyzed. The County Executive Office (CEO) and the departments have not previously conducted a detailed program analysis to determine whether existing levels met, exceeded or fell below legal mandates.

DISCUSSION

In preparation of the 2009-10 budget, an attempt was made to identify core programs and their minimal level of service. Core programs were defined to include mandated functions and some other programs that were traditionally performed by counties as well as financial obligations and internal support functions.

On April 1, 2009, County Executive staff presented this work to the Board of Supervisors in public session. Based on the discussion and questions at that meeting, the project's scope was changed to more clearly focus on countywide priorities and mandated level of services in all programs. Staff worked with departments to examine mandates with reference to changes in mandates and department structures since the 1997 analysis. The revised program structure and services levels were compared to previous County Counsel opinions. CEO staff held departments to a strict standard of providing documentation and benchmarks to justify minimal levels of service required by codes, regulations, ordinances, court decisions, or the County Charter, and to identify measurable standards to indicate whether they were meeting them or not.

This process has resulted in some updates to mandate information for the Board's use in its 2009-10 budget deliberations. The CEO will provide that information to the Board in June. However, it became clear that much more extensive work is required in this review in order to lay a foundation for identifying mandates and level of service in future years. County Counsel has suggested that an in depth analysis be coupled with an analysis of interdependence of functions in various departments and the organizational structure for the delivery of services.

A countywide team of representatives from County Counsel, County Executive Office and departments will be established to develop a scope of study and conduct an analysis of program functions, mandates, mandated service levels and alternatives to providing the services as they are currently presented. A final product should provide a clear picture of mandates, level of service and also a matrix that can be reviewed annually during budget deliberations. It is anticipated the analysis will be completed no later than March 2010 making it useful for the next budget cycle.

MEASURES/EVALUATION

This process is expected to produce an updated and more detailed identification of the counties mandates, service levels required to meet the mandates and a useful organized reference document to be used in future budget decision making.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

Not applicable.

Respectfully submitted,

APPROVED:
TERRY SCHUTTEN
County Executive

NAV GILL, Chief Operations Officer