

INTRODUCTION

The County Executive Office (CEO) is pleased to provide you with the FY 2003-04 Adopted Budget. This document reflects the Board of Supervisors' adopted budget based on Orange County's disciplined approach to fiscal management and is consistent with the priorities set forth in the County's 2003 Strategic Financial Plan. The budget recommendations were presented at a public budget workshop on May 29, 2003, discussed at public budget hearing on June 10 and 11, 2003 and adopted June 24, 2003.

The FY 2003-04 Final Budget reflects the impacts of the local, state and national economies, limited revenue growth and the rising cost of doing business. Although impacted by external factors, the County's local economy continues to be strong and diverse. The FY 2003-04 State Budget faced a \$35 billion funding gap; this budget reflects the impacts of the Governor's May Revise. The County is currently reviewing additional impacts resulting from the final State budget signed on August 2, 2003.

This introduction contains a guide to reading the budget document, a brief description of the County's form of government, Supervisorial Districts, mission statement and the County's Corporate Management System. This report reviews the State budget and economic factors influencing the County budget, provides summary budget information, and issues in various program areas of the budget.

I. A CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO READING THE BUDGET DOCUMENT

This document includes information that provides readers with a greater understanding of each department's mission, organizational structure, and performance results as a narrative context for the budget amounts. The introduction section contains several charts and tables, which provide an overview of issues affecting the budget, sources and uses of funds and budgeted positions. Following the introduction are sections that present each department and fund in the County's seven program areas. The seven program areas are:

1. Public Protection
2. Community Services
3. Infrastructure and Environmental Resources
4. General Government Services

5. Capital Improvements
6. Debt Service
7. Insurance, Reserves and Miscellaneous

When applicable, the presentation for each department within the seven program areas includes:

An **Operational Summary** including:

- Mission
- Budget at a Glance
- Strategic Goals
- Key Outcome Indicators (Performance Measures) (see following paragraph)
- Key Accomplishments of the current year

An **Organizational Summary** including:

- Overview Organization Chart with three levels of detail for most departments
- Description of each major activity
- Ten-year staffing trend chart with highlights of staffing changes

A FY 2002-03 **Budget Summary** including:

- Department's plan for support of the County's strategic priorities
- Changes included in the base budget
- Recap of the department budget
- Highlights of the key budget trends
- A matrix that shows all of the budget units under the department's control

Readers looking for budget information for a specific department can use the Index near the end of the book. Departments are listed in alphabetical order with the page number of that department's budget information.

All County departments prepare annual business plans. A business plan sets forth long-term goals, identifies strategies for making progress on those goals during the coming year and identifies how success will be measured by using outcome indicators (performance measures). Some of the key outcome indicators have changed this year because during

the 2003 business plan process there was thorough review to ensure consistency with the departmental mission and goals. In the future the key outcome indicator changes will be minimized so the reader of the business plans and this budget document can consistently observe trends and progress in meeting objectives.

Following the seven program areas is an appendix for readers who desire an additional level of budget detail. This includes each department's total budget broken down by major revenue and expense category and that same level of revenue and appropriation detail for each of the activities within the department.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL OVERVIEW

The Orange County's FY 2003-04 Adopted Budget presents the County's financial capacity and priorities in providing public safety and health, social services, environmental, and regional planning services for its residents. The County provides the public with a comprehensive array of public services through its departments and through comprehensive community partnerships with public, private and non-profit agencies. The Public Administrator/Public Guardian function of the Community Services Agency (CSA) has been moved to the Health Care Agency. Budgets for the remaining functions of the CSA remain listed under CSA. Subsequent to budget adoption, the Board approved the remaining functions of CSA be combined with the Housing & Community Development Department and renamed that department Housing & Community Services.

FORM OF GOVERNMENT

The County is a charter County as a result of the March 5, 2002 voter approval of Measure V that provides for an electoral process to fill mid-term vacancies on the Board of Supervisors. Before Measure V as a general law County, mid-term vacancies would otherwise be filled by gubernatorial appointment. In all other respects, the County is like a general law County. A five-member Board of Supervisors, each of who serve four-year terms and annually elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman, governs the County. The supervisors represent districts that are each equal in population. The members of the Board of Supervisors by district are as follows:

THOMAS W. WILSON, *CHAIRMAN*, from the Fifth District representing the communities of Aliso Viejo, Dana Point, Laguna Beach, Laguna Hills, Laguna Niguel, Laguna Woods, Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano and Rancho Santa Margarita.

JAMES W. SILVA, *VICE CHAIRMAN*, from the Second District, representing the communities of Costa Mesa, Cypress, Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, La Palma, Los Alamitos, Newport Beach, Seal Beach, Stanton, and portions of Garden Grove.

CHARLES V. SMITH, from the First District, representing the communities of Santa Ana, Westminster, and portions of Garden Grove.

BILL CAMPBELL, from the Third District, representing the communities of Brea, Irvine, Orange, Villa Park, Yorba Linda, Tustin and portions of Anaheim.

CHRIS NORBY, from the Fourth District, representing the communities of Buena Park, Fullerton, La Habra, Placentia and portions of Anaheim.

COUNTY MISSION STATEMENT

In 1996, the County adopted its first mission statement to define Orange County government, its organizational focus and core businesses. The County's mission statement reads:

The County of Orange is a collection of dedicated, public-spirited individuals, who together comprise a regional service provider and planning agency committed to maximizing resources and improving the quality of life for residents in Orange County. Our core businesses are public safety, public health, environmental protection, regional planning, public assistance, social services and aviation.

The County is committed to providing Orange County residents with the highest quality programs and services as articulated in its mission statement. Supporting this mission statement is a series of guiding principles that frame how the County operates and prioritizes its resources:

- **RELY ON THE STRATEGIC FINANCIAL PLAN** to make day-to-day decisions that consistently move the County toward its long-term goals.

- **VALUE OUR WORKFORCE** to ensure that citizens are served by a professional and dedicated workforce.
- **ENHANCE TECHNOLOGY** for productivity and service delivery to use modern methods to reduce costs and improve services.
- **COMMUNICATE COUNTY PRIORITIES** to ensure that our employees and partners understand how the County is achieving its long-term goals.

INNOVATIVE GOVERNMENT

Beginning in 1996, the Board of Supervisors adopted various initiatives in an effort to improve the accountability, efficiency and responsiveness of County government. This effort is referred to as the Corporate Management System and includes a series of related, but independent initiatives to improve how the County plans and prioritizes its resources to achieve its organizational goals. The initiatives consist of:

- County Mission Statement
- Ongoing Organizational Evaluation
- Annual Departmental Business Plans
- Strategic Financial Plan
- Performance Measurement

Beginning with the first restructuring effort in 1996, the County adopted a corporate culture of continuous improvement which challenges managers throughout the organization to continually evaluate how services are provided to determine whether they can better meet customer needs or be provided more efficiently. **Ongoing organizational evaluation** refers to the process of continually reevaluating services to improve customer service, increase cost-effectiveness, and/or enhance service delivery. Through the development of **annual departmental business plans**, departments identify their mission and goals, discuss the value their organization brings to the community and how they measure their progress.

The **Strategic Financial Plan** process provides the framework for implementing new programs and facilities, balancing available resources with operating requirements and serves as the foundation for the annual budget. This framework enables the Board to make annual funding decisions within the constraints of a comprehensive, long-term perspective. Since 1998, the Strategic Financial Plan has been annually updated to review revenue and expense forecasts. New priorities are identified and considered every two years if funding is available as part of a comprehensive re-adoption of the plan.

Complementing strategic and business planning is a comprehensive **County performance measurement system** that includes three main elements:

- **Community Indicators** - The Community Indicators Report provides a comprehensive assessment of Orange County using seven groups of indicators: economic and business climate, technology and innovation, education, health and human services, public safety, environment and civic engagement. Several new indicators were added within these groups including tourism, transit, world trade and physical fitness of children.
- **Performance Measurement** - Measuring outcomes and focusing on results is increasingly becoming a way of doing business for the County. Since July 1998, the County has been working to develop meaningful outcome indicators specific to each department's mission and goals. This budget document contains reporting on key outcome indicators for all departments.
- **Performance Incentive Program** - In order to provide incentives that motivate and reward employees for achievement linked to County goals, employee performance incentive programs have been implemented. Under the leadership of the Orange County Labor Management Taskforce, the Performance Incentive Program (PIP) continues to strengthen the links between individual performance and goal achievement for represented employees. Similarly, the Management Performance Plan (MPP) has directly linked management performance rewards to the achievement of project and competency development goals linked to County and Agency/Department business goals and objectives.

Each year the County makes progress in further integrating these tools into the way the County operates, prioritizes its resources, and makes decisions. Performance measures, for example, are being used to evaluate investments in programs and the community indicators report helps identify target areas for future collaborative initiatives. Augmentations to the FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03 budgets contained performance plans; the outcomes of those performance plans were reviewed as part of the process for recommending continuing funding. New augmentation requests for FY 2003-04 included performance plans and will undergo the same review next year.

During FY 2001-02 the County was assigned higher credit ratings by the two largest rating firms, A+ from Standard and Poors, and Aa2 from Moody's. These ratings, which place Orange County among the highest rated counties in California, are in large measure due to the corporate management system, particularly the Strategic Financial Plan. In FY 2003-04, the County will continue the progress made and strive for innovation in service delivery, strategic planning, and performance measurement. In these ways, Orange County continues to be an example of innovative government.

III. FINANCIAL OUTLOOK FOR FY 2003-04

Two indicators of the state of the Orange County economy are: how well the local economy is performing relative to surrounding counties, the state and the nation (i.e., External Indicators); and how well the local economy is performing relative to its own historical trends (i.e., Internal Indicators). In terms of the external indicators, Orange County's economy routinely out-performs local surrounding counties, the state, and national economies (in annual percentage growth), and, in fact, ranks higher (in absolute dollars) than the economies of the majority of the countries in the world. Current external indicators show that despite the current slowdown of the local economy, conditions in Orange County are expected to remain favorable relative to conditions in surrounding counties, the state and nation. However, in terms of internal indicators, Orange County's economic performance is much more volatile and uncertain. This volatility has lead local economist to ponder with uncertainty over the actual local economic outlook. This section provides various external and internal indicators that describe the current and projected outlook of the Orange County economy.

The growth in Real Gross County Product (a measure of the value of goods and services produced in one year and an indicator of the strength of the local economy) is forecasted by Chapman University to increase by 4.69% in 2003 and reach \$127.2 billion. This compares to an increase in Gross State Product (for the state of California) of 3.37% and an increase in Gross Domestic Product of 3.81% at the national level during the same time period. Comparisons of Orange County's projected 2003 Gross County Product (GCP) relative to prior years, shows a very slow but steady increase in GCP. For example, GCP in 2000 increased by 6.15%, dropped to 1.19% in 2001; increased to 2.35% in 2002, and is projected to increase to 4.69% in 2003.

Orange County's unemployment rate continues to be one of the lowest in the State, and is below that of all surrounding Southern California counties, the state of California and nation. In July 2003 unemployment rates for the U.S., California and Orange County were recorded at 6.2%, 6.9%, and 4.0% respectively. In July 2003 rates for surrounding counties in Southern California were 7.5% (for Los Angeles County), 6.7% (for Riverside County), 6.2% (for San Bernardino County) and 4.5% (for San Diego County). Comparisons of Orange County's unemployment rates from January 2003 through July 2003 were 4.0%, 4.0%, 3.9%, 3.8%, 3.7%, 4.0%, and 4.0%, respectively. Similarly, unemployment rates in Orange County in July 2000, July 2001, July 2002 and July 2003 were 3.0%, 3.4%, 4.6% and 4.0%, respectively.

According to Chapman University, Orange County's job growth totaled 1.79% (approximately 24,840 more jobs) in 2001, decreased by -0.75% (approximately 10,667 less jobs) in 2002, and is forecast to increase by 0.98% (approximately 13,805 more jobs) in 2003, and 2.09% (approximately 29,655 more jobs) in 2004.

Inflation, as measured by the Consumer Price Index (CPI), is expected to remain moderately low in Orange County, despite being higher than the CPI at the state and national levels in 2003. Chapman University projects the CPI at the national level to increase by 2.7%, in California by 2.7%, and in Orange County by 3.3% in 2003. However, in 2004 Chapman University projects CPI to increase by 2.9% at the national level, 2.8% at the California level and 2.9% at the local Orange County level. Comparisons of Orange County's CPI's in 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 are 3.3%, 3.4%, 2.8%, 3.3%, and 2.9%, respectively.

According to DataQuick Information Systems, in July 2003 the median price for new and existing homes in Orange County increased by 18.9% (relative to July 2002), and reached \$428,000. Housing appreciation in Orange County has been rapid in response to the high demand for housing caused, in part, by low interest rates and a tight supply of housing. For the future, Chapman University is projecting that while housing appreciation will slow down, housing affordability (compared to other parts of the country) will continue to remain low.

Median family incomes in 2003 were adjusted ("Re-benchmarked") by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to comply with actual data collected during the 2000 Census. Orange County's adjusted median family income is projected to reach \$70,000 in 2003. This compares to \$50,300 for Los Angeles County, \$59,900 for San Diego County, \$51,000 for Riverside County, \$60,300 for the state of California and \$56,500 for the U.S. during the same time period. Comparisons of adjusted median family income levels in Orange County (based on Chapman University estimates and projections) in 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 are \$69,310; \$70,577; \$70,887; and \$72,985, respectively.

Taxable sales in Orange County are forecast by Chapman University to increase by 3.2% in 2003 and 4.3% in 2004. This compares to forecast of 2.8% in 2003 and 3.7% in 2004 for the State of California. Taxable sales percentage change estimates and forecast in Orange County for 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2003 are 10.1%, 0.3%, -1.2%, 3.2%, and 4.3%, respectively.

STATE LEGISLATION AND BUDGET

The Governor's January budget addressed an estimated FY 2003-04 shortfall of \$34 billion as a result of the economic downturn and declining revenues. A large element of the shortfall was a decline in receipts from the personal income tax on capital gains and stock options. On April 30, 2003 the legislature approved a \$3.7 billion package that helped close the deficit. Included in the package were bills authorizing issuance of Pension Obligation Bonds to make the payment due to the State Employees Retirement Fund in FY 2003-04. The Governor signed the FY 2003-04 State Budget on August 2, 2003. This budget balances an enormous general fund deficit with a combination of bond financing for the \$10.7 billion deficit from FY 2002-03, recognition of new Federal funds, tripling the vehicle license fees (VLF) and recognizing other new revenues and making program spending changes.

The FY 2002-03 State debt will be paid for beginning in FY 2004-05 by a sales tax/ property tax swap known as the "triple flip". The state sales tax will be raised by one-half cent dedicated to paying off the debt. This increase will be offset by repealing the one-half cent sales tax dedicated to local government. The lost sales tax dedicated to local government will be replaced with property tax currently going to education. Other state program spending cuts are made to continue the same funding level to education.

The VLF will be tripled effective October 1, 2003. During the time the fees had been reduced, the State backfilled the reduction to hold counties and cities harmless. The State will not backfill these revenues for the months of July, August or September with repayment in three years. There is an exception for counties and cities that qualify as hardship cases; \$40 million is set aside for those cases. Due to the pledge of Orange County's VLF to pay bankruptcy recovery debt and the fact that VLF is a large portion of Orange County's general purpose revenues, we believe that Orange County qualifies under the hardship provisions. The State Controller made the full VLF payments to Orange County, for July and August. The State Department of Finance believes Orange County should not be receiving the full amount. The County will continue working with the State to resolve this.

With regard to other revenue and program spending impacts, the County adopted the impacts of the Governor's May revision to the proposed State budget. Departments are currently evaluating the differences between this and the final version of the State budget. We will be incorporating these changes into the FY 2003-04 First Quarter Budget Report.

Specific impacts of the State budget crisis on the County budget include the following:

Public Safety

- ◆ The Probation Department, in response to funding reductions, started an early, pro-active strategy to minimize the impact of funding reductions while maintaining services critical to public safety. These actions included a reduction of \$10.4 million from current year funding levels to non-mandated, non-core services and programs.
- ◆ Sweep of undesignated Trial Court Fees of up to \$4 million. These funds are currently used to make the mandated Trial Court Funding maintenance of

effort payment and are currently covered by a revenue agreement with the Court. This agreement should protect Orange County from this revenue sweep for FY 2003-04. If they are lost in future fiscal years, the General Fund will be required to backfill these payments.

Community Services

- ◆ Potential loss to HCA of \$11 million in cost reimbursement for mandated mental health programs.
- ◆ Funding for services provided by the Office on Aging is reduced by \$850,000.
- ◆ Funding for Services provided by the one-stop Workforce Investment Act centers is reduced by \$3.4 million.
- ◆ State allocation to Child Support Services is reduced by \$3.7 million.
- ◆ The State will require the County to pay a share of the Federal penalty imposed due to the State's failure to have a new Child Support case management system in place on time. This is a \$4 million one-time cost to the County General Fund.
- ◆ The State will not fund increases in cost of doing business in programs including Child Welfare Service, Food Stamps, Medi-Cal, CalWORKS and Adult Protective Services. This will result in a \$6.6 million reduction in these programs (\$4.3 million reduction in General Fund costs).

Infrastructure & Environmental Resources

- ◆ Orange County Public Library will lose over \$1 million in Public Library Foundation Act funding. The County Librarian is shifting resources and personnel in order to ensure current operating hours at all branch libraries can be maintained.
- ◆ The Flood Control District will lose \$25.6 million in State Flood Control Subvention funds. These funds are important to the completion of the Santa Ana River project including the raising the Prado

Dam by nearly 30 feet and purchasing property behind the dam at the 100 year flood line. If not reimbursed by the State, The Flood Control District would have to divert funds from other regional flood control projects.

- ◆ Unallocated Redevelopment funds of about \$0.9 million will be swept by the State.

- ◆ Road maintenance funds of \$6 million that were authorized by AB 2928 for the acceleration of road maintenance and local drainage improvements are suspended for FY 03-04.

General Government

- ◆ The State contemplated an undesigned cut to local government that, if allocated based on population, could cost the County General fund about \$20 million. This reduction was not included in the final State budget. The issue could be revived in the future.

MAJOR REVENUE AND EXPENSE ASSUMPTIONS

The County budget includes a wide variety of funding sources. State and Federal funding sources are estimated by departments based on established funding allocation formulas and caseload projections and the latest State budget information. Basic secured and unsecured property taxes are projected to increase by 5.6%. Motor vehicle license fees are projected to decline by about 3% based on State projections, Chapman University forecasts and trend data. In addition, the intercept of a portion of the motor vehicle license fees for the County's 1995 Refunding Recovery Bonds increases from \$21.8 million to \$28.3 million, further reducing this funding source. Although the Governor's original State budget proposed elimination of this backfill, this budget assumes continuation of the backfill. Base sales tax revenue to the general fund is projected to increase by 3.3% based on estimates by Chapman University; Hinderliter, De Llamas & Associates (sales tax consultant to the County) and the State Board of Equalization. Health & Welfare Realignment revenue from the State allocated to Health, Mental Health, Social Services and Probation is projected to increase only 2% from FY 2002-03 estimated amounts and are not keeping pace with program cost increases.

The one-half cent Public Safety Sales Tax of \$224 million (allocated 80% to the Sheriff and 20% to the District Attorney) is projected to be 3.5% greater than the FY 2002-03 estimated amount. The interest rate on cash balances in the County Investment Pool administered by the County Treasurer is expected to be 1.53%, which is lower than the average 1.91% earned during the first nine months of the current year.

On the expense side, labor costs are centrally calculated based on approved positions, historical position vacancy rates and a 3.5% base building wage increase subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors as agreements with the various labor bargaining units are completed. Merit increases for certain represented employees are budgeted based on the incumbent salary step level with actual awards based on the employees' annual performance review. Performance Incentive Pay (PIP) is budgeted at 2% of base pay and actual awards are based on the employees' achievement of specific, measurable goals and do not increase the employee's salary base. Retirement costs have increased significantly for general and safety employees. In total, retirement costs for the County in FY 2003-04 will be about \$150 million, an increase of 38%. Health insurance increases are expected to average 20%. Inflation on other services and supplies is generally estimated at 2.8% with higher rates for medical supplies.

BASIS OF BUDGETING

The County's budget, as is its accounting system, is based on the modified accrual system. The fiscal year begins on July 1. Revenues are budgeted as they are expected to be received or as they are applicable to the fiscal year. Fund balance available (FBA) is estimated and adjusted for increases or decreases to reserves. Revenues plus fund balance available equals total available financing. Consistent with the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) ruling 33, only revenues expected to be received within 60 days of the end of the fiscal year are included. Expenses are budgeted at an amount sufficient for 12 months if they are ongoing and in their full amount if they are one-time items. Expenses and increases to reserves must be balanced with available financing.

BUDGET DEVELOPMENT

In January 2003, the CEO issued the following budget development policies and guidelines to all County departments as a starting point for the FY 2003-04 budget development:

1. **Consistency with Strategic Financial Plan and Business Plan Concepts:** Base operating budget requests shall be consistent with the priorities and operational plans contained in the Strategic Financial Plan and the departmental business plans as resources are available. Department heads are responsible for using these planning processes and program outcome indicators to evaluate existing programs and redirect existing resources as needed for greater efficiency, to reduce cost and minimize the requests for additional resources. A certification regarding the evaluation of existing resources is required as part of the submittal.
2. **Salaries & Employee Benefits:** The Salary and Benefits Forecasting System (SBFS) in BRASS will set the regular salary and employee benefits base budgets. The vacancy factor will be set at the historical actual vacancy rate (12 months ending December 2002 per the bi-weekly Master Position Control reports) for each department.
3. **Services & Supplies:** Services and supplies shall be budgeted at a realistic level as compared to actual use during last fiscal year and current year-end projections, and consistent with the Strategic Financial Plan guidelines.
4. **Billable Services, Fees and Revenue:** Departments planning to charge other County departments for services are responsible for obtaining the recipient department's agreement as to the budgeted amount of charges. Program revenues are to be used to offset the department's proportional share of operating cost changes. Program revenues are to be used for caseload growth. One-time revenues shall be used for one-time expenses. Departmental fees are to be set at full cost recovery. Departments should have on file documentation that their fee studies are current. New revenue sources pending legislation or grant approval will be considered during the quarterly budget report process and should not be included in the base budget request (i.e. when legislation is passed or grants awarded). Departments are required to submit with their budget request a fee inventory. This inventory will list all fees, the date they were last updated (and what fiscal year was used for the cost basis), and the current status (indicated by a percentage figure) of full cost recovery.

5. **Net County Cost (NCC):** The 2003 Strategic Financial Plan projected ongoing general purpose revenues growing at a modest rate (about 3.5% per year) and requirements exceeding revenues in FY 2007-08. In addition, the State budget will likely have significant impacts on available funds. Therefore, there is a continued need to carefully manage the growth in the use of general purpose revenues. NCC limits by department were developed using the following formula and discussed with the departments:

Modified NCC budget per Second Quarter Budget Report

- Less: FY 2002-2003 one-time items
- Less: Step 1 reductions (cost reduction or deferral without impacting service level)
- Less: Step 2 reductions (reduction of non-core, non-mandated, over-matched programs)
- Less: Backfill of program revenues
- Plus: General Purpose Revenue growth factor of not more than 3.5%

Departments must submit budget requests that contain NCC amounts that are at or below the limit.

6. **Funds outside the General Fund:** All budgets for funds outside the General Fund are to be balanced to Available Financing without General Fund subsidy. Available Financing shall be determined by an accurate projection on June 30 Fund Balance Available (FBA). Available Financing includes FBA, a realistic estimate of budget year revenues and any planned decreases to reserves. If available financing exceeds requirements, the difference should be put into reserves for the use in the future.
7. **Augmentations (requests for new resources):** Augmentations are defined depending on the type of budget in question. For budgets within the General Fund, an augmentation request is any resource request that results in increased NCC, increased position totals (including extra-help) or new or enhanced non-mandated, non-core programs or services. These are augmentations even if they were included in the Strategic Financial Plan and/or the Business Plan.

For special revenue funds, Internal Service Funds and all other budgets outside the General Fund, an augmentation request is any resource request that

results in an indirect NCC increase, increased position totals (including extra-help) or major new programs not identified in the Strategic Financial Plan or the Business Plan.

8. **Program Budgets outside the General Fund:** It is the department head's responsibility to ensure that the proposed use of program funds is consistent with the available financing, the department's business plan, the County's strategic priorities and has been coordinated with the appropriate stakeholder groups external to the County.

In context of these policies and guidelines, the Strategic Financial Plan and departmental business plans, departments prepare current year projections of expenses and revenues and requests for the next fiscal year. The CEO/County Budget Offices reviews the requests, meets and discusses the requests with the department and prepares final recommendations for the Board. These recommendations are presented to the public via a budget workshop before the Board of supervisors holds its public budget hearings. Operating and capital budgets are prepared in this single process and presented together in this budget book.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE 2003 STRATEGIC FINANCIAL PLAN

On March 4, 2003 the Board adopted the 2003 Strategic Financial Plan. The 2003 Strategic Financial Plan process began in July as the departments started their operating forecasts. Preparation of the 2002 Strategic Financial Plan included four elements:

- Economic Forecast
- General Purpose Revenue and Fund Balance Available Forecast
- Program cost forecast
- Strategic Priorities

The economic forecast and General Purpose Revenue forecast is prepared by Dr. Esmel Adibi, Director of the A. Gary Anderson Center for Economic Research at Chapman University. The County departments provide program forecasts. Identification of Strategic Priorities is a collaborative effort that involves the department heads and the Board.



The initial plan projected a significant gap between resources and requirements. This gap was greater than previously anticipated; it was caused by the following factors:

- Employee health insurance increases of 20% per year
- Retirement rate increases of 30% per year for the first two years; 5% per year for the subsequent years
- Market driven salary increases
- Nearly all revenues growing more slowly than program operating costs

A department head offsite was held on August 1, 2002 and out of that meeting, a Department Head Committee was formed to assist the CEO in developing balancing recommendations for the plan. In December, the Committee delivered its recommendations to the CEO and these were shared at a second department head offsite. The 2003 plan shows continuing, and in some cases accelerated, cost increases and reflects series of recommendations to achieve long-term balancing.

Building on previous Board direction and the Department Head Committee recommendations, the CEO developed a set of six balancing strategies and incorporated these into the model in order to balance the plan over the next five years:

1. Step 1 reductions-identification of cost reductions and efficiencies without affecting service to the public
2. Step 2 reductions-evaluation of how the County used its general purpose revenues based on core services, mandates and required matches
3. CEO strategies for additional cost savings and revenue enhancements
4. Labor/Management Committee suggestions
5. No backfill of program revenues that grow more slowly than operating costs
6. Strategic Priorities that can be modified or deferred
7. Use of existing reserves while retaining the County contingency funds.

8. Preserve \$94.7 million in debt pre-payment fund for its original purpose; use only if needed after other cost reduction strategies are implemented. This fund may be needed to balance in five years.

By focusing on core services, mandates and matches, the plan included strategic recommendations on what reductions should be made to balance the plan. In adopting the plan, the Board made some very difficult and necessary decisions about what programs and services had to be modified or cancelled. Specific elements from the plan incorporated into the FY 2003-04 Adopted Budget are:

- Elimination of new funds for the Community Social Program grants. Second District carry over funds were reallocated to provide one-time funding for an extra-help position in the Office on Aging (\$37,800), retain the Office of Protocol (\$175,000) and the balance goes to the debt prepayment fund (\$111,436).
- Phased in 50% reduction of the General Fund portion of the Office on Aging and the CEO Central Training and Communications budget.
- Phased in 75% reduction of the General Fund portion of the Human Relations Council.
- 50% reduction in the intern program
- Deferral of the Employee Recognition Program
- Phased in reduction to over-matched funds in Health Care and Social Services.
- Recognition of additional revenues and cost savings from CEO strategies and Labor/Management Committee suggestions.
- Realize savings from canceled and modified strategic priorities including:
 - ◆ Cancel four years of planned General Fund contributions to affordable housing projects making \$34.8 million available for other general fund purposes.
 - ◆ Hold General Fund contingencies at current levels rather than increasing them by \$1 million per year.

- ◆ Annual \$10 million increases to Debt Prepayment Fund eliminated. The current fund remains intact at \$94.7 million for use when the cost effective opportunity to redeem debt is available.
- ◆ South Court Facility - Pay-as-you-go construction, replaced with debt financing, makes \$29.4 million available for other general fund uses
- ◆ Discontinue city watershed grant program

■ Strategic Priorities from the Plan that are incorporated into the FY 2003-04 Recommended Budget are:

- ◆ Adoptions Program
- ◆ Annexation of County Islands
- ◆ Health Care Agency-Bio-terrorism Response

Specific elements from the plan that were not adopted as part of the final FY 2003-04 Recommended Budget are:

- ◆ No General Fund backfill of program revenues. The Proposition 36 Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Program was backfilled with general funds for the District Attorney (\$345,799) and the Public Defender (\$331,457). Proposition 173 Public Safety Sales Tax funds were backfilled with General funds for the District Attorney (\$5,368,765). These exceptions were made in order to continue services in these areas at acceptable levels.
- ◆ Three Public Administrator/Public Guardian positions were funded above Net County Cost limits (\$82,963).
- ◆ A preventive maintenance program was established with four new positions and new general funds (\$319,321) in order to reduce potential future repair costs.
- ◆ The Agricultural Extension program was continued with general funds (\$125,000).
- ◆ The Assessor was funded above Net County Cost limits for potential assessment appeals case legal costs (\$200,000).

- ◆ General funds were restored for Arts Orange County (\$100,000).
- ◆ General funds were increased by \$70,750 for a total of \$100,000 to the Film Commission.
- ◆ General funds were increased by \$45,750 for a total of \$100,000 to the Orange County Business Council.
- ◆ General funds were increased by \$383,250 for a total of \$575,000 for Tourism.

The next (2004) Strategic Financial Planning Process will begin in mid-September.

IV. FINANCIAL SUMMARY OF THE FY 2003-04 RECOMMENDED COUNTY BUDGET

Preceding the budget program sections, the following charts and tables are provided as an overview of the budget:

1. Total County Budget by General Purpose Revenues, Other General Funds and Dedicated Revenues
2. Total County Budget-All Funds Controlled by the County Board of Supervisors
3. Total County Revenues by Source
4. Total County Appropriations by Program
5. General Fund Sources & Uses of Funds
6. General Fund Appropriations by Program
7. General Purpose Revenues (including General Fund Balance Available (FBA))
8. General Fund Net County Cost by Program
9. Public Safety Sales Tax
10. Health & Welfare Realignment Sources & Uses
11. Authorized Positions by Program
12. Total County Budget Comparison to Prior Fiscal Year by Program and Department
13. Total Budgeted Positions Summary by Program and Department
14. County Organization Chart

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FY 2003-04 FINAL BUDGET

In addition to the specific ways in which this budget is consistent with the 2003 Strategic Financial Plan, additional County budget highlights and issues include:

Total Budget:

- Total County Base Budget is \$4.8 billion plus \$844 million for potential Pension Obligation Bonds for a total of \$5.644 billion.
- Total budgeted positions are 17,751 an increase of 10 over the previous adopted budget. This number will likely be reduced in the first quarter of FY 2003-04 due to the impacts of early retirements and the final State budget. About 137 extra-help positions were converted to regular positions due to the on-going and essential nature of work they provide. Departments are absorbing the additional cost of these conversions.
- General Fund Balance Available (FBA) is projected to be \$123.3 million by the end of the current year (**TABLE A**):

TABLE A

	FY 2000-02 Final	FY 2001-02 Final	FY 2002-03 Projected
Beginning FBA July 1	\$ 108.7	\$ 146.0	\$ 152.6
Changes to Reserves	(41.5)	(32.5)	22.1
Revenues	1,888.7	2,041.5	2,170.5
Transfer to PSST Fund	N/A	N/A	(8.0)
Available Financing	1,955.9	2,155.0	2,337.1
Expenditures/Encumbrances	(1,827.9)	(2,017.0)	(2,235.6)
Changes in Encumbrances	18.2	14.6	21.8
Other Adjustments	(0.2)	0.0	0.0
Ending FBA June 30	\$ 146.0	\$ 152.6	\$ 123.3

- The FY 2003-04 Adopted budget was balanced with \$29 million in funds previously set aside for the potential South Court facility, \$8.8 million that had been set aside for FY 2002-03 affordable housing projects and \$15 million in real estate transaction revenue from anticipated sales of surplus properties in Santa Ana, Santa Ana Heights, Westminster and Anaheim. Recognizing that these are one-time funds, the County remains committed, through the Strategic Financial Planning process, to eliminate this structural deficit.
- Includes anticipated reimbursement from the cities and Fire Authority that will share the cost of operation and maintenance of the 800 MHz Communications Network.
- The Probation Department was successful in preserving \$8.4 million in State construction grant funding to relocate the Youth Leadership Academy to the Juvenile Hall property in the City of Orange.
- Sets aside funding for the opening of Theo Lacy Jail Building A Module M that will provide an additional 192 maximum-security beds. Funds will be transferred to the Sheriff's budget when the jail population reaches the point where opening the facility is necessary.

SPECIFIC PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS:

Public Protection

- Provides funding to the District Attorney for the completion of the Case Management System that will serve as the hub for the County's Integrated Law & Justice System.

- Includes funding for completion of the state-of-the art Coroner Training Facility. The construction of this facility was funded primarily with a State grant and once completed, will act as a Statewide training facility and Coroner Division headquarters.

Community Services

- Reflects the March 12, 2003 Board of Supervisors direction that the Public Administrator/Public Guardian function of the Community Services Agency be transferred to the Health Care Agency. Sixty-six positions and \$5.8 million were transferred.
- Increased caseloads and service hours for In-Home Supportive Services is being funded with one-time funds of \$6 million. This entitlement program is growing significantly faster than the available funding source. If this continues, there will be a significant impact to the general fund in the near future.
- Health Care Agency (HCA) made over \$23 million in reduction in services in Behavioral Health Services (\$9.7 million), Correctional and Mental Health services (\$6.2 million) and Public Health Services (\$7.1 million) because realignment and other revenue sources dedicated to these programs are increasing more slowly than program expenses. These service reductions were the subject of special Beilenson Hearings conducted in conjunction with the Budget Hearings on June 10, 2003. In spite of these reductions, the total HCA budget is \$471 million including a general fund contribution of \$75.5 million. This is an increase of 3% and 6.6% respectively.
- Consistent with the provisions of Measure H, the Tobacco Settlement Funds Initiative, approved by the voters in November 2000, total funds including carry-over are estimated at \$41.5 million to be allocated to the following services:

- ◆ 19% Health care services for seniors and persons with disabilities
- ◆ 23% Emergency room physicians and on-call specialists
- ◆ 12% Tobacco related disease prevention and control
- ◆ 20% Nonprofit community clinics

- ◆ 6% Proportional reimbursement to hospitals for charity care
- ◆ 20% Public safety including a drug/alcohol rehabilitation program at Theo Lacy jail (64 secure beds)

Use of all Measure H Tobacco Settlement Funds is monitored for strict adherence to the provisions of the initiative. Actual Tobacco Settlement Funds received will be allocated by the above percentages, whether they fall below, meet or exceed budget amounts.

- Continues the Proposition 36, the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act program although the State funding of \$8 million annually for five years to provide assessment, treatment and monitoring appears to be significantly under funded.

Infrastructure and Environmental Resources

- Includes a Watershed Management budget of \$18 million to facilitate the Board's leadership to address watershed issues. This is about \$4 million less than the current year as a result of pro-active efforts of the Public Facilities & Resources Department to scale the projects down to available funds.
- The Planning & Development Services Department converted to a time and materials fee structure during the current year. This fee structure is intended to achieve full cost recovery. However, there is work to be done on permits filed under the prior (discounted) fee schedule that may required a General Fund subsidy of nearly \$2 million.
- Orange County Public Library will maintain current public service hours in all branches with fewer staff and less funding for new materials due to the loss of over \$1 million in State Public Library Foundation Act funds and operating costs that exceed revenue growth.
- The County will use over \$2 million in Road and Harbors, Beaches & Parks funds to meet the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and other water quality mandates.
- The County is realizing energy cost savings in facilities where energy efficient lighting and digital HVAC controls have been installed. Public Facilities & Resources



Department will continue moving forward with additional energy saving projects such as installing photovoltaic panels at the County Data Center and a cogeneration plant at the Central Utility Facility in the Santa Ana Civic Center.

- Construction will continue on Prima Deshecha Landfill Zone 1 expansion. This project will provide approximately three million tons or four years of additional capacity in the landfill system.

General Government

- Various programs funded by the County Executive Office budget will be reduced including the Intern Program, Employee Recognition Program (deferred), training and communications, workforce issues and the city watershed grant program.
- Includes nearly \$19 million in State and Federal funding for purchase and implementation of the Direct Record Electronic (DRE) voting system.
- Includes \$15.1 million in anticipated revenues from sales of surplus properties in Santa Ana, Santa Ana Heights, Westminster and Anaheim.

Capital Projects

- Continuing construction of Theo Lacy Jail Building B (576 beds; \$33 million)
- Funds the Musick Master Plan (\$1.1 million) for potential future jail and support facilities.
- The Ladera Ranch Branch Library is scheduled to open in August 2003.
- The Dana Point Harbor revitalization project conceptual plan has been completed and a debt-financing plan is being developed to provide the funds necessary for implementation.
- Funds for the Central Utility Facility chiller replacement project is being carried over from the current year.
- Funds are included for a Youth Leadership Academy at Juvenile Hall replacing the Rancho Potrero Leadership Academy at Joplin Ranch (120 beds; \$10.7 million)

- Weapons screening improvements will be provided at four Orange County Justice Centers (\$1.1 million)
- Seismic retrofit improvements will be made at the County Central Garage (\$1 million)
- Deferred Maintenance and Americans with Disability Act improvement projects are included.
- Collectively, the budgets for Community Facility District projects are decreasing about \$50 million due to the completion of various projects.

Debt

- Funds all debt obligation payments. Budgets displayed in Program VI include amounts for annual payments on the County's 1996 Recovery Certificates of Participation (COPS), 1995 Recovery Bonds, refunded debt financing of the Juvenile Justice Center, Manchester parking facilities, and debt financing of infrastructure improvements in the County's Assessment Districts, Community Facilities Districts and the Orange County Development Agency and the potential for an issuance of new Pension Obligation Bonds. Although the former County's Pension Obligation Bonds were economically defeased, this budget reflects the payments made by the trustee from escrow. This program also includes the debt associated with the County's Teeter program. This program also includes budgets for the \$94 million set aside in the Debt Prepayment Fund. Debt related to specific operations such as John Wayne Airport and Integrated Waste Management is included in Program III where the operational budgets for those operations are also found. The County currently has no plans for temporary cash flow borrowing because there are sufficient general fund cash balances and reserves. Based on the County's Strategic Financial Plan and at current funding levels, the County is able to fulfill these debt obligations and sustain current and future services and operations.

V. SUMMARY

This budget serves as a realistic plan of resources available to carry out the County's core businesses and priorities. It is consistent with the County's mission and corporate management system including the strategic financial plan (with some exceptions noted earlier) and departmental business

plans. It follows the CEO budget policy guidelines, meets the majority of departmental requests, incorporates impacts of the State budget (May revise), increases resources for critical capital needs and meets important contingency fund and debt reduction goals.

VI. NEXT STEPS

A public workshop on this recommended budget was held on May 29, 2003. The Board of Supervisors held public hearings regarding this budget on June 10 and 11, 2003. Results of those hearings are incorporated into this budget which the Board adopted on June 24, 2003. The new fiscal year begins

on July 1, 2003. During the fiscal year, the CEO will present the Board with quarterly budget status reports and recommend appropriate changes as needed including changes which may arise from final County fund balances, final State budget impacts, new legislation, new grants awards, and other circumstances or conditions that may affect the budget.

CONTACTS REGARDING INFORMATION IN THIS REPORT:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE:

James D. Ruth, Interim County Executive Officer
714.834.6200

Frederick A. Branca, Interim Chief Financial Officer
714.834.4304

Public Protection

- Frank Kim, Manager 714.834.3028

Community, Health & Social Services

- Team Manager 714.834.4324
- Connie Chang

COUNTY BUDGET OFFICE:

Stephen Dunivent, County Budget Manager 714.834.3530

Budget Planning and Coordination

- Mitch Tevlin, Manager 714.834.6748
- Michelle Aguirre
- Gina Angcaco
- Craig Fowler
- Mar Taloma

Infrastructure and Environmental Resources, General Government, Capital Projects, Debt Service

- Shunna Austin, Manager 714.834.4146
- Astrid Gritton
- Thuy Vu-Le

You may also review the budget document on-line at:

- <http://www.oc.ca.gov/ceo/finance/>

Financial Planning

- Tom Sacco, Manager 714.834.4775

