

Five Year General Fund Proposed Budget Comparison
Average Annual Increase

Ranking	Department	by NCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> by Expense
		Average Annual Increase	Average Annual Increase
1	Farm Advisor	5.9%	6.2%
2	Fire	20.7%	5.8%
3	Community Development Agency	2.0%	5.1%
4	Agriculture, Weights & Measures	4.8%	4.9%
5	Marin County Parks	3.1%	4.1%
6	Sheriff-Coroner	6.0%	3.7%
7	Department of Finance	-0.2%	2.5%
8	County Counsel	0.5%	2.3%
9	Probation	3.9%	1.9%
10	Health and Human Services	5.9%	1.0%
11	Board of Supervisors	0.5%	0.8%
12	Assessor-Recorder	1.2%	0.8%
13	Public Defender	1.9%	0.2%
14	Alternative Defender Contract	1.1%	0.0%
15	Non-Departmental	1.8%	-0.2%
16	Information Systems and Technology	1.6%	-0.5%
17	District Attorney	-1.3%	-0.7%
18	Department of Public Works	-9.2%	-1.0%
19	Human Resources	-1.3%	-1.3%
20	Cultural and Visitor Services	2.5%	-1.3%
21	County Administrator's Office	-6.3%	-3.6%
22	Elections	-7.7%	-5.7%
All Departments		4.9%	0.9%
Median of Average Annual Increase		1.7%	0.8%
Mean of Average Annual Increase		1.7%	1.1%

Five Year General Fund Proposed Budget Comparison - Service Area

All Service Areas - General Fund

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	% Change over 5 Yrs	Avg Annual Increase / (Decrease)
Exp	\$369,035,670	\$377,420,761	\$380,439,723	\$378,787,800	\$381,915,948	3.5%	0.9%
Rev	(\$345,091,032)	(\$355,246,402)	(\$355,885,835)	(\$353,965,515)	(\$353,347,611)	2.4%	0.6%
Use of Fund Bal	\$23,944,638	\$22,174,359	\$24,553,888	\$24,822,285	\$28,568,337	19.3%	4.9%
FTE	1,956.07	1,947.65	1,945.90	1,861.77	1,766.95	-9.7%	-2.5%

Health & Human Services Service Area

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	% Change over 5 Yrs	Avg Annual Increase / (Decrease)
Exp	\$142,722,985	\$145,046,090	\$147,015,293	\$150,955,610	\$148,230,523	3.9%	1.0%
Rev	(\$109,787,395)	(\$109,250,901)	(\$111,119,101)	(\$110,047,684)	(\$107,028,718)	-2.5%	-0.6%
NCC	\$32,935,590	\$35,795,189	\$35,896,192	\$40,907,926	\$41,201,805	25.1%	5.9%
FTE	646.00	638.48	645.79	602.03	549.74	-14.9%	-3.9%

Public Safety Service Area

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	% Change over 5 Yrs	Avg Annual Increase / (Decrease)
Exp	\$97,339,378	\$106,046,984	\$104,835,616	\$110,257,148	\$109,479,702	12.5%	3.1%
Rev	(\$45,229,673)	(\$48,593,633)	(\$46,259,310)	(\$45,345,648)	(\$46,069,448)	1.9%	0.6%
NCC	\$52,109,705	\$57,453,351	\$58,576,306	\$64,911,500	\$63,410,254	21.7%	5.2%
FTE	681.90	681.45	670.22	649.22	626.08	-8.2%	-2.1%

Administration & Finance Service Area

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	% Change over 5 Yrs	Avg Annual Increase / (Decrease)
Exp	\$59,724,764	\$59,900,009	\$57,336,700	\$57,416,040	\$58,017,217	-2.9%	-0.7%
Rev	(\$12,856,977)	(\$12,692,644)	(\$12,018,399)	(\$12,248,646)	(\$13,139,246)	2.2%	0.6%
NCC	\$46,867,787	\$47,207,365	\$45,318,301	\$45,167,394	\$44,877,971	-4.2%	-1.1%
FTE	351.12	345.42	343.32	331.47	327.68	-6.7%	-1.7%

Community Development & Public Works Service Area

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	% Change over 5 Yrs	Avg Annual Increase / (Decrease)
Exp	\$29,439,554	\$30,894,958	\$32,816,951	\$30,671,094	\$29,524,513	0.3%	0.2%
Rev	(\$12,671,304)	(\$14,245,972)	(\$14,958,371)	(\$16,477,107)	(\$17,187,670)	35.6%	8.0%
NCC	\$16,768,250	\$16,648,986	\$17,858,580	\$14,193,987	\$12,336,843	-26.4%	-6.8%
FTE	210.55	215.80	222.07	216.55	201.20	-4.4%	-1.0%

Five Year General Fund Proposed Budget Comparison - Service Area

Community Services Service Area

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	% Change over 5 Yrs	Avg Annual Increase / (Decrease)
Exp	\$9,739,928	\$10,424,310	\$10,229,505	\$10,220,547	\$10,668,694	9.5%	2.4%
Rev	(\$4,689,181)	(\$4,909,016)	(\$4,774,878)	(\$4,861,052)	(\$4,978,827)	6.2%	1.5%
NCC	\$5,050,747	\$5,515,294	\$5,454,627	\$5,359,495	\$5,689,867	12.7%	3.1%
FTE	66.50	66.50	64.50	62.50	62.25	-6.4%	-1.6%

Non-Departmental Service Area

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	% Change over 5 Yrs	Avg Annual Increase / (Decrease)
Exp	\$30,069,061	\$25,108,410	\$28,205,658	\$19,267,361	\$25,995,299	-13.5%	-0.2%
Rev	(\$159,856,502)	(\$165,554,236)	(\$166,755,776)	(\$164,985,378)	(\$164,943,702)	3.2%	0.8%
NCC	(\$129,787,441)	(\$140,445,826)	(\$138,550,118)	(\$145,718,017)	(\$138,948,403)	7.1%	1.8%
FTE	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	n/a

FY 2011-12 Proposed Budget

All Funds Comparison of Comparable Counties

All Counties Summary

☑

Counties	Expenditures	Revenues	Allocated Positions (Full-Time Equivalent)	Per Capita Expenditure (Total Pop)	FTEs per 10,000 Residents (Total Pop)	Number of Total Funds	Un-incorporated Population	Incorporated Population	Total Population
Napa	\$354,776,521	(\$299,552,241)	1,311.48	\$2,578	95.28	28	26,427	111,212	137,639
San Mateo	\$1,371,214,136	(\$1,117,481,867)	5,271.00	\$1,892	72.73	29	61,600	663,102	724,702
Santa Cruz	\$499,154,382	(\$473,310,734)	2,142.58	\$1,888	81.03	35	130,628	133,802	264,430
San Luis Obispo	\$497,771,269	\$470,802,817	2,375.00	\$1,837	87.65	20	118,141	152,825	270,966
Santa Barbara	\$777,817,690	(\$719,179,497)	3,682.40	\$1,825	86.40	38	134,250	291,939	426,189
Marin	\$440,603,806	(\$409,532,042)	2,033.16	\$1,730	79.83	24	68,257	186,435	254,692
Sonoma	\$817,552,670	(\$731,139,777)	3,604.18	\$1,678	73.99	74	146,138	340,988	487,125
Monterey	\$664,159,830	(\$643,149,467)	4,308.80	\$1,585	102.83	18	100,988	318,050	419,038
Median	\$581,657,106	(\$558,230,101)	2,989.59	\$1,831	83.71	29			
Mean	\$677,881,288	(\$490,317,851)	3,091.08	\$1,877	84.97	33			

Comments:

Marin - Only budgeted FTEs are counted.

Monterey - County has 123 funds but 107 are excluded because they are considered special districts.

San Mateo - Funded FTE is 5,076.1 and Salary Resolution is 5,271.0.

Santa Cruz - Includes Internal Service Funds, which was not included in FY 2009-10. If Internal Service Funds are excluded, exp would be \$409 million and revenue would be \$400 million.

Sonoma - County technically has 16 funds but there are 58 funds lumped under "Mandated Funds."

FY 2011-12 Proposed Budget

All Funds Comparison of Comparable Counties

Health and Human Services Service Area

Counties	Expenditures	Revenues	Allocated Positions (Full-Time Equivalent)	Net County Cost / Fund Balance	FTEs per 10,000 Residents	Per Capita NCC (Total Pop)	Per Capita Expenditure (Total Pop)
Sonoma	\$425,934,482	(\$391,647,081)	1,116.99	\$34,287,401	22.93	\$70	\$874
Santa Barbara	\$317,148,551	(\$260,424,849)	1,325.80	\$56,723,702	31.11	\$133	\$744
Santa Cruz	\$179,948,567	(\$172,348,203)	942.55	\$7,600,364	35.64	\$29	\$681
Monterey	\$280,425,845	(\$260,695,765)	1,418.81	\$19,730,080	33.86	\$47	\$669
San Luis Obispo	\$168,820,312	(\$145,942,714)	806.50	\$22,877,598	29.76	\$84	\$623
Marin	\$147,553,843	(\$106,352,038)	549.74	\$41,201,805	21.58	\$162	\$579
San Mateo	\$413,047,122	(\$326,271,975)	1,596.00	\$86,775,147	22.02	\$120	\$570
Napa	\$77,074,397	(\$66,537,536)	380.10	\$10,536,861	27.62	\$77	\$560
Median	\$230,187,206	(\$216,386,526)	1029.77	\$28,582,500	28.69	\$80	\$646
Mean	\$251,244,140	(\$216,277,520)	1,017.06	\$34,966,620	28.07	\$90	\$663

Comments:

Marin has a higher per capita NCC. Given that we have less poverty, this likely indicates that Marin provides General Fund overmatch for many state and federally funded programs.

FY 2011-12 Proposed Budget

General Fund Comparison of Comparable Counties

Public Safety Service Area

Counties	Expenditures	Revenues	Allocated Positions (Full-Time Equivalent)	Net County Cost	FTEs per 10,000 Residents	Per Capita NCC (Total Pop)	Per Capita Expenditure (Total Pop)
Napa	\$83,168,879	(\$41,026,287)	438.63	\$42,142,592	31.87	\$306	\$604
Santa Barbara	\$243,196,174	(\$121,783,486)	1,397.60	\$121,412,688	32.79	\$285	\$571
Marin	\$114,339,734	(\$49,233,564)	642.08	\$65,106,170	25.21	\$256	\$449
San Mateo	\$316,857,371	(\$147,556,120)	1,303.00	\$169,301,251	17.98	\$234	\$437
San Luis Obispo	\$117,616,042	(\$46,154,031)	762.50	\$71,462,011	28.14	\$264	\$434
Sonoma	\$206,533,777	(\$86,060,920)	1,118.25	\$120,472,857	22.96	\$247	\$424
Monterey	\$165,156,685	(\$80,736,938)	966.80	\$84,419,747	23.07	\$201	\$394
Santa Cruz	\$99,195,834	(\$44,790,192)	612.00	\$54,405,642	23.14	\$206	\$375
Median	\$141,386,364	(\$64,985,251)	864.65	\$77,940,879	24.18	\$251	\$436
Mean	\$168,258,062	(\$77,167,692)	905.11	\$91,090,370	25.65	\$250	\$461

Comments:

Includes Child Support Services (all funds), District Attorney, Fire, Probation, Public Defender, Alternative Defender Contract Sheriff-Coroner.

While Marin tends to have lower crime, we are above both mean and median per capita expenditure and per capita net county cost.

A number of counties have a separate fund for Fire.

FY 2011-12 Proposed Budget

General Fund Comparison of Comparable Counties

Administration and Finance Service Area

Counties	Expenditures	Revenues	Allocated Positions (Full-Time Equivalent)	Net County Cost	FTEs per 10,000 Residents	Per Capita NCC (Total Pop)	Per Capita Expenditure (Total Pop)
Napa	\$28,663,770	(\$12,391,885)	175.40	\$16,271,885	12.74	\$118	\$208
Marin	\$51,256,005	(\$10,485,368)	323.48	\$40,770,637	12.70	\$160	\$201
Sonoma	\$81,665,746	(\$54,974,664)	412.33	\$26,691,082	8.46	\$55	\$168
Monterey	\$64,147,684	(\$38,348,051)	408.90	\$25,799,633	9.76	\$62	\$153
San Luis Obispo	\$39,470,002	(\$7,309,360)	305.25	\$32,160,642	11.27	\$119	\$146
Santa Barbara	\$57,295,796	(\$27,104,113)	318.00	\$30,191,683	7.46	\$71	\$134
Santa Cruz	\$33,423,929	(\$23,595,255)	243.75	\$9,828,674	9.22	\$37	\$126
San Mateo	\$69,067,139	(\$34,773,126)	474.00	\$34,294,013	6.54	\$47	\$95
Median	\$54,275,901	(\$25,349,684)	320.74	\$28,441,383	9.49	\$66	\$149
Mean	\$53,123,759	(\$26,122,728)	332.64	\$27,001,031	9.77	\$84	\$154

Comments:

Includes Board of Supervisors, County Administrator's Office, Elections, Assessor - Recorder - County Clerk, Department of Finance, County Counsel, Human Resources, Information Services and Technology. Excludes Retirement, Risk Management.

Marin has a higher per capita NCC, which may reflect a more centralized delivery of certain services vs. other counties - for example, technology support. Many other counties tend to distribute these costs, for example via internal service funds.

FY 2011-12 Proposed Budget

General Fund Comparison of Comparable Counties

Community Development and Public Works Service Area

Counties	Expenditures	Revenues	Allocated Positions (Full-Time Equivalent)	Net County Cost	FTEs per 10,000 Residents	Per Capita NCC (Total Pop)	Per Capita Expenditure (Total Pop)
Napa	\$75,418,416	(\$48,959,018)	213.80	\$26,459,398	15.53	\$192	\$548
Sonoma	\$242,836,678	(\$210,743,526)	434.97	\$32,093,152	8.93	\$66	\$499
Santa Barbara	\$183,907,113	(\$120,793,409)	511.70	\$63,113,704	12.01	\$148	\$432
San Luis Obispo	\$86,132,926	(\$38,564,973)	400.00	\$47,567,953	14.76	\$176	\$318
Santa Cruz	\$62,516,965	(\$57,827,013)	393.98	\$4,689,952	14.90	\$18	\$236
Monterey	\$94,484,537	(\$74,288,237)	321.50	\$20,196,300	7.67	\$48	\$225
Marin	\$54,779,238	(\$40,845,302)	300.53	\$13,933,936	11.80	\$55	\$215
San Mateo	\$103,184,199	(\$70,558,896)	406.00	\$32,625,303	5.60	\$45	\$142
Median	\$90,308,732	(\$64,192,955)	396.99	\$29,276,275	11.90	\$60	\$277
Mean	\$112,907,509	(\$82,822,547)	372.81	\$30,084,962	11.40	\$93	\$327

Comments:

Community Development Agency is mainly comprised of the General Fund whereas Department of Public Works is based on all funds for all counties.

FY 2011-12 Proposed Budget

General Fund Comparison of Comparable Counties

Community Services Service Area

Counties	Expenditures	Revenues	Allocated Positions (Full-Time Equivalent)	Net County Cost	FTEs per 10,000 Residents	Per Capita NCC (Total Pop)	Per Capita Expenditure (Total Pop)
Marin	\$25,346,138	(\$18,749,937)	155.08	\$6,596,201	6.09	\$26	\$100
Napa	\$12,391,176	(\$9,400,406)	86.05	\$2,990,770	6.25	\$22	\$90
San Luis Obispo	\$21,558,574	(\$14,256,387)	158.50	\$7,302,187	5.85	\$27	\$80
Sonoma	\$37,886,488	(\$30,703,311)	256.37	\$7,183,177	5.26	\$15	\$78
Monterey	\$23,003,661	(\$17,123,288)	193.00	\$5,880,373	4.61	\$14	\$55
San Mateo	\$37,224,279	(\$27,564,844)	207.00	\$9,659,435	2.86	\$13	\$51
Santa Barbara	\$19,484,549	(\$12,995,421)	81.50	\$6,489,128	1.91	\$15	\$46
Santa Cruz	\$11,963,144	(\$8,853,548)	50.40	\$3,109,596	1.91	\$12	\$45
Median	\$22,281,118	(\$15,689,838)	156.79	\$6,542,665	4.93	\$15	\$66
Mean	\$23,607,251	(\$17,455,893)	148.49	\$6,151,358	4.34	\$18	\$68

Comments:

Marin includes Agriculture, Weights and Measures, Cultural and Visitor Services, Farm Advisor, Marin County Free Library (Special Revenue Fund), and Marin County Parks (excludes Open Space District).

Several counties place Parks exclusively in their special district fund.

Marin tends to reflect a higher per capita NCC, perhaps due in part to our having a separate Cultural Services Department.

2011 Demographic Information for Marin and Its Comparable Counties

Counties	Population	% of Pop Residing in Unincorporated Area	Percent of Pop Residing in Incorporated Area	Population in Unincorporated Area	Population in Incorporated Area
Marin	254,692	27%	73%	68,257	186,435
Monterey	419,038	24%	76%	100,988	318,050
Napa	137,639	19%	81%	26,427	111,212
San Luis Obispo	270,966	44%	56%	118,141	152,825
San Mateo	724,702	9%	92%	61,600	663,102
Santa Barbara	426,189	32%	69%	134,250	291,939
Santa Cruz	264,430	49%	51%	130,628	133,802
Sonoma	487,125	30%	70%	146,138	340,988

Comments:

Source: California Department of Finance, May 2010

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART/SPAN OF CONTROL CALCULATION METHODOLOGY

Organization Charts and Span of Control calculations are modified position-based and include only budgeted positions. Information reflects position counts with no FTE conversions. Vacant budgeted positions are included.

Unless otherwise noted on the organization chart, the following modifications to the position count were made:

1. Extra hires filling budgeted positions are not included unless the extra hire is "management" and supervising regular hire employees.
2. In cases where regular hires fill multiple positions: the number of times counted equals the number of different supervisors the employee has. If, for example, an employee fills two positions but both positions report to the same supervisor, the position is counted only once.
3. With regard to underfills - the position the employee is underfilling is the position that is counted.

"Management" positions include Department Heads, Assistant Department Heads/Deputies, Managers, and 1st Line Supervisors.

ADDITIONAL NOTES FOR HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Due to the significant recent restructuring efforts of Health and Human Services, organization charts and the span of control calculation are based on organizational units/programs rather than on supervisor of record.

In determining span of control, employees who have multiple positions are counted only once if these positions are within the same organizational unit/program. There are a number of employees who have multiple assignments across organizational units/programs.

The department is currently dedicating resources to validate supervisory relationships as well as to verify that "management" employees are correctly identified.

Creating Flatter Organizations

Questions to Guide Restructuring at the Leadership Level

Objective

To promote a positive culture, by fostering and supporting a business environment where people can do their best work, the County of Marin is cultivating a more horizontal (“flatter”) rather than vertical organizational structure. This guideline provides a diagnostic tool for evaluating our leadership structure and identifying opportunities for restructuring. The 2011 Workforce Strategic Plan includes organization design as one of several strategies for creating a high performance workplace and provides the following actions toward realizing this objective:

- ◆ Analyzing department span of control information
- ◆ Continuing to evaluate supervisory, management, and executive vacancies through the CAO-HR hiring review process
- ◆ Continuing to provide consultation and facilitation services to departments on organization design

Long-Term Vision

- ◆ Every manager has clearly-defined decision authority and accountability
- ◆ Decision authority and accountability *between management layers* is clearly differentiated
- ◆ Average span of control for departments is ideally between 7-12 or similar to our comparable counties (between 6-9 countywide).

Red Flags

- ◆ Supervisory positions with 0, 1, or 2 direct reports
- ◆ Business units with more than two layers of management and/or supervision
- ◆ Supervisors and managers who perform substantial non-supervisory work (50 percent or more)

Reviewing and Reducing Supervisory Positions

1-Does your department have supervisors who perform substantial non-supervisory duties, whose supervisory duties could be eliminated or consolidated?

2-If eliminated or consolidated, what challenges would this present to your department/unit?
Would a change have a significant effect on performance quality and outcome expectations?

Reviewing and Reducing # of Management Layers

1-What is the number of organizational layers in the chain of command?

- In the department?
- In each business unit?

2-Are roles and authorities at each level clearly delineated? Is there overlap?

3-How would accountability be changed by creating greater distinctions between layers?

4-Does your department have mid-level management positions that could be converted to non-supervisory positions?

5-What would need to occur so that your department could delegate roles and responsibilities to lower levels in the chain of command or to professional staff, and thereby provide opportunities for career development?

Incorporating Supervisory Work into Professional Jobs

To what degree can your department replace/increase coordination of activities/tasks by means other than delegation to a supervisor?

Clarifying Roles and Authorities

To what extent do supervisors, managers, and executives in the department operate consistently with the role definitions in the table below?

Role	Decision Rights	Accountability	Time Spent on Mgt/Sup
<i>Supervisor</i>	Supervisory decisions, <ul style="list-style-type: none">• makes selections or has veto on selections, decides assignments, rates performance, and initiates discipline	Accountable for individual and team performance	35%
<i>Manager</i>	In addition to supervisory decision rights, <ul style="list-style-type: none">• decision authority for	Accountable for program/division performance	50%

Role	Decision Rights	Accountability	Time Spent on Mgt/Sup
	allocation of resources for division or program; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • makes program decisions within department strategic framework 		
<i>Executive</i>	In addition to supervisory decision rights, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decides strategic direction of department or major component thereof (e.g., multiple divisions/programs) • Controls and allocates department resources 	Accountable for department performance or major component thereof	100%