

Budget Committee Meeting – May 21, 2018 10:00AM

Re: Community Development Report

- **2017 Citizen’s Budget Advisory Committee
Executive Summary**
- **Oct 18, 2017 BOC memo regarding reorganization
of Community Development Department
by Carolyn Johnson, Community Development Director**

Copies provided by John Jezuit, Administrative Assistant

May 16, 2018

2018/2019 Budget Committee information

2017 Curry County Citizen's Budget Advisory
Committee Executive Summary
and related information

October 18, 2017 Board of Commissioners
memo regarding reorganization of the
Community Development Department

Curry County Citizen's Budget Advisory Committee

Executive Summary

In response to a request from the Curry County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council (LPSCC) the Curry County Board of Commissioners (CCBOC) appointed the Citizen's Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) to examine the Curry County General Fund for the next fiscal year and make recommendations to the CCBOC and Budget Committee.

On February 9, 2017 convened its first meeting to select a committee Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary. Meeting format, dates/times, and other administrative matters were discussed and resolved. The next meeting was conducted on February 13, 2017 that established three specific subcommittees:

Interview Committee – tasked with interviewing Elected Officials and Department Heads based on a questionnaire approved by CBAC.

Consolidation Committee – tasked with reviewing county property and departments to consider possible consolidation internally and externally, if possible.

Finance Committee – tasked with reviewing the previous fiscal year and current fiscal year budgets, to make an estimate of available general funds for the next fiscal year.

CBAC collected and collated the committee reports, reviewed the content, and presents recommendations to the CCBOC for consideration based on the committee's examination. CBAC also notes that the time for this project was limited, with less than 45 days to meet and collect information to develop a report, this process is simply not as conclusive as it could have been. In the future should the CCBOC appoint another committee, we recommend that the committee have at least three full months to conduct their work. CBAC recommends that future committees be supported by Curry County staff. In this case, the CCBOC appointed a committee and only provided support to make public notices of meetings and reserve meeting room space.

CBAC met with the following County Departments and performed a comprehensive review of their services and current year budget:

- Assessor/Tax Collection
- Clerk/Elections
- District Attorney
- Juvenile/Parks
- Road
- Sheriff

CBAC received completed questionnaires from the following County Departments, but was unable to meet with them:

- Community Development
- Treasurer

Recommended for CCBOC Review

1. CCBOC should consider appointing a special committee to review what type of ballot measure should be filed, or what type of long-term revenue should be sought, to support the County General Fund and Road Fund using a 20-year funding methodology. Without sustainable revenue the County cannot continue to provide basic services to the citizens and over the next few years most County services will not be functional, and certainly not available to the citizens.
2. The CCBOC should consider appointing a special committee to review the feasibility of a 911/Dispatch Special District in Curry County. We recommend it be comprised of representatives from the various agencies that use the 911 and dispatch system. We suggest that the committee selection be comprised of municipal law enforcement, County Sheriff's Office, municipal and rural fire districts, Forest Service, Cal Ore Life Flight, and lay citizens. This committee will need at least three months to research and make appropriate recommendations to the CCBOC. The intent of this action is to consider whether or not a ballot measure be presented to the public for a special taxing district to fully support 911/Dispatch services in Curry County, as opposed to the current hosting scenario.
3. Is there a significant cost reduction in contracting the HR/Payroll function out to an agency that is qualified to provide that service? The comparison between the cost of the 1.0 FTE Curry County employee currently providing those services and the annual contract cost by an external qualified agency.
4. Is there a significant cost reduction in contracting the janitorial function out to an agency that is qualified to provide that service? The comparison between the cost of the .45 FTE Curry County employee currently providing those services and the annual contract cost by an external qualified agency.
5. Is it possible to reduce the Treasurer to a .50 FTE (remains Elected Official) and still meet the operational needs, separation of duties, and statutory requirements?
6. Review the cost methodology for non-general fund departments that use County Services. For example, what methodology is used to determine reimbursement for County Counsel, HR/Payroll, AP that Community Development uses.
7. Assemble a group of County Officials to meet with representatives of all the Special Districts in Curry County for the purpose of researching and determining the likelihood of Special Districts contributing to a special fund to support contracted assessors. These assessors would be hired for the sole purpose of bringing assessed properties in Curry County up to current valuation. This would help Special Districts as they receive 94% of all property tax income. At the same time the GF would also benefit. The Assessor then indicates he could remain on a 7.4 year reassessment rate and remain current all new building permits. The general Fund would receive an additional 3% over current property tax funding.

Recommended Service Reductions/Consolidations

1. The County owns several buildings that it is renting out or expending labor and materials costs on. CBAC recommends that the County sell or transfer the buildings and get out of the landlord business. The building addresses are listed below. We also recommend that the County reorganize departmental locations in the County Annex and not rent that space out – this would accommodate the selling or transfer of buildings.
 - a) The Blue Building on the corner of Moore and Colvin in Gold Beach; 29821 Colvin Street. Relocate Veteran's Services, RSVP, and Maintenance to the County Annex where office space is available.
 - b) The Blue Building on Highway 101 in Port Orford; 1403 Oregon Street. Contact CCH to determine if the lease could be terminated earlier.
 - c) Vacant house located at 438 Pine Street, Brookings, OR.
 - d) Vacant property located at R26302, Brookings, OR.
 - e) Vacant property located at 42703 Arizona Street, Port Orford, OR.
2. Transfer or sell the Brookings Airport, 17330 Parkview Drive, Brookings, OR. CBAC recommends the sale or transfer to the City of Brookings.
3. Reduce the Facilities Maintenance Department down to .50 FTE. With reduced facilities, less maintenance staff are required. Contract out for plumbing, electrical, and construction as needed.
4. Integrate County Counsel with the District Attorney Office maintaining current County Counsel, but eliminate (lay-off) one of the Deputy DA's. Eliminate (lay-off) the legal secretary. The proposal is based on County Counsel assisting the DA with cases each morning and then providing County Counsel duties in the afternoon. Utilize the current administrative resources in the DA Office to support County Counsel.
5. Reduce the Juvenile Department by 30% following the protocol identified by the Juvenile Director. Keep Parks with Juvenile to ensure occupancy stays at maximum levels supported by juvenile work crews at little cost to Parks.
6. Eliminate the following positions/funding:
 - a. Deputy Elections Clerk – this position has been vacant during the current funding year.
 - b. The open administrative position in the BOC Office.
 - c. Emergency Services overtime budget.
7. Eliminate funding from the County General Fund to the departments listed below:
 - a. Surveyor
 - b. County Fairgrounds

Conclusions

The recommendations provided in this report are simply a possible “one-year” solution. It is likely, that without a significant change to County Revenue, next fiscal year it will be necessary to continue making reductions that will severely impact public safety. Curry County does not have a spending problem – the shortfall in funds cannot be covered by increased efficiencies. Curry County does have a revenue problem. This problem requires a sustainable long-term funding resource that is stable.

CBAC agrees that using Road Department Funds at the current rate is unacceptable (approximately \$1.7 million). This committee has analyzed this past “funding solution” and clearly recognizes how quickly road funds will be exhausted with this continued process. Ideally, Road Department Funds should not be used to fund Road Deputies in the next budget year, there is some consideration for a reduced amount of Road Department Funds, but only for one year and should be \$400,000 or less. CBAC recommends that there be no reductions to the Curry County Sheriff’s Office to sustain public safety at its current level.

ROAD FUND IMPACTS

Resulting from

Non-Road use of the Road Capital Reserve Fund

February 28, 2017

The Road Fund has traditionally been supported primarily by two sources of income: State Motor Vehicle Fees which are derived from a portion of gas tax revenue, vehicle title and license fees, etc. and Federal Forest Receipts authorized by the 1908 25% Act where the County receives 25% of the gross receipts from Federal lands. The 25% Forest receipts were statutorily dedicated with 75% for public roads and 25% to public schools. Due to a variety of environmental issues the harvest of timber on Federal lands was greatly reduced in the early 1990s. Several different Federal solutions were put in place to provide affected County governments and schools with revenue to offset the loss of timber receipts with the last of these Federal solutions expiring on September 30, 2015. The last payment from these programs was received by Curry County in the spring of 2016. From this point forward, unless Federal solutions are once again reinstated, Curry County will be receiving Federal Forest receipts based upon a seven (7) year rolling average of timber harvested from Federal lands.

In the 1980s Federal Forest receipts to the Curry County Road Fund often totaled between 3 million and 4 million per year. When coupled with approximately 1 million from Motor Vehicle fees the Road Department saw 4 million to 5 million of new income per year. With the limited availability of Forest Receipts and a moderate increase over the past few years in the Motor Vehicle fees the Road Department can expect to see approximately 1.8 million in new income per year.

The maintenance only component of the current Road budget includes the Personnel Services and Materials and Services sections in the budget. For 2016/2017 the road maintenance budget totals 3.3 million, which is 1.5 million more than the available new income. If a reasonable Capital Outlay effort of 2 million were added to this budget the budget shortfall increases to 3.5 million more than available new income. Until new revenue sources can be developed the Road Capital Reserve Fund is needed to provide adequate maintenance to Curry County's road system.

Over the past several years resources from the Road Fund have been diverted to the Sheriff's Department for purposes related to patrol. While the merits of this arrangement may be questionable to many, it is clear that any funds diverted away from the Road Fund at this point

JUVENILE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE

1. Please briefly describe how your department is funded. Total Resources \$594,378

County General Fund:	Amount \$456,423.00	Percentage % 76
Restricted Grants:	Amount \$59,197.00	Percentage % 10
Unrestricted Grants:	Amount \$ 0	Percentage %
Other Funds (describe):	Amount \$47,297.00	Percentage % 8
2. Please describe how you would apply a 30% reduction of County General Funds (GF) to your department. Include a description of how functional you would be and whether or not you could meet your department mandates – State of Oregon Mandates based on current ORS/OARS. Please include services that would be reduced/modified.

30% is \$136,926.90

78% of the total budget funds staffing. Our current position control roster (PCR) is as follows.

Director .80 FTE / .20 Parks

Operations Manager .80 / .20 Parks

Community Service Coordinator .70 FTE / .30 Parks

Senior Juvenile Counselor 1.0 FTE

Juvenile Counselor II 1.0 FTE

School Resource Counselor/Juvenile Counselor 1.0 FTE

It is not reasonable that we could make a 30% reduction without a change in the PRC. I would begin by eliminating the Operations Manager position and replacing it with a Administrative Assistant. This would save roughly 30k. Then I wouldn't replace our open Community Service Coordinator position saving 41,997. (42K). That gets us to a savings of 72K by adjustments to the PCR. I currently have 27K budgeted for a vehicle purchase that would not be needed next year. (+27K) I would then adjust the Directors salary contributions from Juvenile/Parks to be from 80/20 to 50/50 this would redistribute 30K into the parks fund. This totals 129K then I would adjust M&S to make up the additional 7K to meet the 137K or 30% Review:

1. Eliminate Op Director / Replace with Admin Assistant = savings estimate 30K
2. Not replace the Community Service Coordinator = 42K (will result in up to 20k in lost revenue)
3. Eliminate 27k (vehicle replacement fund)
4. Adjust the Directors salary to be 50/50 with parks (30K)
5. Reduce M&S by reducing training 1k, reduce Assigned Vehicles by 4k, reduce non cap furniture 2k. That is 7k total. Total approximate adjustment is 136,000.00. This would still meet that mandated requirement of having a juvenile counselor.
6. Would need to reduce the budget of an additional 20K due to lost revenue generated by the Community Service Projects. Could possibly recapture 10,000.00 of this by having the School Resource position supervise community service projects in the summer. Best case is Juvenile would cut an additional 10K from the budget, this leads to the tipping point of M&S reductions and or possibly cutting another staff position. If we are unable to capture any of the 20k we would have to cut the school resource counselor. This would drastically cut our school based programs.

3. Same as the question above with a 60% reduction of County GF.

273,853.80 would need to be reduced. I would begin with my above answer to get to 30% then we would need to cut both the school resource counselor and the Juvenile Counselor II that focuses on prevention.

School Resource Counselor: 63,576.00

Juvenile Counselor II/ Prevention Specialist: 66,963.19

Reductions in these positions would have natural reductions to M&S estimated at 10k

Total 140,539.19 + 136,000.00 = 276,539.19 60.5% reduction to the general fund.

12. Do you have any recommendations for this committee?

Not at this time

13. Specific question. Please list specific services you provide to the schools.

We run a multitude of prevention services in the schools. We assist weekly with the Pacific Bridges alternative education program. We offer weekly skill building and check in to assist twice a week.

Anger management groups are offered in all the schools in the county on a weekly basis.

Power hour study groups are held once a week at Riley Creek

Girl's empowerment groups are held on an as needed basis.

Preventions services such as drug, alcohol and tobacco awareness, and bullying interventions are offered year round

We have assisted with lunch time supervision at different times of the year.

We have assisted with the development of an Industrial Arts class in Brookings

Facilitated a summer youth flag football league.

In addition to this we are all involved in extra activities within the school such as coaching, clubs etc.

Here is the response to the questions that you asked me to look into for you.

Douglas County Detention Travel. Average length of stay is 4.66 days this decided by 200 budgeted days = 43.5 youth detained a year times two trips = 87. However what isn't equated is the amount of times a youth is transported to court for a hearing only to be returned to detention, estimated at an additional 30 trips. Total 117 trips (exception is that Douglas provides poly com for youth to attend court via video) so this could be cut in half. 15 trips. So the total for Douglas transports would be closer to 102 transports.

87 trips times Douglas County transport IGA offer of \$250 per trip = $87 * 250 = 21750.00$ that would need to be budgeted. If CCJD staff perform the transport it would be

40cents per mile * 278miles (round trip) \$112.00 vehicle costs. (From Gold beach)

Del Norte is 108 mile round trip from Gold Beach @ .40 a mile it = 43.20 per trip in vehicle costs (Already budgeted) Difference in vehicle costs to go to Douglas would be $\$68.80 * 102$ average trips is 7017.60.

1 staff @ an average of \$27.00 per hour for an 8 hour trip = 216.00 in staff costs. If the youth requires two staff for transport it would be 436.00 per trip in staff costs. This doesn't add in the value of losing an entire day of work in the community.

CCJD staff transport = 328.00 (1 staff) 548.00 (2 staff)

In summary it would be at minimum of an increase in cost of \$7017.60 plus the overall cost/value of having a staff (possibly 2) out of the community approximately 102 days of the year and adjusting services accordingly.

Adding this 7k into the budget in addition to the 30% reduction would require the reduction of an additional staff. This would remove the school programs and many of the preventions services. Which would ultimately increase in the Juvenile crime rates and create more transports, detention costs, etc.

Adding this 7K into the budget in addition to the 60% reduction would result in the reduction of staff, leaving one staff and a PT office clerk. (1 staff would be out of County over 100 times a year for transports alone, in addition if they were on the road or off on PTO there would be no person to respond to youth placed into custody by law enforcement.)

Option 2 is adding in 21750.00 into the budget to have Douglas County transport youth and this would require reduction in a staff.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY RESPONSE

1. Please briefly describe how your department *is funded.

*This describes only the D.A. Office proper and does not include, the victim advocate budget (grant funded); the child advocate office (grant funded) or the law library (state funded)

County General Fund: Amount \$340,000* Percentage 93%

I am a state employee so the figures do not include my salary.

Restricted Grants: Amount \$ Percentage %

Unrestricted Grants: Amount \$ Percentage %

Other Funds DHS grant and discovery: Amount \$26,000 Percentage 7%

2. Please describe how you would apply a 30% reduction of County General Funds (GF) to your department. Include a description of how functional you would be and whether or not you could meet your department mandates – State of Oregon Mandates based on current ORS/OARS. Please include a list of services that would be reduced or modified.

A 30% cut would entail the loss of one FTE, most likely our law clerk. We are already understaffed compared to the National District Attorney Association Guidelines and compared to similar sized counties in Oregon. Most Oregon counties of similar size have three or four deputy district attorneys; we have two. Most counties of similar size have staffs varying from 4 FTE to 8 FTE, we have two. The loss of one staff person would require the deputy district attorneys to spend additional time doing clerical work instead of attorney work, to wit: making copies of discovery, answering the telephone and the door, searching for files, typing motions and so on. I would anticipate that additional work load would cause us to not file cases where the crime alleged was a class C misdemeanor. That would include littering cases, trespass in the second degree, criminal mischief (vandalism) in the third degree, about 90% of the shoplifting cases.

3. Same as the question above with a 60% reduction of County GF.

A 60% cut would be far more significant as it would result in the loss of one of the two deputy D.A.s and the law clerk. Currently one deputy does primarily felony cases and the other misdemeanor cases. The 60% cut would most likely result in the office no longer filing on most misdemeanor cases. This may include crimes such as DUII, Menacing, Theft, Assault 4, Trespass in the First Degree and many others. (Most domestic violence cases are misdemeanors.)

4. In a 30% or 60% reduction scenario will you lose grant funds or other funds? If so, please list the grants and amounts for each category (30% reduction and 60% reduction). Also, list what functions will be impacted by the loss of the Grants.

No effect on grants.

5. Please provide the ORS numbers or OARS for the State Mandates regarding your department.

There are 535 statutes and 104 regulations regarding the duties and authorities of a District Attorney.

6. Are you aware of any potential opportunities to consolidate your county department, parts of the department, or services with another county department?

No

7. Are you aware of any potential opportunities to consolidate your county department, parts of the department, or services with an external agency (City Government, Non-Profit, other)?

ROAD DEPARTMENT RESPONSE

1. Please briefly describe how your department is funded.

County General Fund:	Amount \$	Percentage %
Restricted Grants:	Amount \$	Percentage %
Unrestricted Grants:	Amount \$	Percentage %
USFS	\$100,000	1.6%
State shared Fuel Tax (SHF)	\$1,652,732	26%
ODOT exchange fund (STP)	\$284,026	4.5%
Road Reserve Fund	\$2,000,000 +/-	32% +/-

2. Please describe how you would apply a 30% reduction of County General Funds (GF) to your department. Include a description of how functional you would be and whether or not you could meet your department mandates – State of Oregon Mandates based on current ORS/OARS. Please include a list of services that would be reduced or modified.

N/A

3. Same as the question above with a 60% reduction of County GF.

N/A

4. In a 30% or 60% reduction scenario will you lose grant funds or other funds? If so, please list the grants and amounts for each category (30% reduction and 60% reduction). Also, list what functions will be impacted by the loss of the Grants.

N/A

5. Please provide the ORS numbers or OARS for the State Mandates regarding your department.

N/A

6. Are you aware of any potential opportunities to consolidate your county department, parts of the department, or services with another county department?

7. Are you aware of any potential opportunities to consolidate your county department, parts of the department, or services with an external agency (City Government, Non-Profit, other)?

8. Are there any potential funding resources available to your department that could increase your departmental revenue to partially reduce reliance on County GF?

N/A

9. Are you aware of any potential reductions or savings for another department/cost center in Curry County?

10. Do you have any performance standards that you are required to meet contractually, or by agreement (IGA)? If yes, are you meeting those standards?

N/A

11. As the Elected Official/Department Head for your department, what percentage of time do you spend on administrative duties and what percentage on departmental tasks?

50% / 50%

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT RESPONSE

Curry County Department Head/Elected Official Questionnaire Response from Carolyn Johnson, Community Development Director

The Citizen's Budget Advisory Committee was appointed by the Curry County BOC to make funding recommendations for the FY 2017-2018. This questionnaire is provided to help you prepare answers for an in-person interview with three representatives of the CBAC. Your participation in the questionnaire and interview is voluntary. Certainly, your feedback is essential in CBAC developing realistic funding recommendations.

1. Please briefly describe how your department is funded.

County General Fund: Amount \$0 Percentage %0

Restricted Grants: Amount \$0 Percentage %0

Unrestricted Grants: Amount \$0 Percentage %0

Other Funds: in FY 16/17 budget – permit fees and carry over - \$493,958. Small amount of economic development funds, need to confirm with County Accountant. Restricted to CDD dept operations.

2. Please describe how you would apply a 30% reduction of County General Funds (GF) to your department. Include a description of how functional you would be and whether or not you could meet your department mandates – State of Oregon Mandates based on current ORS/OARS. Please include a list of services that would be reduced or modified. **Not applicable, do not use general funds.**

3. Same as the question above with a 60% reduction of County GF. **No services would be modified.**

4. In a 30% or 60% reduction scenario will you lose grant funds or other funds? No. If so, please list the grants and amounts for each category (30% reduction and 60% reduction). Also, list what functions will be impacted by the loss of the Grants. **Not applicable.**

5. Please provide the ORS numbers or OARS for the State Mandates regarding your department.

ORS 197.010 and ORS 455.010 et al

6. Are you aware of any potential opportunities to consolidate your county department, parts of the department, or services with another county department? **Yes: processing of OLLC licenses by Community Development, now in BOC office; using the BOC as a Planning Commission to reduce a great deal of staff time with current Planning Commission (translates to \$), split code enforcement between Comm Dev handling private property building / planning violations and Sheriff handling nuisances, trash, etc. ; save on a code enforcement officer this way.**

7. Are you aware of any potential opportunities to consolidate your county department, parts of the department, or services with an external agency (City Government, Non-Profit, other)? **Yes. Expand IGA services with cities for planning permitting services in each urban growth boundary areas.**

8. Are there any potential funding resources available to your department that could increase your departmental revenue to partially reduce reliance on County GF? **Not applicable**

9. Are you aware of any potential reductions or savings for another department/cost center in Curry County? **See next page noting cost savings and revenue generating ideas. Doug Robbins, Riley Smith and I brainstormed these ideas.**

COUNTY ASSESSOR RESPONSE

CBAC Questionnaire Responses 3-1-17

<u>1. Source</u>	<u>Assessor</u>	<u>Tax</u>
GF	\$408,000	\$89,800
CAFFA grant	\$122,000	\$27,300
PP Penalties	\$ 20,000	\$10,000
Other fees	\$ 25,000	\$ 2,400

2. Assessment -30% = -\$122,400

- a. If the commissioners require a 30% reduction from the assessor's general fund contribution then we would cut an appraisal and clerical position and then nickel and dime our materials and services for an additional \$20,000 or so. This move would mean that we would stop physical reappraisal and we would have to shift other clerical duties to the remaining employees. In order to attempt to service the workload we probably would have to cut public hours to 9-12 M & W and 1-4 T & T. It is doubtful we could administer exemptions, special assessments, business personal property and Mobile Home rolls. Doubtful that we could adequately discuss tax bills or assessments with citizens or defend the increasing number of appeals. Assessment roll would begin to deteriorate at an approximate rate of 5% per year which would equal a 5% loss to districts and this would continue every year. I could not swear the *ASSESSOR'S CERTIFICATE AND OATH OF TOTAL TAXES AND OTHER CHARGES*

Tax -30% = -\$26,000

- a. A 30% general fund reduction in the tax office would require that we reduce our tax collector to 70% FTE and nickel and dime \$8400 from materials and services. We would work our tax collector full time for the first 8 months of the year and then probably lose her. We would not send 2nd and 3rd trimester notices. We would reduce public hours as noted above. It is doubtful that we'd have much of an effort at collecting taxes from non-payers and collections would languish and distributions would be severely delayed. We likely could not process foreclosures or seizures and property transfers may be impacted due to unpaid taxes.

3. Assessment -60% = -\$244,900

- a. If the commissioners chose to visit a 60% cut on assessment and tax collection the only thing left to cut is people. In this event we'd have the Assessor, the Deputy Assessor and a half time position left. At this level there would be no point in funding either the Assessor's or the tax collector's office. However if there was still 40% funding we would have to close off all office hours to the public, we would try to keep the ownership record straight and possibly try to mail tax statements and then accept voluntary payments of taxes. We would do no appraisals nor capture any new construction so anything built after this point would receive no tax bills. This inequity would be noticed immediately and property owners would appeal to the Board of Property Tax Appeals in droves. We honestly have no idea if we could accomplish anything like this as it is untried territory and would expect the tax roll to deteriorate by 25% or more per year.

4. Yes in either a 30% or 60% cut scenario we would lose grants and all other sources of revenues. Therefore in reality a 30% reduction will amount to a 60% reduction because we would lose

In order to ensure that housing inventories for assessment purposes were up to date we estimate that one additional appraiser and a .50 FTE support staff would bring us to an efficiency level that could bring us within a seven year reappraisal cycle. Currently we are reappraising properties that we have not seen in almost 20 years. If we could keep our current trained staff that cycle will come down to approximately 15.40 year cycle. Currently we have two full time appraisers producing 2550 appraisals per year which equals .65 appraisals per hour or 4 to 5 a day on average (20,000 accounts/1300 physical reappraisals/appraiser/yr). Of the 2550 appraisals 1250 are new construction accounts and 1300 are physical reappraisal. One additional trained appraiser would increase our annual physical reappraisal numbers to 2600 to 3000 per year and would reduce the cycle to appraise all taxable property in the county to approximately 7.14 years (20,000/2800)(see calculations below).

It is not common for our county to attract experienced appraisers so we generally have to train them and on the average it takes 3 years to get an appraiser to a 1500 appraisals per year level. We could expect 500 first year, 1200 the second and then 1500 the third. Thereafter production will increase, but not as significantly as in the first three years.

Physical Reappraisal Cycle

20,000 taxable accounts

1300/yr physical reappraisals

$20,000/1300 = 15.40 \text{ yrs}$

$20,000/2800 = 7.14 \text{ yrs}$ (With additional appraiser)

commitment is not sufficient to ensure the viability of the A&T program over the long term..." "We remind each county of its commitment to fund its assessment and taxation programs at the level that the county governing body submitted in the grant application, and that the department has subsequently approved. Any reduction in the dollar appropriation or any other resource restriction will result in loss of grant money."

5. Please provide the ORS numbers or OARS for the State Mandates regarding your department.
ORS 208.010, 208.070, 208.090, 208.140, 275.090, 275.275, 294.080, 311.390; 312.120 368.705

6. Are you aware of any potential opportunities to consolidate your county department, parts of the department, or services with another county department? NO

7. Are you aware of any potential opportunities to consolidate your county department, parts of the department, or services with an external agency (City Government, Non-Profit, other)?

NO

8. Are there any potential funding resources available to your department that could increase your departmental revenue to partially reduce reliance on County GF? NO

9. Are you aware of any potential reductions or savings for another department/cost center in Curry County? NO

10. Do you have any performance standards that you are required to meet contractually, or by agreement (IGA)? If yes, are you meeting those standards? NO

11. As the Elected Official/Department Head for your department, what percentage of time do you spend on administrative duties and what percentage on departmental tasks? NONE

12. Do you have any recommendations for this committee?

I recommend that the County does not hire a County Administrator as there would not be any department to manage with this scenario as well no funding for that position.

The County Clerk, an elected official, is responsible for the Recording Department. The department records all documents that affect the conveyance, encumbrance, or division of Real Property (Deeds, Mortgages, Liens, Leases, Releases, Partition Plats....etc.) Death Certificates and Court Judgements.

The County Clerk also maintains and indexes the County Commissioners' Journal – an official monthly record of Orders, Ordinances, Resolutions, Contracts, Agreements, Leases, Deeds Easements and minutes and agenda of the Board of Commissioners.

Other recorded and filed documents include Marriage Licenses/Marriage Certificates as well as solemnize marriages (Officiates Marriage Ceremonies); Military Discharges (DD214s), Mining Records, Oaths all Taxing Districts Budgets, Formations, Annexations and Ordinances.

The County Clerk is federally approved Passport Acceptance Facility.

Funding 2016-2017 Budget Yr.:

General Funds: \$19,842 Percent 8%

Other Funds (describe): Fees \$228,060 Percentage 92%

Staffing:

County Clerk .5 FTE

Recording Deputy: 1.0 FTE

Recording Deputy: 1.0 FTE

Thirty Percent Reduction = \$5,952.60

Transfer funds from Clerk Reserve Fund to offset costs.

Sixty Percent Reduction= \$11,905.20

Transfer funds from Clerk Reserve Fund to offset costs.



BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MEMORANDUM

Meeting Date: October 18, 2017
Prepared by: John Hitt, Interim County Administrator
Subject: Reorganization of the Community Development Department.

Review of the structure and organization of non-elected County departments is underway. The Community Development Department is the first department to be examined, and I have completed my assessment.

A reorganization of the Department will include:

- Remove the responsibility of the Economic Development Budget and management from the Community Development Director. Economic Development oversight is the responsibility of the County Administrator and is included in the Administrator's job description. The Administrator, at his/her discretion, may require assistance from the Director on varying Economic Development related project.
- Adding the responsibility of Code enforcement to the Community Development Department. The Board has authorized some funding for Code enforcement in the Community Development Department. In the near future I'll be approaching the Board to advertise and fund the position.
- Remove the responsibility of rental advertisement and oversight of rental agreements for County offices from the Community Development Director.

Currently the Community Development Department is comprised of:

- The Community Development Director, who runs the department and is responsible for Building, Planning and Economic Development.
- The Planner, who handles the front counter and phone interface with the public and processes minor planning applications.
- Contract services with the City of Gold Beach and the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) to process Conditional Use Permits
- The Building Official, supervised by the Director, oversees the Building division
- Contract services with the Oregon Department of Building Services. This arrangement will be reduced in 2018.
- A part time building inspector who provides inspections
- The Administrative Assistant who processes building permit applications and manages the paperwork related to the administration of the Department.
- An irregular part time position that is currently filled about 15 hours a week to assist with building permit application processing and administration paperwork.
- An irregular position authorized but not yet filled