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The Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada (GFOA) presented a Distinguished Budget Presentation Award to **San Diego County, California** for its annual budget for the fiscal year beginning **July 1, 2011**. In order to receive this award, a governmental unit must publish a budget document that meets program criteria as a policy document, as an operations guide, as a financial plan and as a communications device.

This award is valid for a period of one year only. We believe our current budget continues to conform to program requirements, and we are submitting it to GFOA to determine its eligibility for another award.
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Message from the Chief Administrative Officer

Embracing Change

Several years ago, two things happened that touched all our lives. The first event was, of course, the recession that began in 2008. Much has already been said about this topic and fortunately, we are starting to see signs of recovery - albeit slow and at times uneven - as we begin to put this event behind us. The second thing that occurred, however, has not been as widely discussed and that is that the pace of change in our world began accelerating exponentially. This dynamic - while not receiving as much attention as the recession - has been every bit as challenging and shows no signs of abating. In fact, the pace of change underway now in our world continues to accelerate. Fueled by technology advances, we are quickly changing and reshaping all aspects of our lives - from how we live and work to how we share information and communicate - in many ways fundamentally changing the public's expectations of and relationship to their government.

Therefore, if I had to sum up this year's Adopted Operational Plan for Fiscal Years 2012-14 in only two words, those words would be "Embracing Change." The County of San Diego will spend the next two years rising to the challenges that change presents, embracing the opportunities it offers and continuously examining how we can change as an organization to better provide the services the public needs and expects. Within this document, which guides how public funds will be spent over the next two years, you will see many references to changes in the way we do business.

A number of important programmatic and spending changes are the result of decisions made at the State level, with legislation enacted in Sacramento requiring us to significantly change how we provide many public safety and health programs. Implementation of Assembly Bill (AB) 118, Local Revenue Fund 2011 shifted the State's financial responsibility for various services to Counties, with funding coming from a dedicated portion of sales tax, and the implementation of AB 109, Public Safety Realignment (2011), expanded County responsibility for the management of criminal offenders. These bills - along with the State's decision to eliminate redevelopment - are requiring Counties to profoundly change not just how we provide services but what services we can or, in some cases, must provide.

In addition to adjusting to new roles and responsibilities in the areas of health, public safety and redevelopment, we're also taking advantage of opportunities to improve how and where we serve the public. Departments throughout the organization are using our Government Without Walls (GWOW) initiative, deploying new technology tools to expand employees' mobility, allowing them to spend more productive time in the community and with customers.

We're changing the way we design our services, too, by continually looking for more opportunities to streamline operations - such as the Red Tape Reduction Task Force - and by addressing public needs in innovative, comprehensive ways, as illustrated by our unique "Live Well, San Diego!" health and wellness initiative.
Message from the Chief Administrative Officer

We’re changing the facilities we use to serve the public -- continuing progress on the new, space- and energy-efficient County Operations Center in Kearny Mesa, and moving forward to turn underutilized parking lots at the historic, waterfront County Administration Center into a multi-purpose park that will serve current and future generations of San Diegans and welcome visitors to our region. We’re moving forward to provide much-needed public safety facilities in the region including the replacement of the Las Colinas Women’s Detention Facility, the East Mesa Detention Re-Entry and Rehabilitation Facility, a new Sheriff station in Rancho San Diego and upgraded facilities for the Sheriff station in Pine Valley and for the Boulevard Fire Station.

And last but not least, we’re changing how we communicate with the public we serve, by creating the County News Center to expand the services and information the public can find online and through social media.

Indeed, change is a constant that’s threaded throughout every County department in this Operational Plan.

One thing, though, that will not change is our commitment to fiscal discipline. We continue to live within our means and to strive to maintain the County’s strong credit ratings. The Fiscal Years 2012-14 Adopted Operational Plan continues our commitment to structural balance and prudent reserves with a total of $4.85 billion budgeted for Fiscal Year 2012-13. This budget contains a total of 16,011 staff years - 324 more than were budgeted in Fiscal Year 2011-12. These positions are being added to provide additional staff to support the County’s family resource centers, to address the County’s public safety realignment responsibilities, staffing for the new women’s detention facility, sworn supervisory staff for the Sheriff’s patrol stations, and additional staff to assist with the timely resolution of residential and commercial assessment appeals.

In the years ahead, we will preserve essential public safety services, continue the multi-year investment in the County’s capital infrastructure to provide needed facilities for the region and expand our investment in health and wellness programs by leveraging new resources to improve the Community Nutrition Education Program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and the Low Income Health Program. As we have done in past years, we'll focus on emergency preparedness and fire protection; protect public health; promote healthier communities and living habits; conduct the November Presidential election; maintain a strong, vibrant public library system; expand and protect park and open space resources and continue to promote sustainability and conservation.

We will do this by working with the Board of Supervisors to ensure that County government in San Diego remains fiscally sound, operationally strong and able to meet the core needs of County residents within available revenues. We will continue to closely monitor changing economic conditions and the uncertainties surrounding key State revenue sources, working with other California counties to protect local revenues and interests as the State works to redefine State/County roles, responsibilities and revenues. And we will continue to use the County’s General Management System (GMS) to carry out the Board’s priorities, using our GMS management disciplines and commitment to innovation, continuous improvement, excellence and customer service to respond as efficiently as possible to increasing case-loads and other demands for service.
For the County of San Diego, our greatest asset is our ability to combine the expertise and dedication of our employees, the pragmatic, seasoned leadership of the Board of Supervisors and our commitment to a culture that embraces change. With these organizational strengths, I am confident that we will meet the challenges of the future.

I invite you to read more about the County’s accomplishments, objectives and programmatic changes in the individual group and department sections that begin on page 115.

Walter F. Ekard, Chief Administrative Officer
2012-13 Adopted Budget at a Glance

Adopted Budget by Functional Area — All Funds

Total Budget: $4,845,238,142

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget by Functional Area - All Funds</th>
<th>Budget in Millions</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>$1,469.4</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>1,928.9</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use &amp; Environment</td>
<td>392.9</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>305.5</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; General Government</td>
<td>340.8</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Program</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Other</td>
<td>313.5</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,845.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In the chart and table, the sum of individual percentages may not total 100.0% due to rounding.
Adopted Budget by Category of Expenditure — All Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget in Millions</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$1,697.3</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>1,881.0</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Charges</td>
<td>736.4</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Transfers Out</td>
<td>376.4</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assets / Land Acquisition &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assets Equipment</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Categories</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance Component Increases</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Reserves</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Reserves</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Transfer &amp; Reimbursements</td>
<td>(29.7)</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,845.2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In the chart and table, the sum of individual percentages may not total 100.0% due to rounding.
Adopted Budget by Category of Revenue — All Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Category</th>
<th>Budget in Millions</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Revenue</td>
<td>$1,367.7</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Revenue</td>
<td>898.1</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges For Current Services</td>
<td>769.6</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes Current Property</td>
<td>547.6</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes Other Than Current Secured</td>
<td>390.7</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Financing Sources</td>
<td>386.3</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Fund Balance</td>
<td>196.1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue From Use of Money &amp; Property</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines, Forfeitures &amp; Penalties</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses, Permits &amp; Franchises</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance Component Decreases</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,845.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In the chart and table, the sum of individual percentages may not total 100.0% due to rounding.
Adopted Staffing by Group/Agency — All Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Agency</th>
<th>Staff Years *</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>7,120.00</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>5,306.25</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use &amp; Environment</td>
<td>1,451.00</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>959.00</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; General Government</td>
<td>1,174.50</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,010.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A staff year in the Operational Plan context equates to one permanent employee working full-time for one year.

Note: In the chart and table, the sum of individual percentages may not total 100.0% due to rounding.
MISSION

To efficiently provide public services that build strong and sustainable communities

VISION

A county that is safe, healthy and thriving

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

Safe Communities
Promote Safe Communities

Sustainable Environments
Support environments that foster viable, livable communities while bolstering economic growth

Healthy Families
Make it easier for residents to lead healthy lives while improving opportunities for children and adults
## San Diego County Facts and Figures

### Founded:
February 18, 1850

### Size:
4,261 square miles

### Coastline:
75 miles

### Elevation:
- Lowest - Sea Level
- Highest - 6,535 ft (Hot Springs Mountain)

### Population¹:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,095,313</td>
<td>3,115,810</td>
<td>3,143,429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Second most populous county in California and fifth most populous in the U.S.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010; State of California, Department of Finance, May 2012

### Incorporated Cities:
18

### Civilian Labor Force:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,583,808</td>
<td>1,593,043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Employment Development Department, Historical Data for Unemployment Rate and Labor Force, 2011 Annual Average and 2012 January to July average.

### Unemployment Rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Employment Development Department, Historical Data for Unemployment Rate and Labor Force, 2011 Annual Average and 2012 January to July average.

### Employment Mix: (Industry)¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2011 Employees</th>
<th>2012 Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>213,600</td>
<td>218,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>211,400</td>
<td>217,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>198,900</td>
<td>202,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>165,500</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>146,700</td>
<td>151,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>92,500</td>
<td>91,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>66,400</td>
<td>69,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>57,300</td>
<td>58,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>46,400</td>
<td>48,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>23,900</td>
<td>23,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining &amp; Logging</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Industry employment is by place of work; excludes self-employed individuals, unpaid family workers, and household domestic workers.

²Excludes the U.S. Department of Defense.

Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division (August 2012 Benchmark, Preliminary)

### Ten Largest Employers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>2010 Employees</th>
<th>2011 Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government¹</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>46,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td>45,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>26,823</td>
<td>27,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego²</td>
<td>15,842</td>
<td>15,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp Healthcare</td>
<td>14,832</td>
<td>14,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripps Health</td>
<td>13,823</td>
<td>13,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Unified School District</td>
<td>14,485</td>
<td>13,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualcomm Inc.</td>
<td>11,847</td>
<td>10,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>10,470</td>
<td>10,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente</td>
<td>7,404</td>
<td>8,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Excludes the U.S. Department of Defense.

²County of San Diego, Fiscal Year 2011-13 Adopted Operational Plan

## San Diego County Facts and Figures

### MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME¹:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$60,231</td>
<td>$59,923</td>
<td>$59,477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Adjusted for inflation.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau

### FISCAL YEAR 2012-13 ASSESSED VALUATION:

- $393 billion

### 2011 CONSUMER PRICE INDEX:

- 252.91

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
March 2012

### MEDIAN HOME PRICE ¹:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 2010</th>
<th>June 2011</th>
<th>June 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$335,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Median price of all existing homes sold in June of each year.
Source: California Association of Realtors/DataQuick Information System

### Fiscal Year 2012-13 Top Ten Property Taxpayers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Taxpayer</th>
<th>2012-13 Estimated Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Gas &amp; Electric Company</td>
<td>$88,731,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Edison Company</td>
<td>$32,836,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine Company</td>
<td>$16,713,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilroy Realty, LLP</td>
<td>$14,829,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualcomm Incorporated</td>
<td>$14,024,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Hotel and Resorts</td>
<td>$13,929,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Bell Telephone Company</td>
<td>$10,861,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSK Del Partners, LLC</td>
<td>$8,921,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC/SD Holdings, LLC</td>
<td>$6,791,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunstone Park Lessees, LLC</td>
<td>$6,675,186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County of San Diego, Auditor and Controller, Property Tax Services Division
### LAND USE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>2011 Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>1,100,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or Undeveloped Land</td>
<td>851,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>361,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Government</td>
<td>155,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>118,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Transportation</td>
<td>105,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Industrial</td>
<td>34,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,727,340</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The acres available for land use may vary year to year due to survey updates that include tide level changes.

   Source: San Diego Association of Governments, 2011

### AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011 Value</th>
<th>2011 Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursery &amp; Flower Crops (e.g., indoor plants, trees &amp; shrubs, bedding plants, cut flowers, etc.)</td>
<td>$1,092,916,550</td>
<td>12,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit &amp; Nut Crops (e.g., avocados, citrus, berries, etc.)</td>
<td>$319,205,955</td>
<td>33,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Crops (e.g., tomatoes, herbs, mushrooms, etc.)</td>
<td>$177,013,955</td>
<td>6,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock &amp; Poultry Products (e.g., chicken eggs, milk, etc.)</td>
<td>$65,550,005</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock &amp; Poultry (e.g., cattle, calves, chicken, hogs &amp; pigs)</td>
<td>$20,996,688</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Crops (e.g., pastures, ranges, hay, etc.)</td>
<td>$5,038,735</td>
<td>248,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apiary (e.g., honey, pollination, bees &amp; queen bees, etc.)</td>
<td>$2,245,470</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Products (e.g., firewood and timber)</td>
<td>$777,714</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,683,745,072</strong></td>
<td><strong>300,786</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights & Measures - 2011- San Diego County Crop Statistics & Annual Report
MAJOR MILITARY BASES AND INSTALLATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base/Installation</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Coast Guard Sector San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps Air Station Miramar (3rd Marine Aircraft Wing)</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton (largest West Coast expeditionary training facility)</td>
<td>North County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps Recruit Depot San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Base Coronado (includes Naval Air Station North Island and Naval Amphibious Base)</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Base Point Loma (includes Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command - SPAWAR)</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Medical Center San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Base San Diego (principal home port of the Pacific Fleet)</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TOURIST ATTRACTIONS:

- Anza-Borrego Desert State Park¹, Borrego Springs
- Balboa Park and Museums, San Diego
- Birch Aquarium at Scripps, La Jolla
- Del Mar Racetrack, Del Mar
- Gaslamp Quarter National Historic District, San Diego
- Hotel Del Coronado, Coronado
- Legoland California, Carlsbad
- Maritime Museum, San Diego
- Old Town State Historic Park, San Diego
- Palomar Observatory, Palomar Mountain
- Petco Park, San Diego
- Point Loma and Cabrillo National Monument, San Diego
- Qualcomm Stadium, San Diego
- San Diego Zoo Safari Park, Escondido
- San Diego Zoo, San Diego
- Sea World San Diego, San Diego
- Torrey Pines Golf Course, La Jolla
- Torrey Pines State Beach and Reserve, San Diego
- U.S. Olympic Training Center, Chula Vista
- USS Midway Museum, San Diego

¹ Anza-Borrego Desert State Park is primarily in San Diego County but also in Imperial and Riverside Counties.
Source: California Division of Tourism

TOTAL VISITORS 2011:

31,146,000

Source: San Diego Convention and Visitors Bureau Quarterly Travel Forecast, June 2012
San Diego County Profile and Economic Indicators

History & Geography

San Diego County became one of California’s original 27 counties on February 18, 1850, shortly after California became the 31st State in the Union. The County functions under a Charter adopted in 1933, including subsequent amendments. At the time of its creation, San Diego County comprised much of the southern section of California. The original boundaries included San Diego, along with portions of what are now Imperial, Riverside, San Bernardino and Inyo counties.

The original territory of nearly 40,000 square miles was gradually reduced until 1907, when the present boundaries were established. Today, San Diego County covers 4,261 square miles, approximately the size of the state of Connecticut, extending 75 miles along the Pacific Coast from Mexico to Orange County and inland 75 miles to Imperial County along the international border shared with Mexico. Riverside and Orange counties form the northern border. It is the southwesternmost county in the contiguous 48 states.

For thousands of years, American Indians have lived in this area. The four tribal groupings that make up the indigenous Indians of San Diego County are the Kumeyaay (also referred to as Diegueño or Mission Indians), the Luiseño, the Cupeño and the Cahuilla. San Diego County has the largest number of Indian reservations (19) of any county in the United States. However, the reservations are very small, with total land holdings of an estimated 193 square miles.

The Spanish explorer Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo arrived by sea in the region on September 28, 1542. Although he named the area San Miguel, it was renamed 60 years later by Spaniard Sebastian Vizcaino. He chose the name San Diego in honor of his flagship and, it is said, his favorite saint, San Diego de Alcala.

San Diego County enjoys a wide variety of climate and terrain, from coastal plains and fertile inland valleys to mountain ranges and the Anza-Borrego Desert in the east. The Cleveland National Forest occupies much of the interior portion of the county. The climate is equable in the coastal and valley regions where most resources and population are located. The average annual rainfall is only 10 inches for the coastal regions, so the county is highly reliant on imported water.

County Population

San Diego County is the southernmost major metropolitan area in the State. In March 2011, the U.S. Census Bureau estimated the County’s population for 2010 to be 3,095,313, an increase of 10.0% from the 2000 figure of 2,813,833. The State of California Department of Finance released population data incorporating the 2010 Census counts as the benchmark, and the County’s revised population estimate for January 1, 2011 was 3,115,810 and the County’s population estimate for January 1, 2012 was 3,143,429. San Diego County is the second largest county by population in California and the fifth largest county by population in the country, as measured by the U.S. Census Bureau.

San Diego County Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Incorporated</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>78,247</td>
<td>106,403</td>
<td>107,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>173,556</td>
<td>245,987</td>
<td>249,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>23,329</td>
<td>23,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>4,182</td>
<td>4,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>94,869</td>
<td>99,981</td>
<td>100,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>58,014</td>
<td>59,827</td>
<td>60,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>133,559</td>
<td>144,998</td>
<td>146,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>26,992</td>
<td>26,437</td>
<td>26,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>54,749</td>
<td>57,969</td>
<td>58,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>24,918</td>
<td>25,445</td>
<td>25,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>54,260</td>
<td>58,688</td>
<td>58,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>161,029</td>
<td>167,943</td>
<td>169,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>48,044</td>
<td>48,088</td>
<td>48,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,223,400</td>
<td>1,309,784</td>
<td>1,321,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>54,977</td>
<td>84,586</td>
<td>85,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>52,975</td>
<td>54,102</td>
<td>54,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>12,979</td>
<td>12,928</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>89,857</td>
<td>94,269</td>
<td>95,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>442,919</td>
<td>490,864</td>
<td>495,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
<td>3,115,810</td>
<td>3,143,429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Diego County Population Distribution by Race, Ethnicity and Age
2010 Total Population: 3,095,313

Source: 2010 U.S. Census

San Diego County Distribution by Race/Ethnicity
2000, 2010, and 2030 Projection
Percentage of Total Population

Note: Percentages represent the share of each group compared to the total population.
Source: U.S. Census - 2000 and 2010 Population
San Diego Association of Governments 2050 Regional Growth Forecast (Feb 2010) - 2030 Projection
The first chart on the previous page shows for 2010 the most recent age, race/ethnicity composition for the regional population. On the second chart, data for 2030 forecasts that the San Diego regional population will be approximately 3.9 million according to the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) based on the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast final series as of October 2011, a 38% increase from calendar year 2000. San Diego County’s racial and ethnic composition is as diverse as its geography. SANDAG projects that in 2030, San Diego’s population breakdown will be: 41.9% White; 37.0% Hispanic; 11.4% Asian and Pacific Islander; 5.4% African American; and 4.3% all other groups. A significant growth in the Hispanic population is seen in this projection. The chart below indicates the regional population trends are also anticipated to show changes to the population in several age segments with individuals under 15 years of age declining gradually and those individuals 65 and older estimated to increase approximately 131% in 2030 from 2000.

Annual population growth has averaged approximately 0.9% over the past 11 years as presented on the chart on the following page. Natural increase is the primary source of population growth. Another contributor to the change in population is net migration (both foreign and domestic) which has varied dramatically in the past 11 years.
Economic Indicators

U.S. Economy

The U.S. economy suffered through a very deep recession beginning in December 2007 and ending in June 2009 according to the National Bureau of Economic Research, approximately 18 months from when it began, making it the longest recession since 1929. The recovery, which began just over three years ago, remains lackluster according to Mark Zandi, "The Recession's Lingering Grip" 11 September, 2012 (Source: Moody's Analytics, http://www.economy.com). He added that "It's not that the economy has gone nowhere since the recession; significant progress has been made...But despite the gains, growth has been tepid and sporadic. Businesses are reluctant to hire and invest, haunted by memories of the recession and worried about the European debt crisis and Washington's fiscal challenges."

On July 27, 2012, the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) released revised data for 2009 through 2011 that indicated that the recession had been slightly less deep and the early part of the subsequent recovery had been a bit more gradual than previously thought. In 2011, the revised real gross domestic product (GDP) increased by 1.8% compared to the revised 2.4% increase in 2010. (See the chart on the following page for a historical comparison.) According to the second estimate released by the BEA, the U.S. economy increased at an annual rate of 1.7% in the second quarter of 2012. In the first quarter, real GDP increased by 2.0%. The increase in real GDP in the second quarter primarily reflected positive contributions from personal consumption expenditures (PCE), exports, nonresidential fixed investment, and residential fixed investment that were partly offset by negative contributions from private inventory investment and from state and local government spending. Imports, which are a subtraction in the calculation of GDP, increased. The near-term projection for real GDP growth was revised down somewhat according to the July 31 and August 1, 2012 minutes of the Federal Open Market Committee.

Further, according to the minutes of the Federal Open Market Committee meeting on July 31 and August 1, 2012, economic activity increased at a slower pace in the second quarter than earlier in the year and labor market conditions have improved little in recent months. In the second quarter, consumer price inflation was markedly lower than in the first quarter, mostly reflecting declines in consumer energy prices, while measures of longer-run inflation expectations
remain stable. Private nonfarm employment expanded in June at about the same modest pace as in the second quarter as a whole, and government employment decreased slightly. The unemployment rate improved compared to 2011; however, long-duration unemployment has stayed elevated.

Conditions in the housing market generally improved further in recent months, but activity remained at a low level against the backdrop of the large inventory of foreclosed and distressed properties and tight underwriting standards for mortgage loans. Manufacturing production decelerated significantly in the second quarter following a large gain in the first quarter. The production of motor vehicles and parts increased considerably last quarter, but factory output outside of the motor vehicle sector was essentially flat. Households' real disposable income rose at a faster pace than consumer spending in both the first and second quarters, boosted in part in recent months by lower energy prices. Real business expenditures on equipment and software rose in the second quarter at a faster pace than in the first quarter. However, new orders for nondefense capital goods excluding aircraft decreased and the backlog of unfilled orders decelerated sharply.

Some significant risks facing the U.S. economy in 2012 include continued weakness in the housing market, continued uncertainty among households and businesses about the economic outlook, slower global economic growth, concerns about the fiscal and banking situation in the euro area, and the overall outlook for global economic growth (Source: Minutes from the Federal Open Market Committee meeting on July 31 and August 1, 2012). Households continue to face significant challenges including limited growth in disposable income, stubbornly high unemployment levels, tight credit markets, and burdensome, although declining, mortgage debt. (Source: State of California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) 2012-13 Budget: Economic and Revenue Update February 27, 2012).

**California Economy**

California's economy continues to recover from the impact of the worst recession since the Great Depression. In 2011, California's labor market registered gains, albeit at an uneven pace during the course of the year. Further, California is on track for a second year of net job gains. In a year-over-year comparison (July 2011 to July 2012), nonfarm payroll employment in California increased by 365,100 jobs.
(up 2.6 %). The State unemployment rate fell modestly from 12.4% in 2010 to 11.7% in 2011. The July 2012 unemployment rate was 10.9% which was equal to the seven month average for 2012. Across the major industries of the State, 2011 brought some much needed relief after years of job losses. Most, but not all, industries in the State registered gains, with the largest percentage increases coming in Information, Education, and Administrative Services. Further, most of the major industries saw job gains continue into 2012. Aerospace and Technology has continued to add jobs in 2012. International trade continues to play an important role in the State’s economy, and California ranks as the second largest exporting state in the country. California’s largest exports come from aerospace, pharmaceuticals, other information technology sectors, and agriculture. Imports outweigh exports by a 2-to-1 margin. The tourism and hospitality industry in the State has improved over the past two years. Occupancy rates through the first five months of 2012 rose by roughly 3% in the major markets of the State. (Source: Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation - The Kyser Center for Economic Research: 2012-2013 Mid-Year Economic Forecast and Industry Outlook, July 2012).

Following a decline of 5.4% in 2009, real personal income grew by 2.5% in 2010 and 3.5% in 2011. Taxable sales declined 14.4% in 2009 and grew by 3.0% in 2010 and are estimated to grow by 6.5% in 2011 (final taxable sales figures will not be available until early 2013). Consumer spending continues to be impacted by this economic volatility. (See chart below.) California’s economy continues to recover from the steep recession. Nonfarm employment grew by 0.9% in 2011 and is projected to grow by 1.6% in 2012 and 1.8% in 2013. In 2012, real personal income is expected to grow by 1.5% and taxable sales are predicted to increase by 4.3%. More improvement is expected in 2013.

For 2012 and 2013, even with the headwinds of a global economic slowdown, California’s economy should move forward this year and next. While the labor market is still years away from normal, progress will be made over the next two years with gains in private sector jobs, notably in technology-related industries, professional and business services, and information, with some welcome gains in construction. (Source: Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation - The Kyser Center for Economic Research: 2012-2013 Mid-Year Economic Forecast and Industry Outlook, July 2012).
San Diego Economy

San Diego’s recent relative economic stability has been based on its increasing diversification of economic activity. The region is a thriving hub for the biotech and telecommunications industries. San Diego is also an important manufacturing center and a popular travel destination. Since the end of the Cold War, the military’s presence has diminished but remains an important driver of the region’s economy.

San Diego certainly shared the pain of the recession along with the rest of Southern California. The outlook for San Diego County for the second half of 2012 is for continued though moderate expansion (Source: Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation - The Kyser Center for Economic Research: 2012-2013 Mid-Year Economic Forecast and Industry Outlook, July 2012). Unemployment in the region in 2011 averaged 10.0%, and was lower than the 2011 median of 10.4% for the 10 largest counties in the State. In 2012, the average unemployment rate for the first seven months was 9.2%. San Diego’s employment continues to compare favorably to other Southern California counties, with only Orange County experiencing lower unemployment.

Another indicator of economic health is county taxable sales. Taxable sales started to decline overall in the county in 2007 and that trend continued in 2008 and 2009. In 2010, taxable sales showed moderate growth. While the annual figures on taxable sales for 2011 are not yet available from the California State Board of Equalization, sales tax revenues in 2011 have shown continued improvement. One category that has contributed to the higher growth rates in 2011 has been increased fuel costs. Growth in taxable sales is expected to continue in 2012 and 2013.

San Diego County Taxable Sales by Category
2005 Through 2010¹

![San Diego County Taxable Sales by Category](image)

![San Diego County Taxable Sales by Category](image)

Source: State Board of Equalization

¹Beginning in 2009, the State Board of Equalization began summarizing taxable sales using the North American Industry Classification System codes. As a result of the coding change, industry-level data for 2009 are not comparable to that of prior years.

*Due to coding changes as described above, this category no longer exists for calendar year 2009; taxable sales in the Business and Personal Services have been absorbed and redistributed to the remaining categories.
In reference to the previous table, the Categories of Taxable Sales include:

- General Retail — apparel stores, general merchandise, home furnishings and appliances, and other retail.
- Automotive Related — automotive stores and service stations.
- Food Related — food stores and eating and drinking establishments.
- Building Materials — hardware stores.
- Business and Personal Services — for example: beauty salons and hotels.

All Other Outlets — Use Tax Collections. The State’s use tax applies to the use, storage or other consumption of merchandise.

Unemployment Rate Comparison by Select California Regions
July 2011 and July 2012

Inflation as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics consumer price index for all urban consumers (CPI-U) showed the cost of living increased 3.0% in 2011 compared to 1.3% in 2010 and virtually zero -0.02% in 2009. The increase was led by energy prices rising 16.7% including gas prices jumping 23.7%. Moreover, transportation accounts for San Diego’s second-largest category of consumer expenditures (Source: National University System Institute for Policy Research Economic Ledger - March 2012).

More current indicators show that the economy continued to gradually improve during 2012. Stock prices, building permits, help wanted advertising, consumer confidence, and the national economy as measured by the Conference Board Index of Leading Economic Indicators were positive in July 2012. Consumer confidence was up for the eighth straight month (University of San Diego Burnham-Moores Center). Nonfarm wage and salary employment increased by 35,100 in July 2012 compared to July 2011.

The region’s health care industry continues to expand and add jobs. San Diego attracts a significant number of retirees, a demographic that requires a larger share of health care services. Moreover, several of the region’s major health care providers have expansion plans underway or have future projects: Sharp Healthcare, Scripps Health and Kaiser Permanente. The manufacturing sector continues to
struggle. However, the San Diego region has the benefit of several innovative clusters including communications, biofuels, genomics, energy storage, cyber-security and cleantech. While smaller than it once was, San Diego's agricultural industry is still significant. It ranks as the 17th largest agricultural economy among counties in the United States. (Source: Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation - The Kyser Center for Economic Research: 2012-13 Economic Forecast and Industry Outlook, February 2012 and the 2012-2013 Mid-Year Economic Forecast and Industry Outlook, July 2012).

In 2012-13, the federal government and Pentagon initiatives to cut back on defense spending will have an impact on San Diego's economy. Offsetting the cutback is the fact that the region is home to significant military commands and training centers. Additionally, the Department of Defense is shifting its focus to the Pacific and deploying more forces in San Diego.

While demand for cruises to Mexico has declined and cruise lines have been shrinking their presence in San Diego, positive news is seen in a plan to expand the San Diego Convention Center. If the expansion goes forward, the $520 million project would begin in 2013 and be complete in 2016.

Residential real estate is improving but will not see a significant turnaround this year. The median price for a single-family home in San Diego has been rising on a month to month basis, and the year over year declines are slowing. Nonresidential real estate is on the mend, but remains a long way from being fully recovered. Still, steady job growth is raising demand for office and other types of commercial real estate.

Approximately one-half of San Diego County's population is part of the civilian labor force (1,615,100 in July 2012). The region is also home to one of the largest military complexes in the world. San Diego's annual average unemployment rate continues to compare favorably to the State rate, and it is expected to be somewhat higher than the U.S. rate.

Annual Average Unemployment Rate Comparison
U.S., California and San Diego County

Notes: Unemployment rates are measured by calendar year. The rates for 2012 represent January through July figures only.
Source: California Employment Development Department; Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor
San Diego’s median household income has experienced strong annual growth in recent years, but median household income actually declined in 2009, 2010 and 2011 due to high unemployment and constrained consumer spending.

An unintended consequence of the housing market’s recent turmoil has been the improvement in housing affordability during this period. The California Association of Realtors index for first-time buyers throughout California showed a marginal decrease for San Diego for June 2012 (65%) compared to December 2011 (67%). However, the percentage of households that could afford to buy an entry-level home in San Diego for June 2012 show an overall increase to 65% up from 27% in December 2006. The median home price of existing homes sold continues to fluctuate slightly. During 2009 and 2010, median home sales started to rebound from the low experienced at the end of 2008 and early 2009. Median home prices declined marginally in 2011 but are showing moderate improvement in June 2012 compared to June 2011.

Note: Median Household Income is measured by calendar year.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau - American Community Survey

Note: Median home price of all existing homes sold in June of each year.
Source: Data Quick Information Systems
Another measure of the downturn in housing is the rate of foreclosures, as well as the companion indices notices of loan default and deeds recorded (changes in ownership). The number of total deeds recorded has fallen significantly since 2003 from 223,087 to a low 119,933 in 2011, reflecting the continued weakness in the housing market overall. Through June 2012, the number of total deeds recorded was 66,983 up 20% from 55,649 in the first half of 2011.

In San Diego County, notices from lenders to property owners that they were in default on their mortgage loans increased markedly from 2003 through 2009, and foreclosures rose dramatically from 2003 through 2008 before declining 21% in 2009. In 2010, notices of default were down 35.2% and down an additional 11.0% in 2011. In 2010, foreclosures declined 13.0% and down an additional 9.3% in 2011. The percentage of properties with delinquent mortgage loans that went into foreclosure averaged at approximately 11.6% from 2003 through 2005. During the recession, this indicator peaked at 57.5% in 2008 and declined to 55.3% in 2011. Foreclosures compared to total deeds recorded (change in ownership) averaged 0.3% over the three-year period of 2003, 2004 and 2005, then rose significantly beginning in 2006, reaching 16.9% in 2008 declining to 10.2% in 2011.

### San Diego County Total Notices of Default and Foreclosures 2003 Through 2011

![Graph showing the number of default notices and foreclosures from 2003 to 2011.](image)

**Notes:** A Notice of Default is an official notice of payment delinquency to a borrower with property as security under a mortgage or deed of trust; it prescribes the terms that must be met in order to prevent foreclosure proceedings.

Foreclosures are measured by the number of Trustee’s Deeds recorded.

**Source:** San Diego County Assessor/Recorder/County Clerk
San Diego tourism slowed in 2009, with the number of visitors declining by 4.8% compared to 2008; however, tourism improved gradually in 2010 increasing by 0.9%. In 2011, visitor growth improved by 4.3% totaling more than 31 million visitors. Overall, tourism continues to be a stimulus to the local economy. Total visitor spending was approximately $7.5 billion in 2011 up from $7.1 billion in 2010 and up from $7.0 billion in 2009. As of June 2012, growth in visitation to San Diego is expected to slow to 2.2% but total visitor spending is estimated to grow 5.0%. Visitor expenditure levels, however, are anticipated to remain below 2007 levels.

The state of the economy continues to impact the ability of the County to fund and provide many of the services that county residents have come to expect. The revenue and workload effects along with the strategies being employed by the County to manage the public's resources are described in the pages following that summarize the expenditures, revenues and staffing levels for Fiscal Years 2012-13 and 2013-14 and in the individual Group and department presentations that begin on page 115.
Governmental Structure

The County of San Diego is one of 58 counties in the State of California. The basic provisions for the government of the County are contained in the California Constitution and the California Government Code. A county, which is a legal subdivision, is also the largest political division of the State having corporate powers. The California Constitution acknowledges two types of counties - general law counties and charter counties. General law counties adhere to State law as to the number and duties of county elected officials. San Diego County is one of 14 charter counties in California, whereby the county adopts a charter for its own government. A charter, however, does not give county officials any additional authority over local regulations, revenue-raising abilities, budgetary decisions or intergovernmental relations. (Source: California State Association of Counties.)

The Charter of San Diego County provides for:

- The election, compensation, terms, removal and salary of a governing board of five members, elected by district.
- An elected sheriff, an elected district attorney, an elected assessor/recorder/county clerk, an elected treasurer-tax collector, the appointment of other officers, their compensation, terms and removal from office.
- The performance of functions required by statute.
- The powers and duties of governing bodies and all other county officers and the consolidation and segregation of county offices.

The County of San Diego is governed by a five-member Board of Supervisors elected to four-year terms in district, nonpartisan elections. Each board member is limited to no more than two terms and must reside in the district from which he or she is elected. The Board of Supervisors sets priorities for the County and oversees most County departments and programs and approves their budgets. Per California Government Code §23005, the County may exercise its powers only through the Board of Supervisors or through agents and officers acting under authority of the Board or authority conferred by law. The Board of Supervisors appoints the following officers: the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), the County Counsel, the Probation Officer and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. All other appointive officers are appointed by the CAO. The CAO assists the Board of Supervisors in coordinating the functions and operations of the County; is responsible for carrying out all of the Board’s policy decisions that pertain to the functions assigned to that officer; and supervises the expenditures of all departments.

The State Legislature has granted each county the power necessary to provide for the health and well-being of its residents. There are 18 incorporated cities in the County of San Diego and a vast number of unincorporated communities. The County provides a full range of public services to its residents, including law enforcement, detention and correction, emergency response services, health and sanitation, parks and recreation, libraries and roads. The County also serves as a delivery channel for many State services, such as foster care, public health care and elections. These services are provided by five business Groups (Public Safety, Land Use and Environment, Community Services, Finance and General Government and the Health and Human Services Agency), each headed by a General Manager who reports to the CAO. Within the Groups, there are four departments that are headed by elected officials - the District Attorney and the Sheriff in the Public Safety Group and the Assessor/Recorder/County Clerk and the Treasurer-Tax Collector in the Finance and General Government Group. An organizational chart for the County can be found on page 4.

The General Management System

The County’s General Management System (GMS) is the framework that guides the management of County operations and service delivery to residents, businesses and visitors. The GMS identifies how the County sets goals, prioritizes the use of resources, evaluates performance, ensures cooperation and recognizes accomplishments in a structured, coordinated way. By developing and adhering to a written operations manual, the County of San Diego is able to create and maintain an organizational culture that values efficiency, innovation, and fiscal discipline and that provides focused, meaningful public services that improve lives and benefit the community.
At the heart of the GMS are five overlapping components which ensure that the County asks and answers crucial questions:

**Strategic Planning** asks: *Where do we want to go?* The Strategic Plan looks ahead five years to anticipate significant needs, challenges, risks and opportunities that are likely to develop and sets goals for the future. Long-range strategic planning activities require us to assess where the County is and where it wants to be.

**Operational Planning** asks: *How do we get there from here?* Operational Planning allocates resources over the next two fiscal years to specific programs and services that support the County’s long-term goals as articulated in the Strategic Plan. This includes adoption of an annual budget and approval in principle of a second year spending plan.

**Monitoring and Control** asks: *How is our performance?* Monitoring and Control shows whether the County is on track to achieve its goals. The County evaluates its progress frequently, including structured monthly, quarterly, and annual reviews so that necessary adjustments may be made without delay.

**Functional Threading** asks: *Are we working together?* Although the County is divided into groups, departments and divisions for operational purposes, the County has many critical functions and goals that cross these organizational lines. Functional threading ensures that information and resources are coordinated and shared throughout the organization to achieve common goals, solve problems and maximize efficiency.

**Motivation, Rewards and Recognition** asks: *Are we encouraging excellence?* County employees must embrace the GMS disciplines and understand how this system guides the success of County operations and contributes to their success on the job. To encourage excellence, managers must set clear expectations, provide incentives, evaluate performance, and reward those who meet or exceed goals. And County employees meet the challenge by becoming Knowledge Workers who are comfortable with changing technology and who prepare themselves and their departments for changes expected in the future.

The five GMS components form an annual cycle that is renewed each fiscal year with review of the Strategic Plan and development of a new Operational Plan.

**GMS 2.0/2.1**

In Fiscal Year 2008-09, the County launched GMS 2.0, an enterprisewide initiative that challenged County employees to identify and prepare for the significant changes taking place in their workplace, community, economy and world using the GMS framework. GMS 2.0 required County managers and employees to identify: how their units were addressing the region’s increasing need for resource conservation and sustainability and how staff will manage the exploding amount of information available to them to stay on the cutting edge of their fields. In Fiscal Year 2009-10, GMS 2.1 followed on these principles by challenging the workforce to make better use of technology tools to accomplish its goals and to identify how the County can make its operations and the organization more nimble, mobile and adaptable as circumstances and needs change.
GMS 2.0/2.1 emphasizes that everyone in the County workforce shares responsibility for helping the organization adapt to change and move forward in this fast-paced world. Examples of how County employees are embracing GMS 2.0/2.1 and what they have accomplished are now reflected throughout the enterprise. In keeping with the GMS disciplines and our commitment to continuous improvement, the County will continue to look ahead and aggressively embrace, adapt to and use the increasingly fast pace of change to ensure that County services meet residents' needs and provide the best value to taxpayers.

**Context for Strategic and Operational Planning**

To be effective, the goals that the County sets and the resources that are allocated are consistent with the purpose of the organization. The context for all strategic and operational planning is provided by the County’s Vision and Mission. First and foremost, the Strategic Plan sets the course for accomplishing the County’s Vision:

**A county that is safe, healthy and thriving**

By establishing a clear Vision, the County can articulate the strategies and approaches it will take to carry out its Mission. The Mission reflects the County’s commitment to identify, understand and respond to the critical issues that affect county residents as well as to provide services that help make San Diego County an enjoyable area in which to live. The County’s Mission:

**To efficiently provide public services that build strong and sustainable communities**

The County recognizes that "The noblest motive is the public good." As such, there is an ethical obligation and commitment to uphold basic standards as we conduct operations to realize a shared Vision. The County embraces the following values:

- **Integrity** - We are dedicated to the highest ethical standards.
- **Stewardship** - We will ensure responsible stewardship of all that is entrusted to us.
- **Commitment** - We are committed to excellence in all that we do.

**Strategic Plan**

As noted on the previous page, the GMS outlines how County government will operate to ensure that services are provided in an efficient, effective manner. The first thing the County does to ensure that it operates efficiently and effectively is to develop a long-term (five-year) Strategic Plan that sets forth the County's priorities and what it will accomplish with its resources. The Strategic Plan articulates the organization’s external and internal priorities and the goals it will achieve in that period.

The Strategic Plan is developed by the Chief Administrative Officer and the County Executive Team, based on the policies and priorities set by the Board of Supervisors and an enterprise-wide review of the issues, risks and opportunities facing the region and the County organization. In reviewing the Strategic Plan as part of the annual GMS cycle, it was determined that some changes were needed in order to keep up with the changing world we live in and the residents that we serve. These changes were also made to promote increased collaboration between Groups and Departments to better achieve our goals. All County programs support at least one of these three new Strategic Initiatives or the Required Disciplines for Excellence that make achievement of the initiatives possible:

- **Safe Communities** (Promote safe communities),
- **Sustainable Environments** (Support environments that foster viable, livable communities while bolstering economic growth), and
- **Healthy Families** (Make it easier for residents to lead healthy lives while improving opportunities for children and adults).

The Strategic Plan also commits the organization to adhere to eight key internal organizational disciplines that are necessary to maintain a high level of operational excellence and accomplish the Strategic Initiatives. These Required Disciplines for Excellence are:

- **Fiscal Stability** - Maintain fiscal stability to ensure services that customers rely on, in good times and in bad.
- **Customer Satisfaction** - Ensure customers are provided with superior services.
- **Regional Leadership** - As a regional leader, the County forges cooperative partnerships and leverages additional resources for residents.
- **Skilled, Adaptable and Diverse Workforce** - Develop a committed, skilled, adaptable and diverse workforce that turns plans and resources into achievement and success.
- **Essential Infrastructure** - Provide the essential infrastructure to ensure superior service delivery to our residents.
- **Accountability, Transparency and Ethical Conduct** - Ensure accountability to ourselves and the public by requiring that County business be conducted as openly as possible, resulting in the efficient and ethical use of public funds.
Continuous Improvement and Innovation - Achieve operational efficiency through continuous efforts to improve and innovate, thereby maximizing value for taxpayers.

Information Services - The County of San Diego will be the center of Information Services innovation for advancing the delivery of County services, anytime and anywhere.

To ensure that the Strategic Plan incorporates a fiscal perspective, the CAO, Chief Financial Officer and General Managers annually assess the long-term fiscal health of the County and review a five-year forecast of revenues and expenditures to which all departments contribute. This process leads to the development of preliminary short and medium-term operational objectives and the resource allocations necessary to achieve them.

Operational Plan

The Operational Plan provides the County’s financial plan for the next two fiscal years (e.g., July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2014). However, pursuant to Government Code §29000 et seq., State law allows the Board of Supervisors to formally adopt only the first year of the Operational Plan as the County’s budget. The Board approves the second year of the plan in principle for planning purposes. To demonstrate that resources are allocated to support the County’s Strategic Plan goals, all program objectives in the Operational Plan and department performance measures are aligned with the Strategic Plan Initiatives and/or the Required Disciplines for Excellence.

The five business Groups and their respective departments develop specific objectives as part of the preparation of the Operational Plan. Objectives are clear discussions of anticipated levels of achievement for the next two years. They communicate the entity’s core services and organizational priorities. The objectives include measurable targets for accomplishing specific goals plus a discussion of the resources necessary to meet those goals. The Operational Plan also details each department’s major accomplishments during the past fiscal year as related to achievement of the goals laid out in the County’s five-year Strategic Plan.

Performance Measurement

Since Fiscal Year 2005-06, the County has undertaken an extensive effort to demonstrate performance to citizens through reporting meaningful and uncomplicated performance measures. The focus was shifted from reporting on what was happening to the organization, to what is happening in the lives of citizens, customers and stakeholders because of County services. This effort remains a priority and each department is required to measure performance in terms of outcomes - how they affect peoples' lives - not just a count of the activities they perform. The most significant measures are reflected in this document as part of the respective narrative section of each department’s budget presentation.

Budget Documents

Several documents are produced to aid in budget development and deliberations:

The CAO Proposed Operational Plan is a comprehensive overview of the Chief Administrative Officer’s (CAO) proposed plan for the County’s operations for the next two fiscal years. It is submitted to the Board of Supervisors in mid-May of each year. It includes:

- Summary tables outlining financing sources and expenditures for all County funds, plus an overview of staffing levels.
- A summary of the County’s projected reserves, debt management policies and short-term and long-term financial obligations.
- A detailed section by Group/Agency and Department/Program describing each entity’s functions, mission, current fiscal year anticipated accomplishments, operating objectives for the two upcoming fiscal years, and performance measures and staffing by program, expenditures by category, revenue amounts and sources.
- An explanation of the capital program planning process along with a description of the capital projects with new appropriations proposed, the operating impact of the capital projects scheduled for completion during the next two fiscal years, and budget summaries for capital projects by fund.
- Other supporting material including budget summaries, a glossary and an index.

Public Review and Hearings — Prior to adopting a budget, the Board of Supervisors conducts public hearings for 10 calendar days. Pursuant to California Government Code §29081, budget hearings may be continued from day to day until concluded, but not to exceed a total of 14 calendar days. This process commences with presentations by community organizations that have applied for grant funds.

Performance Measurement

Since Fiscal Year 2005-06, the County has undertaken an extensive effort to demonstrate performance to citizens through reporting meaningful and uncomplicated performance measures. The focus was shifted from reporting on
available through the Community Enhancement Program. Public hearings on the Operational Plan begin during the first half of June.

All requests for increases to the CAO Proposed Operational Plan, whether they come from Board members, County staff, County advisory boards or members of the public, must be submitted to the Clerk of the Board in writing by the close of public hearings.

**Change Letters** are proposed changes to the CAO Proposed Operational Plan submitted by the CAO and members of the Board of Supervisors. The CAO Change Letter updates the CAO Proposed Operational Plan with information that becomes available after the latter document is presented to the Board of Supervisors. Such modifications may be due to Board actions that occurred subsequent to the submission of the CAO Proposed Operational Plan or recent changes in State or federal funding. The CAO Change Letter typically contains a schedule of revisions by department along with explanatory text.

**Referrals to Budget** are items on which the Board of Supervisors has deferred action during the current fiscal year so that they may be considered in the context of the overall budget. Each business Group tracks its referrals to budget. As Budget Deliberations approach, the status of each referral is updated and included in a compilation of all the referrals made throughout the year. This document is submitted to the Board of Supervisors for its review and action during Budget Deliberations.

**Citizen Advisory Board Statements** are the comments of citizen committees on the CAO Proposed Operational Plan.

**Budget Deliberations** — After the conclusion of public hearings, the Board of Supervisors discusses the CAO Proposed Operational Plan, requested amendments and public testimony with the CAO and other County officials as necessary. Based on these discussions, the Board gives direction to the CAO regarding the expenditure and revenue levels to be included in the adopted Operational Plan. Board of Supervisors Budget Deliberations are usually completed by the end of June.

**Referrals from Budget** are requests made by the Board of Supervisors during Budget Deliberations for additional information to assist them in making decisions during the fiscal year. The applicable business Group is responsible for providing requested information to the Board of Supervisors.

The **Adopted Operational Plan** shows the Board of Supervisors’ adopted budget for the immediate budget year and the plan approved in principle for the following year. The Adopted Operational Plan is an update of the CAO Proposed Operational Plan reflecting revisions made by the Board of Supervisors during Budget Deliberations. Unlike the CAO Proposed Operational Plan, which displays the two prior fiscal years’ adopted budgets and the proposed amounts for the two upcoming fiscal years, the Adopted Operational Plan provides perspective by displaying actual expenditures and revenue at the Group/Agency and Department level for the two prior fiscal years, as well as the adopted and amended budget for the immediate prior fiscal year. The amended budget for each department is the budget at the end of the fiscal year. It reflects the adopted budget plus any amounts carried forward from the previous year through the encumbrance process and any changes that were authorized during the year. Any budget-to-actual comparisons are best made using the amended budget as a base.

**Note on Actual General Purpose Revenue and Use of Fund Balance in departmental tables** - Each department’s budget table shows the funding sources for its programs for the indicated budget years, including various categories of program revenues, fund balance, fund balance component decreases and General Purpose Revenue Allocation. For any given budget year, the amount of the general purpose revenue allocation is intended to be fixed, meaning that the amount is anticipated to be the same for the adopted budget, the amended budget and the actuals. Exceptions are made due to unique one-time events. In the case of the use of fund balance, the amount in the actual column may be either positive or negative. The sum of the actual fund balance, any fund balance component decreases and the general purpose revenue allocation equals the total amount of nonprogram revenue funding sources used to support the actual expenditures of the department.

**Budget Modifications** — State Law permits modifications to the adopted budget during the year with approval by the Board of Supervisors or, in certain instances, by the Auditor and Controller. There are two options for requesting a mid-year budget adjustment from the Board of Supervisors:

- **Board of Supervisors Regular Agenda Process** — Budget modifications are generally made due to unforeseen and program-specific changes. In compliance with Government Code §29130, increases in appropriations require a four-fifths vote by the Board of Supervisors after the budget is adopted. Such changes could include requests for additional appropriations as a result of additional revenues for specific programs or a contract modification. Items placed on the agenda that have a fiscal or budgetary impact are reviewed and approved by the Chief Finan-
cial Officer. Contract modifications also require the approval of the Purchasing Agent. County Counsel reviews and approves all Board letters.

- **Quarterly Status Reports** — The CAO provides a quarterly budget status report to the Board of Supervisors that may also recommend appropriation changes to address unanticipated needs or make technical adjustments to the budget. These reports are placed on the Board of Supervisors regular agenda and are also posted on the Auditor and Controller's website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 23</td>
<td>Narrative instructions for Operational Plan issued by Office of Financial Planning (OFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 6</td>
<td>Budget instructions for Operational Plan issued by OFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 13</td>
<td>Budget database opens for Operational Plan development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 29</td>
<td>Due date for departments to submit draft Anticipated Accomplishments, Objectives and Performance Measures sections of narratives to OFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 16</td>
<td>Budget database closed to departments to enable business Groups (Groups) to review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 26</td>
<td>Deadline for departments to submit their budget changes from current year adopted budget plus their final Anticipated Accomplishments, Objectives and Performance Measures sections of narratives to their Group Finance Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 29</td>
<td>Budget database closed to Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 4</td>
<td>Deadline for Groups to have all department narratives reviewed and submitted to OFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 24</td>
<td>Draft copy of balanced CAO Proposed Operational Plan sent to Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), Assistant CAO, Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and General Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 30</td>
<td>CAO Proposed Operational Plan docketed and released to the Board of Supervisors and public Change Letter Instructions issued by OFP and budget database opens for modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors accepts CAO Proposed Operational Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>OFP sends request to Groups for Referrals to Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>Budget Change Letter database closed to departments to enable final review by Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>Department Change Letter narratives due to Groups for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>Budget Change Letter database closed to Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25</td>
<td>Deadline for Groups to submit responses to Referrals to Budget to OFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30</td>
<td>Deadline for Groups to have all departments' Change Letter narratives reviewed and submitted to OFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 11-20</td>
<td>Public Hearings on CAO Proposed Operational Plan (10 calendar days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 20</td>
<td>Last day for Citizen Advisory Committees to submit statements to the Clerk of the Board The CAO Change Letter to be filed with the Clerk of the Board; all other proposals from Board members or the public to increase the CAO Proposed Operational Plan are due to the Clerk of the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 26-27</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Budget Deliberations and approval of the 2012-14 Operational Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 7</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors adopts Fiscal Year 2012-13 Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operational Plan Format

Introduction - County Overview

This Operational Plan provides the financial plan for the County of San Diego for the next two fiscal years - July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2014. The introductory portion of the document highlights the following:

- Board of Supervisors and Organizational Chart
- Message from the Chief Administrative Officer
- Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget at a Glance
- County Profile, County History and Economic Indicators
- Governmental Structure, Budget Documents and Financial Planning Calendar
- Appropriations and Funding Sources for all funds and the General Fund
- Staffing
- Financial Policies
- Financial Obligations and Debt Service
- Recognition of County Performance

Groups and Departments

This section highlights the five business groups and the departments in each group. The following information is presented:

- **Group Description**
  Highlights the responsibilities of the group/department and some of the programs it operates or the major functions it performs.

- **Department Description**

- **Mission Statement**
  A clear and concise statement of the overall purpose and general assignment of the group or department.
2011-12 Accomplishments

Brief descriptions of the group's/department's accomplishments for Fiscal Year 2011-12. The discussions address the progress made on the 2011-13 Objectives reported in the prior fiscal year and include the final results based on the actual work completed. Accomplishments are categorized by the County’s Strategic Initiatives or Required Disciplines for Excellence.

2012-14 Objectives

Group's/department's key goals and priorities for the next two fiscal years and statements on how they will be achieved. Each objective is linked to one of the County's Strategic Initiatives or Required Disciplines for Excellence and focuses on the outcome desired by the work performed.

Related Links

The County's website for the group/department. Some departments list additional websites that may be of interest to the reader.

Performance Measures

Each department's key performance measures are outlined in a table format. The department's progress in achieving its goals and objectives is depicted over time. Data include past performance, current year goals and the actual results, as well as approved targets for the next two fiscal years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defined Measure . .</td>
<td>90% of xxx</td>
<td>92% of xxx</td>
<td>92% of xxx</td>
<td>94% of xxx</td>
<td>94% of xxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Notes

Footnotes to the Performance Measures table which provide additional details to explain or clarify a measure or the measurement data.

Budget Changes and Operational Impact: 2011-12 to 2012-13

Detailed explanations of the budget changes in staffing, expenditures and revenues from the prior year's adopted budget to the newly adopted budget. Dollar changes are rounded. Therefore, the sum of the individual expenditure and revenue categories may not equal the total change for the overall expenditures and revenues.

Budget Changes and Operational Impact: 2012-13 to 2013-14

A brief narrative description of significant changes in staffing, expenditures and revenues from the first year of the Adopted Operational Plan to the second year of the two-year plan.

Budget Tables

Tables of comparative data on staffing, expenditures and revenues are presented for each group and department. The following page provides an example of the table format which includes Fiscal Year 2010-11 Actuals; the Adopted Budget, Amended Budget and Actuals for Fiscal Year 2011-12; the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget; and the Approved Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-14.
### Sample Budget Tables

#### Staffing by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Budget by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Budget by Categories of Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries &amp; Benefits</th>
<th>Services &amp; Supplies</th>
<th>Other Charges</th>
<th>Capital Asset Equipment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Budget by Categories of Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxes Current Property</th>
<th>Licenses, Permits &amp; Franchises</th>
<th>Charges for Current Services</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Revenues</th>
<th>Other Financing Sources</th>
<th>Use of Fund Balance</th>
<th>General Purpose Revenue Allocation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Operational Plan Format

Capital Program

This section of the Operational Plan discusses the County’s Capital Program - its structure, funds, policies and procedures. Details are provided for the following:

- Capital Appropriations — Discusses new appropriations to the capital budget for Fiscal Years 2012-14, including the amount and purpose of each capital item.
- Operating Impact of Capital Program — A summary of the potential impact on the operating budget is presented for a handful of capital projects that are scheduled for completion during Fiscal Years 2012-14.
- Tables summarizing the Capital Program budget, including the budget by fund, by categories of expenditures and revenues, and the revenue detail. Data include Fiscal Year 2010-11 Actuals; Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget, Amended Budget and Actuals; Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget; and the Fiscal Year 2013-14 Approved Budget.
  - Tables are presented for each fund within the Capital Program that has budgeted appropriations for the fiscal years presented, which may include any or all of the following funds: Capital Outlay, County Health Complex, Justice Facility Construction, Multiple Species Conservation Program, Library Projects and Edgemoor Development.
  - Information includes: Budget by Categories of Expenditures; Project Details listing each capital project by name and number; and Funding Source which provides all funding sources and lists each project funded by each source.
  - Data include Fiscal Year 2010-11 Actuals; Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget, Amended Budget and Actuals; Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget; and the Fiscal Year 2013-14 Approved Budget.
- Lease Payments — Details lease payment expenditures, revenues and funding sources for the same fiscal years as described above.
- Outstanding Capital Projects by Group/Agency — Total appropriations and the remaining balance for each capital project within each business group is displayed, along with the fiscal year the project was established.

Finance Other

This component of the document highlights miscellaneous funds and programs that are predominantly Countywide in nature, have no staffing associated with them or exist for proper budgetary accounting purposes.

Appendices

- Appendices A, B and C present tables of data which include Fiscal Year 2010-11 Actuals; Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget, Amended Budget and Actuals; Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget; and the Fiscal Year 2013-14 Approved Budget.
  - Appendix A: All Funds - Budget Summary - Tables outline staff years and expenditures and revenues by category for each business group, the Capital Program and Finance Other.
  - Appendix B: Budget Summary of All Funds - Tables of Countywide appropriations by fund type and appropriations by fund type within each business group, the Capital Program and Finance Other.
  - Appendix C: General Fund Budget Summary - Tables of General Fund expenditures for each department within each business group and for Finance Other; also provided are financing sources by category for the total General Fund.
- Appendix D: Health & Human Services - Regional Operations - Tables depict staff years and total appropriations by type of program or administrative service for the Regional Operations division of the Health and Human Services Agency.
- Appendix E: Operational Plan Abbreviations and Acronyms - Common abbreviations and acronyms referenced in the plan.
- Appendix F: Glossary of Operational Plan Terms - Explanations of key terms used in the document and during the budget process.
- Index: An alphabetical listing of key topics and the page reference for each.
All Funds: Total Appropriations

Total Appropriations by Group/Agency

Appropriations total $4.85 billion in the Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $4.65 billion for Fiscal Year 2013-14. This is a decrease of $14.4 million or 0.3% for Fiscal Year 2012-13 from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget. Looking at the Operational Plan by Group/Agency, appropriations decrease in Land Use and Environment, Finance and General Government, the Capital Program and Finance Other, while they are increasing in Public Safety, Health and Human Services and Community Services.

The pie chart above shows each Group/Agency’s share of the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget, while the bar chart and table on the following page compare the Fiscal Years 2012-13 and 2013-14 appropriations to the two prior fiscal years. The percentage change is also calculated for the variance between Fiscal Years 2012-13 Adopted Budget and the 2011-12 Adopted Budget. An overview of the County’s Operational Plan for Fiscal Year 2012-13 is presented below by Group/Agency and highlights changes and key areas of focus. Appendix A: All Funds - Budget Summary, provides a summary of expenditures and financing sources by account group for the entire County and for each Group and the Agency. More detail by department begins on page 115.

Note: In charts, the sum of individual percentages may not total 100.0% due to rounding. Also, in tables, the sum of individual figures within a column may not equal the total for that column due to rounding.
Public Safety Group (PSG) — A net increase of 4.2% or $59.1 million from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget. The increase primarily relates to increased costs reflecting negotiated labor agreements and increases in County retirement contributions, growth in Proposition 172, the Local Public Safety Protection and Improvement Act of 1993, funding, additional service requirements due to the transfer of responsibilities for offenders from the State to the counties, and the planned use of one-time resources. Reductions in State funding and the expiration of funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 are recognized. All mandated services are maintained.

Major changes include:

- Resources and services to address the transfer of responsibility for certain offenders from the State to the counties pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 109, Public Safety Realignment (2011). As outlined in State budget bills, funds to support services and activities required by counties due to Public Safety Realignment are allocated to the Local Community Corrections Account within each county’s County Local Revenue Fund.
Increased services include supervision of offenders, costs associated with the custody of offenders, including food and medical costs, and resources for services including mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment, vocational and behavioral services.

- Transition planning for the staffing and operation of the Women’s Detention Facility.
- Increase in sworn supervisory positions at patrol stations in the unincorporated area. Increases to support hiring and training activities in the Sheriff, and to support Emergency Planning, Crime Lab and Records, Inmate Welfare and the operations in support of the Regional Communications System.
- Resources to fund the replacement of the conventional radio system providing support to critical public fire-safety voice communications for local and statewide mutual aid response to emergencies throughout the county.
- The implementation of a public defense internship pilot program and adjustments in public defense to allow positions to be filled at authorized levels as required by the volume and complexity of cases.
- Reductions in amounts allocated for one-time expenditures in the previous fiscal year.

The departments within the Public Safety Group will continue to provide core services, supporting safe and livable communities for the residents of San Diego County and operating an efficient and responsive criminal justice system.

Key areas of focus include:
- Promoting strategies that prevent crime and make neighborhoods safe places to live, work and play.
- Promoting and implementing strategies that protect residents from crime, including proactive law enforcement and monitoring of offenders subject to community supervision.
- Providing for a strong, collaborative criminal justice system that holds offenders accountable.
- Reducing recidivism by implementing treatment strategies that help offenders successfully reenter society.
- Continuing to strengthen the County’s and communities’ ability to prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters.
- Promoting the well-being of children and the self-sufficiency of families through the success of the child support program.
- Leveraging new technology innovations to improve service delivery and operational efficiency.

Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) - A net increase of 0.5% or $9.0 million from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget. The increase relates to the increase in staff years as well as increases in wage and benefit costs that reflect negotiated labor agreements and increases in retirement contributions, and costs associated with contracted services and client payments. Reductions in funding and caseloads are also recognized as well as the implementation of Assembly Bill (AB) 118, Local Revenue Fund 2011, which shifts State financial responsibility of various services to counties, funded with a dedicated portion of sales tax.

Major changes include:
- Ongoing implementation of Assembly Bill (AB) 109, Public Safety Realignment, in partnership with Probation and the community for the provision of mental and substance abuse services.
- Increase in In-Home Supportive Services associated with the sunset of a State imposed reduction of hours.
- Increase associated with Aid to Adoptive Children payments and expansion of services to emancipated youth under the Transitional Housing Program.
- Decrease in Mental Health Services contracts and in Child Welfare Services due to the San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) assuming responsibility for provision of Emotionally Related Mental Health Services in the schools.
- Decrease in CalWORKs Assistance payments, and Foster Care payments to align with projected caseload costs.

A major goal in the development of the Agency’s operational plan is to advance the Live Well, San Diego! initiative. In that endeavor, HHSA has pursued and acquired grants that will help improve the health and well-being of San Diego’s communities and citizens. As in the past, HHSA continues to work with advisory boards and other key stakeholders in these efforts.

Key areas of focus include:

Continue implementation of Phrase 1 and develop framework for Phase 2 of Live Well, San Diego! to achieve the vision of healthy, safe and thriving communities by:
- Building a better service delivery system that is innovative and outcome-driven.
- Implement Year 1 of the Community Transformation Grant (CTG) to support public health efforts to reduce chronic diseases, promote healthier lifestyles, reduce health disparities and decrease health care costs.
Implement the Community Based Care Transition program to reduce readmissions to hospitals by Medicare recipients.

Evaluate data from the two pilot programs integrating physical and behavioral health services.

Establish the Extended Foster Care program, an outcome from Assembly Bill 12, The California Fostering Connections to Success Act, to extend foster care to 21 years of age.

Supporting positive choices that empower residents to take responsibility for their own health and well-being.

Implement Year 1 of the Community Nutrition Education Program (CNEP) grant to increase access and nutrition education for CalFresh eligible or potentially eligible clients.

Pursuing policy and environmental changes that make it easier for people to engage in healthy and safe behaviors.

Complete and document community input to the six regional Live Well, San Diego! plans by using the MAPP process from the National Association of County and City Health Officials.

Improving the culture from within by increasing employees’ knowledge on how to incorporate health and safety.

Implement second phase of the succession plan to advance Live Well, San Diego!

Advancing operational excellence by ensuring fiscal stability, customer service, leadership, accountability and transparency, continuous improvement and workforce excellence.

Begin improvements to Family Resource Centers and ACCESS (a public benefits transaction call center), including increasing accuracy of payment, and technological enhancements to improve customer service.

Implement Year 1 of the SNAP grant to implement a system for electronic documents conversion and tracking, and to help reduce processing time and minimize lost documents.

Begin phase 2 of the Knowledge Integration Project (KIP) to develop the foundation for information exchange across multiple disciplines to improve the information available and coordinate services for shared clients.

Complete co-location of Public Administrator/Public Guardian with Mental Health Conservatorship to improve service coordination.

Land Use and Environment Group (LUEG) - A net decrease of 6.2 or $26.1 million from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget. Significant decreases are in: right-of-way acquisition costs for Bear Valley Parkway; completion of capital projects in the County of San Diego Sanitation District and Airports; completion of grant funded contracts; one-time costs for completion of several business process reengineering projects and reductions in staffing.

Major changes include:

- Reductions in the Road Fund Detail Work Program’s construction and consulting contracts resulting from near completion of Proposition 1B, Transportation Bond Act, funded projects.
- One-time funding in the Watershed Protection Program for new Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load requirements by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- One-time funds for major maintenance projects identified in the facility conditions assessment program and for upgrades for the Agua Caliente Park Water, Sewer and Electrical Line Replacement project.
- Decrease in one-time funds due to completion of the Mobile Source Emission Reduction Incentive Programs.
- One-time funding for the completion for the final phase of the Business Case Management System - Accela, (BCMS) and associated online reporting tools.

Key areas of focus include:

- Improving the land development process overall, as well as the associated customer experience and streamlining permit processing.
- Continuing business process reengineering efforts to develop new online tools that will streamline processes and improve customer service.
- Working on the Property Specific Requests for a General Plan Amendment.
- Protecting public health and helping to prevent disease via education and awareness of vector-borne diseases and proper disposal of household hazardous, electronic and universal waste.
- Protecting San Diego County’s $1.65 billion agricultural industry from damaging pests, noxious nonnative weeds and diseases.
- Awarding and managing construction contracts for road improvement projects in various county communities to enhance safety and improve traffic flow.
- Expanding and protecting park resources, improving infrastructure and acquiring additional parkland throughout the county.
Preserving and enhancing the quality of life for county residents by implementing habitat conservation programs such as the Multiple Species Conservation Program, Special Area Management Plan and Resource Management Plans.

- Completing required toxic air contaminant emission health risk assessments to verify compliance of new and expanding businesses with health risk standards.
- Protecting and preserving the county’s water quality and watersheds.

**Community Services Group (CSG) - A net increase of 5.7% or $16.4 million from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget.**

The increase is due to a major upgrade of the Documentum Enterprise Content Management application, the use of loans from the California Energy Commission to finance energy-efficiency projects, State CalHome grant funding for down payment and closing costs assistance to eligible first-time homebuyers, and increases in wage and benefit costs that reflect negotiated labor agreements and increases in County retirement contributions. Offsetting the increases in program appropriations is a decrease of $7.6 million in elections’ costs due to the scheduled February 2012 Presidential Primary.

**Major changes include:**

- Major upgrade of the Documentum Enterprise Content Management application.
- Conducting one election in Fiscal Year 2012-13 (two primaries were budgeted in Fiscal Year 2011-12).
- Use of loans from the California Energy Commission to finance energy-efficiency projects.
- Increased costs of major maintenance and energy-efficiency projects, routine maintenance and contracted services for County-owned facilities.
- Higher demand for fuel and higher fuel costs.
- Dissolution of the County of San Diego Redevelopment Agency and subsequent budgeting and management of the Successor Agency. Effective February 1, 2012, all California redevelopment agencies were dissolved and their assets, obligations and programs were transferred to successor agencies, usually the sponsoring agency. The County of San Diego elected to be the Successor Agency for the former Redevelopment Agency.

**Key areas of focus include:**

- Conducting the November 2012 Primary Elections.
- Maintaining library hours to provide patron access to library materials and services.
- Completing the Lincoln Acres library, replacing a much older and smaller facility.
- Providing resources to homeless families exiting from transitional housing.
- Assisting first-time homebuyers with down payment and closing costs assistance with a combination of State and federal grant funding.
- Savings in the purchase and contracting of goods and services for all County departments through innovative procurement methods.
- Design and construction of capital improvements for the new Women’s Detention Facility, the County Administration Center Waterfront Park and related new parking garage at Cedar and Kettner streets in downtown San Diego, moving County staff into Phase 1B of the County Operations Center development in Kearny Mesa, and the new Rancho San Diego Sheriff’s Station.
- Improving animal shelters and the medical treatment of animals to make them adoptable sooner.

**Finance and General Government Group (FGG) - A net decrease of 6.2% or $22.4 million from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget.**

The decrease is mainly due to the completion of one-time funding of major enterprise information technology (IT) projects in Fiscal Year 2011-12 partially offset by smaller IT projects in Fiscal Year 2012-13. There are also offsetting increases in staffing costs due to an increase in staff years and for retirement costs related to existing positions.

**Major changes include:**

- A reduction of funding to reflect the fact that the Integrated Property Tax System (IPTS) project initiated in Fiscal Year 2011-12 is not anticipated to require additional appropriations in Fiscal Year 2012-13.
- An increase in planned IT services for a number of County departments through the County’s information technology outsourcing contract.
- An increase in staff years for property appraisal activities countywide and for restored clerk service levels in one branch office of the Assessor/Recorder/County Clerk.

**Key areas of focus include:**

- Maintaining the County’s fiscal stability through active monitoring of economic conditions, sound accounting, auditing, budgetary practices and management discipline, including continued assurance of accountability and transparency in the use of federal economic stimulus funds.
- Maintaining a robust, diverse and adaptable workforce.
Aggressively pursuing opportunities to restructure the County’s debt portfolio to maximize taxpayer savings.

Maintaining a strong Treasurer’s Investment Pool.

Developing a new Integrated Property Tax System.

Completing upgrades to the County’s key financial systems, including the enterprise budget software system, the imaging system for supporting financial documents, and the system used for information technology billing purposes.

Providing the highest quality legal services to the Board of Supervisors and County departments.

Maintaining the investment in modern information technology.

**Capital Program** - A decrease of 26.0% or $33.0 million from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget. The amount budgeted in the Capital Program for Capital Projects can vary significantly from year to year. The Fiscal Year 2012-13 Capital Program includes the following capital projects:

- $35.4 million for the Cedar and Kettner Development.
- $27.6 million for the East Mesa Detention Re-Entry and Rehabilitation Facility.
- $10.0 million for the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP).
- $8.0 million for the HHSA, PSG, CSG Office Relocation project.
- $2.0 million for the Agua Caliente Park Water, Sewer and Electrical Line Replacement project.
- $0.9 million for the County Administration Center Waterfront Park.
- $0.1 million for Rainbow County Park improvements.

- $0.1 million for the Mountain Empire (Campo) Community Center playground.$0.1 million for Spring Valley Park LED Lighting and Landscaping.

The Capital Program also includes appropriations for the Edgemoor Development Fund to pay debt service on the 2005 and 2006 Edgemoor Certificates of Participation and other costs to maintain the Edgemoor property.

In Fiscal Year 2013-14, appropriations decrease $81.8 million, and the program includes funding of $2.5 million for MSCP.

**Finance Other** - A decrease of 5.3% or $17.6 million from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget. Many of the appropriations in this group vary little from year to year, but some appropriations reported here are one-time and can fluctuate significantly. One-time appropriations in Fiscal Year 2011-12 included $70.0 million for the Women’s Detention Facility replacement project, $10.0 million for Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), $0.5 million for the Agua Caliente Park Cabins and $0.46 million for the Long-Term Animal Care Facility.

In the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted budget, the General Fund contribution to the Capital Program continues to include appropriations for MSCP of $10.0 million, $27.6 million loan for the East Mesa Detention Re-Entry and Rehabilitation Facility, $8.0 million for the HHSA, PSG, CSG Office Relocation, and $2.0 million for the Agua Caliente Park Water, Sewer and Electrical Line Replacement project. In addition, lease payments for certain long-term lease obligations have increased by $4.4 million and a one-time appropriation of $9.7 million is budgeted to fund future capital projects or anticipated higher payments to the retirement fund in future years. See page 433 for the details of the budget for Finance Other.
Total Appropriations by Category of Expenditure

The pie chart below shows the Adopted Budget broken down by category of expenditure. As noted previously, the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget is decreasing overall by $14.4 million from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget and decreasing further by $195.2 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14.

Total Appropriations by Category of Expenditure
Fiscal Year 2012-13: $4.85 billion

- Salaries & Benefits: $1,697.3M (35.0%)
- Services & Supplies: $1,881.0M (38.8%)
- Operating Transfers Out: $376.4M (7.8%)
- Other Charges: $736.4M (15.2%)
- Remaining Categories: $154.1M (3.2%)

The changes by category are summarized as follows:

- **Salaries and Benefits** are increasing overall by a net $41.8 million or 2.5% in Fiscal Year 2012-13. This change reflects higher retirement contribution requirements, negotiated reductions in the County funding of the employee share of retirement costs, negotiated benefit increases and an increase of 323.50 staff years. The current labor contracts are effective through June 23, 2013, except for the Deputy Sheriffs’ Association (DSA) contract which is effective through June 26, 2014. All contracts include increases in flexible benefit credits effective January 2013; and further negotiated reductions in the County funding of the employee share of retirement costs. There is no increase in base pay. In addition, current contracts for six bargaining units of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 221, include a one-time monetary payment equivalent to 1% of base pay in Fiscal Year 2012-13.

In Fiscal Year 2013-14, Salaries and Benefits are increasing by a net of $64.1 million or 3.8%, which reflects anticipated higher retirement contribution requirements, a 1% negotiated wage increase in base pay for the DSA bargaining unit, an increase in flexible benefit credits for the DSA bargaining unit effective January 2014, and a net increase of 104.00 staff years. See Total Staffing on page 54 for a summary of staffing changes by business group.
Services and Supplies are increasing by a net of $29.5 million or 1.6%. This category accounts for expenditures for items such as office supplies, contracted services, facility leases, facility maintenance, minor equipment, utility usage, services provided by internal service funds and various other requirements. While individual accounts are increasing or decreasing by varying amounts, the most significant changes include a $41.3 million decrease due to the reduction of one-time appropriations for the Integrated Property Tax System, a $5.9 million increase to replace the conventional radio system, a $16.9 million increase for services supporting Public Safety Realignment, a $7.9 million increase for Mental Health Services Act programs, an increase of $7.5 million in health care administration and primary care services contracts, and an
increase in information technology costs of $13.3 million and a corresponding increase in the Information Technology Internal Service Fund of $12.7 million.

A decrease of $116.2 million or 6.2% in Fiscal Year 2013-14, is primarily due to completion of one-time expenditures in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and redirection of resources to address anticipated increases in retirement contributions.

- **Other Charges** are decreasing by $34.5 million or 4.5%. This category includes items such as aid payments, debt service payments, interest expense, right-of-way easement purchases and various other payments including contributions to trial courts and grants to organizations participating in the Community Enhancement and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Programs. The decreases are primarily due to reduced funding from CalWORKs ($8.6 million), Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children ($10.8 million), foster care ($5.5 million), and completion of the Bear Valley Parkway right-of-way acquisition ($9.6 million).

A net decrease of $10.0 million or 1.4% is projected in Fiscal Year 2013-14 due to decreases in certain scheduled lease payments and reduction of the Homeland Security Grant grant funding.

- **Operating Transfers Out**, the accounting vehicle for transferring the resources of one fund to pay for activities in another, is increasing by $7.1 million or 1.9%. The most significant increases are in the Public Safety Group in the Proposition 172, Local Public Safety Protection and Improvement Act of 1993, special revenue fund for transfer to the General Fund; in Community Services largely in General Services due to project management labor provided for the Major Maintenance Improvement Program projects, in Purchasing and Contracting for one-time costs for the Document 6.7 version upgrade; and in Finance Other for appropriations to fund anticipated one-time capital projects, for the East Mesa Detention Re-Entry and Rehabilitation Facility, the Registrar of Voter’s Relocation, the Agua Caliente Park Water, Sewer and Electrical Line Replacement and for the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The most significant decrease is in Finance Other and is due to the nonrecurrence of one-time funding for the Women’s Detention Facility capital project ($70.0 million).

A decrease of $23.0 million or 6.1% is projected for Fiscal Year 2013-14, and is due to the nonrecurrence of one-time items from the prior year, including a $7.5 million decrease for MSCP and an $8.7 million decrease for funding future capital projects.

- **Capital Assets/Land Acquisition**, which includes capital improvement projects and property acquisitions, is decreasing by $44.8 million or 32.5% from Fiscal Year 2011-12. Appropriations vary from year to year depending upon the cost of the projects being funded. Of the $93.0 million budgeted for Fiscal Year 2012-13, $83.3 million is for projects in the Capital Program, $8.0 million is for the Registrar of Voters’ relocation, upgrading Fleet facilities and improving tenant areas for County Mail Services, Sheriff Transportation and Probation Work Projects, with the remainder for projects in the Airport Enterprise Fund and in the San Diego County Sanitation District. Specifically, the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Capital Program includes $27.6 million for the East Mesa Detention Re-Entry and Rehabilitation Facility, $27.1 million for the Cedar and Kettner Development, $10.0 million for land acquisition for MSCP and $2.0 million for the Agua Caliente Park Water, Sewer and Electrical Line Replacement project. A decrease of $82.9 million or 89.1% is projected for Fiscal Year 2013-14. $2.5 million is planned for MSCP land acquisition.

- **Capital Assets Equipment** is increasing by $2.3 million or 10.1% from last year. This account primarily includes routine internal service fund purchases of replacement vehicles and heavy equipment. It may also include appropriations for information technology hardware and communications equipment. Amounts may vary from year to year. A decrease of $7.8 million is expected for Fiscal Year 2013-14.

- **Expenditure Transfers and Reimbursements** are increasing by $9.5 million or 47.1%. Activity in this account reflects the transfer of expenses to another department within the same fund for services provided. A transfer can occur because a department’s funding source requires the expenses to be recorded in that department for revenue claiming purposes, although the actual services are being provided by another department.

The Expenditure Transfers and Reimbursement accounts are negative amounts to avoid the duplication of expenditures. One significant example is the agreement between the Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) and the District Attorney for Public Assistance Fraud investigation services. The District Attorney investigates and prosecutes suspected fraudulent public assistance cases for HHSA. The District Attorney offsets the budgeted expenses with a negative amount in the Expenditure Transfers and Reimbursements account. HHSA budgets the expense for that activity in...
a Services and Supplies account offset by the appropriate State or federal revenue account. In Fiscal Year 2012-13, $3.0 million in HHSA expenditures are associated with the reimbursement for services under Public Safety Realignment through the Probation Department.

**Contingency Reserves** are appropriations that are set aside for unanticipated needs during the year. In Fiscal Year 2012-13, three funds have a contingency reserve. The General Fund contingency reserve remains at $20.0 million. See the discussion of the General Fund Contingency Reserve in the Finance Other section on page 485. The Employee Benefits Internal Service Fund contingency reserve increases to $2.0 million from $1.7 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13. The Fleet Internal Service Fund contingency reserve is budgeted at $0.1 million, which is unchanged from Fiscal Year 2011-12.

**Fund Balance Component Increases** (formerly Reserve/Designation Increase) can vary from year to year depending upon the need to set aside fund balance for specific future uses. In Fiscal Year 2012-13, fund balance has been committed for replacement reserves for equipment and infrastructure in the San Diego County Sanitation District for Lakeside, Julian and Wintergarden service areas ($11.4 million), for initial amount toward the replacement/upgrade of fire apparatus and equipment for regional support for the San Diego County Fire Authority ($1.9 million), and for reserves for building maintenance and replacement for the Air Pollution Control District ($0.3 million).

**Management Reserves** are decreasing by $2.0 million or 6.2%. The level of Management Reserves can vary from year to year. They are used to fund one-time projects or to serve as a prudent mitigation for revenue and economic uncertainties at the business group or department level.
Total Appropriations by Fund Type

The financial transactions of the County are recorded in individual funds and account groups. The State Controller prescribes uniform accounting practices for California counties. Various revenue sources are controlled and spent for purposes that require those funds to be accounted for separately. Accordingly, the funds/fund types described below provide the basic structure for the Operational Plan. Appendix B: Budget Summary and Changes in Fund Balance provides expenditure amounts for County funds by Type of Fund and by Group/Agency. (See also "Measurement Focus and Basis of Accounting" on page 91.)

**Total Appropriations by Fund Type**

**Fiscal Year 2012-13: $4.85 billion**

- **General Fund** ($3,718.9M) 76.8%
- **Special Revenue Funds** ($398.2M) 8.2%
- **Internal Service Funds** ($399.4M) 8.2%
- **Debt Service Funds** ($81.5M) 1.7%
- **Capital Project Funds** ($94.2M) 1.9%
- **Enterprise Funds** ($25.0M) 0.5%
- **Special Districts & Redevelopment Funds** ($128.1M) 2.6%

**Governmental Fund Types**

The **General Fund** accounts for all financial resources except those required to be accounted for in another fund. The General Fund is the County’s primary operating fund.

**Special Revenue Funds** account for the proceeds of specific revenue sources that are legally restricted to expenditures for specified purposes (other than for major capital projects). Examples include Road, Library, Asset Forfeiture and Proposition 172 Special Revenue funds.

**Debt Service Funds** account for the accumulation of resources for and the payment of principal and interest on general long-term debt. The Debt Service Funds include bond principal and interest payments and administrative expenses for Pension Obligation Bonds. A discussion of long and short-term financial obligations can be found on 102.

**Capital Projects Funds** account for financial resources to be used for the acquisition or construction of major capital facilities (other than those financed by proprietary funds and trust funds).
All Funds: Total Appropriations

Proprietary Fund Types

Internal Service Funds account for the financing of goods or services provided by one department to other departments of the County, or to other governmental units, on a cost-reimbursement basis. Examples include the Facilities Management, Fleet, Purchasing and Contracting, Employee Benefits, Public Liability and Information Technology Internal Service Funds.

Enterprise Funds account for any activity for which a fee is charged to external users for goods or services. Enterprise funds are also used for any activity whose principal external revenue sources meet any of the following criteria:

- Issued debt is backed solely by fees and charges.
- Cost of providing services must legally be recovered through fees and charges.
- Government’s policy is to establish fees or charges to recover the cost of provided services.

Examples include the Airport and Wastewater Funds.
Special Districts & Redevelopment Funds

Special Districts are separate legal entities governed by the Board of Supervisors that provide for specialized public improvements and services deemed to benefit properties and residents financed by specific taxes and assessments. The special districts provide authorized services such as air pollution control, sanitation, flood control, road, park, lighting maintenance, fire protection or ambulance service to specific areas in the county.

Redevelopment Funds were originally established to account for the proceeds of redevelopment area incremental taxes, interest revenues and temporary loans which were used to eliminate slums and blighted areas, improve housing, expand employment opportunities and provide an environment for the social, economic and psychological growth and well-being of all citizens of the county.

The State of California, through the passage of Assembly Bill X1 26, Community Redevelopment Dissolution, dissolved all redevelopment agencies as of February 1, 2012. As a requirement of the dissolution process, all funds, assets and obligations of the redevelopment agencies were transferred to a successor agency for payment or disbursement. Redevelopment Funds will be removed from future year Operational Plans, replaced by successor agency funds and included under Governmental Fund Types within the Special Revenue Funds and Debt Service Funds, as they apply.

Appropriations Limits

Spending limits for the County are governed by the 1979 passage of California Proposition 4, Limitation of Government Appropriations (Article XIII B of the California Constitution, commonly known as the Gann initiative or Gann Limit). Proposition 4 places an appropriations limit on most spending from tax proceeds.

The limit for each year is equal to the prior year’s spending with upward adjustments allowed for changes in population and the cost of living. Most appropriations are subject to the limit. However, Proposition 4 and subsequently Proposition 99 (1988), Tobacco Tax and Health Protection Act, Proposition 10 (1998), California Children and Families First Act and Proposition 111 (1990), Traffic Congestion Relief and Spending Limitations Act, exempt certain appropriations from the limit. These exemptions include capital outlay, debt service, local government subventions, new tobacco taxes, appropriations supported by increased gas taxes, and appropriations resulting from national disasters.

When the limit is exceeded, Proposition 4 requires the surplus to be returned to the taxpayers within two years. Appropriations in the two-year period can be averaged before becoming subject to the excess revenue provisions of the Gann Limit. As shown in the following table, the County continues to be far below the Gann Limit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego County Appropriation Limit (in millions)</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2005-06</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2006-07</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2007-08</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2008-09</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2009-10</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gann Limit</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>$3,433</td>
<td>$3,619</td>
<td>$3,825</td>
<td>$3,897</td>
<td>$3,852</td>
<td>$3,977</td>
<td>$4,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations subject to the limit</td>
<td>$877</td>
<td>$1,002</td>
<td>$1,287</td>
<td>$1,340</td>
<td>$1,309</td>
<td>$1,264</td>
<td>$1,255</td>
<td>$1,527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adopted staff years\(^1\) for Fiscal Year 2012-13 are 323.50 greater than the Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2011-12, an increase of 2.1% to 16,010.75 staff years. This net increase is primarily attributable to increased staffing in the Public Safety Group and the Health and Human Services Agency. While overall staffing levels are increasing, there are some departments and programs in which staffing levels are decreasing. A further net increase of 104.00 staff years is expected in Fiscal Year 2013-14. The staffing changes are summarized below by business group.

\(^1\) One staff year equates to one permanent employee working full-time for one year.
The Public Safety Group (PSG) has a net increase of 149.00 staff years, a 2.1% increase, to align staffing with available revenues and to address key operational requirements.

- District Attorney - decreases by 44.00 staff years. This reduction is mitigated by previous investment in information technology to improve business efficiency.
- Sheriff’s Department - increases by a net of 84.00 staff years. This includes an increase of 20.00 staff years for the East Mesa Detention Re-Entry and Rehabilitation Facility, 15.00 staff years to create an Alternate Custody Unit in response to Public Safety Realignment and one position to direct the implementation of Public Safety Realignment in the Sheriff’s Department, an increase of 18.00 staff years to form the transition team to prepare for the staffing and operation of the Women’s Detention Facility, an additional 14.00 staff years to support the hiring and training needs of the department and an increase of 8.00 staff years to provide additional sworn supervisory positions at patrol stations.

Other changes include an increase of 4.00 staff years in the Crime Lab and the Records Unit to perform functions supported by Cal ID revenues, an increase of 3.00 staff years in the Inmate Services Division, an increase
of 3.00 staff years in the Wireless Service Division, an increase of 3.00 staff years to support emergency planning, manage grant funds and support data services, an increase of 2.00 staff years for law enforcement services in the North County Transit District, a decrease of 4.00 staff years due to a reduction in the law enforcement services requested by the contract cities and a reduction of 2.00 staff years due to the expiration of two American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) grants.

- Medical Examiner - increase of 1.00 staff year supported by the contract for Toxicology Services with the County of San Bernardino.
- Probation Department - increases by a net of 106.00 staff years. This includes an increase of 103.00 staff years to supervise offenders as required by Public Safety Realignment. Other changes include an increase of 7.00 staff years to continue to provide required staffing ratios in the juvenile institutions previously achieved through the use of staff overtime, an increase of 2.00 staff years for services related to the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act, an increase of 1.00 staff year to provide financial and operational support to Public Safety Realignment, an increase of 1.00 staff year to provide reentry services to juvenile offenders, a decrease of 5.00 staff years due to the elimination of State funding for programs created by Senate Bill (SB) 618 San Diego Prisoner Reentry Program, a decrease of 2.00 staff year due to a reduction in school district revenue for the Truancy Intervention Program and a reduction of 1.00 staff year due to the expiration of an ARRA grant.
- Public Defender - increases by 2.00 staff years to respond to additional criminal case defense responsibilities as the result of Public Safety Realignment.

In Fiscal Year 2013-14, the Public Safety Group increases by 108.00 staff years in the Sheriff’s Department; 107.00 staff years for the East Mesa Detention Re-Entry and Rehabilitation Facility and 1.00 staff year in Emergency Planning required to assist in the department’s efforts in emergency preparedness and disaster response.

The Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) has an increase of 176.00 staff years or 3.4%.

- Regional Operations - increases by 155.00 staff years to support Family Resource Centers, ACCESS operations (a public benefits transaction call center), Health Promotion operations and Family Resource Center Centralized Imaging operations, offset by transfers to other divisions based on operational needs.
- Strategic Planning and Operational Support (SPOS) - increases by 9.00 staff years in the Office of Business Intelligence (OBI) to advance operational excellence by managing and coordinating data and information analysis, and to support efforts to enhance quality control in eligibility services, offset by transfers to other divisions based on operational needs.
- Administrative Support - increases by 4.00 staff years in Human Resources to meet increased recruitment and training needs, especially in frontline positions such as eligibility and child welfare services. Increases are the result of transfers from other divisions within the Agency.
- Aging and Independence Services - decreases by 1.00 staff year due to the transfer of staff to another division based on operational needs.
- Behavioral Health Services - decreases by 8.00 staff years due to the transfer of staff to other divisions based on operational needs.
- Child Welfare Services - increases by 14.00 staff years due to the move of the Court Unit from Regional Child Welfare Services. Increases are the result of transfers from other divisions within the Agency.
- Public Health Services - increases by 3.00 staff years to support activities in Epidemiology, Emergency Medical Services, and Maternal, Child and Family Health Services. Increases are the result of transfers from other divisions within the Agency.

In Fiscal Year 2013-14, there is no change in staffing.

The Land Use and Environment Group (LUEG) has a decrease of 5.00 staff years or 0.3%.

- Agriculture, Weights and Measures - increases by 3.00 staff years in the Standards Program for increased standardization, quality control inspections and coordination with various agencies.
- Environmental Health - decreases by 1.00 staff year due to workload reductions in the Land and Water Quality Division.
- Farm and Home Advisor - decreases by 1.00 staff year as a result of operational changes and consolidation of duties.
- Planning and Land Use - decreases by 4.00 staff years. A decrease of 2.00 staff years in Code Enforcement as a result of reengineering, cross-training and automation services, a decrease of 1.00 staff year in LUEG Geographic Information Services (GIS) as a result of reorganization of duties within the division, and a decrease of 1.00 staff year in Project Planning due to reduced workload as a result of current economic conditions.
Public Works - decreases by 2.00 staff years in the Road Fund; a decrease of 1.00 staff year in the Land Development Program due to consolidation of management oversight and a decrease of 1.00 staff year in Engineering Services Program due to reductions in workload.

In Fiscal Year 2013-14, there is no change in staffing.

The **Community Services Group (CSG)** has a **decrease of 4.50 staff years or 0.5%**.

- County Library - decreases by 10.50 staff years to continue to adjust to ongoing costs as a result of the loss of revenue from property taxes, State grants, and General Fund support since Fiscal Year 2008-09. The Library will continue to mitigate the impacts of these reductions through library design, automation and business process improvements. A decrease of 1.75 staff years is due to a technical adjustment to correct prior year’s processing of staff reductions.

- General Services - increases by a net 5.00 staff years. An increase of 9.00 staff years related to the transfer of maintenance responsibilities at the County Administration Center from the Clerk of the Board; a decrease of 3.00 staff years as a result of building maintenance efficiencies; an increase of 2.00 staff years as a result of reorganizing work related to maintenance of fleet vehicles; a reduction of 2.00 staff years to consolidate welding-related labor due to a diminished workload, and a reduction of 1.00 staff year as a result of streamlining support services.

- Registrar of Voters - increases by 1.00 staff year to implement and manage the new Chinese language service program, which will provide community outreach and elections materials translation.

In Fiscal Year 2013-14, the County Library decreases by 4.00 staff years to continue to realign staffing with available resources.

The **Finance and General Government Group (FGG)** has an **increase of 8.00 staff years or 0.7%**.

- Assessor/Recorder/County Clerk - increases by 13.00 staff years. The staffing increase results from the reinstatement of 10.00 appraisal positions to assist with the timely resolution of residential and commercial assessment appeals filings. An increase of 3.00 clerical support positions will allow the department to extend clerk services (primarily marriage licenses and ceremonies) at the Chula Vista branch office.

- Clerk of the Board of Supervisors - decreases by 9.00 staff years. The staffing decrease results from the transfer of County Administration Center facility management responsibilities from the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to the Department of General Services.

- Department of Human Resources - increases by 2.00 staff years. The staffing increase results from the addition of a Wellness Coordinator to oversee and manage the Workers’ Compensation Work Safe Stay/Healthy and Employee Wellness Program and the addition of a Human Resources Assistant in the Human Resources Services Division due to additional support needed to meet the increasing hiring needs of the Public Safety Group. One position will be added in the Administration Division due to the reorganization of duties within the department, and will be offset by the deletion of a position in the Employee Benefits Division.

Auditor and Controller - increases by 1.00 staff year. The staffing increase results from transfers among programs to accommodate increasing workloads in redevelopment dissolution activities and to restore one previously deleted position in Central Payroll to meet projected needs.

- Finance and General Government Group Executive Office - increases by 1.00 staff year. The staffing increase results from the reinstatement of one previously deleted position to accommodate increasing workloads in group program management.

In Fiscal Year 2013-14, there is no change in staffing.

More detail on staff year changes can be found in the Group/Agency section that begins on page 115.
### Total Staffing by Department within Group (staff years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2013-14 Approved Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Safety</strong></td>
<td>7,041.25</td>
<td>6,971.00</td>
<td>7,120.00</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7,228.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Executive Office</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>1,053.00</td>
<td>1,022.00</td>
<td>978.00</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>978.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>3,800.00</td>
<td>3,812.00</td>
<td>3,896.00</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4,004.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Support Services</td>
<td>473.00</td>
<td>472.00</td>
<td>472.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>472.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens’ Law Enforcement Review Board</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Emergency Services</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Examiner</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>1,234.25</td>
<td>1,225.00</td>
<td>1,331.00</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1,331.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>399.00</td>
<td>344.00</td>
<td>346.00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>346.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Fire Authority</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Human Services</strong></td>
<td>5,156.25</td>
<td>5,130.25</td>
<td>5,306.25</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5,306.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Operations</td>
<td>2,262.00</td>
<td>2,277.00</td>
<td>2,432.00</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2,432.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning &amp; Operational Support</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>202.00</td>
<td>211.00</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>211.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging and Independence Services</td>
<td>292.50</td>
<td>292.50</td>
<td>291.50</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>291.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health Services</td>
<td>840.50</td>
<td>837.50</td>
<td>829.50</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>829.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare Services</td>
<td>744.50</td>
<td>703.50</td>
<td>717.50</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>717.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Services</td>
<td>479.75</td>
<td>480.75</td>
<td>483.75</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>483.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administrator / Public Guardian</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>303.00</td>
<td>303.00</td>
<td>307.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>307.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use &amp; Environment</strong></td>
<td>1,501.00</td>
<td>1,456.00</td>
<td>1,451.00</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>1,451.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Environment Executive Office</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Weights and Measures</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>153.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>153.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>146.00</td>
<td>146.00</td>
<td>146.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>146.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>282.00</td>
<td>281.00</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>281.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm and Home Advisor</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Land Use</td>
<td>196.00</td>
<td>164.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>534.00</td>
<td>526.00</td>
<td>524.00</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>524.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total Staffing by Department within Group (staff years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2013-14 Approved Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services Executive Office</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Services</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>123.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Library</td>
<td>290.25</td>
<td>280.50</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
<td>266.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services</td>
<td>334.00</td>
<td>331.00</td>
<td>336.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing and Contracting</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar of Voters</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance &amp; General Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; General Government Office</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor/Recorder/County Clerk</td>
<td>397.50</td>
<td>397.50</td>
<td>410.50</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>410.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer-Tax Collector</td>
<td>121.00</td>
<td>121.00</td>
<td>121.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>121.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Administrative Office</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor and Controller</td>
<td>245.50</td>
<td>245.50</td>
<td>246.50</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>246.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Technology Office</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service Commission</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of the Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Counsel</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Jury</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>112.00</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Communications Office</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Total</strong></td>
<td>15,842.25</td>
<td>15,687.25</td>
<td>16,010.75</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>16,114.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Funding by Source

Total resources available to support County services for Fiscal Year 2012-13 are $4.85 billion, a decrease of $14.4 million or 0.3% from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget. Total resources decrease further by $195.2 million or 4.0% to $4.65 billion in Fiscal Year 2013-14. For Fiscal Year 2012-13, the combination of State Revenue ($1,367.7 billion), Federal Revenue ($898.1 million) and Other Intergovernmental Revenue ($84.1 million) supplies 48.5% of the funding sources for the County’s budget. Interfund Operating Transfers, Use of Money & Property, Miscellaneous Revenues and Other Financing Sources make up 10.1% of the funding sources ($487.3 million). Another 18.0% ($873.2 million) comes from Charges for Current Services, Fees and Fines. Use of Fund Balance and Fund Balance Component Decreases supply 4.1% ($196.6 million) of the funding sources.

Finally, revenues in the Property and Other Taxes category received from property taxes, property tax in lieu of vehicle license fees, the Teeter program, sales and use tax, real property transfer tax, transient occupancy tax and miscellaneous other revenues account for 19.4% ($938.3 million) of the financing sources for the County’s budget. The majority of the revenues in this category (95.3%) are in the General Fund with the balance in the Library Fund, the Road Fund and miscellaneous other funds.
### Total Funding by Source

**Fiscal Years 2010-11 Through 2013-14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Segment</th>
<th>FY2010-11 Adopted (in millions)</th>
<th>FY2011-12 Adopted (in millions)</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Adopted (in millions)</th>
<th>FY2013-14 Approved (in millions)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Revenue</td>
<td>$1,204.4</td>
<td>$1,257.2</td>
<td>$1,367.7</td>
<td>$1,382.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Revenue</td>
<td>888.1</td>
<td>905.7</td>
<td>898.1</td>
<td>873.9</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>111.6</td>
<td>117.9</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>(31.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Transfers and Other Revenues*</td>
<td>534.3</td>
<td>475.8</td>
<td>487.3</td>
<td>400.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services, Fees, and Fines</td>
<td>859.3</td>
<td>854.6</td>
<td>873.2</td>
<td>859.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; Other Taxes</td>
<td>932.8</td>
<td>939.5</td>
<td>938.3</td>
<td>945.4</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB Component Decrease</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>(97.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Fund Balance</td>
<td>413.2</td>
<td>286.7</td>
<td>196.1</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>(31.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,957.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,859.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,845.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,650.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>(0.3)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other Revenues include Other Financing Sources, Use of Money & Property and Miscellaneous Revenues.
Overall Change

The $14.4 million decrease in the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget is the net of increases in some funding sources and decreases in others. In the table on the previous page, State Revenue, Operating Transfers and Other Financing Sources and Charges for Services, Fees & Fine increase a combined $140.5 million. Reductions totaling $154.8 million are in the combined categories of Federal Revenue, Other Intergovernmental Revenue, Property and Other Taxes and Fund Balance Component Decrease/Use of Fund Balance. The General Fund Financing Sources section beginning on page 66 addresses significant revenue changes by source in the General Fund. Changes other than those in the General Fund are highlighted below.

Change by Source

State Revenue

State Revenue increases by $110.4 million or 8.8% overall in Fiscal Year 2012-13.

Federal Revenue

Federal Revenue decreases by $7.6 million or 0.8% overall in Fiscal Year 2012-13.

There are increases in the Public Safety Group (PSG) of $100.0 million, in the Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) of $10.1 million and in Finance Other of $2.8 million, offset by decreases in the Community Services Group (CSG) of $1.3 million and in the Land Use and Environment Group (LUEG) of $1.2 million.

The $100.0 million increase in PSG includes a $24.0 million estimated increase in Proposition 172, Local Public Safety Protection and Improvement Act of 1993, sales tax revenues. Please see the General Fund Financing Sources section on page 66 for more information on Proposition 172 funding. The remaining General Fund increase of $76.0 million is primarily the result of Public Safety Realignment 2011 implementation, which is also discussed in the General Fund Financing Sources section.

HHSA’s increase of $10.1 million is in the General Fund and is discussed in that section.

In Finance Other, the $2.8 million increase is in the Local Detention Facility Revenue account due to a reclassification from Other Intergovernmental revenue.

The $1.4 million decrease in CSG is due to the elimination of prior year one-time funding in Registrar of Voters, offset by an increase in Housing and Community Development (HCD) for the CalHome Program General Loan Funding grant which are both discussed in the General Fund section.

LUEG’s decrease of $1.2 million is primarily due to completion of mobile source emissions incentives programs in the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and in the Department of Public Works (DPW) mainly resulting from fewer State funded construction projects and a completed slope and drainage repair project. There are offsetting increases of $0.4 million in the General Fund in DPW which is discussed in the General Fund section.

A net decrease of $5.8 million is in the General Fund, and is largely due to decreases in PSG, LUEG and CSG, offset by an increase in HHSA. See the General Fund Financing Sources section for additional details related to these changes. Outside of the General Fund, there is a total decrease of $1.8 million primarily in LUEG, in DPW, due to funding reduction resulting from decreased work or completion of various projects such as Community Development Block Grant construction, 2010 Flooding Emergency, airport construction and highway projects in the Road Fund, as well as in APCD for the completion of mobile source emissions incentives programs, and in the Capital Program related to the elimination of prior year one-time funding in various capital projects.
Other Intergovernmental Revenue

Other Intergovernmental Revenue decreases by a net of $33.8 million or 28.7% overall in Fiscal Year 2012-13.

The decreases are primarily in PSG and a small portion is in Finance Other, both of which are discussed in the General Fund Financing section. The decrease is offset by a net increase outside of the General Fund predominantly in the Capital Program, which is mainly from Aid from Redevelopment Successor Agencies, to partially fund the Cedar and Kettner Development project, offset by a reduction due to prior year one-time funding for the County Administration Center (CAC) Waterfront Park capital project. The balance of the net increase is in HHSA resulting from additional ambulance transport fees in County Service Areas (CSAs) 17 and 69.

Operating Transfers and Other Financing Sources, Use of Money & Property and Miscellaneous Revenues

Other Financing Sources (primarily Operating Transfers between funds) decrease by a net of $0.2 million or 0.04%. The most significant changes include a decrease of $36.1 million in the Capital Program and a decrease of $4.8 million in LUEG, offset by increases in PSG of $23.5 million and in CSG of $17.3 million. The net decrease in the Capital Program is primarily attributable to the elimination of prior year one-time funding for the development of the CAC Waterfront Park, the Women’s Detention Facility, Sweetwater Lane Park Synthetic Turf, Agua Caliente Park and the Long-Term Animal Care Facility, offset by an increase in funding for the following projects: Cedar and Kettner Development, HHSA PSG and CSG Office Relocation, Agua Caliente Park Water, Sewer and Electrical Line Replacement, Edgemoor Development and the East Mesa Detention Re-Entry and Rehabilitation Facility.

The decrease in LUEG is in DPW due to reduced revenue in capital improvement projects, Equipment Operations Internal Service Fund (ISF) and the Road Fund Equipment Acquisition Fund, and an additional reduction in the Department of Parks and Recreation in the General Fund due to reduced staff support in Recreation and Community Center Operations (CSAs).

An increase of $23.5 million in PSG is largely due to an increase in Proposition 172, which supports regional law enforcement and detention services, due to increases in annual receipts and the use of prior year fund balance available in the Proposition 172 Special Revenue Fund. This also includes an increase in San Diego County Fire Authority of $0.5 million as a result of the transfer of funds and a transition of operation activities to CSA 135. The $17.3 million increase in CSG is largely due to activities related to SDGE’s “on bill financing” and California Energy Commission financing in General Services; in the County Successor Agency for transfers among Successor Agency funds; and in Purchasing and Contracting as a result of Documentum system maintenance and upgrade and for the rebudget of one-time projects.

Revenue from Use of Money & Property increases by a net of $4.7 million or 8.7% in Fiscal Year 2012-13. Changes include:

- Increase of $6.8 million in the Capital Program primarily in Edgemoor Development, CAC Waterfront Park and Cedar Kettner Development.
- Increase of $1.3 million in LUEG related to increased rental rates on equipment in the Equipment Operations ISF and on properties owned by County airports.
- Increase of $0.5 million in CSG primarily due to increased operating leases of County-owned properties.
- Increase of $0.3 million in PSG is in the General Fund which is further discussed in that section.
Decrease of $4.1 million in Finance Other, also in the General Fund due to declining interest rates on investments and deposits.

Miscellaneous Revenues increase by $6.9 million or 19.6%. The increases are primarily in the General Fund: $6.4 million increase in PSG, $0.9 million in LUEG and $0.2 million in Finance and General Government (FGG), offset by $1.5 million decrease in HHSA and $0.1 million decrease in CSG. Please see the General Fund Financing section for more information.

Outside of the General Fund, there is a net increase of $1.0 million: increase of $1.1 million in PSG due to increased revenue from sales of commissary goods to inmates in the Sheriff; $0.2 million increase in LUEG due to an increase in capital projects in the Road Fund; offset by a decrease of $0.3 million in CSG resulting from reduced donations to the Vista library.

Charges for Services, Fees and Fines

Charges for Current Services increase by $18.9 million or 2.5%. Of this total, an increase of $12.7 million is in FGG, primarily in the County Technology Office due to planned information technology (IT) services to various departments; an increase of $5.5 million in CSG for services provided by General Services to client department's based on operational needs; an increase of $2.0 million in Finance Other is due to additional charges to departments in the Workers’ Compensation Employee Benefit ISF and Pension Obligation Bonds, offset by a decrease in Public Liability ISF; an increase of $0.5 million in HHSA additional revenue for nonresident transport fees in CSAs 17 and 69; and offset by a net decrease of $1.5 million in LUEG, in DPW, which includes reduced funding from Transportation Impact Fees, Liquid Waste, Inactive Waste, Airport, Flood Control and Sanitation Districts.

In addition, a $0.4 million net decrease is in the General Fund which includes: $3.3 million increase in Finance Other and $2.6 million increase in FGG; offset by decreases of $3.1 million in HHSA, $0.7 million in LUEG and $2.5 million in PSG, all of which are discussed in the General Fund Financing section.

Licenses, Permits & Franchises decrease by $0.3 million or 0.6%. A net decrease of $0.2 million is budgeted in LUEG, mainly in APCD to align budget with prior year actuals and due to re-categorizing of emission fees. $0.1 million is in HHSA and is discussed in the General Fund Financing section.

Fines, Forfeitures & Penalties remain unchanged.

Property and Other Taxes

Property and Other Taxes decrease by $1.2 million or 0.1%.

The overall decreases are in DPW due to the completion of projects in the Road Fund funded by TransNet sales tax and in CSG for property taxes distributed from the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund.
Fund Balance Component Decreases

The use of Fund Balance Component Decreases decrease by $21.6 million or 97.6% compared to Fiscal Year 2011-12.

The decreases in this category are primarily in DPW due to the dissolution of sanitation districts and the consolidation of the San Diego County Sanitation District. Additional decreases are mainly in HHSA and CSG, which are discussed further in the General Fund Financing section.

Use of Fund Balance

Finally, the Use of Fund Balance decreases by $90.6 million or 31.6% primarily in the General Fund due to the normal fluctuations in one-time projects, including prior year funding for the Integrated Property Tax System (IPTS) and Regional Communications System (RCS), as well as funding of a one-time negotiated salary adjustment.

See the Group/Agency section beginning on page 115 for the breakdown of financing sources by department.
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General Fund Financing Sources - Overview

The General Fund is the County’s largest single and primary operating fund. It is used to account for all financial resources of the County except those required to be accounted for in other funds. In this Adopted Operational Plan, General Fund Financing Sources total $3.72 billion for Fiscal Year 2012-13, a $23.9 million or 0.64% decrease from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget. In comparison, the ten years average annual growth rate through Fiscal Year 2012-13 was 3.4%. The decrease in Fiscal Year 2012-13 is primarily due to a reduction in the use of one-time resources (fund balance) offset by growth in program revenues and a slight improvement in General Purpose Revenue. General Fund Financing Sources are expected to decrease by $81.3 million or 2.2% in Fiscal Year 2013-14 primarily due to a further reduction in the use of one-time resources.

General Fund Financing Sources
Fiscal Year 2012-13: $3.72 billion

- State Revenue ($1,069.7M) 28.8%
- Federal Revenue ($884.5M) 23.8%
- Other Intergovernmental Revenue ($61.9M) 1.7%
- Operating Transfers and Other Financing Sources, Use of Money & Property & Misc. Revenues ($310.0M) 8.3%
- Charges for Services, Fees, & Fines ($383.5M) 10.3%
- Fund Balance Component Dec. / Use of Fund Balance ($115.0M) 3.1%
- Property & Other Taxes ($894.3M) 24.0%
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Total Funding by Source
Fiscal Years 2010-11 Through 2013-14

*Other Revenues include Other Financing Sources, Use of Money & Property and Miscellaneous Revenues.
General Fund Financing Sources by Category

The preceding section displayed General Fund Financing Sources by account type. This section looks at General Fund Financing Sources according to how they are generated. From that perspective, they can be categorized as one of three funding types: Program Revenue, General Purpose Revenue or Use of Fund Balance (including Fund Balance Component-Decreases).

**General Fund Financing Sources by Category**

*Fiscal Year 2012-13: $3.72 billion*

- **Program Revenue**
  - $2,636.8M
  - 70.9%

- **General Purpose Revenue**
  - $967.1M
  - 26.0%

- **Fund Balance Component Dec./Use of Fund Balance**
  - ($115.0M)
  - 3.1%

---

**General Fund Financing by Group and Category**

*Fiscal Year 2012-13: $3.72 billion*
In Fiscal Year 2012-13, General Purpose Revenue (GPR) increases by 0.3% ($2.7 million), the planned use of fund balance declines by 46.7% ($100.9 million) and Program Revenue increases by 2.9% ($74.3 million) from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget. In Fiscal Year 2013-14, GPR is projected to increase by 0.8% ($7.3 million), Program Revenue is projected to decline by 1.0% ($25.7 million), and the planned use of fund balance is expected to decline by 54.8% ($63.0 million). Uses of fund balance in Fiscal Year 2013-14 are tentative and subject to revision during the next Operational Plan development cycle.

General Fund Financing Sources
Fiscal Years 2010-11 Through 2013-14

General Fund Financing Sources by Category (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2013-14 Approved Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Revenues</td>
<td>$2,493.3</td>
<td>$2,562.4</td>
<td>$2,636.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$2,611.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance Component Decreases / Use of Fund Balance</td>
<td>291.4</td>
<td>216.0</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>(46.7)</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Purpose Revenues</td>
<td>954.4</td>
<td>964.4</td>
<td>967.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>974.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,739.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,742.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,718.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>(0.6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,637.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Fund - Program Revenue

Program Revenue, as the name implies, is dedicated to and can be used only for the specific programs with which they are associated. This revenue makes up 70.9% of General Fund Financing Sources in Fiscal Year 2012-13, and is derived primarily from State and federal subventions and grants, and from charges and fees earned from specific programs. Of the County’s Program Revenue, the Health and Human Services Agency manages 67.7%, the Public Safety Group manages 23.9% and the balance is managed across the County’s other service delivery groups. Program Revenue is expected to increase by 2.9% ($74.3 million) from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget compared to an average annual growth for the last ten years of 2.9%.
General Fund - Program Revenue by Source
Fiscal Year 2012-13: $2.64 billion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2013-14 Approved Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Revenue</td>
<td>$935.7</td>
<td>$976.8</td>
<td>$1,062.0</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>$1,070.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Revenue</td>
<td>872.9</td>
<td>889.2</td>
<td>883.4</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
<td>861.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Financing Sources</td>
<td>225.1</td>
<td>241.5</td>
<td>264.6</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>265.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges For Current Services</td>
<td>290.5</td>
<td>290.4</td>
<td>289.9</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
<td>290.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>(53.2%)</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines, Forfeitures &amp; Penalties</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses, Permits &amp; Franchises</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue From Use of Money &amp; Property</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,493.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,562.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,636.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,611.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Fund - Change in Program Revenue

The $74.3 million increase in Program Revenue in the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget is the net of increases and decreases in various funding sources. As indicated in the table on the previous page, State Revenue; Other Financing Sources; Fines, Forfeitures & Penalties; Miscellaneous Revenues and Revenue from the Use of Money & Property increase a combined $114.6 million. Reductions totaling $40.3 million are in the categories of Federal Revenue; Charges for Current Services; Other Intergovernmental Revenue; Taxes Other than Current Secured and Licenses, Permits & Franchises.

General Fund - Change in Program Revenue by Source

State Revenue

State Revenue increases by $85.2 million or 8.7% in Fiscal Year 2012-13.

Of this total, the increase is largely due to $76.0 million in the Public Safety Group (PSG) resulting from the implementation of Public Safety Realignment of 2011. Additionally, there are increases in the Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) of $10.1 million and in the Land Use and Environment Group (LUEG) of $0.4 million, partially offset by a decrease in the Community Services Group (CSG) of $1.4 million.

In HHSA, the increase of $10.1 million is primarily the result of 2011 Realignment implementation affecting social services and mental health services programs.

The $0.4 million increase in LUEG is in the Department of Public Works for Proposition 84 grants to implement an Integrated Regional Water Management plan to improve water quality.

The $1.4 million decrease in CSG is primarily due to the elimination of one-time prior year funding in Help America Vote Act (HAVA) for voting booths, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) voting booths and Precinct Inspector supply bag/ballot box in the Registrar of Voters.

Federal Revenue

Federal Revenue decreases by a net of $5.8 million or 0.7%.

It decreases in PSG by $7.5 million, in LUEG by $4.2 million and in CSG by $1.6 million, partially offset by an increase in HHSA of $7.4 million.

The net decrease in PSG of $7.5 million is primarily due to the expiration of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) grant funded programs, decreases in the Criminal Alien Assistance Program, the Urban Areas Security Initiative, Community Oriented Policing (COPS), and the Operation Stonegarden Grant Program in the Sheriff’s Department; and the Homeland Security Grant programs in both the Sheriff’s Department and the Office of Emergency Services.

The $4.2 million net decrease in LUEG is largely in the Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) primarily attributed to completion of grant projects for the Energy Efficiency Conservation Block Grants and in Environmental Health for Urban Areas and Homeland Security Initiatives for emergency response training and equipment.

The decrease of $1.6 million in CSG is in Housing and Community Development (HCD) and is associated with reductions in Home Investment Partnership, in the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and various one-time prior year projects.

The net increase of $7.4 million in HHSA is associated with the implementation of the Low Income Health Program (LIHP) and projected increase in funding for IHSS program and Aid for Adopted Children.
Other Financing Sources

Other Financing Sources (including Operating Transfers from Other Funds) increase by a net of $23.1 million or 9.6%. There is an increase of $22.9 million in PSG and $0.3 million in CSG, offset by a decrease of $0.1 million in LUEG.

The $22.9 million increase in PSG is primarily due to funding from Proposition 172. Please see the following section for more information on Proposition 172 funding. The $0.3 million increase in CSG is a result of energy-efficiency projects related to SDG&E’s on-bill financing and California Energy Commission financing. The $0.1 million decrease in LUEG is due to the transfer of staff support to PSG for County Service Areas.

Charges For Current Services

Charges For Current Services decrease by $0.4 million or 0.1%. Revenues increase by $3.4 million in Finance and General Government Group (FGG) and $2.6 million in CSG, and are offset by decreases of $3.1 million in HHSA, $0.7 million in LUEG and $2.5 million in PSG.

The increases in FGG are in the Assessor/Recorder/County Clerk based on one-time initiatives for the integrated recording/vital records system, increases in E-recording revenue, Social Security Number Truncation revenue, marriage ceremonies, and recorded document fees; in FGG Administration related to external department overhead payments (A-87) for enterprise resource planning system support; in County Counsel due to an increase in project workloads; in the Clerk of the Board due to increases in passport application and photo services; and in the County Technology Office based on overall information technology expenditures of all county departments.

The CSG increase is in the Registrar of Voters as a result of a greater number of billable jurisdictions participating in the Presidential General Election as compared to the Presidential Primary Election, as well as in Animal Services due to an increase in the contract cities’ proportional share of the department’s operational budget.

In HHSA, the decreases are in Regional Operations associated with the San Diego First Five Commission contract ending the Early Childhood program; in Public Administrator/Public Guardian based on declining estate values; in Public Health Services due to the elimination of Urban Area Security Initiative grant allocation; and in Health Care Administration due to Third Party Reimbursement and a decrease in Child Abuse prevention fees.

In LUEG, the decreases are in Environmental Health due to completion of projects associated with the Vector Control Program Benefit Assessment funds; in Planning and Land Use related to economic conditions; and in Parks due to the reclassification of grant funds to Intergovernmental Revenues and the reduction of park and camping revenues.

In PSG, the decreases are in Probation as a result of overall reductions in collections for cost of supervision and in the Sheriff based on Jail Bed Leasing due to decreased misdemeanor jail bookings by the City of San Diego.

Other Intergovernmental Revenue

Other Intergovernmental Revenue decreases by $33.9 million or 53.2%. This decrease is largely in PSG predominantly in the Sheriff's Department related to the recategorization of reimbursement for Trial Courts to State revenue resulting from the implementation of Public Safety Realignment of 2011 and in the San Diego County Fire Authority resulting from a revised projection of revenue for the Dead, Dying and Diseased Tree Grant Program. The decreases are partially offset by increases in CSG of $0.4 million in HCD due to carried-forward prior year funding from Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA); and in LUEG of $0.3 million in Parks and Recreation due to reclassification of grants from Charges to Current Services, as well as increased grant funding from Coastal Impact Assistance Program; and in Public Works related to Proposition 84, Stormwater Grant Program, grant to implement the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan.

Fines, Forfeitures & Penalties

Fines, Forfeitures & Penalties increase by $0.3 million or 0.7%, primarily in PSG, to support maintenance and operation costs associated with juvenile institutional facilities in the Probation Department.

Licenses, Permits & Franchises

Licenses, Permits & Franchises decrease by $0.2 million or 0.7%, primarily in HHSA, to align projected available revenue from the Domestic Violence Trust Fund. The decrease is offset by an increase in FGG which is the result of increased marriage license fees.

Miscellaneous Revenues

Miscellaneous Revenues increase by $5.8 million or 23.5%. Increases include $6.4 million in PSG due to a settlement to resolve litigation with San Diego Gas & Electric, increase from sales of commissary goods to inmates, and reimbursement for Regional Communications System expenditures; $0.9 million in LUEG in Public Works due to an increase in fuel sales at the airport and the development of Business Case Management System (Accela) report-
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Proposition 172 and 1991 Realignment Sales Tax Revenue
Fiscal Year 2002-03 to Fiscal Year 2013-14

Revenue from Use of Money & Property

Revenue from Use of Money & Property increases by $0.3 million or 2.9%. The primary source of the increase is in PSG associated with the lease of the Otay Mesa Detention Facility.

Select General Fund Program Revenues

Following are some of the largest and most closely watched program revenues. Please see the individual Group and department sections beginning on page 115 for more specific information on the various other program revenues.

1991 Health and Social Services Realignment Revenues ($279.3 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $284.3 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14) are received from the State to support health and social services programs. The term 1991 Realignment refers to the transfer in 1991 of responsibility from the State to counties for certain health, mental health and social services programs, along with the provision of dedicated sales tax and vehicle license fee revenues to pay for these services. The 2011 State budget realigned various programs and the revenues to support them. See the section below on the 2011 Realignment. Mental health programs and funding were shifted from the 1991 Realignment to 2011 Realignment. Starting in Fiscal Year 2011-12, additional CalWORKs funding has been incorporated into the 1991 Realignment.

Between Fiscal Years 2002-03 and 2006-07, annual revenue growth averaged 5.0%. Revenues declined by an average 4.6% from the peak in 2006-07 of $313.0 million through 2010-11.

These revenues are budgeted above the Fiscal Year 2011-12 budgeted amount by 5.5% ($14.5 million) or 4.1% above prior year actuals ($11.0 million). It is anticipated that these revenues will grow modestly in Fiscal Year 2013-14. The chart above shows the realized reve-
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Revenues for Health and Social Services Realignment for Fiscal Years 2002-03 through 2011-12 and projected levels for Fiscal Years 2012-13 through 2013-14.

2011 Realignment (Health and Human Services and Public Safety). As part of the Fiscal Year 2011-12 State of California budget plan, the legislature enacted a major shift or “realignment” of State program responsibilities and revenues to local governments. Legislative changes were included in Assembly Bills (AB) 109, 117 and 118 along with other implementing legislation associated with the State of California’s Budget for Fiscal Year 2011-12. Due to the passage of AB 118, Local Revenue Fund 2011, the State replaced State General Funds with a portion of State sales tax and State and local Vehicle License Fee (VLF) revenues to local governments to fund various criminal justice, mental health, and social service programs beginning in Fiscal Year 2011-12. This is a significant shift from a known and committed amount of State funding for a broad range of programs to an estimated variable amount of sales tax which is remitted based on economic activity. The revenues provided for realignment are deposited into the Local Revenue Fund 2011 and allocated to specific accounts by statute. Additional changes are anticipated which would expand realignment further.

Public Safety Realignment 2011 ($106.7 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $116.0 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14). Funds allocated to the Local Community Corrections Account will support services required to address the transfer of responsibility for certain offenders from the State to the counties pursuant to AB 109, Public Safety Realignment (2011), including supervision of offenders, costs associated with the custody of offenders, including food and medical costs and equipment and furnishings for the East Mesa Detention Re-Entry and Rehabilitation Facility, and resources for services including mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment, and vocational and behavioral services.

Public Safety Realignment 2011 also includes these accounts and related subaccounts: Juvenile Justice (Youthful Offender Block Grant and Juvenile Reentry), Local Community Corrections (AB 109), Local Law Enforcement Services (various programs), District Attorney and Public Defender (AB 109), and Trial Court Security.

Health and Human Services Realignment 2011 ($200.7 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $200.7 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14). Health and Human Services Realignment 2011 includes activities in Behavioral Health Services, Adult Protective Services, Child Abuse Prevention, Child Welfare Services, Foster Care, Adoptions, and the activities related to mental health programs shifted from 1991 Realignment.

Proposition 172 - Public Safety Sales Tax Revenues ($220.5 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $226.6 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14) support regionwide public safety services provided by three Public Safety Group departments - the Sheriff, District Attorney and Probation. The revenue source is a dedicated one-half cent of the statewide sales tax that was approved by the voters in 1993 and is distributed to counties based on the relative levels of taxable sales in each county to the total taxable sales in all qualified counties. Counties in turn distribute a portion of the Proposition 172 receipts to their cities according to ratios established pursuant to the Government Code.

Between Fiscal Years 2002-03 and 2005-06, annual revenue growth averaged 9.0%. Revenues declined by an average 3.1% from the peak in 2005-06 of $236.4 million through 2010-11.

For Fiscal Year 2012-13, these revenues are budgeted above the Fiscal Year 2011-12 budgeted amount by 12.2% ($24.0 million) but below prior year actuals by 1.7% ($3.7 million) due to stronger than expected growth in Fiscal Year 2011-12 subsequent to budget development. It is anticipated that these revenues will grow modestly in Fiscal Year 2013-14. The chart on the preceding page shows the realized revenues for Proposition 172 for Fiscal Years 2002-03 through 2011-12 and projected levels for Fiscal Years 2012-13 through 2013-14. See, also, the discussion of General Purpose Revenue on page 77.

Tobacco Settlement Revenues ($32.2 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $24.2 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14) by Board of Supervisors Policy E-14, Expenditure of Tobacco Settlement Revenue in San Diego County, are dedicated to health care-based programs. These revenues are the result of the historic Master Settlement Agreement in 1998 between the California Attorney General and several other states and the four major tobacco companies. The agreement provided more than $206 billion in Tobacco Settlement Payments over 25 years in exchange for the release of all past, present and future claims related to the use of tobacco products. California agreed to distribute its share of the settlement to its counties based on population.
To reduce the risk of nonreceipt of the Tobacco Settlement Payments, some counties and states opted to securitize these payments. Securitization is a process whereby the owner of the receivable sells the right to that income stream to a third party in exchange for an up-front payment. The County of San Diego helped to pioneer this process and deposited the net proceeds of $412.0 million into the Tobacco Securitization Endowment Fund on a total securitization of $466 million in January 2002 in exchange for its Tobacco Settlement Payments. These funds are spent pursuant to the Board of Supervisors Policy.

In May 2006, the County securitized additional anticipated receipts and added $123.5 million to the endowment fund. These proceeds will enable the County to fund approximately $27.5 million of health care programs annually through approximately 2034. The $32.2 million budgeted in Fiscal Year 2012-13 reflects $8.0 million in one-time, nonsecuritized Tobacco Settlement funds and $24.2 million in Securitized Tobacco funds. Another $3.3 million is budgeted and retained in the Tobacco Securitization Special Revenue Fund. $3.1 million is budgeted and retained in the Tobacco Securitization Special Revenue Fund. $3.1 million is set aside as an unallocated reserve and $0.2 million is budgeted for processing costs in Fiscal Year 2012-13. A request will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors if the additional resources are needed.

General Fund - General Purpose Revenue

General Purpose Revenue (GPR) makes up 26.0% of the General Fund Financing Sources. Please see the separate discussion of General Purpose Revenue beginning on page 77.

General Fund - Use of Fund Balance/Fund Balance Component Decreases (previously Designations)

Use of Fund Balance, including Fund Balance Component Decreases, ($115.0 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $52.0 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14), represents 3.1% of General Fund Financing Sources in Fiscal Year 2012-13. Fund Balance is the result of careful management of resources Countywide in past years. It is both a resource that can be used for one-time expenses and one that serves as a mitigation for unexpected events or requirements. By its nature, fund balance is not suitable for the support of ongoing operations.

The following list details the various General Fund - Use of Fund Balance budgeted for Fiscal Year 2012-13:

- Management reserves.
- Negotiated one-time 1% salary payment not covered by other funding sources.
- Reentry program in the District Attorney and Probation departments.
- Information Technology (IT) equipment purchase and installation in the District Attorney.
- Resources for Child Support Services to match available federal funds.
- Medical Examiner equipment replacement.
- Equipment and equipment replacement rebudget in Sheriff’s.
- Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services Grant Program for one-time capital needs for volunteer fire protection districts.
- Aerial Fire Suppression “Call When Needed” support.
- Radio communication equipment for the Probation Department.
- Defense of special circumstance cases rebudget.
- Graduate law clerks and temporary staff for the Public Defender.
- Public Defender support for the remaining term of certain lease costs associated with the discontinued contract for Family Dependency Services.
- San Diego County Fire Authority equipment replacement commitment, acquisition of a reserve fire engine, and various program prevention and response activities.
- One-time major maintenance.
- Mainframe system software support.
- One-time resources to support recruitment activities associated with Assembly Bill (AB) 109, Public Safety Realignment (2011).
- Relocation efforts related to the County Operations Center capital project.
- Health and Human Services Juvenile Diversion Program support.
- Health and Human Services resources for transition from future State enacted cuts or economic downturn.
- Grand Avenue clinic sale proceeds commitment for Public Health.
- Childhood Obesity Initiative in Public Health.
Summary of General Fund Financing Sources

- Public Administration/Public Guardian (PA/PG) for one-time use to mitigate the projected decline in revenues and the continued reorganization of warehouse functions.
- HHSA technological advancements to support Live Well, San Diegof.
- Polaris all-terrain with vehicle spray equipment for pest management.
- Tribal liaison consultant and support rebudget.
- Firestorm 2007 rebuilding permit fee waiver rebudget.
- Environmental Health support for beach water quality monitoring rebudget.
- Green Building Program and Homeowner Relief Act Fee Waivers.
- Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) (North) Resource Management Plans to protect biological and cultural resources.
- Land Use implementation of workplan and associated General Plan amendments.
- Land Use rebudgets for Purchase of Agriculture Conservation Easements (PACE) program support, zoning ordinance update, Greenhouse Gas Guidelines Phase I, and code enforcement abatements.
- Land Use continuous improvement program and sponsor group training.
- Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) testing for Watershed Program.
- Traffic modeling support.
- Public Works rebudgets for Integrated Regional Water Management data management system grant match, Residential Integrated Pest Management program, and Proctor Valley Road closure.
- Downtown Justice Center Support Facilities Master Plan.
- Upgrade Fleet work order system to M5.
- Continuation of Vote-by-Mail program.
- Voice Response System rebudget
- Digital X-ray cameras for Carlsbad and Bonita animal shelters.
- Various information technology projects, such as:
  - Business Process Reengineering initiatives.
  - Probation Case Management System.
  - Accela for Mobile Office Implementation, CalAg-Permit System (CAPS), Agriculture Water Quality, and Pesticide Regulation Program and implementation costs for fee offset staff.
  - Business Case Management System - Accela rebudget for continued implementation, user acceptance testing, reporting tools and training.
  - Data imaging project rebudget.
  - Online Payment Solution Integration.
  - Parcel Genealogy, Business Intelligence and Asset Management applications rebudget.
  - Web-based Reporting System for Waste Haulers rebudget.
  - Documentum - document digitization, re-architect and upgrade to version 6.7, Community Development files (rebudget).
  - Upgrades or replacement of BRASS, XenDocs, and Chargeback.
  - Transition of County Counsel's Case Management System.
  - Electronic Document Submittal/Review Automation for Land Use rebudget.
  - Justice Electronic Library System implementation to create electronic files for juvenile case management.
  - Desktop virtualization.
  - Electronic Approval System and SharePoint enhancements and Documentum integration.
  - Transformation of Project Portfolio Management, Application Lifecycle Management, and Application Rationalization project to manage and identify existing software for replacement or upgrade.
  - Learning Management System database upgrade.
  - Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) short-term data storage and unanticipated project costs.
- Assessor Film Deterioration Project.
- Terminal leave for long-term staff.
- Workforce Academy for Youth (WAY) program.
- San Dieguito River Valley Open Space.
- Grants provided to community organizations.
- Capital projects including MSCP land purchases and Agua Caliente Campground Expansion and upgrades to sewer system and other utilities.
General Purpose Revenue

General Purpose Revenue by Source

General Purpose Revenue (GPR) represents approximately 26.0% of the General Fund’s Financing Sources. This revenue comes from property taxes, property tax in lieu of vehicle license fees (VLF), the Teeter program, sales and use tax, real property transfer tax (RPTT), Aid from Redevelopment Successor Agencies, and miscellaneous other sources. It may be used for any purpose that is a legal expenditure of County funds. The Board of Supervisors, therefore, has the greatest flexibility in allocating this revenue. Details of the major components of General Purpose Revenue are discussed below.

For the twelve-year period of Fiscal Year 1999-2000 through Fiscal Year 2011-12, GPR grew by an annual average of $38.4 million. This is a decrease from the eleven-year average of $41.4 million from Fiscal Year 1999-2000 through Fiscal Year 2010-11, and a decrease from the ten-year average of $46.4 million from Fiscal Year 1999-2000 through Fiscal Year 2009-10. The national recession that began in December 2007 and ended in June 2009, along with the State and local downturn that corresponded with the national recession, have had a significant impact on GPR. The U.S. economy is still continuing to recover from the deep recession. For Fiscal Year 2012-13, the $967.1 million budgeted for GPR is an increase of $2.7 million or 0.3% from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 budgeted amount of $964.4 million. These resources are projected to increase slightly to $974.5 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14. See the chart on the following page for a historical view of GPR. Also see the accompanying table for a summary by account of historical and projected GPR.
General Purpose Revenue History
Fiscal Year 1999-00 to Fiscal Year 2013-14

Notes: General Purpose Revenue (GPR) for Fiscal Years 1999-00 through 2011-12 represents actual revenue. GPR projections for Fiscal Years 2012-13 and 2013-14 are included in the 2012-14 Adopted Operational Plan.

General Purpose Revenue by Source
Fiscal Years 2010-11 Through 2013-14
### General Purpose Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2013-14 Approved Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes Current Secured</td>
<td>$477,192,517</td>
<td>$487,158,053</td>
<td>$490,625,867</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$494,058,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes Current Supplemental</td>
<td>3,044,869</td>
<td>1,874,015</td>
<td>3,291,750</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>3,324,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes Current Unsecured</td>
<td>17,338,957</td>
<td>16,781,591</td>
<td>16,522,894</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>16,459,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes Current Unsecured Supplemental</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Property Tax Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$497,576,343</td>
<td>$505,813,659</td>
<td>$510,490,511</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$513,893,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Property Tax In Lieu of VLF</strong></td>
<td>$301,837,082</td>
<td>$302,159,104</td>
<td>$301,668,991</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>$304,584,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeter Tax Reserve Excess</td>
<td>$21,500,000</td>
<td>$19,000,000</td>
<td>$21,000,000</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>$21,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeter Prop Tax Cumulative Prior Years</td>
<td>6,204,217</td>
<td>4,376,700</td>
<td>3,769,926</td>
<td>(13.9)</td>
<td>3,524,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeter Prop Tax Prior Year</td>
<td>12,554,621</td>
<td>9,542,387</td>
<td>7,756,580</td>
<td>(18.7)</td>
<td>7,687,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Teeter Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$40,258,838</td>
<td>$32,919,087</td>
<td>$32,526,506</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>$32,212,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Use Taxes</td>
<td>$14,999,966</td>
<td>$15,993,213</td>
<td>$18,406,197</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>$18,958,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Lieu Local Sales &amp; Use Tax</td>
<td>5,003,345</td>
<td>5,713,046</td>
<td>5,999,874</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,179,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sales &amp; Use Tax / In Lieu of Sales Tax</strong></td>
<td>$20,003,311</td>
<td>$21,706,259</td>
<td>$24,406,071</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>$25,138,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Aid HOPTR</td>
<td>$4,985,000</td>
<td>$4,910,000</td>
<td>$4,882,356</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>$4,882,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal In-Lieu Taxes</td>
<td>1,056,408</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>1,081,818</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td>1,081,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Detention Facility Revenue</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,850,953</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,850,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid From City of San Diego</td>
<td>5,222,553</td>
<td>5,222,553</td>
<td>2,371,600</td>
<td>(54.6)</td>
<td>2,371,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid from Redevelopment Agencies/Aid from Redevelopment Successor Agencies</td>
<td>24,362,009</td>
<td>29,612,382</td>
<td>29,772,755</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>29,971,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Intergovernmental Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$35,625,970</td>
<td>$40,844,935</td>
<td>$40,959,482</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$41,158,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes Prior Secured</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes Prior Secured Supplemental</td>
<td>2,030,625</td>
<td>4,033,363</td>
<td>4,914,113</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>4,963,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes Prior Unsecured</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>(16.7)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes Prior Unsecured Suppl.</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Tax Aircraft Unsecured</td>
<td>3,045,000</td>
<td>3,451,000</td>
<td>2,609,264</td>
<td>(24.4)</td>
<td>2,648,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Occupancy Tax</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Property Transfer Taxes</td>
<td>12,659,593</td>
<td>13,828,537</td>
<td>14,097,121</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>14,238,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchises, Licenses, Permits</td>
<td>10,083,693</td>
<td>10,336,530</td>
<td>10,513,537</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10,567,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees, Fines &amp; Forfeitures</td>
<td>2,124,258</td>
<td>2,064,742</td>
<td>2,221,017</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2,265,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalties &amp; Cost Delinquency Taxes</td>
<td>17,102,675</td>
<td>15,161,049</td>
<td>14,693,668</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
<td>14,774,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest On Deposits &amp; Investments</td>
<td>7,623,775</td>
<td>7,525,430</td>
<td>3,437,944</td>
<td>(54.3)</td>
<td>3,437,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Charges/Miscellaneous Revenues</td>
<td>1,028,305</td>
<td>1,028,305</td>
<td>1,027,775</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>1,032,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Revenues including RPTT</strong></td>
<td>$59,098,456</td>
<td>$60,978,956</td>
<td>$57,064,439</td>
<td>(6.4)</td>
<td>$57,478,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Revenues including RPTT</strong></td>
<td>$594,400,000</td>
<td>$964,422,000</td>
<td>$967,116,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$974,465,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Property Tax Revenue

Property Tax Revenue, ($510.5 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $513.9 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14), including current secured, current supplemental, current unsecured and current unsecured supplemental, represents 52.8% of the total General Purpose Revenue in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and 52.7% of the projected amount in Fiscal Year 2013-14.

(The term "current" refers to those taxes that are due and expected to be paid in the referenced budget year.) For Fiscal Year 2012-13, budgeted property tax revenue is $4.7 million or 0.9% higher than the budget for Fiscal Year 2011-12. Property tax revenue is projected to increase 0.7% or $3.4 million for Fiscal Year 2013-14. Property Tax Revenue in the State of California is a funding source for local governments and school districts and is based on ad valorem property taxation, whereby the amount due is calculated by applying a 1% tax rate to the assessed value of real property (land and improvements) and certain business personal property owned by tenants. The assessed value of property is tracked on the secured, unsecured and supplemental tax rolls. Counties generate the property tax bills and collect the tax payments on behalf of the taxing entities within their respective boundaries. In some cases, there are additional ad valorem taxes and special assessments approved by the voters, which are included on the tax bills as well. Property tax payment amounts received by the counties are then distributed to the various taxing entities.

San Diego County Locally Assessed Secured Property Values
Fiscal Year 2001-02 to Fiscal Year 2013-14

Notes: The projected locally assessed secured values assumes a -1.0% decline in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and 1.0% increase for Fiscal Year 2013-14. Source: San Diego County Auditor and Controller

The assessed value of real property declined in 2009 and 2010 (following the credit crisis and economic downturn that began in 2007) and it grew marginally in 2011. For 2012, weakness in residential markets is contributing to a 1% projected and budgeted decline in assessed value of real property overall.
Current Secured property tax revenue ($490.6 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $494.1 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14) is budgeted to increase by $3.5 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 from the adopted level for Fiscal Year 2011-12. This revenue is generated from the secured roll, that part of the roll containing real property, including residential and commercial property as well as State-assessed public utilities. The Fiscal Year 2012-13 revenue amount assumes a decline of 1% in the local secured assessed value compared to the actual current secured assessed value amount for 2011-12 (which was an approximate 0.4% increase from the prior year), but it also makes certain assumptions regarding the County’s share of countywide property tax revenues, the delinquency rate and the amount of tax roll corrections and refunds on prior year assessments.

In Fiscal Year 2012-13, refunds and corrections combined are projected to decline to $7.5 million compared to the Fiscal Year 2010-11 actual level of $19.4 million and the Fiscal Year 2011-12 actual level of $16.6 million because a significant portion of the decrease in property values since 2007 will have been captured and reflected in the total value of the 2012 tax assessment roll. While refunds and corrections are expected to decline, there is a risk that refunds and corrections may exceed budgeted levels due to commercial property assessment reviews currently in progress. The anticipated reduction in refunds and corrections will not increase current secured revenue as refunds and corrections were budgeted at $5.8 million in Fiscal Year 2011-12. The timing and amount of these potential resultant refunds is unknown and will be monitored closely.

The expected increase in revenue of $3.5 million or 0.7% is the net result of the budgeted increase in refunds and corrections compared to budget, the decrease in the budgeted current secured assessed value amount, an improvement in the delinquency rate, and the fact that the assessed value assumption used to develop the budget in Fiscal Year 2011-12 improved to a positive 0.4%. Specifically, the Fiscal Year 2011-12 current secured revenue assumed a 0.5% decrease in the local secured assessed value over the actual current secured assessed value amount for 2010-11. However, the actual current secured assessed value increased by 0.4%. Further, as noted above, for Fiscal Year 2012-13, local secured assessed value was budgeted to decline by 1.0%. The Fiscal Year 2012-13 actual change in local secured assessed value resulted in a 0.3% decline (gross less regular exemptions). This adjustment would generally contribute to a positive variance to budget, but it is expected to be offset by additional corrections and refunds in Fiscal Year 2012-13. For Fiscal Year 2013-14, local secured assessed value is assumed to grow by 1.0% and the County’s share of total property tax revenues is expected to increase based on this anticipated growth.

Current Supplemental property tax revenue ($3.3 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $3.3 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14) is budgeted to increase by $1.4 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 from the adopted level in Fiscal Year 2011-12. This revenue is derived from net increases to the secured tax roll from either new construction or changes in ownership that occur subsequent to the January 1 lien date and are, therefore, more difficult to predict. These actions are captured on the supplemental roll. The slowdown in new construction and the decline in real estate prices have been acutely felt in supplemental property tax revenues. In many change of ownership transactions, instead of a property owner being billed for an additional amount of property tax because the value of the property after the transaction is higher than the value as of the lien date, the property owner receives a refund because the value is lower than it was on the lien date.

In Fiscal Year 2005-06, supplemental refunds countywide totaled $4.0 million. They increased to $6.2 million in Fiscal Year 2006-07, increased to $15.0 million in 2007-08, and exceeded $38.3 million in Fiscal Year 2008-09. Supplemental refunds dropped to $21.6 million in Fiscal Year 2009-10 and dropped to $15.3 million in Fiscal Year 2010-11. In Fiscal Year 2011-12, supplemental refunds actually increased to $17.2 million. However, they are anticipated to continue to decline gradually over time as residential and commercial assessed values improve.

Current supplemental property tax revenues were $29.5 million in Fiscal Year 2005-06. They dropped to $23.4 million in Fiscal Year 2006-07, to $14.0 million in Fiscal Year 2007-08, to $2.4 million in Fiscal Year 2008-09, and to $1.9 million in Fiscal Year 2009-10. In Fiscal Year 2010-11, Current Supplemental property tax revenues were $3.9 million and in Fiscal Year 2011-12, Current Supplemental property tax revenues were $3.5 million. The budget assumes that this weakness will continue through the next two fiscal years with the Fiscal Year 2012-13 amount being $3.3 million, followed by $3.3 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14.

Current Unsecured property tax revenue ($16.5 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $16.5 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14) is not based on a lien on real property. The
unsecured roll is that part of the assessment roll consisting largely of business personal property owned by tenants. The roll is forecasted based on trends and available information at the time the budget is developed. A marginally more conservative projection is used for Fiscal Year 2013-14.

Current Unsecured Supplemental property tax revenue ($0.1 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $0.1 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14) is derived from supplemental bills that are transferred to the unsecured roll when a change in ownership occurs. There may be a subsequent change in ownership following the initial change in ownership or completion of new construction, which occurs prior to the mailing of the initial supplemental tax bill. When this occurs, the bill is prorated and a portion of the original supplemental tax bill that is attributable to the initial change in ownership or completion of new construction becomes an unsecured supplemental tax bill. Historically, this revenue category has not been budgeted because the actual amount of revenue received has been low.

Property Tax in Lieu of Vehicle License Fees (VLF)
Property Tax in Lieu of Vehicle License Fees (VLF) comprises 31.2% ($301.7 million) of the General Purpose Revenue amount in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and 31.3% of the projected amount ($304.6 million) in Fiscal Year 2013-14.

Beginning in Fiscal Year 2004-05, this revenue source replaced the previous distribution of vehicle license fees to local governments. Per the implementing legislation, revenue levels for this funding source are based on the growth or reduction in net taxable unsecured and local secured assessed value. With a projected and budgeted 1% decline in taxable unsecured and local secured assessed value in Fiscal Year 2012-13, revenues are anticipated to be $0.5 million lower than what was budgeted for Fiscal Year 2011-12. The decline is partially offset by the actual assessed value increase in Fiscal Year 2011-12 of 0.3% compared to a budgeted reduction of 0.5%. The Fiscal Year 2013-14 revenue is estimated using a 1.0% assessed value growth calculation.

Teeter Revenue
Teeter Revenue ($32.5 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $32.2 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14) represents about 3.4% of General Purpose Revenue in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and 3.3% of the projected amount in Fiscal Year 2013-14. For Fiscal Year 2012-13, budgeted Teeter Revenue is $0.4 million or 1.2% less than the budget for Fiscal Year 2011-12.

In Fiscal Year 1993-94, the County adopted the alternative method of secured property tax apportionment available under Chapter 3, Part 8, Division 1, of the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California (also known as the “Teeter Plan”). This alternative method provides for funding each taxing entity included in the Teeter Plan (named after its author) with its total secured property taxes and special assessments during the year for which the taxes are levied, regardless of whether all taxes due were paid by the property owner in that year. Under this plan, the County advances funds to these entities to cover the unpaid (delinquent) taxes (the “Teetered taxes”). The County’s general fund benefits from this plan by being entitled to future collections of penalties and interest that are also due once the delinquent taxes are paid.

Teeter Revenue is projected based on the anticipated collection of the County’s portion of the Teetered taxes from the prior year and cumulative prior years as well as the interest and penalty payments, which appear in the Teeter Tax Loss Reserve Excess account. See the table on page 79 for the amount of revenue pertaining to each of these three components. A legal requirement of the Teeter Plan requires the County to maintain a tax loss reserve fund to cover losses that may occur if delinquent taxes are not paid and the property goes into default and is sold for less than the outstanding taxes and assessments. Throughout the year, all interest and penalties collected on Teetered secured and supplemental property taxes are first deposited into the Teeter Tax Loss Reserve Fund. Any excess amounts above 25% of the total delinquent secured taxes and assessments may be transferred to the general fund.
For Fiscal Year 2012-13, collections from previous years' receivables are budgeted to decrease by $2.4 million based on the size of the outstanding annual receivables and anticipated collection trends and market conditions. In Fiscal Year 2012-13, excess amounts from the Teeter Tax Loss Reserve Fund are budgeted to increase from the $19.0 million in the Fiscal Year 2011-12 budget to $21.0 million. They are also projected at $21.0 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14.

Sales & Use Tax Revenue

Sales & Use Tax Revenue ($24.4 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $25.1 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14) represents about 2.5% of General Purpose Revenue in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and 2.6% of the projected amount in Fiscal Year 2013-14. This revenue is derived from taxable sales by retailers who sell or rent tangible personal property in unincorporated areas of the county or from use taxes from consumers who purchase tangible personal property from out of state. Use taxes are also imposed on the storage, use, lease or other consumption of tangible personal property at any time a sales tax has not been paid by the retailer. The amounts shown in the table on page 79 reflect the combined Sales and Use Tax revenues and the In Lieu Local Sales & Use Tax replacement funding that will be transferred to the County from the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF).

The ERAF was established in 1992-93 and 1993-94 in response to serious State budgetary shortfalls. The legislature and administration permanently redirected over $3 billion of property taxes from cities, counties and special districts to schools and community college districts. These redirected funds reduced the state’s funding obligation for K-14 school districts by a commensurate amount.

Sales & Use Tax revenue, in the county, had been growing moderately through Fiscal Year 2007-08 in concert with population growth and new retail business formation in the unincorporated areas of the county. However, the recession, housing market declines and unemployment trends negatively impacted taxable sales at the statewide, Southern California and San Diego regional level. Sales and Use Tax revenue started to improve during calendar year 2010 with year-over-year quarterly increases in all four quarters. This trend continued throughout calendar year 2011. Fiscal Year 2011-12 Sales and Use Tax revenue increased by $3.3 million or 15.4% compared to budget and $2.6 million or 11.6% compared to Fiscal Year 2010-11 actuals. For Fiscal Year 2012-13, the amount is budgeted to increase by $2.7 million or 12.4% above the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget. Sales Tax growth in Fiscal Year 2013-14 is anticipated to be $0.7 million or 3.0% over Fiscal Year 2012-13.

Intergovernmental Revenue

Intergovernmental Revenue ($41.0 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and $41.2 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14) comprises 4.2% of the General Purpose Revenue amount in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and 4.2% of the projected amount in Fiscal Year 2013-14.
For Fiscal Year 2012-13, the amount budgeted is $0.1 million or 0.3% above the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget. Funding from various intergovernmental sources include Redevelopment Successor Agencies, the City of San Diego (pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) related to the County’s Central Jail), the federal government (Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) for tax-exempt federal lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), and the State of California (reimbursement to the County for the Homeowner’s Property Tax Relief (HOPTR) program). Under the HOPTR program, homeowners are exempted from paying property taxes on the first $7,000 of the assessed value of their personal residence and the State reimburses local taxing entities for the related loss of revenue.

The largest portion of this funding is from aid from Redevelopment Successor Agencies. Redevelopment agencies were dissolved by the California legislature in ABX1 26 on June 28, 2011. The California Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the dissolution on December 29, 2011. The Court extended the date of dissolution to February 1, 2012. Based on Section 34183 of the Health and Safety Code, the county auditor-controller shall remit from the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund to each local agency and school entity an amount of property tax revenues in an amount equal to that which would have been received under Section 33401, 33492.14, 33607, 33607.6, 33607.7 or 33676. Residual funds not allocated for specific purposes will be distributed to local taxing agencies under Section 34183 of the Health and Safety Code, but the specific amount for Fiscal Year 2012-13 will not be finalized until later in the year.

Other Revenues

Other Revenues for Fiscal Year 2012-13 total $57.1 million and increase to $57.5 million in Fiscal Year 2013-14, and it is approximately 5.9% of the total General Purpose Revenue amount in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and 5.9% of the projected amount in Fiscal Year 2013-14. The Fiscal Year 2012-13 amount represents a 6.4% or $3.9 million decrease from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget.

Various revenue sources make up this "Other Revenues" category including Real Property Transfer Tax (RPTT), interest on deposits, fees, fines and forfeitures, prior year property taxes, penalties & cost delinquency taxes, franchise fee revenue, cable and video licenses and other miscellaneous revenues.

The largest component of this revenue category for Fiscal Year 2012-13, at $14.7 million, is Penalties & Cost Delinquency Taxes. These revenues are received as a result of penalties assessed on the late payment of current year taxes (those taxes paid late, but before the end of the fiscal year). The second largest component of Other Revenues, RPTT, is a leading indicator of local economic strength. RPTT revenue for Fiscal Year 2012-13 is budgeted at $14.1 million, a 1.9% ($0.3 million) increase from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget, reflecting a continued improvement in receipts compared to the substantial slowing and overall volatility that began in fall 2008. Revenues are projected to improve by $0.1 million or 1.0% in Fiscal Year 2013-14 with an assumption that property re-sales will continue to improve, but only modestly. RPTT is paid when any lands, tenements or other realty exceeding $100 in value are sold and granted, assigned, transferred or conveyed to the purchaser. The tax rate, set by the State, is $0.55 per $500 of assessed valuation. The County realizes 100% of the revenues from transactions in the unincorporated area and 50% of the revenues from transactions in the incorporated areas.
General Purpose Revenue (GPR) is allocated annually to fund County services based on an analysis of available program revenues, federal/State service delivery obligations and the priorities and strategic direction set by the Board of Supervisors. While the Fiscal Year 2012-13 budget for the Public Safety Group represents 30.3% of total County expenditures, the allocation of GPR for services in that Group equals 60.0% of the total GPR. By contrast, the Health and Human Services Agency’s budget represents 39.8% of total County expenditures but, because of significant amounts of funding from program revenues, it is allocated only about 6.6% of the total GPR. As noted above, the total amount of GPR increases in the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget by $2.7 million.

The allocation of GPR for Fiscal Years 2012-13 and 2013-14 reflects a multi-year strategy to managing County resources within the recovering economic environment, which began to show signs of stabilization and gradual recovery in Fiscal Year 2010-11 and continued in Fiscal Year 2011-12 despite weakness in current secured assessed values. The primary goals of this strategy are to preserve core public safety and nonpublic safety services, maintain the commitment to the County’s capital program, and address increases in contributions to the retirement fund.

Although various aspects of the economic environment are described elsewhere in this document, the following is a brief summary of trends. The total assessed value of real estate in the County fell in Fiscal Years 2009-10 and 2010-11, and grew marginally in Fiscal Year 2011-12. In Fiscal Year 2012-13, assessed value declined marginally again.

In Fiscal Year 2012-13, GPR is budgeted at $967.1 million, a slight improvement from Fiscal Year 2011-12, which was budgeted at $964.4 million, but still a significant drop from a high of $1.01 billion in Fiscal Year 2008-09. More
detail on the assessed value changes are described earlier in the General Purpose Revenue section. Also important are increases in the required contributions to the retirement fund driven by the 25.7% loss in the retirement fund’s market value in Fiscal Year 2008-09. The annual retirement contributions are budgeted to increase in Fiscal Year 2012-13 by 17.4% and in Fiscal Year 2013-14 by 15.7%. However, in Fiscal Year 2012-13 the negotiated decrease in the County portion of the employee paid retirement offset effective July 1, 2012 partially mitigates the increase. The Fiscal Year 2012-13 net employer contributions to the retirement fund are budgeted to increase by 9.1%. Contributions are expected to continue to increase significantly through Fiscal Year 2014-15; however, the annual rate of increase beyond Fiscal Year 2012-13 is not certain. Future contribution rates will be driven by the actual performance of the retirement fund. However, it is prudent to plan with these possibilities in mind.

### General Purpose Revenue Allocations by Group/Agency

**Fiscal Years 2010-11 Through 2013-14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Agency</th>
<th>FY2010-11 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY2013-14 Approved Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>$530.5</td>
<td>$563.9</td>
<td>$579.9</td>
<td>$609.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>$62.0</td>
<td>$62.9</td>
<td>$63.4</td>
<td>$65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use &amp; Environment</td>
<td>$54.6</td>
<td>$42.5</td>
<td>$43.6</td>
<td>$45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>$18.5</td>
<td>$18.7</td>
<td>$19.3</td>
<td>$19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; General Government</td>
<td>$108.2</td>
<td>$109.8</td>
<td>$111.5</td>
<td>$114.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Other</td>
<td>$180.6</td>
<td>$166.6</td>
<td>$149.4</td>
<td>$119.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$954.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$964.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$967.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$974.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The significant drop in retail sales statewide driven by economic contraction caused Proposition 172 and 1991 Realignment revenues to plummet from highs of $236.4 million for Proposition 172 in Fiscal Year 2005-06 and $313.0 million for 1991 Realignment in Fiscal Year 2006-07. Fiscal Year 2011-12 Proposition 172 budgeted revenues are still down $39.9 million from the 2005-06 peak but are anticipated to improve in Fiscal Year 2012-13 growing by $24.0 million from the Fiscal Year 2011-12 budgeted level. In Fiscal Year 2011-12, 1991 Realignment budgeted revenues are down $48.2 million from the 2006-07 high but are also anticipated to recover by $14.5 million in Fiscal Year 2012-13.

The resource management strategy to address these issues over the next two years is summarized as follows:

- The Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget factors in the County’s labor agreements and assumes salaries will remain at the Fiscal Year 2011-12 levels except for changes due to step or merit increases. In Fiscal Year 2012-13, employees in the CL, CM, FS, HS and SW bargaining units will receive a negotiated one-time 1% payment estimated at $3.0 million. Flex credits will increase 5% as of January 1, 2013. The County portion of the employee paid retirement offset will be further reduced in Fiscal Year 2012-13 by $17.0 million.

- Shifts $15.9 million from the pension stabilization fund in Fiscal Year 2012-13 to the five operating groups to fund the net cost increase in required retirement fund contributions and negotiated flex credit increases.

- Initially, $16.3 million of fund balance was allocated for public safety services in the Public Safety Group (PSG) as a placeholder. The PSG Proposition 172 Fund stabilization strategy was refined for Fiscal Year 2012-13 now that the revenue picture has become clearer. This revised strategy nearly eliminates the $16.3 million placeholder using a combination of Proposition 172 revenue growth and $1.4 million Proposition 172 fund balance generated in Fiscal Year 2011-12.

- The Fiscal Year 2013-14 Approved Budget also factors in the County’s labor agreements and assumes no negotiated wage increases, except for the DSA bargaining unit. The Fiscal Year 2013-14 Approved Budget includes a 1% negotiated wage increase for the DSA bargaining unit effective June 28, 2013 and a negotiated increase in flex credits effective January 1, 2014.

- Shifts $37.2 million from the pension stabilization fund in Fiscal Year 2013-14 to the five operating groups to fund the net cost increase in required retirement fund contributions.

- Uses $13.0 million of the Realignment fund balance commitment in Fiscal Year 2013-14 to offset the anticipated shortfall in realignment revenues compared to the County’s obligation to fund a share of the costs for certain health and social services programs. This amount is tentative and dependent upon the direction of the economy over the next year.

Further detail on GPR allocations is provided in the Group and department sections that begin on page 115. The previous charts and table show the amount of General Purpose Revenue allocated to support each Group/Agency for Fiscal Years 2012-13 and 2013-14 compared to the two prior fiscal years.
Summary of Financial Policies

Background

The County of San Diego has long been recognized for its strong financial management practices. The Government Finance Officers Association has recognized the County for its annual financial report with the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting and for its budget document with the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award. The following is an overview of various policies that the County adheres to in its financial management practices and uses to guide the County’s budgetary decision making process.

Financial Planning and Budget

The County is actively engaged in financial and strategic planning activities. As discussed previously, the General Management System is the framework that guides County operations as is set forth in Board of Supervisors Policy A-136, Use of County of San Diego General Management System for Administration of County Operations.

- With the GMS as a guide for fiscal management practices, the County will:
  - Maintain fiscal stability to ensure the ability to provide services that customers rely on, in good times and in bad. All departments share in the responsibility of ensuring fiscal stability for the County.
  - Ensure that the financial management activities of the County support structural balance between ongoing revenues and expenditures.
  - Use the Strategic Plan as a guide to develop an annual five-year financial forecast to review primary cost drivers, service needs and available funding sources, which will lay the foundation for the upcoming Operational Plan.
  - Annually develop a structurally balanced two-year Operational Plan, the first year of which is formally adopted by the Board of Supervisors as the County’s budget and the second year is accepted as a tentative plan.
    - California Government Code §29009 requires a balanced budget, defined as “the funding sources shall equal the financing uses,” in the recommended, adopted and final budgets.
    - A structurally balanced budget means that ongoing, not one-time, resources are used to fund ongoing costs.
  - Conduct quarterly financial reporting processes to allow County managers to appropriately address changes in the external economic or internal financial conditions of the organization. At no time shall total expenditures exceed total appropriations; a budget amendment must be submitted and approved by the Board of Supervisors.
  - Develop and use performance measures to monitor progress and ensure that the County is on track to achieve its goals.

Revenues

- As a political subdivision of the State of California, the County has all the powers specifically stated and necessarily implied in general law and the County Charter, including the power to assess, levy and collect taxes.
- The County shall review and evaluate revenues from all sources in order to maximize these revenues within existing legal provisions - County Administrative Manual 0030-22, Revenue Management: Auditor and Controller Responsibilities. The Auditor and Controller will:
  - Devise and monitor the goals and objectives of a revenue management program within policy guidelines prescribed by the Board of Supervisors. This includes a periodic review of the County's financial condition in order to ensure that the County’s financial sources (revenues) are sufficient to meet anticipated obligations.
  - Develop annual revenue estimates for the development of the Operational Plan relating to revenues under control of the Chief Administrative Officer.
  - Ensure that full cost is recovered from fees, grants and revenue contracts to the extent legally possible. If not, the reasons for recovery of less than full cost will be documented and disclosed.
- All revenues received by the County identified as “one-time” revenues will only be appropriated for “one-time” expenditures - County Administrative Manual 0030-14, Use of One-Time Revenues.
- County departments will seek to recover the full cost of all services they provide to agencies or individuals outside the County of San Diego organization on a contractual or fee basis or when obtaining grant funding. Exceptions to this policy require specific Board of Supervisors approval for the nonreimbursable costs - Board of Supervisors Policy B-29, Fees, Grants, Revenue Contracts - Department Responsibility for Cost Recovery.
Full cost is defined as the sum of direct costs plus departmental overhead costs plus external indirect costs as calculated pursuant to the federal Office of Management and Budget Circular A-87 cost plan for the County.
(http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/agencyinformation_circulars_pdf/a87_2004.pdf)

All proposed grant funding requests must be certified by the department head as being worthy of funding with County resources if external financing was unavailable.

Funding sources that will require a revenue match from the County General Fund shall be limited to the designated match level mandated as a condition of funding.

The establishment of fees, and subsequent changes to fees, will be done by ordinance or resolution at regularly scheduled meetings of the Board of Supervisors. Fees are to be deposited or paid in advance of delivery or completion of services. All fee schedules will be reviewed annually or more frequently, if warranted, to allow for full cost recovery.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall review all proposed new or changed fee schedules, grant applications and revenue contracts from an overall policy perspective before they are submitted to the Board of Supervisors for action. The County Counsel shall review all revenue contracts to ensure that the County’s interests are protected.

During the budget development process, selected departments may be asked to analyze services, either County operated or contracted, to determine if the quality, economy and productivity are equal to that of an alternative delivery method, including other government agencies, and to determine how the revenues can be maximized so the highest level or volume of services can be provided - Board of Supervisors Policy B-63, Competitive Determination of Optimum Service Delivery Method).

There are three basic categories of funding sources for County programs and services - Program Revenue, General Purpose Revenue and fund balance.

Program Revenue may be received in the form of fees paid by customers for a particular service or may be received as a subvention or grant from the State or federal government based on qualifying services being provided to local residents. For purposes of constructing the Operational Plan, Program Revenue is defined to also include all revenue received by special funds.

General Purpose Revenue may be used to provide for any service that is within the legal purview of the County. It is used to match federal or State program revenues where required and to fund mandated and discretionary services where either no program revenue or insufficient program revenue is received. General Purpose Revenue shall be budgeted only after all other funding sources for those services are taken into account.

Fund balance results from an excess of revenues over expenditures in prior fiscal years. Fund balance is used to support one-time projects only, not ongoing services.

Revenue received from the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement (1998) shall be allocated to support a comprehensive tobacco control strategy, to increase funding for health care-based programs, and to supplement, but not replace, existing health care revenue — Board of Supervisors Policy E-14, Expenditure of Tobacco Settlement Revenue in San Diego County.

All County funds shall be established according to the procedures set forth in County Administrative Manual 0030-18, Establishing Funds and Transfer of Excess Cash Balances to the General Fund. Interest earned on all funds is deposited to the General Fund, unless specific legislation, codes or Board of Supervisors action directs otherwise.

Expenditures

The Chief Administrative Officer supervises the expenditures of all departments and reports to the Board of Supervisors whether those expenditures are necessary - County Charter, Article VII, Section 703.4.

Changes during the year to the adopted budget are permitted by State law with approval by the Board of Supervisors or, in certain instances, by the Auditor and Controller.

Appropriation transfers of any amount between objects within a budget unit may be processed by the Auditor and Controller except when the transfer would have actual or potential programmatic impacts or is to or from Capital Projects, Road Projects or Operating Transfers between departmental budget units. Programmatic impact is defined as a change in program emphasis (e.g., due to shifts in workload or new opportunities), staffing or method of service delivery from the adopted budget. Appropriation transfer requests that fall within the exception categories require approval from the
Board of Supervisors — **County Administrative Manual 0030-10, Transfers of Appropriations between Objects within a Budget Unit.**

- As a general policy, the County does not backfill programmatic funding eliminated by the State of California.
- Contracts for services, when properly issued and administered, are an approved method to accomplish County program objectives. Pursuant to County Charter §§703.10 and §916, the County may employ an independent contractor if it is determined that the services can be provided more economically and efficiently than by persons employed in the Classified Service. The County may enter into contracts for services based upon conditions and methods as set forth in **Board of Supervisors Policy A-81, Procurement of Contract Services.**

The County shall procure items or services on a competitive basis unless it is in the County’s best interests not to use the competitive procurement process. The competitive procurement requirements may be satisfied through conducting either (a) formal bidding or (b) competitive negotiated procurement. Definitions and guidelines for exemptions and exceptions are outlined in **Board of Supervisors Policy A-87, Competitive Procurement.**

- The County will establish appropriations for the Community Enhancement Program at a level approximately equal to the amount of Transient Occupancy Tax revenues estimated to be collected each fiscal year. Each of the five Board of Supervisors office is allocated 20% of the total program amount for purposes of recommending grant awards to community organizations based on eligibility criteria and application guidelines — **Board of Supervisors Policy B-58, Funding of the Community Enhancement Program.**

All appropriations available for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Program will be included annually in the County’s Operational Plan. Resources available may vary and may range up to $10.0 million subject to the budget priorities of the Board of Supervisors as detailed in **Board of Supervisors Policy B-72, Neighborhood Reinvestment Program.**

**Reserves**

- The County provides a wide variety of services that are funded by a number of revenue sources. The County must be prepared for unforeseen events that could result in additional expenditure requirements or loss of revenue by establishing and maintaining prudent levels of fund balance and reserves.

- Pursuant to **Board of Supervisors Policy B-71, Fund Balance and Reserves,** the County will maintain fund balances and reserves in the General Fund to support fiscal health and stability including:
  - Fund Balance Committed for Unforeseen Catastrophic Events
  - General Fund Contingency Reserve
  - General Fund Minimum Fund Balance for Economic Uncertainty

- The Board of Supervisors may waive the requirement to maintain fund balance and reserve amounts at the targeted levels if it finds that it is in the best interest of the residents of the County to do so.

- In the event that the Commitment for Unforeseen Catastrophic Events, the Contingency Reserve or General Fund Minimum Fund Balance for Economic Uncertainty falls below targeted levels, the Chief Administrative Officer will present a plan to the Board of Supervisors for restoration to those targeted levels.

- For additional details on County Reserves, refer to page 95, Reserves and Resources.

**Debt Management**

- The County adopted **Board of Supervisors Policy B-65, Long-Term Financial Obligation Management Policy,** to ensure sound financial management. The Policy governs the County’s entry into financial obligations that exceed one fiscal year.

- The County may issue Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) as a short-term financing instrument to overcome temporary shortfalls in cash due to the timing of expenditures and receipt of revenues.

- For additional details on the County’s debt management policy, refer to page 98, Debt Management Policies and Obligations section.
Investments

- The San Diego County Treasurer-Tax Collector is responsible for the collection, banking, investment, disbursement and accountability of public funds, excluding pension funds. Accordingly, the County Treasurer shall annually prepare an Investment Policy that will be reviewed and monitored by the County Treasury Oversight Committee, established by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to California Government Code §§27130-27137.

- The monies entrusted to the County Treasurer (the Fund) will comprise an actively managed portfolio. This means that the Treasurer and his staff will observe, review and react to changing conditions that affect the Fund.

- The San Diego County Treasurer’s Pooled Money Fund Investment Policy shall be annually reviewed and approved at a public hearing by the Board of Supervisors. When investing, reinvesting, purchasing, acquiring, exchanging, selling and managing public funds:
  - The primary objective shall be to safeguard the principal of the funds under the County Treasurer’s control.
  - The secondary objective shall be to meet the liquidity needs of the participants.
  - The third objective shall be to achieve an investment return on the funds under control of the Treasurer within the parameters of prudent risk management.

- The Treasurer shall prepare a monthly investment report to be posted on the Treasurer-Tax Collector’s website.

- The Treasurer shall provide to the Treasury Oversight Committee an annual independent review by an external auditor to assure compliance with policies and procedures set forth by the California Government Code.

Capital Improvements

- The County Board of Supervisors has jurisdiction over the acquisition, use and disposal of County-owned real property and County-leased property under the authority of California Government Code §23004.

- The need for capital improvements is assessed annually. Board of Supervisors Policy B-37, Use of the Capital Program Funds, establishes funding methods, administration and control, and allowable uses of the Capital Program Funds.

- The physical assets of the County are extensive; thus, it is essential that the County follows an effective strategy to manage and plan for current and long-term capital and space needs. The Department of General Services shall be the responsible agency to manage the capital facilities planning and space needs of the County. The department is responsible for establishing the general objectives and standards for the location, design and occupancy of County-owned or leased facilities, as well as serving as the steward of a Countywide master plan and individual campus plan - Board of Supervisors Policy G-16, Capital Facilities and Space Planning.

- Additional details on the County’s Capital Program may be found on page 433.

Measurement Focus and Basis of Accounting

Governmentwide, proprietary and fiduciary fund financial statements are reported using the economic resources measurement focus and the accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recorded when earned and expenses are recorded when a liability is incurred, regardless of the timing of related cash flows. Property taxes are recognized as revenue in the fiscal year for which the taxes are levied. Grants and similar items are recognized as revenue as soon as all eligibility requirements imposed by the provider have been met.

Governmental Funds are reported using the current financial resources measurement focus and the modified accrual basis of accounting. Under this method, revenues are recognized when measurable and available. Sales taxes, investment income, State and federal grants and charges for services are accrued at the end of the fiscal year if their receipt is anticipated within 180 days. Property taxes are accrued if they are collectible within 60 days after the end of the accounting period. Expenditures are generally recorded when a liability is incurred, as under accrual accounting. However, debt service expenditures, as well as expenditures related to compensated absences, claims and judgments, are recorded only when payment is due. General capital asset acquisitions and general principal payments are reported as expenditures in governmental funds. Proceeds of general long-term debt and capital leases are reported as other financing sources.

Proprietary Funds distinguish operating revenues and expenses from nonoperating items. Operating revenues and expenses generally result from providing services and producing and delivering goods in connection with a proprietary fund’s principal ongoing operations. The principal operating revenues of the County’s enterprise funds and internal service funds are charges to customers for services. Operating expenses for enterprise funds and internal service funds include the costs of services, administrative
expenses and depreciation on capital assets. All revenues and expenses not meeting this definition are reported as nonoperating revenues and expenses.

For governmentwide (governmental and business-type activities) and proprietary fund activities, the County applies all applicable Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) pronouncements, as well as any applicable pronouncement of the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB), the Accounting Principles Board, or any Accounting Research Bulletins issued on or before November 30, 1989, unless those pronouncements conflict with or contradict GASB pronouncements. The County has elected not to apply the FASB standards issued subsequent to November 30, 1989, in reporting business-type activities and proprietary funds. The GASB periodically updates its codification of the existing Governmental Accounting and Financial Reporting Standards, which, along with subsequent GASB pronouncements (Statements and Interpretations), constitutes Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) for government agencies.

**Financial Statement Presentation**

For governmental funds only, current assets, current liabilities and fund balances are generally included on the balance sheet. The statement of revenues, expenditures and changes in fund balances - governmental funds present increases (i.e., revenues and other financing sources), decreases (i.e., expenditures and other financing uses) and the net change in fund balances.

For proprietary funds and fiduciary funds, all assets and all liabilities associated with the operation of these funds are included on the statement of net assets. Net assets for the proprietary funds are segregated into "invested in capital assets, net of related debt" and "unrestricted net assets" in the County’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). The net assets for the fiduciary funds are described as "held in trust for other pool participants" and "held in trust for individual investment accounts" in the CAFR. Proprietary funds statement of revenues, expenses and changes in fund net assets present increases (i.e., operating revenues and nonoperating revenue), decreases (i.e., operating expenses and nonoperating expenses), income/loss before capital contributions and transfers and the change in net assets.

**Differences Between Budgetary and Financial Reports**

**Governmental Funds** — An operating budget is adopted each fiscal year by the Board of Supervisors for the governmental funds. The annual resolution adopts the budget at the object level of expenditure within departments and authorizes the carry forward of appropriations and related funding for prior year encumbrances. Certain annual appropriations are budgeted on a project or program basis. If such projects or programs are not completed at the end of the fiscal year, unexpended appropriations, including encumbered funds, are carried forward to the following year with the approval of the Board of Supervisors. Any budget amendments are approved by the Group and department managers or the Board of Supervisors.

The schedule of revenues, expenditures and changes in fund balance - budget and actual - is presented as Required Supplementary Information in the CAFR and is prepared in accordance with GAAP. This statement includes the following columns:

- The Original Budget column consists of the adopted budget plus the encumbrances carried forward from the prior fiscal year. The County adopts its budget subsequent to the start of the new fiscal year.
- The Final Budget column consists of the Original Budget column plus amendments to the budget occurring during the fiscal year.
- The Actual column represents the actual amounts of revenues and expenditures reported on a GAAP basis which is the same basis that is used to present the aforementioned original and final budget.

**Proprietary Funds** — The Board of Supervisors approves an annual spending plan for proprietary funds. Although the adopted expense estimates are not appropriations, their budgetary controls are the same as those of the governmental funds. Because these funds collect fees and revenues generally to cover the cost of the goods and services they provide, their accounting and budgeting bases are closer to commercial models.

**All Funds/GASB 54** — The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) issued GASB Statement No. 54, Fund Balance Reporting and Governmental Fund Type Definitions, which structures the fund balance components to focus financial reporting on planned use of funds and constraints on the specific purposes for which funds can be spent.
The five components of fund balance are:
- Nonspendable fund balance - inherently nonspendable.
- Restricted fund balance - externally enforceable limitations on use.
- Committed fund balance - self-imposed limitations set in place prior to the end of the period.
- Assigned fund balance - limitation resulting from intended use.
- Unassigned fund balance - residual net resources.

Fund Balance Component Increases are shown as appropriations (expenditures) and Fund Balance Component Decreases are shown as revenues when used as a funding source. These two categories are only used for adjustments to Restricted, Committed or Assigned fund balance. The term "Use of Fund Balance" indicates that budgetary fund balance available for use is being applied as a funding source.
Capital Projects

Each year, the County assesses the need for capital improvements in accordance with Board of Supervisors Policies G-16, Capital Facilities and Space Planning and B-37, Use of the Capital Program Funds. These policies provide guidelines for the County's multi-year approach to planning for capital projects. The projects identified in this process include the improvement to or acquisition of land and facilities. Certain infrastructure projects, such as roads, bridges and sewer lines, are reviewed separately and budgeted in the applicable operating fund (e.g., Road Fund or sanitation district funds). The Fiscal Year 2012-13 capital projects budget for the County is $84.3 million and $2.5 million for Fiscal Year 2013-14. This excludes amounts appropriated in the Edgemoor Development Fund to support the long-term lease payments associated with the construction of the Edgemoor Skilled Nursing Facility. The Capital Program section of this Operational Plan on page 433 highlights major projects and includes a schedule of lease-purchase payments related to previously debt-financed projects.

The following chart shows the dollar amount and number of projects with new appropriations by Capital Program fund, as well as a summary by Group/Agency of the remaining dollar amount for projects previously budgeted and the number of projects still underway. Once appropriations are established for a capital project, they are carried forward until the project is completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Project Appropriations</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriation Increases for New &amp; Existing Capital Projects (Fiscal Year 2012-13)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay Fund</td>
<td>$ 46,702,282</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Facility Construction Fund</td>
<td>27,600,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Species Conservation Program Fund</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Appropriation Increases for New &amp; Existing Capital Projects (Fiscal Year 2012-13)</strong></td>
<td>$ 84,302,282</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects Underway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Group</td>
<td>$ 215,302,968</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services Agency</td>
<td>1,285,905</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use &amp; Environment Group</td>
<td>49,050,742</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services Group</td>
<td>83,324,796</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; General Government Group</td>
<td>39,252,707</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Projects Underway</strong></td>
<td>$ 388,217,119</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 472,519,401</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Capital Program section of this Operational Plan on page 433 highlights major projects and includes a schedule of lease-purchase payments related to previously debt-financed projects.
Reserves and Resources

The County maintains a prudent level of resources to help protect the fiscal health and stability of the County. These tables include frequently referenced budgetary reserves and resources but do not include the reserves and resources of all funds as reported in the Consolidated Annual Financial Report (CAFR). The figures in the tables reflect budgeted and/or estimated amounts for the items listed. The totals for these items may vary from those in the CAFR since the CAFR reflects final audited fiscal year end balances. The CAFR can be accessed at http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/auditor/cafr.html.

In addition, due to the implementation of Governmental Accounting and Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 54, Fund Balance Reporting and Governmental Fund Type Definitions, certain accounts have been revised to reflect the new naming convention. See Summary of Financial Policies for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserves and Resources (in millions)</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Minimum Fund Balance for Economic Uncertainty</td>
<td>$ 100.0</td>
<td>$ 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Contingency Reserve - Operations</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed Fund Balance - Unforeseen Catastrophic Events</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Agency Management Reserves</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 207.7</td>
<td>$ 205.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Fund - Fund Balance and Reserves**

The County provides a wide variety of services that are funded by a number of revenue sources. Expenditures for these services are subject to fluctuations in demand; revenues are influenced by changes in the economy and budgetary decisions made by the State of California and the federal government. In accordance with Board of Supervisors Policy B-71, Fund Balance and Reserves, the County must be prepared for unforeseen events or economic uncertainties that could result in additional expenditure requirements or loss of revenue by establishing and maintaining prudent levels of fund balance and reserves.

- **General Fund Minimum Fund Balance for Economic Uncertainty** — Established in Fiscal Year 2009-10, pursuant to Board of Supervisors Policy B-71, Fund Balance and Reserves (previously known as General Fund Designation of Fund Balance for Economic Uncertainty), sets a target amount that equates to 10% of General Purpose Revenue. The $100.0 million set aside of General Fund unassigned fund balance for Fiscal Year 2012-13 equates to 10.3% of General Purpose Revenue and is in compliance with that policy.

- **General Fund Contingency Reserve** — Appropriated for unanticipated needs or to offset revenue shortfalls during the fiscal year. Board of Supervisors Policy B-71, Fund Balance and Reserves, sets a target amount that equates to 2% of budgeted General Purpose Revenue. The $20.0 million budgeted for Fiscal Year 2012-13 equates to 2.1% of General Purpose Revenue and is in compliance with that policy.

- **Committed - Unforeseen Catastrophic Events** — Established in Fiscal Year 2007-08 by the Board of Supervisors, previously known as General Reserve, to address unforeseen catastrophic situations. By law, the General Reserve may be established, cancelled, increased or decreased at the time of adopting the budget with a three-fifths vote of the Board of Supervisors. It may be increased at any time during the year with a four-fifths vote of the Board, and in the case of a legally declared emergency as defined in Government Code §29127, the Board by a four-fifths vote may appropriate these funds and make the expenditures necessary for the emergency. Board of Supervisors Policy B-71, Fund
Reserves and Resources

**Balance and Reserves**, sets a target amount for this reserve that equates to 5% of budgeted General Purpose Revenue. The County’s fund balance commitment for Unforeseen Catastrophic Events of $55.5 million equates to 5.7% of Fiscal Year 2012-13 budgeted General Purpose Revenue and is in compliance with the policy.

**Group/Agency Management Reserves** — Appropriations established at the Group/Agency or department level to fund unanticipated items during the fiscal year or for a planned future year use. There is no targeted level for these reserves. However, establishment of management reserves shall not be permitted if the action would result in the amount of unassigned fund balance falling below the targeted level.

### Additional Reserves and Resources (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Securitization Endowment Fund</td>
<td>$392.6</td>
<td>$370.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Compensation Fund</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>106.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Trust Fund</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Liability Fund</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted - Debt Service</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$610.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$592.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Reserves and Resources**

The additional reserves and resources reflected in the table above represent the most frequently referenced budgetary reserves and resources but do not include all reserves and resources reported in the CAFR.

**Tobacco Securitization Endowment Fund** — The County established the Tobacco Securitization Endowment Fund in January 2002. In lieu of receiving the Tobacco Settlement revenue on an annual basis, the County securitized the payment stream and deposited the net proceeds of $412.0 million into the Tobacco Securitization Endowment Fund. Based on certain interest rate assumptions, these proceeds would have enabled the County to fund approximately $24.2 million of health care programs annually through approximately 2020. Due to lower than anticipated interest earnings, in May 2006, the original issuance was refunded through a second securitization and an additional $123.5 million was deposited into the fund. It is estimated that this will extend the life of the endowment fund from the year 2020 to 2034 and allow for $27.5 million in anticipated proceeds annually.

**Workers’ Compensation Fund** — The County contracts with an actuary to annually estimate the liability and capture the costs associated with all reported and unreported workers’ compensation claims. The liability is estimated to be $113.0 million, which includes $25.3 million in expected costs for Fiscal Year 2011-12. The cash balance in the fund was $106.6 million as of July 1, 2012.

**Environmental Trust Fund** — Proceeds from the sale of the County’s Solid Waste System on August 12, 1997, were set aside to fund inactive/closed landfill management for approximately 30 years. The decrease from Fiscal Year 2011-12 to Fiscal Year 2012-13 represents the net amount drawn down to support landfill management operations.

**Public Liability Fund** — The County contracts with an actuary to annually assess the long-term liability of the fund and determine adequate level of reserves for current and future public risk management claims. The liability is estimated to be $25.9 million, which includes $10.6 million in expected costs for Fiscal Year 2011-12. The cash balance in the fund was $35.5 million as of July 1, 2012.

**Restricted - Debt Service** — The portion of bond proceeds from various County Certificates of Participation and Lease Revenue Bonds that are set aside to provide assurance to the investors that funds are available should the County not be able to make a lease payment from currently budgeted resources.
Reserves and Resources

Committed Fund Balance (General Fund only)
The Board of Supervisors has determined from time to time that certain amounts of fund balance be set aside for specific purposes. Balances can increase or decrease depending upon whether the funds are being accumulated for later use, are being used because of fluctuating workloads, or to make scheduled payments over a limited period of time. The figures in the table do not reflect all General Fund commitments, but rather those with an increase or decrease. Totals for these items may vary from those in the Consolidated Annual Financial Report (CAFR) since the CAFR reflects final audited fiscal year end balances. The CAFR can be accessed at http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/auditor/cafr.html.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committed Fund Balance (General Fund only, in millions)</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Increase/(Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committed - Sale Proceeds Grand Avenue Clinic</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed - SDCFA Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed - Environmental Health</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Committed - Sales Proceeds Grand Avenue Clinic** — Established in Fiscal Year 2010-11 to set aside funds for future replacement of a Health and Human Services Agency public health clinic based on proceeds from the sale of the former North Central Public Health Clinic on Grand Avenue.

- **Committed - SDCFA Equipment Replacement** — Established in Fiscal Year 2012-13 to set aside funds for future replacement of San Diego County Fire Authority (SDCFA) equipment.

- **Committed - Environmental Health** — Established in Fiscal Year 2003-04, by the Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to set aside any excess revenue over cost that may occur in some fiscal years for use in a subsequent fiscal year when costs exceed revenue. This ensures that excess revenue over cost paid by DEH customers is used only to fund expenses in DEH.
Debt Management

The County of San Diego uses debt financing to: (i) fund certain capital assets that support the provision of services by the County; (ii) achieve savings in meeting its obligations to the pension fund; or (iii) provide for short-term cash flow requirements. The decision to use debt financing is governed by several factors including the nature of the project to be financed, availability of other financing, and debt affordability. The County enters into both long-term and short-term financings, which undergo the scrutiny of the credit rating agencies. The County’s long-term financings adhere to a Board of Supervisors approved policy. This policy, the County’s current credit ratings and the various forms of debt financing utilized by the County are described in more detail below. The term debt is used to refer to certain financial obligations of the County that are sold in the capital markets, including its bonds, Certificates of Participation and notes.

Long-Term Obligation Policy

The foundation of any well-managed debt program is a comprehensive and fiscally prudent policy that sets forth the parameters for issuing debt and managing the outstanding debt portfolio and provides guidance to decision makers. Adherence to a long-term financial strategy and policy is important to ensure that the County maintains a sound debt position and that credit quality is protected. The County Board of Supervisors adopted Board Policy B-65, Long-Term Financial Obligation Management Policy, on August 11, 1998, and periodically reviews and updates it as necessary. Policy B-65, along with the rating agencies' analyses, have been the foundation for managing the County’s debt program. For purposes of this policy, long-term financial obligations are those that exceed one fiscal year.

Long-Term Obligation Limits

- All long-term financings shall comply with federal, State and County Charter requirements.
- All long-term obligations must be approved by the Board of Supervisors after approval and recommendation by the Debt Advisory Committee, which is composed of the Chief Financial Officer (CFO), the Auditor and Controller and the Treasurer-Tax Collector.
- Prior to its recommendation, the Debt Advisory Committee shall assess the ability of the County to repay the obligation, identify the funding source of repayment, evaluate the impact of the ongoing obligation on the current budget and future budgets, assess the maintenance and operational requirements of the project to be financed, and consider the impact on the County’s credit rating.
- The term of the long-term obligation will not exceed the useful life or the average life of the project or projects being financed.
- Annual principal and interest payments on long-term obligations of the General Fund will not exceed 5% of General Fund revenue.

Uses of Long-Term Obligations

- Long-term financial obligations will not be used to finance current operations or recurring needs.
- The Board of Supervisors may consider long-term financial obligations for the purpose of providing office space or operational facilities to County departments or agencies, upon recommendation of the Debt Advisory Committee. Capital projects identified as candidates for debt financing should have first been identified and prioritized during the development of the County’s multi-year Capital Improvement Needs Assessment. If the Debt Advisory Committee deems that the financing is feasible, financially and economically prudent, coincides with the County’s objectives and does not impair the County’s creditworthiness, then it will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for consideration.

Structuring Practices

- Variable rate obligations shall not exceed 15% of the County’s outstanding long-term obligations.
- Derivative products, such as interest rate swaps, will be considered only if they meet the economic goals and policy objectives of the County as outlined in the Swap Policy of the Debt Advisory Committee.
- Long-term obligations taken on by organizations utilizing the County as a conduit issuer must qualify for an investment grade rating by one of the nationally recognized rating agencies (either with or without alternative credit enhancement). An exception to this requirement would be private placements subject to approval by the Debt Advisory Committee.

Management Practices

- The County shall encourage and maintain good relations with credit rating agencies, investors in the County’s long-term financial obligations, and those in the financial community who participate in the issuance or monitoring of the County’s long-term obligations. A policy of full
and open disclosure on every financial report and long-term obligation transaction will be enforced, an investor relations website will be maintained with current and accurate information, and a credit rating agency presentation/update shall be conducted annually.

- The County shall comply with all ongoing disclosure conditions and shall file such required documents in a timely manner.
- The County shall monitor earnings on bond proceeds and rebate excess earnings as required to the U.S. Treasury to avoid the loss of tax-exempt status.
- The County of San Diego will enforce filing notices of completion on all projects within five years of their financing. The County shall continually review outstanding obligations and aggressively initiate refinancings when economically feasible and advantageous.

Credit Ratings

The most recent long-term credit review by Moody’s Investors Service, Standard and Poor’s and Fitch Ratings was performed in May and June 2012, when the agencies assigned ratings to the County’s Fiscal Year 2012-13 Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes, and affirmed the County’s long-term obligation and issuer ratings as well. All three rating agencies cited the County’s strong financial management, broad and diverse economy, and low to moderate debt burden in their rationale for the ratings they assigned. According to Fitch Ratings, “the county’s strong financial results are supported by forward-looking management policies and practices that include reserve targets, disciplined funding of capital needs and long-term obligations, and conservative budgeting.” Moody’s Investors Service states that the County’s financial position remains strong and its affirmation of County ratings is based on “the county’s solid fiscal position, very large and slowly growing economy, and low debt levels.” Standard and Poor’s affirms its ratings of the County and its obligations and maintains the stable outlook on the County’s ratings because of “the county’s deep and diverse economy, strong reserves, formal policies, manageable debt, and record of conservative budgeting.”

The San Diego County Employees Retirement Association (SDCERA) had its ‘AAA’ rating affirmed by Standard & Poor’s in February 2012. The rating reflects the organization’s overall capacity to pay its financial obligations, and is based on SDCERA’s strong fund management, good funded status despite a challenging fiscal year and continued strong credit quality of the pension system’s sponsor (County of San Diego).

The San Diego County Investment Pool continues to hold an AAAf/S1 rating from Standard & Poor’s. The rating reflects the extremely strong protection the pool’s portfolio investments provide against losses from credit defaults. The pool invests primarily in ‘AAA’ or ‘A-1/P-1/F-1’ rated securities. The ‘S1’ volatility rating signifies that the pool possesses low sensitivity to changing market conditions given its low-risk profile and conservative investment policies.

The County of San Diego’s credit ratings are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Ratings</th>
<th>Moody’s Investors Service</th>
<th>Standard &amp; Poor’s</th>
<th>Fitch Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego (Issuer Rating)</td>
<td>Aa1 (GSR)</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Participation and</td>
<td>Aa3 (GSR)</td>
<td>AA+</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Revenue Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Obligation Bonds</td>
<td>Aa2 (GSR)</td>
<td>AA+</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Employees Retirement</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Investment Pool</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>AAAf/S1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GSR - Global Scale Rating
Authority to Finance and Bond Ratios

The table below lists the statutes authorizing the County of San Diego to enter into long-term and short-term obligations and, if applicable, the legal authority on maximum bonded indebtedness. All long-term and short-term obligations must conform to State and local laws and regulations. The basic constitutional authority for State and local entities to enter into long-term and short-term obligations is in the Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. To incur long-term or short-term obligations within the State of California, a political subdivision must have either express or implied statutory authority.

State constitutional limitations prohibit cities and counties from entering into indebtedness or liability exceeding in any year the income and revenue provided for such year unless the local agency first obtains two-thirds voter approval for the obligation.

However, there are three major exceptions to the debt limit which have been recognized by the California courts: (i) the Offner-Dean lease exception, (ii) the special fund doctrine and (iii) the obligation imposed by law exception.

The Offner-Dean lease exception provides that a long-term lease obligation entered into by an agency will not be considered an indebtedness or liability under the debt limit if the lease meets certain criteria.

The special fund doctrine is an exception to the debt limit which permits long-term indebtedness or liabilities to be incurred without an election if the indebtedness or liability is payable from a special fund and not from the entity’s general revenue. An example of a special fund would be one consisting of enterprise revenue that is used to finance an activity related to the source of the revenue.

The courts have applied the obligation imposed by law exception to indebtedness used to finance an obligation imposed on the local agency by law. The theory of this exception is that the obligation is involuntary; therefore, it would not be relevant to obtain voter approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority to Finance</th>
<th>Issuance Legal Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issuer</strong></td>
<td><strong>General: Government Code §5900 et seq. and §29900 et seq.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Maximum Indebtedness: Government Code §29909</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Short-Term TRANs: Government Code §53820 et seq.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pension Obligation Bonds: Government Code §53580 et seq.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation</td>
<td>Corporations Code §5110 et seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Powers Authority</td>
<td>Government Code §6500 et seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Agency*</td>
<td>Health and Safety Code §33000 et seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>Health and Safety Code §34200 et seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mello-Roos Community Facilities District</td>
<td>Street and Highway Code §6400 et seq. and §8500 et seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Bonds</td>
<td>Government Code §53311 et seq.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Effective February 1, 2012, Redevelopment Agencies in California have been dissolved and the authority for Redevelopment Agencies to issue new bonds has expired.
Bond Ratios

Bond ratios useful to County management, the general public and investors are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Ratios</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2007-08</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2008-09</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2009-10</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Bonded Debt (in millions)¹</td>
<td>$1,578.7</td>
<td>$1,404.1</td>
<td>$1,436.7</td>
<td>$1,265.5</td>
<td>$1,204.4</td>
<td>$1,177.0²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Bonded Debt per Capita³,⁴</td>
<td>$521</td>
<td>$458</td>
<td>$465</td>
<td>$406</td>
<td>$383</td>
<td>$371⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Net Bonded Debt to Assessed Value</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Net Bonded Debt excludes Redevelopment Agency Bonds and reflects the net effect of debt service reserves.
³ Based on the January 1st annual estimated population figures for the County of San Diego provided by the State of California Department of Finance (DOF). E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State with Annual Percent Change - January 2001 to 2009, with 2000 and 2010 Census counts. This also includes revised January 1, 2011 and January 1, 2012 population estimates by the DOF that incorporate the 2010 Census counts.
⁴ Based on estimated January 1, 2013 population figures for the County of San Diego using an annual average growth for the last ten years.

Note: If the County were to issue General Obligation Bonds, the debt limit pursuant to Government Code §29909 would be 1.25% of the taxable property of the county. The estimated taxable assessed value in the county as of June 30, 2012 is $393.0 billion.

General Fund Debt Service Ratios

The Total Debt Service reported in the table below is composed of payments on the County’s Pension Obligation Bonds, Certificates of Participation and Lease Revenue Bonds. They are described in the following section titled Long-Term Obligations. In addition, the detail of the payments required for assets financed through the Certificates of Participation and Lease Revenue Bonds is provided on page 474 in the Capital Program section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of General Fund Debt Service Ratio (in millions)</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2009-10 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2013-14 Approved Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Revenue¹</td>
<td>$3,446.3</td>
<td>$3,447.7</td>
<td>$3,526.9</td>
<td>$3,603.9</td>
<td>$3,585.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Debt Service ²</td>
<td>$129.4</td>
<td>$120.5</td>
<td>$120.5</td>
<td>$124.5</td>
<td>$118.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Total Debt Service to General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Share of Debt Service Cost ³</td>
<td>$103.5</td>
<td>$93.6</td>
<td>$95.0</td>
<td>$97.2</td>
<td>$91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of General Fund Share of Debt Service to General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See table notes on the following page.
Debt Management Policies and Obligations

General Fund Revenue excludes fund balance and fund balance component decreases.

The decrease in Total Debt Service in Fiscal Year 2010-11 is mainly due to the final payment of principal and interest for the Information Technology Certificates of Participation made in Fiscal Year 2009-10.

General Fund Share of Debt Service Cost excludes debt service chargeable to special revenue funds, enterprise funds, special districts and external funding sources.

Long-Term Obligations

The County’s outstanding long-term principal bonded debt as of June 30, 2012 and projected as of June 30, 2013 is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Principal Bonded Debt (in millions)</th>
<th>As of June 30, 2012</th>
<th>Projected as of June 30, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Participation</td>
<td>$ 261.4</td>
<td>$ 239.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>133.8</td>
<td>130.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Obligation Bonds</td>
<td>806.8</td>
<td>770.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Agency Tax Allocation Bonds</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 1,215.9</td>
<td>$ 1,154.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following discussion explains the nature and purpose of each of the long-term financing instruments available to or used by the County.

Certificates of Participation (COPs) and Lease Revenue Bonds (LRBs) are sold to investors to raise cash for the financing of capital infrastructure. The repayment of these COPs and LRBs is secured by a revenue stream created by lease payments, often associated with the capital asset that the proceeds of the COPs or LRBs are funding. These lease payments are established in agreements between the County and another entity, typically either a nonprofit corporation, such as the San Diego County Capital Asset Leasing Corporation, or a joint powers authority, such as the San Diego Regional Building Authority. The annual lease payments from the County to the financing entity are in an amount sufficient to satisfy the principal and interest payments due to the holders of the COPs or LRBs. At the end of the lease period, the title to the asset is typically conveyed to the County.

The County first used COPs in 1955 with the financing of the El Cajon Administrative Building. Since then, the County has made use of various lease-backed transactions, both COPs and LRBs, to fund the County’s major capital requirements. The County currently has COPs and LRBs outstanding, the proceeds of which were used to fund the construction of various justice facilities, the Edgemoor Skilled Nursing Facility, the County Operations Center and the anticipated County Administration Center Waterfront Park.

Taxable Pension Obligation Bonds (POBs) are financing instruments typically used to pay some or all of a pension plan’s unfunded liability. The bond proceeds are transferred to the issuer’s pension system as a prepayment of all or part of the unfunded pension liabilities of the issuer, and the proceeds are invested as directed by the pension system. POBs have been issued on several occasions by the County to reduce the unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL) of the San Diego County Employees Retirement Association (SDCERA) on a lump sum basis rather than making actuarially determined amortized payments over a specified period of years. The size of the UAAL is determined annually by an actuary and can increase or decrease depending on changes in actuarial assumptions, earnings on the assets of the fund and retiree benefits. POBs totaling $430.4 million were first issued by the County in February 1994. Since this initial issue, the County has issued additional series of POBs: in September 2002, the County issued $737,340,000 of POBs, a portion of which refunded the POBs issued in 1994; in June 2004, the County issued an additional $454,112,916 of POBs; and in August 2008, $443,515,000 of POBs were issued to refund the variable rate portion of the POBs issued in 2002.

A total of $264 million of the principal component of the County’s outstanding taxable POBs has been prepaid. As reflected in the Fiscal Year 2009-10 Adopted Operational Plan, the most recent prepayment occurred on July 1, 2009 and retired the $100 million of outstanding 2008 Series B1-B2 POBs (variable rate demand obligations). This most recent prepayment resulted in lowering the aggregate...
annual debt service for the taxable POBs from $86.0 million to $81.4 million and a further shortening of the final maturity to Fiscal Year 2026-27. As of June 30, 2012, the County had $806.8 million of taxable POBs outstanding.

**Redevelopment Agency Tax Allocation Bonds (TABs)** are limited obligations issued by the Redevelopment Agency of the County of San Diego (Agency) to help pay for improvements related to redevelopment projects. The Agency was formed on October 14, 1974 pursuant to Redevelopment Law, and effective February 1, 2012 has been dissolved by the State legislature. Any outstanding TABs of the Agency are now limited obligations of the County’s Successor Agency, which now manages the assets, repays the debts, and fulfills other obligations that were previously attributable to the Agency. An initial series of TABs was issued on September 12, 1995 as limited obligations of the Agency in the amount of $5.1 million for the construction of public improvements at the Gillespie Field Airport located on the Gillespie Field Redevelopment Project Area, which was one of the Agency’s two redevelopment project areas. On December 22, 2005, the Agency issued $16 million in TABs to refund all of the Agency’s outstanding 1995 bonds and to repay loans owed to the County’s Airport Enterprise Fund. These loans from the County Airport Enterprise were used by the Agency to finance redevelopment activities in the Gillespie Field Redevelopment Project Area. In connection with the 2005 TABs, the County pledged to make limited payments to the Agency from the Airport Enterprise Fund. This pledge remains a limited obligation of the County and is not secured by the County’s General Fund. This pledge, along with certain tax increment revenues generated in the Gillespie Field Redevelopment Project Area, support annual principal and interest payments of approximately $1.2 million through Fiscal Year 2032-33; the final maturity of the 2005 TABs is in December 2032.

**General Obligation Bonds** (GO Bonds) are debt instruments issued by local governments to raise funds for the acquisition or improvement of real property. GO bonds are backed by the full faith and credit of the issuing entity; in California, authorization to issue GO bonds requires super-majority (two-thirds) voter approval. GO bonds are unique in that the bonds are secured by an ad valorem tax that may be levied in whatever amount is necessary to pay debt service. The County has no outstanding General Obligation Bonds.

The chart below shows the County’s scheduled long-term obligation payments through Fiscal Year 2041-42, which include Certificates of Participation (COPs), Lease Revenue Bonds (LRBs), Taxable Pension Obligation Bonds (POBs) and Tax Allocation Bonds (TABs). The table following it shows the final maturity date, original principal amount and the outstanding principal amount for each of the County’s current long-term financings.

### Long-Term Debt Obligations
**Fiscal Years 2011-12 Through 2041-42**

![Long-Term Debt Obligations Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2002 COPs</th>
<th>2004 COPs</th>
<th>2000 COPs</th>
<th>2005 Gillespie Redevelopments</th>
<th>COPs &amp; LRBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030-31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031-32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032-33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037-38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040-41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041-42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table reflects the County’s outstanding financings as of June 30, 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding County Financings (in thousands)</th>
<th>Final Maturity Date</th>
<th>Original Principal Amount</th>
<th>Principal Amount Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificates of Participation &amp; Lease Revenue Bonds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 Master Refunding</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$ 203,400</td>
<td>$ 3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Edgemoor &amp; RCS Refunding</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>112,395</td>
<td>82,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 North &amp; East County Justice Facility Refunding</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>28,210</td>
<td>18,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Edgemoor Completion Project</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>42,390</td>
<td>38,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 County Operations Center Phase 1A</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>136,885</td>
<td>133,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Justice Facilities Refunding</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>80,940</td>
<td>68,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 MTS Tower Refunding</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>19,260</td>
<td>17,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 County Administration Center Waterfront Park</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>32,665</td>
<td>32,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Certificates of Participation and Lease Revenue Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 656,145</td>
<td>$ 395,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxable Pension Obligation Bonds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2002</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>132,215</td>
<td>69,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2004 (1)</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>454,113</td>
<td>416,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2008</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>343,515</td>
<td>320,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pension Obligation Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 929,843</td>
<td>$ 806,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redevelopment Agency Tax Allocation Bonds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Gillespie Field Refunding</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>$ 16,000</td>
<td>$ 13,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tax Allocations Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 16,000</td>
<td>$ 13,905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Series 2004 Principal Amount Outstanding is net of unaccreted value of the 2004 Series C Pension Obligation Bonds.
Short-Term Obligations

During the ordinary course of business, local governments, such as the County, typically experience temporary mismatches in cash flow due to the shortfalls in cash because of the mismatch in timing of the County’s payment of expenditures, which is ongoing, and receipt of revenues, which is largely focused on months surrounding tax payment dates. To mitigate these cash flow imbalances, the County borrows cash through the issuance of Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs). These notes mature within twelve to thirteen months of the date of issuance and are, therefore, considered short-term obligations. The chart below shows TRANs borrowing since 2001-02.

Conduit Issuances

Board of Supervisors Policy B-65, Long-Term Financial Obligation Management Policy, also provides for the County to assist qualified nonprofit and for-profit entities to access low-cost, tax-exempt financing for projects that provide a tangible public benefit, contribute to social and economic growth and improve the overall quality of life to the residents of the San Diego region. In these financings, the County is a conduit issuer whereby it issues tax-exempt long-term bonds on behalf of the qualifying entity. That entity, the conduit borrower, is responsible for all costs in connection with the issuance and repayment of the financing. Debt issued under the conduit program is secured by the borrower, and is not considered to be a debt of the County.

The Board of Supervisors, as outlined in Board Policy B-65, may consider conduit financing on behalf of nonprofit organizations upon recommendation of the Debt Advisory Committee. The Board of Supervisors may also consider assessment district and community facilities district financings to provide for public improvements, whether initiated by petition of the property owners, the County or a non-Count agency.

All considerations for financing will be directed to the Debt Advisory Committee and, if the Committee decides that the conduit financing is feasible, financially and economically prudent, coincides with the County’s objectives, and does not impair the County’s creditworthiness, it will then be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. All expenses related to the conduit financing will be borne by the applicants.
Debt Management Policies and Obligations

The following table reflects the County’s outstanding conduit issuances as of June 30, 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduits</th>
<th>Final Maturity Dates</th>
<th>Original Principal Amount</th>
<th>Principal Amount Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998 Sharp Healthcare</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$112,020</td>
<td>$79,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 San Diego Natural History Museum</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 San Diego Museum of Art</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 University of San Diego</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>$36,870</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 San Diego Imperial Counties</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$10,750</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Chabad</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td>$7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 San Diego Jewish Academy</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$13,325</td>
<td>$10,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Bishop School</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Museum of Contemporary Art</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$6,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Sanford-Burnham Institute for Medical Research*</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
<td>$19,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Sanford-Burnham Institute for Medical Research</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>$59,405</td>
<td>$53,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 San Diego Foundation</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 The ARC of San Diego</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>$13,250</td>
<td>$12,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Salk Institute for Biological Studies</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>$37,445</td>
<td>$37,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Conduits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$391,765</strong></td>
<td><strong>$265,080</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Housing                                       |                      |                          |                             |
| 1999 Laurel Village Apartments                | 2014                 | $1,670                   | $1,331                      |
| 2001 Village West                             | 2031                 | $4,438                   | 0                           |
| 2002 Spring Valley                            | 2032                 | $3,250                   | $1,824                      |
| **Total Housing**                             |                      | **$9,358**               | **$3,155**                  |

| Reassessment Bonds                            |                      |                          |                             |
| 1997 4S Ranch Reassessment District Bonds     | 2012                 | $21,755                  | 0                           |
| **Total Reassessment Bonds**                  |                      | **$21,755**              | **0**                       |

* On July 2, 2009 the outstanding County of San Diego Variable Rate Demand Certificates of Participation (COPs) secured by payments received from the Sidney Kimmel Cancer Center, dated October 5, 2005, were remarketed as County of San Diego Variable Rate Demand COPs secured by payments received from the Burnham Institute for Medical Research.
Excellence in Governing

Recognitions of Excellence

Embracing change is the key challenge for area governments. The County of San Diego is rising to that challenge and continually looks to improve by seeking opportunities to streamline operations, utilize technology to provide innovative solutions for services, create space- and energy-efficient workplaces, and expand the services and information to the public through the use of online and social media.

The County of San Diego works hard to maintain its standing as a best practices organization, offering programs that improve the lives of San Diego County residents in ways that are relevant and measurable. The County is proud that its leadership in these areas has been recognized for the following:

- In 2012, the County of San Diego has once again won national recognition by the National Association of Counties (NACo). Thirty-nine programs received the Achievement Awards for excellence. San Diego County and Los Angeles County tied for the most awards in the country this year. These awards, selected from 21 categories, recognize innovative programs that modernize county government and increase services to residents.
- The award-winning programs operate within all five County business groups and include programs that serve children, youth and seniors, as well as those that promote environmental protection, public safety and efficient, effective county administration.
- The San Diego County Taxpayer Association recognized the County of San Diego Capital Program as the winner of the 2012 Grand Golden Watchdog Award. As a result of cost saving measures over the past decade, the County of San Diego Capital Program will save taxpayers approximately $1.46 billion over the next 30 years.
- By setting aside cash reserves during the years of high revenue growth, the County has been able to pay cash for one-time capital improvement projects rather than financing them with long-term debts.
- San Diego County Library was honored with the prestigious 2012 Library of the Year award by the educational publishing company Gale and Library Journal magazine which recognizes outstanding service to the community, creativity and leadership. The County Library’s unprecedented growth in recent years, strategic budget allocation and innovative programming all helped it earn the award.

- The National Recreation and Park Association’s Environmental Agency of the Year Barb King Environmental Stewardship Award went to the Department of Parks and Recreation for its work on land acquisitions, project design, stewardship, preservation and outreach. The award was also based on the County’s role as a national leader in conserving open space and natural resources cultivating environmental stewardship in others.

Detail of recognitions of excellence received by San Diego County that highlight the County’s progress in meeting its strategic goals include:

Strategic Initiative - Kids

- The Department of Housing and Community Development received a 2012 Award of Merit from the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials for its Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program. Since 2009, the program has provided housing to 77 homeless families and prevented 69 families from becoming homeless.
- The leading national organization for intergenerational programming, Generations United, and the MetLife Foundation designated San Diego County as one of five Best Intergenerational Communities for recognizing the value of promoting strong bonds between the generations.
- The National Association of Counties (NACo) Achievement Awards - 2012
  - ”It’s Up to Us“ Mental Health Awareness and Stigma Reduction - a five-year mass media campaign designed to empower San Diegans to talk openly about mental illness, recognize symptoms, utilize local resources and seek help.
  - “Positive Solutions” Depression Busters for Homebound Seniors - a program to help homebound or socially isolated seniors who are at risk of depression or suicide redirect their lives to be more social and active, and to rediscover pleasure.
  - Acoustic Showcase Series - an inexpensive and fun program hosting free concerts outside of local library branches in the County.
  - Caregiving Clips Webinar Series - a series of online videos featuring regional experts on topics of interest to family caregivers.
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- **Child Support Employer Webinar** - a live, online webinar presentation to more effectively educate employers on their responsibilities when receiving an Income Withholding Order (IWO) for employees' mandated court ordered child support deductions.

- **Health & Human Services Agency Video Interviewing** - Through collaboration with community partners, the County established Video Interviewing as a means to improve customer service and enhance access to health coverage and food assistance.

- **Healthy Works(sm): Paths to Healthy Living Media and Marketing Campaign** - a comprehensive and innovative program developed and launched as part of a large-scale effort to curb the tide on the obesity epidemic.

- **Passport to Healthy Aging: Elder Multicultural Access and Support Services** - a grassroots approach to assist immigrants and refugees, who often fail to navigate the public services system, with increased access to, and education about, strategies to improve mental and physical health.

- **Parenting Classes** - developed by the County Library to provide educational assistance to parents with raising children.

- **Public-Private Partnership to Improve Access to Nutrition and Health Benefits** - a successful partnership with 2-1-1 San Diego (2-1-1) a local, private nonprofit organization, to increase access to Cal-Fresh and Medi-Cal benefits.

- **Recovery Innovations - Client Operated Peer Supported Mental Health Services** - a program that integrates mental health, rehabilitation and recovery services for adults who have serious mental illnesses, to improve their mental health and quality of life.

- **SmartCare: Integrated Physical and Behavioral Healthcare for Rural Families** - a program to provide integrated physical and behavioral health care to the rural areas that are historically underserved, particularly when it comes to mental health treatment.

- **California State Association of Counties (CSAC) Innovation Award** awarded San Diego County, a California Counties Innovation Award for the reformation of the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS). The creation of a new program integrity initiative and other measures, including integration of a long-term care system with wrap-around services blending health and social services funding while reducing gaps in care, reduced program cost growth from an average of 8-10% annually to 0.2%. Annual budget expenditures were $24 million less than projected.

- **California State Association of Counties (CSAC) Challenge Award 2011**

- **Free Foreclosure Prevention HOME Clinic** - which provides counseling and education for families facing bankruptcy or foreclosure in partnership with the Housing Opportunities Collaborative.

- **Camp Connect San Diego** - which brings together siblings separated by placement in the foster care system. The program offers approximately 65-80 children opportunities to connect with their siblings through four-day camps and all-day activities.

- **California State Association of Counties (CSAC) Merit Award 2011**

- **Educating Non-Custodial Parents** - for videos produced in-house by Department of Child Support Services and posted on the department website in an effort to engage parents owing child support to participate in the process.

- For the third time the California Child Support Director's Association, honored San Diego County Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) as the state's Top Performing County (very large). DCSS ranked highest for outstanding performance on five federal performance measures and dollars given to families.

- **The It’s Up to Us campaign** received the Inspiration Media Award from the National Association on Mental Illness San Diego. The campaign reinforces the idea that mental health is just as important to quality of life as physical wellbeing, and also educates people about mental health challenges and the use of local resources.

- **The First 5 Commissions’ San Diego’s Oral Health campaign** received the top Public Service Announcement (PSA) Award from the Public Relations Society of America. The honor recognized efforts to promote good oral health care for pregnant women and children through the age of five.

### Strategic Initiative - Environment

- **The National Association of County Park and Recreation Officials’ (NACPRO)** recognized the Department of Parks and Recreation with two awards:
  - The Removing Barriers Initiative Award for the newly constructed cabins at Dos Picos County Park for their Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility.
  - The Park and Recreation Program Award for the 2011 Movies in the Park series.

- The Department of Parks and Recreation also won the Recreation Facility/Park Design Achievement Award for the Collier Park Soccer Arena from the California
Park and Recreation Society District. The construction of the soccer arena incorporated ADA design guidelines and “green” technologies.

The National Association of Counties (NACo) Achievement Awards - 2012
- Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance - a Zoning Ordinance to streamline the regulations regarding various accessory dwelling types second dwelling units and guest living quarters.
- Innovative Approach to Promoting Low Impact Design Techniques - Through a unique partnership with the Water Conservation Garden at Cuyamaca College, the County of San Diego funded installation of two exhibits using Low Impact Design (LID) principles to reduce the contribution of pollutants from urban runoff and stormwater to local water bodies.
- Tiered Winery Ordinance and Environmental Impact Report - new winery regulations covering approximately 441,000 acres within the unincorporated County, to establish small boutique wineries on agricultural lands without the need for a discretionary permit.
- The completed Valley Center Road Bridge project received the 2012 Project of the Year Award from the American Public Works Association (APWA) and the 2012 Transportation Project Achievement Award from the Construction Management Association of America.
- A housing reconstruction project at San Pasqual Academy built in the wake of the 2007 Witch Creek Fire received two Gold Nugget awards from the Pacific Coast Builders Conference. The project won an Award of Merit in the Green Sustainable Communities category and a Judges Special Award of Excellence.
- The completed Black Canyon Road Bridge project received a 2012 Honor Award from APWA and a 2012 Outstanding Bridge Award from the American Society of Civil Engineers.

Strategic Initiative - Safe and Livable Communities

National Association of Counties (NACo) Achievement Awards - 2012
- Accessible Hazard Alert System - Accessible Alert-San Diego - a regional system to improve the emergency alerts for residents with sensory disabilities (deaf, blind, hard of hearing, or deaf/blind).
- Community Ratings System Program - a voluntary program that recognizes and encourages community flood plain management activities that exceed the standard of the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program’s requirements.
- Community Law School - an innovative effort to provide free legal education by bringing lawyers and judges to the public at the trusted venue of the library.
- District Attorney Collaboration with Public Defender and Private Defense Counsel on eDiscovery - a system to streamline the dissemination of discovery materials to defense counsel.
- Drive Like Your Life Depends On It - The Patrol Speed and Safe Driving Initiative to address high speed on-duty patrol-related collisions developed by the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department.
- eVisit System - The Sheriff’s Department schedules over 114,000 Inmate Social Visits each year. Previously, the scheduling was done exclusively by phone, which caused extended wait times. The eVisit System allows the public (with Internet access) to schedule an Inmate Social Visit via the Internet, resulting in a more efficient operation.
- Flood Forecasting for the San Luis Rey River Watershed - To combat damaging floods and forecast potential flood impacts, the County has developed a first of its kind model for forecasting flooding throughout the 562 square mile San Luis Rey watershed.
- Justice Electronic Library System - This completely automates the distribution, receipt and off-site use of Probation documents, police reports, and other documents received from outside parties that are all required for Juvenile Court Delinquency hearings.
- San Diego County Emergency Portal Website - a new emergency portal website that provides the public with updates on evacuations, shelters, interactive maps, and other critical information delivered to wherever people are – at home, at work, or on a mobile device.
- San Diego County Probation Tracking Known Offenders - a collaborative project where the Probation Department provides information and criminal intelligence to assist the Sheriff’s Department in solving crimes, and the Sheriff’s Department assists the Probation Department in the field supervision of medium and high-risk probationers by enforcing court orders.
- San Diego County Probation Youthful Offender Unit (YOU) - a local custodial and community supervision program to address the highest risk youthful offenders who were formerly sent to State institutions.
The California Association of Public Information Officials honored the County with the Award of Distinction for its antiterrorism awareness campaign. Part of the campaign included a video, called "Eight Signs of Terrorism" which was promoted to the public and used to train employees at the County, City of San Diego and other local government agencies.

The County's Juvenile Forensic Assistance for Stabilization and Treatment Program (JFAST) - a collaborative court program for juvenile offenders with mental health needs, was awarded the 2012 Juvenile Justice “At Large” Award by the County Juvenile Justice Commission.

California State Association of Counties (CSAC) Merit Award 2011
- Integrated Fire Suppression/Stormwater Compliance System - this system was developed in collaboration with area industry other stakeholders to enhance safety, ecological stewardship, and efficiency.
- Responsible Pet Ownership (RePo) - this program works like a "traffic school" for individuals cited for minor animal violations, providing resources, rehabilitation and cost savings while reducing recidivism and court time.
- Senior Expo: Protect Yourself and Your Wallet - these events help prevent crimes against older adults by empowering and educating seniors with physical and financial self-defense techniques. The program has educated more than 1,100 seniors at 24 events.

The Sheriff’s Department Helicopter Unit ASTREA received a Partnership Award CAL FIRE, State fire protection agency. The award recognizes the cooperation between law enforcement and fire agencies in times of wildfires and other emergencies.

Operational Excellence Awards

The awards listed below pertain to programs or accomplishments that support the County’s Required Disciplines as outlined in the General Management System:

- National Association of Counties (NACo) Achievement Awards - 2012
  - Advanced Competencies for the Administrative Professional of the 21st Century - A decreasing workforce and increasing numbers of San Diego residents needing services spawned the creation of a rigorous seven week training program to empower administrative support staff at the Health and Human Services Agency to develop the skills needed to meet these heightened demands.
  - Automating Housing Inspections Saves Staff Time, Mileage & Gas - A computerized route optimization and planning program for inspection of rental assistance housing units that replaces Housing and Community Development’s manual process of routing and scheduling inspections.
  - AWM Invoice Bar Coding - a bar coding program for processing permit and registration payments in the Agriculture, Weights and Measures Department, which has resulted in increased efficiency and reliability.
  - Cloud-Based Contract Administration System - a cloud-based contract administration software service that has increased oversight of contracting functions by the department, employee or contractor.
  - Deferred Compensation Women & Retirement Program - as part of a retirement planning and investment educational campaign for all County employees, this focused program presented an opportunity to incorporate education aimed at a clearly defined audience while addressing current objectives and reaching a whole new audience.
  - Deputy Sheriff Cadet Recruitment Redesign - a substantial redesign by the Department of Human Resources, of the recruitment process for qualified Deputy Sheriff Cadets through more effective screening of applicants at the front end of the process, that has resulted in expedited recruitment of quality candidates.
  - Development of Portfolio Accounting and Portfolio Analytics Interface - a technology-based data extraction process allowing staff to perform analytics on current and historical portfolios.
  - District Attorney Transcription Process Reengineered - a comprehensive streamlined approach developed to ensure an accurate reproduction of evidential recordings from law enforcement agencies about an alleged crime by an individual or individuals.
  - E-Audit for Health & Human Services Contractors - In support of a comprehensive initiative called “Live Well, San Diego!” , the Health and Human Services Agency developed a program to automate the manual process of contractor audits.
  - Preventing 1503 MEDS Errors - an electronic training course designed to help eligibility staff prevent the 1503 Critical Medi-Cal (a.k.a. Medicaid) Eligibility Determination System (MEDS) errors.
Public Administrator/Public Guardian E-referral System - an online system that allows the public, as well as community and County partners, to refer individuals to the Public Administrator or Public Guardian electronically over a secure Internet, thus improving customer service.

San Diego County SDFusion - a centralized intelligence indexing system in the Sheriff’s Department that provides increased data sharing between law enforcement agencies, improve disaster preparedness and deliver actionable data to assist decision making by officers and first-responders in the field.

For the tenth consecutive year, the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada (GFOA) recognized the County with the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award for the Adopted Operational Plan Fiscal Years 2011-2012 & 2012-2013. This award is a significant achievement for the County as it reflects the organization’s commitment to maintaining the highest standards of governmental budgeting.

For the fourth year in a row the San Diego Society for Human Resource Management honored the District Attorney's Office with an Excellence Award for innovative planning that allowed the office to reduce its workforce by 10% while maintaining quality of service to the public.

The County received the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting from the GFOA for its Fiscal Year 2010-11 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). This certificate is the highest form of recognition for governmental accounting and financial reporting.

California State Association of Counties (CSAC) Merit Award 2011

Regional GIS Data Exchange - this county-sponsored project improved Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data exchanges between local governments and regional governmental agencies, while lowering costs and increasing reliability.

The Center for Digital Government provided national recognition to the County with two awards:

Regional GIS Data Exchange - this county-sponsored project improved Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data exchanges between local governments and regional governmental agencies, while lowering costs and increasing reliability.

The Center for Digital Government provided national recognition to the County with two awards:

The Digital Government Achievement Award for an innovative program to help rural residents get Medi-Cal and CalFresh (formerly Food Stamps). This video program makes it easier for some 450,000 residents living in the rural North County and North Inland Regions to access needed County services.

A second place award was given in the Digital Counties Survey 2011 for counties with a population over 500,000. This award recognizes leading examples of counties using information and communications technology.

The Department of General Services was honored the fifth year in a row with the Award of Excellence 2011 from the California Counties Facilities Services Association for demonstrating exceptional dedication to facilities excellence through best practices, innovation, staff development, automation and customer service.

The Department of General Services received a Qualifications-Based Selection Merit Award 2011 by the American Council of Engineering Companies and National Society of Professional Engineers. This national award recognizes those who use qualifications-based methods to procure the services of consulting engineers at the state and local level.

The Department of Housing and Community Development received the Nan McKay Pioneer Award by Nan McKay & Associates, Inc. for its TourSolver software program, which optimizes inspector travel routes, saving approximately $30,000 annually.

The James R. Mills Building was awarded Building of the Year 2011 (TOBY) in the government category by the Building Owners and Managers Association. The award recognizes excellence in building operations, property management, energy and water cost saving upgrades.

The Program Awareness Award 2011 was presented by the Child Support Directors Association of California to the Department of Child Support Services. The honor was in recognition of the department’s new Spanish website, which mirrors the information and functionality of its English site.

The Fallbrook Library was the winner of the People’s Choice Orchard 2011 from the San Diego Architectural Foundation. The building achieved LEED Silver Certification for sustainable design. The library features include: natural lighting, “living room” area, Poets Patio, homework center, and a portion of the roof landscaped with succulents.

The San Diego Chapter of Associated Builders & Contractors honored the Fallbrook Branch Library with an Award of Excellence 2011 and became a finalist for “Top Project by a General Contractor.”