

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
1	<p>Defer COLA's in FY09-10</p> <p>Variations: Freeze or reduce salaries; Eliminate COLA for Board of Supervisors, Dept Heads, Managers and Confidential group for up-coming year; Cut pay for managers and attorneys, cut Dept Head pay 5%, Let each manager take a very small voluntary reduction in salary, roll-back most recent COLA for all groups. Freeze salaries above \$100k</p> <p>(See #2 MTO and #45 COLA, Retirement p/u rollback)</p>	\$7.7M	\$4.2 M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Popular with the public</li> <li>• Does not take away something that is already being received</li> <li>• May be implemented for unrepresented employee groups without meet and confer</li> <li>• May also be implemented for represented groups who do not have current contracts requiring a COLA in 2009, but still subject to good faith negotiations</li> <li>• Unrepresented staff seems to be supportive if it helps retain services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be controversial with some employees</li> <li>• Could require larger COLA's in the future to maintain parity of pay in the market</li> <li>• Employees close to retirement may chose to remain in the workplace until deferred COLA's enacted which would reduce number of employees voluntarily leaving</li> <li>• Temporary. Eventually salaries will have to be restored to remain competitive in the marketplace</li> <li>• Meet and confer required for represented employees who have contract that commits to a COLA in 2009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion partially implemented.</li> <li>• On 4/7/09 the Board received report from the unrepresented group and approved recommendation to defer COLA's for unrepresented for 2009-10.</li> <li>• Projected savings \$1.6 million total, \$900k general fund for deferral of COLA for unrepresented employees.</li> <li>• Budget was prepared with the assumption that implementation will be expanded to other employee groups except those with contracts extending into FY 09-10 and this resulted in the additional cost savings noted.</li> <li>• Two of the variations were separately evaluated. This approach garners the most potential savings short of pursuing re-negotiating existing contracts, which was not pursued based upon Board direction.</li> <li>• We have placed this issue on the table with labor groups.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
2	<p><b>Mandatory Time Off</b></p> <p>Numerous variations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close administrative offices 4 hours per week</li> <li>• Close business one, two or more days per month</li> <li>• All County offices to be closed on Fridays</li> <li>• Employee's whose jobs do not require 40 hours coverage per week take 10% time cut by creating work week from Monday through Thursday at 9 hours per day. For those whose jobs require 40 hours of coverage per week and/or 24 hour facility operation, a 2.5 to 5% cut in salary.</li> <li>• Salary cuts to be implemented with no impact on current employee or future retirement benefits (they continue as though the employee is working at 100% time/pay with retirement based on an employee's highest month wage X 12 in career.</li> </ul>	\$4.6 M for 5-day	\$3.1 M for 5-day  Includes \$700k for elimination of vacation buy-back.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May result in a reduced need for employee lay-offs</li> <li>• All employees furloughed share in the cost cutting</li> <li>• Some employees may desire the added time off</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public service impact if County offices are closed</li> <li>• Challenging to administer</li> <li>• Impacts a larger number of employees</li> <li>• Essentially the same as a 2% involuntary pay reduction for all furloughed employees</li> <li>• Meet and Confer required for represented employees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion may be implemented</li> <li>• On 4/7/09 the Board received report from the unrepresented group including support for MTO.</li> <li>• Board approved a recommendation to seek to implement a countywide 5-day MTO, and directed staff to engage in meet and confer with represented employee groups.</li> <li>• Board directed HR to meet and confer with all employee groups to negotiate language in all agreements to allow up to 12 days per year MTO</li> <li>• HR has proposed 5-day MTO to all employee groups for FY 09-10 and is in the process of meeting and conferring.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
3	<p>Eliminate Management Benefit Allowance (MBA) and Training Tuition (TT) accounts until financial situation improves. Reduce or eliminate Tuition and Textbook</p> <p>variation suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective 7/1/09 these funds available only as needed to a maximum negotiated amount with no balance rollover from FY 09-10 forward and renegotiating the maximum rollover available from FY 08-09.</li> <li>Budget for 5 year average use vs. budgeting total potential benefit. (Note: MBA /TT are budgeted at historical usage levels)</li> <li>Limit amount and use to mandatory trainings.</li> <li>Eliminating and redirect wellness portion of MBA.</li> </ul>	\$1.3 M/yr	\$1.0 M/yr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relatively low impact</li> <li>simple to administer</li> <li>Provides funding to retain services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May have impact on training, employee wellness, and training function in HR</li> <li>Controversial with employees</li> <li>Some of this cost will be shifted to departments since this funds a lot of department memberships, subscriptions, training</li> <li>TT benefits negotiable – requires meet and confer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion being implemented for unrepresented employees, but should be revisited if unable to reach agreement with labor groups</li> <li>On 4/7/09 the Board received report from the unrepresented group (department heads, management and confidential employees) and approved a recommendation to suspend MBA / CBA for 2009-10 and 2010-11.</li> <li>Projected savings \$ 550K total, \$400k general fund for unrepresented groups.</li> <li>HR has proposed 2-yr suspension to all employee groups and is in process of meeting and conferring.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
4	Retirement incentives (RI)	<p>Amount of savings depends on retirement incentive is structured and the cost to the county of the RI benefit.</p> <p>If positions refilled – little to no savings.</p> <p>If positions were going to be cut anyway – little or no savings.</p> <p>Countywide and GF savings depend on which positions qualify and offered incentive.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May result in individuals voluntarily leaving thereby reducing need for involuntary lay-offs</li> <li>• May provide career enhancement opportunities</li> <li>• Allows departments to retain newer hires which may be less costly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May result in loss of institutional knowledge if not properly managed</li> <li>• Depending on how implemented, cost could necessitate reductions in services to offset added expenses paid to retirement</li> <li>• Must be implemented in such a way as not address concerns regarding pension spiking and gift of public funds</li> <li>• Incentives must be structured to provide equity in employee treatment</li> <li>• Depending upon option chosen result in some employees that departments want to retain retiring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefit of program is not dollar savings, but to assist certain employees who were going to retire in a year anyway, to consider retiring now in lieu of laying off a newly hired position</li> <li>• On 4/7/09 the Board received report from the unrepresented group (department heads, management and confidential employees) and approved a recommendation to seek to implement retirement incentives countywide and directed staff to engage in meet and confer with represented employee groups</li> <li>• County is waiting for actuary report before meeting and conferring on RI</li> <li>• Board will be briefed in 6/2 closed session resulting in direction to be shared with employee groups</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
5	<p>Voluntary Time Off (VTO)</p> <p>Institute voluntary time off program, assuming no reduction in county paid health or retirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One variation specified allowing unrepresented employees to work a 32 hour work week without a change to benefits including retirement and without effect on losing position.</li> </ul>	<p>The amount of saving which could be achieved through VTO depends on how many individuals choose and are approved to participate in VTO department-by-department</p> <p>If VTO is implemented departments will received any VTO savings directly in their budget</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>User directed – some employees may desire additional time off and be willing to accept reduced pay</li> <li>may have more direct link to home dept motivation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficult to estimate if actual savings would result</li> <li>Requires meet and confer If benefits not decreased, limited savings with loss of work hours given degree of benefit costs paid on non-work hour</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of savings cannot be calculated since program is voluntary</li> <li>Any savings through VTO should not be counted on and if achieved should remain in individual department to offset department budget reductions.</li> <li>HR has proposed a specific VTO program to all employee groups and is in the process of meeting and conferring on this option.</li> </ul>
6	<p>Job Sharing</p>	<p>Job sharing may result in savings, provided the cost for two part time employees does not exceed the cost of one full time employee.</p> <p>The amount of any potential savings is impossible to calculate without specific job share opportunities identified Most departments using this option report &lt;\$10k per year in savings and applying it with less than 5 positions countywide</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides added flexibility for employees who desire to work less than full time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May increase cost if salary and benefits for two employees job sharing exceeds cost of individual employee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion is being implemented where determined by a department to be appropriate.</li> <li>Any savings realized are utilized by individual departments to offset budget reductions.</li> <li>Staff recommends the Board not count on any savings from this option beyond that realized by individual departments</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
7	<p>Limit Personal Data Asst. (PDA) or Smartphone purchases per manager per year.</p> <p>Most PDA's are purchased using MBA. Current MBA policy limits hardware purchases to once every 2 years.</p> <p>Approximately 211 Smartphones that were purchased on county plan are currently active county-wide.</p> <p>The monthly cost for the current 211 devices is approximately \$60-90 per month. (Appx. \$152k – \$228k per year)</p>	<p>Est. \$18k spent via MBA on Smartphones in FY 08-09.</p>	<p>Apprx \$11k estimated expenditures for GF</p> <p>Approximately 60% of the devices are in GF depts.</p> <p>(\$91k-\$137k)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is some cost savings available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May require meet and confer</li> <li>Elimination of PDA's /Smartphones does not eliminate the need for some communication device as they fill a business need.</li> <li>In many instances the elimination of a Smartphone would require its replacement with a cell phone.</li> <li>Cost associated with non-county plan devices could increase commensurately. A reduction from the \$60-90 monthly charge could be replaced with an approximate \$30-40 charge.</li> <li>Could be degradation to county work/efficiency with unknown impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion being partially implemented through suspension of MBA for 2 years and through individual departments decisions as a means to reduce costs.</li> <li>On 4/7/09 the Board received report from the unrepresented employees and approved a recommendation to suspend MBA / CBA for 2009-10 and 2010-11. This will reduce the availability of funds for PDA purchases.</li> <li>HR has proposed suspension of MBA/TT to all employee groups and is in the process of meeting and conferring.</li> <li>Additional departments should consider reducing PDA purchases as a means to minimize the need for further departmental reductions.</li> <li>ISD evaluating option to consider stipend in lieu of county paid cell phone / smart phone service.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
8	Share standby pagers and phones	Less than \$10k in theoretical savings countywide due to number of staff sharing standby duty and able to share equipment				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sharing equipment is being implemented by departments where feasible as a cost saving measure</li> <li>Departments are encouraged to share equipment where feasible without compromising communication needs.</li> </ul>
9	Management Academy: stop hiring outside consultants for training in performance improvement and leadership evaluation or do away with Management Academy, evaluate effectiveness of this academy, stop allowing Management Academy to hold seminars at wineries.	<p>&lt; \$75k countywide, &lt;\$40k general fund (highly dependent on student mix)</p> <p>Assumes elimination of all three academies – Supervisors, Managers, and Executive.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eliminates valuable training and networking opportunity</li> <li>Reduces opportunities for existing employees to prepare themselves for advancement within the county.</li> <li>Limits future potential of promoting from within, since county staff will not be prepared for advancement</li> <li>Academy has not been held at winery. Graduation luncheons have been held at winery or other catering location if the price is reasonable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion being partially implemented since majority of academy participants paid for the training using professional development funds and the Board has acted to suspend MBA funds for the next two years. In addition, a number of departments are reducing department training budgets to meet reduced budget funding. Further suspension of professional development accounts as negotiated in union contracts may result in suspension of the academies.</li> <li>HR will continue to evaluate academies and will seek the most effective ways to continue to offer beneficial trainings at the lowest cost while developing ways to maximize revenues</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
						from outside sources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nearby governmental jurisdictions and nonprofits are also seeking cost effective training opportunities</li> <li>• Efforts to build strategic relationships with these entities have already begun</li> <li>• HR has been encouraged to review and moderate their chosen location for classes and graduation</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
10	<p>Evaluate cost effectiveness of providing other training classes like: Fraud &amp; Identity Theft; Nutrition, and Smart Car Buying.</p> <p>Variations:</p> <p>Value in <u>increasing</u> training on retirement, managing change, and self-inventory.</p> <p>In conjunction with MTO offer no/low cost seminars for employees who wish to improve their skills (i.e. Grant Writing, how to get federal funding for County, etc.)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal cost savings may come at expense of improved skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Related to offering in conjunction with MTO. Employees would have to volunteer to participate, since required participation could not occur on a mandatory day off.</li> <li>Unlikely many employees would participate in training on mandatory day off particularly when courses are offered during working hours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HR is evaluating training opportunities and offerings.</li> <li>Departments are implementing this suggestion and evaluating the cost effectiveness of training in relation to other priorities.</li> <li>As a result of the two-year suspension of MBA accounts a new business model for County-wide training is being developed.</li> <li>HR will continue to access low or no-cost training opportunities, e.g., our existing contract with Mental Health Network for Employee Assistance Program services, our relationship with Redwood Credit Union, and online training available through CSAC. HR will also seek to access internal resources to provide training. Existing County staff are excellent subject matter experts and can be supported with curriculum development and presentation skills to fashion excellent training opportunities for our employees.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
						<p>Training topics will be focused to provide the greatest appeal at a price point affordable to departments and individual employees interested in paying directly. We will also seek to develop an online training capability to apply as appropriate.</p>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
11	<p>Implement Web Conferencing and Collaboration solutions (i.e. WebEx; Sametime), conference calls, Adobe Breeze, to manage meetings or bring together groups from multiple areas or departments easily when a face-2-face is not required (most of the time); quickly resolve problems / issues by sharing data to ensure thorough communication; for training and other educational purposes; and to benefit from recording option.</p> <p>Variation: Review county offered training and provide as much as possible in automated, on-demand, web-based formats as opposed to classroom style with internal or external trainers, use Linda.com or similar</p>	<p>Some savings could be realized by expanded use of technology for training purposes. It is extremely difficult to assess actual countywide savings for this recommendation as information regarding the opportunity to web conferencing, conferences calls, etc is not available. Departments will be in a better position to estimate their potential savings</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanded use of technology may reduce travel time and expense</li> <li>Allows employees to “train” when convenient</li> <li>Since MBA/TT may be suspended, employees and departments will be motivated to use this technology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many trainings, meetings, etc. may not be provide this option</li> <li>One-time costs may be incurred to develop required technology to perform these functions.</li> <li>Reduces some of the “soft” benefits of training as a group, i.e. interaction with other county employees, discussions, hearing other employee questions, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion being implemented</li> <li>Many departments already use web conferencing and teleconferencing extensively to reduce travel time and expense.</li> <li>Departments will continue to transition to technology based access as more trainings, etc. become available in this way.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
12	Evaluate what County Risk resources are actually needed, evaluate effectiveness of County driving program			•	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion is being implemented</li> <li>• As part of the FY 09-10 budget development process, all departments were required to evaluate resource allocations and develop reduction plans.</li> <li>• HR evaluated Risk and Training resource needs and cost saving potential as part of their budget development process.</li> <li>• All departments are expected to be making these evaluations on an ongoing basis.</li> <li>• Expectations for further budget reductions will require additional scrutiny of all resource allocation decisions.</li> </ul>
13	Look at levels of approval for routine items that currently need to go to the Board of Supervisors for approval; increase departmental approval authority.	Limited if any hard savings, but will free up staff time for higher priority work		•	• Requires Board support -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion is being implemented – see Strategic Plan</li> <li>• Evaluating levels of approval is ongoing throughout the County.</li> <li>• Specific suggestions will be evaluated as they are received</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
14	Streamline and simplify approval processes to reduce staff time on administrative processes.	Limited if any hard savings, but will free up staff time for higher priority work		•	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion is being implemented – see Strategic Plan</li> <li>• Streamlining and simplification are ongoing throughout the County.</li> <li>• Specific suggestions will be evaluated as they are received</li> <li>• HRMS system will computerize many approval processes and an evaluation of those that relate to employment will be made as part of the HRMS change management process.</li> </ul>
15	Audit A-87 overhead costs to ensure that they are allocated appropriately.	Reallocation of A-87 costs would not generate savings county-wide; costs may just be distributed differently, with a potential increase in costs for some and potential savings for others.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accurate allocation of A-87 costs is appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence presented to suggest existing practices inaccurately allocate A-87 costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion is being implemented. A-87 costs are audited annually as required by State law. If A-87 costs were found to be under-allocated to departments with substantial outside revenue, then costs would shift to them, potentially increasing Federal and/or state revenue. If costs were found to be over-allocated to departments with substantial outside revenue, then costs for these departments would decrease and the costs to the General Fund would increase.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
16	Use empty county offices for meetings instead of renting space	Unquantifiable savings. In Countywide survey departments report less than \$25k per year spent on space rental countywide.  Since county rooms are used whenever available, minimal savings anticipated		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced need to travel to meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>County facilities may not be available or unable to accommodate the number of participants at some meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion being implemented.</li> <li>County Departments currently use county offices, meeting rooms, and other rent-free options when they are available and can accommodate the number of required participants.</li> <li>County departments will continue to encourage and expand this practice where appropriate.</li> </ul>
17	Surplus equipment: require depts. to use instead of buying new, sell remainder rather than storing. Variations included County only "Craigslist" and periodic swap meets, auctioning off of items.	Based on FYs 04-05 and 05-06 activity the program's net <u>expense</u> was \$30k and \$20k respectively  Savings would depend on how much life can be extended  Value of surplus property very minimal		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extending life of some furniture and equipment is possible</li> <li>Decreased storage costs if surplus sold and not stored</li> <li>Reusing items is environmentally friendly</li> <li>Schools benefits from ISD's surplus computers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depending on equipment, extending life may result in more costly repairs than cost to replace</li> <li>Savings are not estimated</li> <li>Safety exposure to department staff while relocating/moving heavy items, if outside vendor for moves is not used</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion is being implemented.</li> <li>Individual departments are looking to extend life of equipment as a means to reduce costs.</li> <li>General Services stores minimal amount of surplus property and disposes of pursuant to state law.</li> </ul>
18	Renegotiate leases and explore rent reductions in exchange for property tax reductions	GS is evaluating potential to save on lease / rent reductions in FY 09-10			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property taxes, set pursuant to law, support state and local governments.</li> <li>It is not legal for the County to offer a landlord a reduction in property taxes in exchange for a rent reduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The County actively seeks opportunities to save money when: 1) it needs to lease additional space; 2) leases come up for renewal, and 3) market conditions indicate the possibility for mid-term renegotiation.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
19	Increase use of drought tolerant landscaping around county facilities, evaluate over-watering.	Minimal savings – est. less than \$15k countywide.  Majority of irrigation is done with well water, resulting in very limited costs.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduces water use, which is important during times of drought and for overall conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One-time funding is needed to implement change. Given that current irrigation costs are low, would take considerable time to recover initial investment costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion is being implemented.</li> <li>A multi-year plan is being implemented to convert to drought tolerant landscaping at county owned facilities</li> </ul>
20	Stop food and beverage catering for management meetings.	Per the survey, 60% of depts spend some money on food and beverages outside of the Department Employee Recognition Program (see item 57 for DERP) , approx \$9k total countywide is spent in about 15 depts on management and staff meeting food.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion being implemented as appropriate within individual departments as a cost cutting measure.</li> <li>County policy for food reimbursement revised last year to restrict expenses in this category</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
21	Stop departmental subscriptions to newspapers, and other periodicals -- access on-line.	Difficult to quantify savings without more extensive research  < 500k per year budgeted for books and periodicals (this includes almost \$200k for the public law library)	Difficult to quantify savings without more extensive research  < 190k per year budgeted for books & periodicals (this is total 08-09 GF budget for books, trade journals, & periodicals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces use of paper</li> <li>• Reduces waste production</li> <li>• Consistent with greenhouse gas efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all periodicals are available on line</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion being implemented where appropriate.</li> <li>• Departments are evaluating all purchases with increased scrutiny as they develop department budget reductions strategies.</li> <li>• Where possible and appropriate department will take advantage of free on-line access.</li> <li>• Increasingly on-line access is moving to paid subscription services. As such, unclear whether long-term savings will be realized.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
22	County should stop providing bottled water, variations: drink tap, tap with faucet filter (cost split with employees)	Based upon a survey there is less than \$40k countywide spent annually on bottled water		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced waste production of small plastic bottles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some bottled water may be necessary to meet CAL OSHA requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departments are evaluating all purchases with increased scrutiny as they develop department budget reductions strategies.</li> </ul>
23	Cut overtime paid when sick and other paid leaves are used in same pay period. Example day one sick 10 hours, day two overtime 6 hours should result in 4 hours sick paid and no over time paid.	<p>\$2 - \$4M annual expenditure for overtime not required by federal law. Further analysis required to determine potential general fund savings.</p> <p>Est. based on one pay period (3/18/09 pay period)</p> <p>Savings potential is for overtime paid to employees who worked less than 40 hours in the pay period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Larger sample required to validate.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could result in substantial savings particularly in public safety departments.</li> <li>Could also result in retirement savings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May impact recruitment and retention if benchmark counties have similar overtime pay policies</li> <li>Will be perceived as a "take back" by employee groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In general, federal law requires overtime pay for hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week.</li> <li>Pursuant to MOU's County pays overtime in excess of federal requirements</li> <li>Staff has made this proposal at the table with labor groups</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
24	Eliminate holidays (Lincoln's Birthday, floating holiday)	<p>Est. \$225k/holiday countywide. Further analysis required to est. potential general funds savings.</p> <p>Savings is from overtime paid to employees working holidays.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased productivity from employees working additional day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative impact on some employees that would have to make arrangement for childcare, etc. if children not in school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Board could direct staff to meet and confer to reduce the number of paid holidays.</li> <li>The savings which would be achieved is overtime pay that would be eliminated for positions that are normally required to work on holidays.</li> </ul>
25	Expand use of telecommuting.	<p>Less than half of depts. currently use some but about half of all depts. see potential to begin or expand. Most anticipate additional savings to be less than \$10k per year.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May reduce green house gases</li> <li>May reduce office space needs</li> <li>May be possible for some positions</li> <li>Some employees may desire the opportunity to work from home</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impossible for many positions that require employees to be in the office for coverage, public contact, meetings, etc.</li> <li>Impact on FLSA status of employees</li> <li>Workers Compensation and safety impacts need to be considered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HR has / will propose a pilot program. It is expected that any additional savings would be relatively small, felt directly in participating departments and allow for redirection of resources and efforts to provide services within current constraints. It is possible that additional, incremental savings will continue to be realized over time.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
26	Reduce or eliminate travel  Variation cap or reduce cap on allowable meal reimbursement	Est. \$2.5M countywide  (Equates to less than .002 of the FY 08-09 adopted budget)	Est. \$772k is GF.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel is necessary/ required to conduct county business.</li> <li>• Travel requests are approved by Department Heads who must certify that travel is necessary /required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced travel is being implemented within individual department as a means to reduce costs</li> <li>• Department reductions and deferral of MBA/TT will reduce travel</li> <li>• County reimbursed for travel and meals is restricted by county policy.</li> <li>• Travel must be necessary in order to be eligible for reimbursement.</li> <li>• County policy also restricts and places a cap on allowable meal reimbursement.</li> <li>• Budget constraints will further reduce available funding for travel</li> </ul>
		This is the total budget for various line items, including conference, travel, training, etc. Some portion of this total amount could be reduced, but is not quantifiable				

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
27	<p>Reduce or eliminate cell phones</p> <p>\$640k / yr expended annually for approximately 1,400 devices. This total includes approximately 600 temporary cell phones (voter polling stations, loaner phones, etc. and 100 wireless air cards)</p> <p>Approximately 35% of cell phones are within Non-General Fund depts. resulting in \$416k GF expended annually</p>	Saving potential requires further analysis. This analysis is in progress.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>County would realize some level of cost savings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would limit 24/7 and emergency access to many employees</li> <li>Availability and communications among staff – particularly field staff – could be reduced as would availability and communications with senior/management personnel.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing cell phone costs is being implemented within individual departments as a means to reduce costs.</li> <li>ISD collected information from similar counties and has determine that county's annual expenditure on cell phones is in line with similarly sized entities.</li> <li>ISD is evaluating cost/benefit of moving to a stipend policy to determine whether it produces a net savings. At this time it is too early to tell</li> <li>Departments will be directed to evaluate need for cell phones that are issued.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
28	Extend useful life of vehicles rather than current replacement schedules.	Cost / Benefit of achieving this potential savings is still under evaluation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extending useful life reduces waste</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced resale value as vehicles become older with higher mileage; Replacement vehicle cost increases; Grant from Dept of Energy and the California Energy Commission assumes 09-10 replacement funding for match</li> <li>• Delayed replacement of higher emitting vehicles contrary to County Greenhouse Gas Reduction efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumes 1 yr delay in replacement of 700 general fleet vehicles</li> <li>• Fleet Mgr recommends that vehicles assigned to the Sheriffs Department be excluded which would reduce savings by \$1.4 M</li> <li>• Fleet evaluating delaying replacement of general fleet vehicles by one year or developing some other alternative that would provide savings.</li> </ul>
		\$3.4 M annual cost countywide	\$1.0 M one-time GF			
		Savings would be offset by Est. \$300k in revenue loss from vehicles sales and Est. \$82k/yr in increased cost to maintain older fleet				

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
29	<p>Extend useful life of computers and monitors rather than current replacement schedules.</p> <p>One variation suggested an allowance for computers / smartphone instead of current desktop pc's &amp; replacement policy. Employee choice (within specified set of options) – referenced Fortune article</p> <p>Another variation is to eliminate fax machines and stand-alone scanners, to be replaced by copy machines that have this functionality.</p>	<p>Appx \$1.3 million county-wide savings based on FY 09-10 planned contribution amount</p> <p>GF portion of savings is appx. \$690k</p>	<p>Potential savings for variations unknown</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extending useful life reduces waste</li> <li>• Some computers may become obsolete</li> </ul>	<p>Est. up to \$200k cost increase due to anticipated – but unknown – increases in maintenance and computer break-downs; ISD anticipates an increase in labor/ materials for additional repairs, and a potential loss in productivity.</p> <p>Potential for an additional staffing reduction of 1.5 FTE currently funded through replacement rates.</p> <p>Allowance would shift device choice and replacement to employee rather than the county. Contrary to goals to standardize equipment.</p> <p>The existing replacement contributions are set to capture the cost of replacing devices. If the allowance is set lower than current replacement rates to achieve savings, the allowance may not be great enough to cover equipment purchases.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current replacement is 5 yr cycle, this would move to 6 year replacement cycle.</li> <li>• ISD evaluating savings of delaying computer replacement, but not recommended at this time</li> <li>• Evaluation of these suggestions and variations may not be complete prior to budget hearings</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
30	Determine if voice over internet service would be less expensive than phone service	Not quantifiable		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VOIP is likely the direction of communication technology in the workplace, and in the longer term will likely produce direct cost savings. There are workplace efficiency benefits that are expected when moving to a VOIP system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no immediate financial savings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ISD is currently evaluating moving to VOIP technology including the costs/ benefits of such a transition as current technology reaches the end of its useful life. Potential savings will be identified through that project.</li> <li>Current research (Gartner, 15 September, 2008; ID Number: G00160438; 14 April, 2008; ID Number: G00156086) suggests that there are little if any technology cost savings in moving to VOIP technology in the immediate term. However, there are non-monetary benefits, such as work space efficiencies and more efficient integrated communications.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
31	Mandate standardization for all county web pages	Standardization of all county web pages would require an initial investment of approximately \$250 - \$500k. Standardization could save staff time to address various web issues stemming from the variance of pages across the county.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May improve usability for public</li> <li>• After approximately 3 years, labor/staff savings would be greater than initial investment.</li> <li>• There is a potential for cost avoidance through standardization as web pages developed by individual depts. may not meet legal requirements, such as ADA standards, which would create costs from legal challenges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initially would result in increased cost to develop and implement standards</li> <li>• It would take approximately 3 years for any savings to be realized.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further evaluation is necessary to determine potential cost / benefit of this suggestion.</li> <li>• ISD is currently evaluating approaches to bringing more standardization across web-pages without the significant up-front investment.</li> </ul>
32	Mandate use of ISD, funnel improvements through IS divisions, employ IT governance standards, invest in business analysts			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISD will be undergoing a management review which will evaluate best management practices in a public ISD setting..</li> <li>• Management review will evaluate these suggestions as part of a much broader look at the Information Systems Department.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
33	Stop paying moving expenses for management recruits.	Est < \$50k/yr countywide. Typical moving expense est at \$5-\$10k depending on where individual is relocating from and size of household.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will have a negative impact on recruitments</li> <li>• Common business practice for managers – would be unfortunate to loose a candidate due to this one-time cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a board policy adopted to enhance recruitment efforts.</li> <li>• The Board could direct staff to re-evaluate or could discontinue this policy at any time.</li> <li>• Expense paid by individual department who will be prioritizing this in relation to other priorities.</li> </ul>
34	Evaluate cost effectiveness of using “head hunters” as opposed to less costly ways of recruiting.	Est. < \$ 50k /yr  Executive recruiters are primarily used to recruit for Department Head positions. Savings would depend on how many positions at that level to be replaced.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will have a negative impact on recruitments</li> <li>• Firms provide national outreach and exposure for executive level positions</li> <li>• Executive search firms have extensive network of potential candidates – some that may not be actively seeking employment thus would not respond to a traditional HR recruitment process</li> <li>• Enhanced confidentiality for candidates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion being evaluated on a case by case basis.</li> <li>• Benefits of hiring the “right” person for department management positions that oversee multi-million dollar budgets far out weights one-time recruitment costs.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
35	Evaluate professional services consulting contracts for CAO, HR, and other County departments for need and potential to complete work in house.	Est. up to \$52 M could be spent in FY 08-09 for professional service contracts countywide.  Annual amount may vary dramatically. Any potential savings would, in the absence of a centralized contract management system, require a more exhaustive study of the individual contracts in each of the departments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could result in some savings if total staffing and other costs for services provision are less than consultant costs.</li> <li>• May result in savings if services determined to be no longer necessary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing consulting contracts would result in increased costs in other areas (salaries, benefits, etc.)</li> <li>• Retaining consultants for specialized limited term projects cheaper than hiring permanent full-time employees</li> <li>• County typically staffs for workload “valleys” and contracts for “peaks” only</li> <li>• Costs may increase for in-house staffing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately \$52 million in professional services contracts across all departments based on actual to date plus remaining encumbrances in the associated line-items without a centralized contract management system, this number may include contracts that are not comparable and may miss some accounted for in other line-items.</li> <li>• In FY 08-09, CAO department is managing about \$846k centrally for the organization. This is made up of \$234k for Board approved projects such as Performance Measurement, SW SR annexation and redevelopment, negotiations with tribal governments, Juvenile Justice study, and the Budget Town Hall meetings; \$180k for litigation on property appraisals; \$148k for the Assessor’s Benchmark study which produced recommendations to achieve \$1 million in on-going savings; \$148k for</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
						<p>grantwriting and organizational development services; and \$135k for state and federal lobbying efforts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In FY 08-09 HR (including the risk management insurance programs) is managing about \$8.6 million. This is primarily made up of \$2.7 million for outside claims administration; \$2.3 million in outside legal services for litigation \$1.4 million approved by Risk and County Counsel for the insurance programs and \$900k for litigation with employee organizations; \$600k for independent investigation services used by departments; \$570k in employee relations negotiations; \$320k for Occupational Health services; \$300k each for Professional development training and recruitment advertising and assistance; \$250k each for benefits consulting (actuary, purchased insurance negotiations) and organizational development used by departments; \$230k on safety programs; \$200k</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
						<p>on the Employee Assistance Program; \$120k on health care advocacy services; and the rest in a group of smaller specific contracts with the exception of one for \$115k with one of our actuarial consultants that also includes some absence management and safety management project services, this year. It should be noted that the negotiations and litigation services with respect to employee organizations were significantly greater than usual in the above listing due to the convergence of : vacancies in several employee relations staff positions during a time where nearly all employee organizations were involved in negotiations, several of which also included defense litigation. With the review conducted, it does not appear that any of these services could have been brought in-house during this past year. A more extensive project would have to be developed to determine if there are any opportunities</p>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
						for savings into the future though, these internal departments, as well as all departments have and will continue to review all of their expenses in an effort to reduce costs.
36	Set appropriate ratio of management to staff, variation specified eliminating managers who don't supervise staff.	Unknown savings depending upon number and cost of positions and any offsets for revenue and reimbursements.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be cost savings through the elimination of management layers, and "flattening" the organization.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminating all management positions that do not directly supervise staff would put the County out of step with virtually every comparable organization, public and private.</li> <li>• Managers are exempt therefore substantial overtime and premium pay is not required as these positions routinely work in excess of standard work hours including weekends and holidays.</li> <li>• Could increase costs or decrease the completion of work if current management staff were converted to non-management hourly employees.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no acknowledged or generally accepted staff to management ratio in either the public or private sector; these ratios are highly dependant on variables such as work function, service provided, location of work conducted, etc.</li> <li>• There is a lack of data for comparable jurisdictions.</li> <li>• Some positions in the county organization require specialized skills and abilities that are best filled with management-level employees, even when supervision of others is not required on a daily basis.</li> <li>• Further evaluation necessary to determine appropriate and actual ratios.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
37	Concentrate on “core functions” and discontinue environmental strategic plan items and other unfunded mandates (such as Sustainability, Citizen’s Energy Initiative, Climate Change, Renewable Energy Projects, Development of ISO9000 and ISO 14000 standards, etc) which should be put on hold during economic crisis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for savings depends on what is defined as core function and mandated service</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would focus limited resources</li> <li>Ultimately part of important conversation with public and strategic vision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreement on “core functions” may be difficult to achieve, longer term process</li> <li>Some non-mandated, non “core functions” reflect local priorities</li> <li>Identifying &amp; quantifying of mandates is complex – for example service, but not service level, may be mandated – would require detailed analysis of all applicable laws to determine which services are truly mandated and what level</li> <li>Conflicts w/BOS policy goals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion and further evaluation of local priorities is occurring through Strategic Planning activities, Public Workshops on Budget, and Budget hearings</li> <li>Departments also prioritize services through budget process</li> <li>Some non-core functions are essential to achieve long-term savings or impact. Example would be emphasis on climate change efforts that require short term investment for longer term gain</li> </ul>
38	<p>Have HMO’s share their cost cutting measures – Provide additional health care options which could reduce cost to employee / county.</p> <p>Variation Provide incentives for individuals not to use County Health benefits</p>	Unquantifiable		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could provide additional flexibility to employees</li> <li>New compensation structure recently enacted provides incentives to use health benefits wisely</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional options would required added administration for benefits</li> <li>More options could reduce number of individuals participating in each plan which could lead to increased cost.</li> <li>Important part of health benefits is preventive care which can result in overall savings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health Plan options are evaluated every year prior to open enrollment and the County is looking at providing more health insurance options for retirees to save them money directly. There is a balance to be struck between the number of plans offered and cost – more plans means fewer per plan participants which can increase costs per person.</li> <li>Suggestion needs further evaluation to determine potential cost / savings.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
39	Increase revenues from wine industry and gambling	No direct increase from wine or gambling anticipated for FY 09-10.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Sin” taxes popular with the public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wine and gaming industry are both impacted by the economic downturn – increased taxes/fees negatively impact business.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tribal developments, including two potential gaming operations may provide new revenues to mitigate off reservation impacts of those projects. Based upon one current agreement for such mitigation efforts, the total new revenues could be in the \$millions per year and will pay for the additional costs associated with the impacts of the developments.</li> <li>• Wine industry indirect revenues come from property taxes, sales taxes from multiplier effect and will grow based upon economy.</li> <li>• Several county efforts already support and will continue to support the ag industry as a whole including wine.</li> <li>• Further evaluation of this suggestion will be undertaken as part of Strategic Plan Project.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
40	Include solar/geothermal energy efficiency upgrades to public buildings. The federal government has been providing special tax incentive programs such as the Clean Renewable Energy Bond (CREBs) program so private financing can pay for the upgrades and the local agencies can repay the financing out of energy savings.	Est. Savings of \$25M over 20yrs. However no savings will be realized until year 17 (2025) of the project.	No net savings to the County or GF until after the project is paid.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce energy costs</li> <li>• Consistent with climate protection efforts</li> <li>• Some programs have benefit of reducing future costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GS is evaluating CREBs for some smaller facilities, and are using the ESCo model and private financing to fund energy work.</li> <li>• Savings is longer-term and will not be realized until after the project had been paid off.</li> <li>• Saving captures in the energy index until pay-off</li> <li>• General Services is actively engaged in exploring all known opportunities for State/Federal funding for energy efficiency upgrades</li> </ul>
41	Other energy savings efforts: check for most efficient use of light bulbs, removing where unnecessary, re-evaluating where motion sensor switches should be used (perhaps add some hard switches to eliminate unneeded on-time for some rooms, review day and night light usage patterns, turn off computers and copiers at night, and computers when away from desk for some period of time (1.5-3 hours), use individual workstation lighting, adjust thermostat minimums and maximums, shut down water heaters).	Est. 80k/yr if heating/AC for all county buildings maintained 2 degrees warmer /colder than current settings.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potentially reduce energy costs</li> <li>• Consistent with climate protection efforts</li> </ul> <p>Some programs have benefit of reducing future costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• .</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion being implemented.</li> <li>• Heating/AC set lower for heating and higher for air can create a potential for energy savings of approximately 2% per 2-degree change.</li> <li>• County usually forecasts an increase for energy use year over year, but due to changes, for this year, we might see a small reduction, and for future years, we would see a smaller increase, not a decrease. We should still pursue this effort.</li> <li>• Individual lighting change outs, while "the right thing to</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

No	Suggestion	Est. County Savings	Est. GF Savings	Pros	Cons	Evaluation or Implementation Status
		Based on FY 08-09 Adopted Budget				
						<p>do", will have a negligible cost savings and will requires labor resources to accomplish - pursuing in the normal; course of maintenance is recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Services is actively engaged in exploring all known opportunities for State/Federal funding for energy efficiency upgrades</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

<p><b>42</b></p>	<p>“Green” suggestions from California Academy of Sciences (reuse/recycle packing supplies; purchase commodities only in bulk, eliminate anti-bacterial soap, replace restroom paper towels with electric hand dryers) – Also look into rechargeable batteries and chargers.</p>	<p>Unquantifiable</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with county recycling efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost benefit of replacing paper towels with electric hand dryers and eliminating anti-bacterial soap unclear</li> <li>• Cost benefit of purchasing in bulk and increased storage costs unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion being implemented where appropriate.</li> <li>• The County encourages recycling and provides recycling containers throughout county facilities.</li> <li>• General Services is charged with evaluating energy efficiencies throughout county facilities and with evaluating the cost/benefit of similar suggestion.</li> </ul>
<p><b>43</b></p>	<p>Mandate that the majority of county printing should be done at the county print shop (i.e. Use Reprographics as opposed to outside vendors or distributed printing via the many small printers and copiers in departments.) Suggested variations: Establish Printer/person ratios that make sense per division function; Install multi-function printer/fax/copier/scanners with color and larger page size (i.e. 11 x 17) and Confidential settings (log in to print these documents); Eliminate old printers and accessories (continue donating old stock to local non-profits); Target fewer, more efficient, faster devices in common areas; and ensuring default setting is for 2 sided printing on all local printers.</p>	<p>Unquantifiable savings. Uncertain that this suggestion would result in cost savings. May increase costs for some printed materials as both distributed printing costs and external printing costs are less expensive in some cases. Difficult to factor dept overhead into in-house costs, this may increase instances where Reprographics costs less. Departments are encouraged to seek the lowest price option for printing.</p> <p>More than half of departments reported preference to have ability to use outside vendors to meet some needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some efficiency could be gained and some departments may not be aware of current Reprographics capabilities and pricing compared to running copies on departmental printers or copiers or purchasing services from an outside commercial vendor.</li> <li>• Economies of scale for the fixed costs in Reprographics could be maximized and reduce some costs for all users.</li> <li>• Efficiencies in suggested variations could help reduce waste and resource use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reprographics may be more expensive than outside printing options for some tasks</li> <li>• Reprographics capabilities may not meet all needs, for example, Elections reported that Reprographics cannot currently print the ballots used by the County.</li> <li>• Additional staff costs of sending and picking up print jobs that could be done at department locations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A much more detailed evaluation of the cost / benefit of using reprographics as opposed to outside vendors for printing would be necessary to calculate individual departmental savings or added costs arising from this suggestion.</li> <li>• The Board could direct staff to undertake such a study or require each department to conduct their own review subject to some guiding principles if further evaluation of this suggestion is desired</li> <li>• Departments should be looking at the variations to this idea noted here that offer individual potential for efficiencies and minor cost savings.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

<p><b>44</b></p>	<p>Enhance space standards by following steps: Design and identify space typical (6x6;6x8, 8x8...); Design floor layouts that optimize cube flexibility; Eliminate most walled offices; Include multiple storage options that are ergonomically safe; Transfer ownership of all furniture product to General Services (to minimize attachment to assets and manage more effectively); Work towards adjustable work surface components; Add in more multi-purpose conference room areas that can be scheduled or drop-in Invest in inviting, optimized multi-function break areas and eliminate individual department areas; Create ‘public’ lobby areas for all contact (where possible); and Develop Space Management system to support locating space, areas, people, departments and other key space components.</p>	<p>It is uncertain that this suggestion would result in cost savings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further analysis would be needed to determine the cost/savings. In any event, any savings would not be immediate - in fact there would be short term costs to implement the suggestion beyond current practices already in place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion of the General Services program, including ownership of all furnishings, may have some benefits but also has many logistic and cost issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing space standards with existing facilities would require extensive renovation of buildings and offices.</li> <li>• Warehousing of product and parts involves facility and operating costs that need to be balanced against savings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standardizing space requirements and design approaches can be a cost efficient use of resources.</li> <li>• The county has adopted space design-guidelines based on the work requirements of specific job classes and applies them when ever possible.</li> <li>• Hard walls are provided where confidentially and other aspects of a specific function demand them.</li> <li>• Current space planning practice assumes the use of both the space guidelines and ergonomic furnishings, and space layout objectives include flexibility and optimum space utilization.</li> <li>• The Comprehensive County Facilities Plan will re-examine space guidelines and space utilization with the goal of minimizing facility costs and maximizing facility utilization.</li> <li>• Co-location of functions and use of common support areas will be important consideration not only for better space utilization, but for better service delivery as well.</li> <li>• General Services department maintains a</li> </ul>
------------------	---	---	---	---	--

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

					<p>supply of some excess modular and other furnishings to provide departments the opportunity to reuse furnishings that have become surplus, as a cost savings measure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Some other departments maintain their own inventory.</li><li>• With the Comprehensive County Facilities Plan project, the county will be considering how its assets can best be used to support the delivery of services to the community in the future, recognizing the community has grown and changed, as have the delivery methods and technologies of county services.</li><li>• Aspects of this suggestion (public contact and lobby areas, optimized multi-function break areas, etc) will be considered within the context of this project</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

45	<p>Work with purchasing to negotiate better rates with consultants who have multiple contracts with the County.</p>	<p>County does not have system to facilitate centralized purchasing.</p> <p>If centralized purchasing system developed est potential for savings of \$1 million annually (1% of purchases).</p> <p>Savings would be offset by one-time system investment \$150k plus ongoing system maintenance costs.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be lower operational costs if centralized system is implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot be implemented in time to achieve FY 09-10 savings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business case for a centralized procurement system is under development</li> <li>• Short term investment in centralized purchasing system required. Estimated cost of system \$150k</li> <li>• Est. added staffing needs of 4-5 personnel to centralize – may be possible to reduce similar number of staff in departments meaning could be cost neutral</li> <li>• Investment payback period unknown.</li> </ul>
46	<p>Roll back FY 08-09 COLA for unrepresented employees.</p> <p>Includes:            000 Unrepresented (Misc.)            50 Management            51 Confidential            52 Dept. Heads            49 BOS</p> <p>Roll back equivalent for other employee groups – includes COLA's and pension pick-up</p>	<p>Est. \$2.9 M for 3% COLA effective 7/1/8</p> <p>~ \$1 M for every 1%</p> <p>\$7.6 M but does not include offset for reduced revenues</p>	<p>Est. \$1.6 M of countywide total is GF</p> <p>Est. 4.0 M of countywide is GF but does not include any offset for reduced revenues</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Singles out one group of employees for salary roll back and will have negative impact on labor relations with unrepresented who have been supportive of BOS / CAO efforts and initiatives</li> <li>• Unrepresented employee salaries already lag behind market for similar positions in benchmark counties</li> <li>• Could create recruitment and retention issues</li> <li>• Could create pay compaction issues</li> <li>• Unrepresented has already agreed to 2% defacto roll back with MTO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff recommends suggestion not be implemented</li> <li>• Annual cost for COLA's /Pension PU granted in FY 08-09 for other employee groups totals \$7.6M:            SCPDAA - \$141k            SEIU - \$2.6M            DSA/DSLEM - \$1.3M            SCLEA - \$1.6M            SCPDIA - \$29k            SCPA - \$288k            WCE - \$233k            Local 39 - \$527k            ESC - \$871k</li> <li>• Salary reductions / roll-backs should be applied to all employee groups equitably. One group should not be singled out</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roll backs should be considered in combination with other salary reductions (MTO (equivalent of 2% pay reduction), no FY 09-10 COLA, etc.)</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>
<b>47</b>	<p><b>Reduce Work Week</b></p> <p>Consider reducing work hours – i.e. 36 or 32 hour work weeks, could be done with same hours of operation or reduced hours</p>	<p>\$113k per hour</p> <p>\$452k per week if reduced 4 hours</p>	<p>\$81k per hour</p> <p>\$324k per week if reduced 4 hours</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing work week from 40 to 36 hours equates to a 10% pay reduction</li> <li>• Currently FLSA exempt employees (many managers and unrepresented) would become FLSA non-exempt and be eligible for overtime which could reduce any savings gained</li> <li>• Creates problems with fixed post (24/7) positions or unequal application,</li> <li>• Has public service impact</li> <li>• Added upfront and on-going administration effort</li> <li>• Involuntary reduction in work hours and pay would be controversial with employees</li> <li>• Meet and confer required for represented employees</li> <li>• Many employees already work more than 40 hours/wk to complete their work. This could exacerbate that problem.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial assessment is that a mandatory reduction in work hours, with reduced benefits, would have an adverse impact on public service, current employees, and would impact the County's ability to recruit and retain new employees.</li> <li>• Eventually county would transition back to a standard 40 hour work week. Going back would be expensive proposition.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> <li>• Informal survey of other agencies who have implemented is that they regret the decision</li> </ul>
		<p>Est. assumes reduced benefits and includes estimated loss of revenue</p>				

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

48	<p>Consider cutting hours of operations in other ways – limit services to 4 day/week, assumes 4/10's</p>	<p>\$180 k / yr.</p> <p>Assumes no salary and benefit savings which are covered under other suggestions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May reduce greenhouse gases</li> <li>• Non-personnel reductions achieve if buildings are not open</li> <li>• Employees may like extra day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact public service</li> <li>• May affect productivity</li> <li>• Problem with fixed post, and 24/7 operations</li> <li>• Meet and confer required for represented employees</li> <li>• No salary and benefit savings - savings limited to facility costs if facilities closed on the 5<sup>th</sup> day</li> <li>• Negative impact on employees, especially ones with child care issues</li> <li>• May be unpopular with employees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Services estimated maximum potential savings based on building/utility savings for main campus, non-24/7 uses</li> <li>• Based on initial assessment cutting hours of operations would result in very limited savings and result in a high public service impact.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>
49	<p>Expand Sabbatical Policy</p> <p>Suggested variations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow employees to take up to a year off, or another specified time frame and county continue to pay health benefits. Don't back fill behind staff out. Rotate # of sabbaticals allowed to keep more positions vacant to get through next two to three years budget crunch.</li> <li>• Increasing flexibility to allow for some sort of rotation; e.g. 3 months each, rotated so that 21 people fill 20 FTE on an on-going basis.</li> </ul>	<p>The amount of any savings would depend on how many individuals requested and were granted a sabbatical and whether departments could grant without filling behind.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be seen as a valuable opportunity for some employees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sabbaticals are a form of voluntary time off. As currently structured sabbaticals impact employee benefits which would make them a less desirable form of VTO</li> <li>• If a VTO program is instituted it is likely there would be very limited or no interest in expanded sabbaticals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board may want to allow this as an option for individual departments to implement if it would serve to minimize department reductions required.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

50	<p>Fill public records requests, electronically and change request forms to promote electronic transmission of requested records.</p>	<p>Potential minimal savings in paper cost due to electronic submission / transmission. Potential for some staff time redirection to other tasks as more requests are filled electronically.</p> <p>Unknown dollar savings as the number and type of records requests vary significantly: Public records requests include a copy of a Board agenda item, to complex litigation requests. The county does not track the number and type of public records requests, and these requests are not collected in a consolidated location.</p>	<p>Staff efficiencies could be gained through easier identification and delivery of records.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State law requires public records requests be provided in multiple formats</li> </ul> <p>Public records requests do not come into the County via a single, standard point of contact, and can range from a request for a copy of a Board agenda item to a request related to ongoing litigation. The costs of requiring electronic requests and deliveries of this information could potentially create increased costs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISD is working on long-term project (year 1 of approximately 10) to convert paper records to electronic records as much as possible throughout the organization. Where possible requestors should be offered and encouraged to receive electronic versions.</li> <li>• ISD has purchased software that will allow records to be located and searched electronically. In addition, ISD has initiated an approximately 10-year project to convert all paper files to electronic format. These efforts should create efficiencies and cost savings in future years.</li> </ul>
51	<p>Change to electronic paid leave request and approvals as opposed to paper versions currently required.</p>	<p>Est. &lt; \$1k/yr Potential savings in paper costs due to electronic submission / transmission</p> <p>Additional important savings from not processing paper is expected and already included in the calculations of savings for the Board approved HRMS project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would reduce paper use</li> <li>• Reduce time moving paper through organization</li> <li>• Reduced errors due to lost paperwork</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current payroll system does not support paperless requests /approvals.</li> <li>• The HRMS system will support paperless processing which is a primary goal of that system.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended until the HRMS system is in place to support to transition to paperless</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

52	Distribute paychecks electronically, variation added: heavily promote direct deposit.	<p>Currently less than .09% of employees get actual paychecks. Savings would be in the form of less paper processed and distributed</p> <p>HRMS System will aid in transition to more paperless system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less paper generated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State law requires ability for employees to receive paper check if they so desire</li> <li>• Some employees desire to receive a paper check</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 99.91% of employees participate in direct deposit and do not receive paper paychecks.</li> <li>• Current system does not provide option to distribute copies of warrants electronically. HRMS system will allow this option.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended until HRMS is implemented and paperless option can be offered.</li> </ul>
53	Alternate payroll processing (1/2 employees each week) or go to monthly payroll	<p>Payroll Mgr. believes minor savings could be achieved through monthly processing of payroll. Large one-time costs to reprogram systems for monthly processing. Similarly weekly processing of 1/2 of payroll would not reduce costs.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly paychecks would negatively impact current employee who would receive paychecks less frequently</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payroll Mgr. indicated that reprogramming systems to accommodate a different pay schedule would be costly.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>
54	Reduce janitorial services to 2 days per week as opposed to 3.	<p>\$60k for primary buildings on the Administrative campus.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be possible in some low use areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many areas require more regular cleaning (i.e. high use public restrooms, food items sitting in trash bins, etc)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very limited savings available with potential for significant public impact in high public use areas.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

55	<p>Charge employees for parking permits.</p> <p>Variations suggest incentives for employees not to use parking passes and incentives for carpooling, provide scooters or bikes to those that must travel about town.</p>	<p>Potential revenue - \$600k @ \$10 / week pass</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May reduce greenhouse gases</li> <li>• Could free up some County property for other uses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May move parking off-site, angering public and employees</li> <li>• May discourage public participation</li> <li>• Depending on charge, may require meet and confer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of pay parking may be undertaken as part of the longer-term master facility planning project or greenhouse gas reduction program.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>
56	<p>Artwork: stop purchasing artwork for offices, donate sculpture in front of Admin bldg (get a write off) and replace with simple plaque thanking public servants and/or veterans for service and dedication.</p>	<p>Excluding purchase of Admin sculpture, Est. less than &lt;\$25k countywide has been spent on one-time basis.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County doesn't pay taxes so no "write off" is available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>
57	<p>Redirect Department Employee Recognition Program (DERP) funds to the General Fund for the next 2 years and then revisit</p>	<p>Est. \$ 100k annual savings countywide. Est. \$54k (54%) GF.</p> <p>DERP is \$25/employee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited impact on many departments that do not use the monies or do not see it as a material recognition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May negatively impact employee morale who do use funding</li> <li>• Recognition / celebration of accomplishments is increasingly important in difficult time</li> <li>• Board previously discussed and elected to keep DERP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board could direct staff to implement this suggestion at any time.</li> <li>• Minimal savings</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

<b>58</b>	<p>Suspend implementation of the new Human Resources Management System</p>	<p>\$0 in FY 09-10</p> <p>Est. 2.6 million (\$3.1 M staff minus \$600k in software license) will be expended. These project expenses are to be financed by borrowing or one-time funds.</p> <p>Savings would be offset by penalties and added costs to restart project in the future.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One-time cash availability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contradicts Board direction to continue 1 time investment to improve county's systems and create resource efficiencies                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suspension will trigger penalties from software vendor and lease space of about \$200k</li> <li>• Restart may require \$20k for IT training refresher and \$50k to re-negotiate lease space and re-hire staff</li> <li>• Releasing in-house project staff may result in layoffs/displacement of up to 10.5 FTEs</li> <li>• Employees' Open Enrollment for Spring 2010 will be require the usual voluminous paper base process instead of benefiting from the electronic/self-serve streamlined electronic solution</li> <li>• 35-yr old payroll system puts county at risk for system failure</li> <li>• Management systems to improve HR and Payroll process will be delayed</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRMS project is already underway.</li> <li>• Substantial long-term benefit in terms of reduced costs, process automation will be realized through HRMS system.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>
-----------	--	---	--	---	---

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

59	Reduce or eliminate home internet service	Est. 12k / yr	There is a potential savings in departments that currently reimburse employees for home internet service – a service that many employees likely already have in place.	Employee relations – if work is required from home using high-speed internet, some employees may feel entitled to have their internet service costs reimbursed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some departments have made arrangements on a case-by-case basis with employees to reimburse the costs of installing and carrying high-speed internet services. If these arrangements were disallowed, there would be an unknown cost savings.</li> <li>• Based on the number of VPN accounts in the County (appx. 400), and a typical cost for home high-speed internet service (appx. \$30), this could potentially save \$12,000.</li> <li>• However, the cost is likely significantly lower as high-speed home internet access is becoming a common feature of home technology.</li> <li>• VPN use is a critical and necessary tool for county staff to conduct work from home. There is no marginal cost for VPN as the cost is included in licensing.</li> <li>• Management staff routinely work from home via VPN during non-office hours such as evenings, weekends, and holidays. VPN allows this time to be productive hours.</li> <li>• ISD recently ceased its reimbursement policy, which will save the department approximately \$10k per year.</li> </ul>
----	---	---------------	--	---	--

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

					However, the department likely has a higher number of staff required to have high-speed internet services at home than do other departments.
--	--	--	--	--	--

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

60	Eliminate bi-lingual premium	~ 775k paid in regular and overtime bi-lingual premiums.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires meet and confer</li> <li>• Employees may refuse to provide services</li> <li>• May reduce service to public</li> <li>• May cause errors in service delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial assessment is that eliminating bilingual pay would have a detrimental public service impact. Strategic Plan identifies increased need to reach growing Latino population. This suggestion runs counter to that finding.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>
61	Eliminate or reduce the \$600 cash allowance	Est.\$38.4M countywide	Est.\$21.2M GF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminating the benefit would decrease employee pay and retirement and retirement and greatly impact employee morale</li> <li>• Conflicts with BOS/CAO/Department Head goals for services</li> <li>• Requires meet and confer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion has been analyzed, discussed, and negotiated over the last 18 months. Total compensation for our employees would be greatly reduced below other public entities causing employee retention and recruitment problems Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>
62	Postpone the implementation of the \$600/mo cash allowance for employees and the \$500 flat monthly health insurance contributions for both employees and retirees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depends on length of time of postponed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depends on length of time of postponed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Postponing implementation would decrease employee pay</li> <li>• Increases County cost for active and retiree health plus increases OPEB liability greater than savings</li> <li>• Serious impact on employees who have already made health plan, personal budget, and other life choices and would be negatively impacted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To amend current benefit requires formal meet and confer process.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

63	<p>Delay Master Capital Planning</p>	<p>Up to \$1.5 M is requested in the FY 09/10 for a combination of projects including Master Capital Plan.</p> <p>Est. one-time savings assumes one year delay for two master planning efforts. The first relates to continuing the analysis of natural hazards that exist in Sonoma County (threats from flooding, fire, earthquake, etc) to the county's key infrastructure and services</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazard mitigation study delay would slow identifying and mitigating hazards and jeopardize federal funds in the event of the disaster.</li> <li>• Master planning allows the county to plan more efficient and cost effective operation of programs and use of multiple assets.</li> <li>• Lack of master planning, and developing capital projects to respond to particular county program or building needs in isolation, can result in increased costs, less efficient use of resources and less effective delivery of service to the public.</li> <li>• Master plan delay may offer short term savings, but can result in increased capital and operating costs that offset those savings.</li> <li>• Delays can also mean missed opportunities to compete for grants or funds from other sources that are time specific, i.e., programs of the Recovery Act.</li> <li>• The County is overdue for a master plan update. Depending on the master planning effort, delays may place the county out of compliance in meeting state or federal requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board could direct staff to delay master capital planning efforts, but minimal savings would result.</li> <li>• This effort is required in response to federal legislation and without it, the County would be ineligible to receive reimbursement from the federal government in the event of disaster.</li> <li>• Planning will also enable the County to identify potential hazards in critical emergency response and recovery facilities, and develop plans to mitigate them.</li> <li>• The second master planning effort is the Comprehensive County Facilities Plan (CCFP) which is a new project now underway that will implement aspects of the County's Strategic Plan. Its specific final costs have yet to be determined.</li> <li>• Master planning for capital assets is consistent with best management practices of using real estate to its best and highest potential, and fostering good stewardship, sustainability, and cost containment.</li> </ul>
----	--------------------------------------	--	--	---	---

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

64	Certify/Validate correct street address for all business systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant one-time costs, which would then produce some distributed savings among depts. as various duplicative efforts maintaining separate databases and dealing with corrections would not be needed. Survey indicates range of potentially redirected efforts from less than \$1000 per year to nearly \$20k per year in a few cases</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Save on mailing costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently part of business practices of all departments – when returned mail received attempt made to validate correct address</li> <li>Very difficult for some departments who serve populations that are more transient than others</li> <li>Further evaluation not recommended until technology more readily available to assist in reducing the significant upfront project costs at this time</li> </ul>
65	Eliminate DH auto allowance	Est. \$266k annually countywide	Est. \$143k GF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could result in increased use of County fleet vehicles which may be more expensive in the long run</li> <li>Would result in additional claims for mileage in county that are not now allowed</li> <li>Auto allowance is part of compensation package for Department Heads. Reducing compensation will result in recruitment and retention issues in the future.</li> <li>This is one benefit that is almost universal with employers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Board could provide direction to implement this action.</li> <li>Savings would be offset by increased cost to departments for use of county cars and for mileage reimbursement for in county miles</li> <li>Potential savings minimal unless Board also restricted use of county cars</li> <li>Further evaluation or implementation not recommended.</li> </ul>
		<p>Includes roll-up costs such as increased retirement</p> <p>Assumes 54% GF but does not include any offset for loss of revenue.</p>				

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

66	Create hot-line to confidentially report administrative waste, fraud, and abuse, to be monitored by Board of Supervisors or their staff.	Est. cost to establish new program < \$50k/yr would be offset by any savings realized if waste, fraud or abuse identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May result in the identification of waste, fraud and abuse</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would involve a new cost to implement, staff, investigate information received</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are currently many avenues for reporting these activities</li> <li>• Employees are encouraged to report to supervisor, department head, HR, CAO, etc.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended</li> </ul>
67	<p>Remove minimum mileage standards (reduce mileage reimbursements below Federally-established levels)</p> <p>Variation: Eliminate mileage reimbursement</p>	<p>\$580k countywide mileage reimbursement paid in FY 08/09</p> <p>Determining GF amount difficult – mileage reimbursement paid through payroll</p> <p>IRS rate for FY 08-09 \$0.505 cents per mile.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some cost savings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reimbursement levels are established by the IRS</li> <li>• Employees would not be reimbursed appropriately</li> <li>• Could increase use of County vehicles to avoid reimbursement limits which would increase county cost.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Departments are reducing travel and scrutinizing related costs as part of their budget reduction measures.</li> <li>• Eliminating mileage reimbursement may cost departments more than it would save if fleet vehicles are used instead of private vehicles.</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended, though Fleet operations is working on a related idea to calculate pool vehicle rates differently, in conjunction with number 28 above, that may have the effect of capturing more miles driven on fleet vehicles.</li> </ul>

## Non-Department Specific Reductions and Savings Options

<b>68</b>	Eliminate deferred comp	Est. \$ 4.9 M countywide paid in FY 08/09	Est. \$ 2.6 GF	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deferred comp is part of compensation package. Reducing compensation will result in recruitment and retention issues in the future</li> <li>• Surveys of comparable jurisdictions supports either a deferred comp contribution or retirement pickup</li> <li>• This would be singling out a specific group of employees with a reduction</li> <li>• Requires meet and confer with employee groups receiving this as part of compensation package</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any reductions in salary and benefits should be considered collectively – i.e. reduced deferred comp and retirement pickup</li> <li>• The board could provide direction to HR to meet and confer on this issue</li> <li>• Further evaluation or implementation not recommended in light of other salary and benefit reductions imposed or under consideration</li> </ul>
		Includes retirement paid and FICA on 457  Assumes 54% GF				