

Board Inquiry Form

Board Member	
Carbajal	
Wolf	x
Farr	
Adam	
Lavagnino	

Inquiry Number: 09

Department: County Counsel

Date: 6/7/2013

Page(s) of Budget Book: D-31 vs. Budget Adjustments [Attachment A]

Request/Question: Page D-31 attributes reduction of 2 FTE attorneys to “reduced caseload” yet it appeared on an addendum to the BOS agenda last week that funds were being sought for contracting with outside counsel for litigation, and the CEO is recommending “one-time” addition of one attorney.

Response Prepared by: Dennis Marshall, County Counsel

Response:

The two FTE positions were programmed for revenue generating workload and we did not generate the revenue necessary to support the positions.

The reasons we failed to meet revenue projects included a reduction in Risk Management case load of approximately .5 FTE. The remaining 1.5 FTE represents a management shift of resources to more exigent General Fund services including Planning and Development, Community Services and North County Jail project.

Restoration of these positions would reduce the need for outside counsel and allow County Counsel to maintain current service levels. Approval of two positions will still leave County Counsel with 4 FTE attorneys less than allocated 5 years ago.