

The results of the analysis indicated that 42% of the underutilized vehicles were being used less than half the "break-even" point, and that the departments' underutilized vehicles were mostly comprised of aging vehicles. More than 2/3rd of the vehicles were 2002 or older.

- On September 9, 2010, the Executive Office, with participation from Fleet Services, distributed updated Vehicle Utilization Reports to each county department and agency with vehicles. Departments were instructed to provide a written justification why the vehicle is still needed. The results of that combined effort were a 182 reduction in vehicles. (See Table A below)

Savings Through Mileage and Fuel Reductions

As a result of the efficiencies achieved through county budget reductions, fewer miles are being driven and less fuel is being purchased. Mileage and fuel usage does not affect the number of vehicles in a department's fleet. These are indicators that suggest that the ultimate size of the county's fleet should reflect the minimum number of appropriate vehicles required to fulfill the organization's mission, regardless of the source of funds.

An analysis of mileage and fuel purchases for the period between January to June 2010 and the same period in the preceding year concluded that countywide, the mileage and fuel savings totaled \$737,056. In addition:

- Non-patrol vehicle mileage decreased 17% while fuel purchases decreased 13%.
- For patrol vehicles, which operate on a 24/7 basis, the mileage decrease was 4% while the fuel purchases decreased 11%. The table below summarizes the top nine department savings in mileage and gallons of fuel purchased:

Department	Total Dept. Savings	Size of Dept. Fleet <small>Source: Fleet Services</small>	Change in Miles Driven <small>Source: Fleet Services</small>	Mileage Savings at .12/mile	Change in Fuel Used (gal) <small>Source: Fleet Services</small>	Fuel Savings**
Sheriff*	\$ (298,078)	1,708	-414,280	\$ (60,689)	-89,920	\$ (237,389)
District Attorney	\$ (212,078)	245	-903,115	\$ (108,374)	-39,282	\$ (103,704)
DPSS	\$ (67,431)	626	-252,843	\$ (30,341)	-14,049	\$ (37,089)
Community Health Agency	\$ (56,659)	265	-196,231	\$ (23,548)	-12,542	\$ (33,111)
Transportation	\$ (32,483)	60	-109,846	\$ (13,182)	-7,311	\$ (19,301)
Probation	\$ (25,060)	205	-105,870	\$ (12,704)	-4,680	\$ (12,355)
Code Enforcement	\$ (19,246)	120	-68,623	\$ (8,235)	-4,171	\$ (11,011)
Agricultural Commissioner	\$ (17,821)	43	-105,410	\$ (12,649)	-1,959	\$ (5,172)
Board of Supervisors	\$ (17,355)	16	-61,291	\$ (7,355)	-3,788	\$ (10,000)

* Sheriff Patrol = /.17/mile while Sheriff Non-Patrol =.12/mile

** The fuel savings calculation was adjusted for the variance in fuel prices during the two periods.

To summarize, since March 2010, a total of 182 vehicles were retired for auction, a savings of \$462,117. The net number of vehicles retired, by department, is shown in the table below:

TABLE A

	Count of Underutilized Vehicles 8- 31-10	Retired/ Auctioned	Replaced /Exchanged	New Vehicles Requested in FY 10-11	Net Vehicle Reduction	SAVINGS (Actual Vehicle Cost in FY 09-10)
Sheriff	362	19	0	40	-21	\$162,831
DPSS	261	56	0	0	56	\$86,162
Mental Health	91	6	1	0	6	\$7,763
Fleet Motor Pool	94	5	0	0	5	\$1,674
Community Health Agency	91	14	0	0	14	\$22,370
Probation	90	17	0	0	17	\$26,251
EDA/Facilities Management	91	2	0	0	2	\$7,924
District Attorney	66	1	0	0	1	\$0
Code Enforcement	52	20	0	0	20	\$34,112
Building & Safety	12	13	0	0	13	\$31,043
Transportation	19	4	0	0	4	\$5,580
TLMA Admin	7	1	0	0	1	\$2,663
Planning	2	1	0	0	1	\$831
Assessor	17	6	2	0	6	\$9,866
Information Technology	15	5	0	0	5	\$14,102
Ag Commissioner	13	1	1	0	1	\$3,221
Child Support Services	9	1	0	0	1	\$1,029
Parks	6	2	0	0	2	\$2,621
Purchasing/Fleet	13	5	1	0	5	\$35,812
Office on Aging	4	0	0	0	0	\$0
Board of Supervisors	6	0	0	0	0	\$0
Auditor-Controller	1	0	0	0	0	\$0
Public Defender	1	0	1	0	0	\$0
Rideshare	1	1	0	0	1	\$2,433
Veterans	1	0	1	0	0	\$0
Housing Authority	1	1	0	0	1	\$650
Human Resources	1	1	0	0	1	\$3,179
	1,219	182	7	40	142	\$462,117

November 8, 2010

Riverside County Board of Supervisors

Re: **Agenda Item 3.24**
2010-11 Budget Report
Oppose - Reductions to Public Safety

Dear Supervisors,

Please accept this personal input when considering your extremely difficult budget choices. I am fully aware that your budget choices are a result of many external factors, including a significant failure on behalf of State government to respect the growing responsibilities, unfunded mandates, theft of local funds and limited funding options that Counties (and cities) are experiencing.

In my (minority) capacity at the state level I have been advocating that the state live within its means, and that the first priority of our limited tax dollars be directed towards maintaining adequate front-line public safety services. And while the state has been unwilling to make the difficult choices to truly and honestly balance its annual budget, it is evident that most local governing entities are prepared to do what must be done to stay fiscally solvent.

With the full respect and recognition that you are going to be forced to make some very difficult on-going budget decisions, **I respectfully ask that you spare making any deep cuts to front-line law enforcement and fire protection services.** As you know - public safety is arguably the first and foremost responsibility of government. If at all possible - reductions in front-line life-saving emergency responders should be the last choice in any staffing reductions.

Again, I recognize that a good portion of your extremely difficult budget choices have been made WORSE by the actions or inactions of our state and federal governments. If I could find the legal rationale to defend it – I would advocate that you substantially delay and/or legally challenge a large portion of the “Administrative Fee” that the county pays to the State of California as it relates to the fire protection contract and the indirect support services the fee is allegedly funding at the state level. A fee that is unjustly charged by any government entity should not be allowed to continue without challenge and correction (but I digress).

In closing, let me again state that I fully respect the difficult decisions you have and will be making. Please continue to use your experience and entrusted authority to squeeze out every last option, inefficiency or non-essential expenditure before you make cuts to front-line public safety positions.

If I can ever be of any assistance to the Board – please do not hesitate to ask.

Respectfully,



Kevin Jeffries
Lakeland Village

11.08.10
3.24

Riverside County Board of Supervisors,
Request to Speak

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium),
Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject
Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME: LEB WEGGEND

Address: 2
(only if follow-up mail response requested)

City: _____ Zip: _____

Phone #: _____

Date: _____ Agenda # 3.24

PLEASE STATE YOUR POSITION BELOW:

Position on "Regular" (non-appealed) Agenda Item:

Support _____ Oppose _____ Neutral

Note: If you are here for an agenda item that is filed
for "Appeal", please state separately your position on
the appeal below:

Support _____ Oppose _____ Neutral

I give my 3 minutes to: _____

Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Request to Speak

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium),
Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject
Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME: Patie Winder

Address: 5174 Fallwood Ave.
(only if follow-up mail response requested)

City: Riverside Zip: 92506

Phone #: 951-662-7655

Date: 11/2/10 Agenda # 3.24

PLEASE STATE YOUR POSITION BELOW:

Position on "Regular" (non-appealed) Agenda Item:

Support _____ Oppose _____ Neutral

Note: If you are here for an agenda item that is filed
for "Appeal", please state separately your position on
the appeal below:

Support _____ Oppose _____ Neutral

I give my 3 minutes to: _____