

Handout  
5A

FY 2015 Year End Budget to Actual Review  
February 23, 2016  
Note - Negative numbers are net positive.

FundDept	2014 Bud		2014 Act		% of Budget	
	Rev	Exp	Rev	Exp	Rev	Exp
<b>General Fund</b>						
<b>Administration/General Gov't Depts</b>						
1 1 Commissioners	0	246,894	0	233,648		95%
1 40 Auditor	(278,730)	601,807	(260,814)	594,461	94%	99%
1 41 Internal Audit	0	65,000	0	57,541		89%
1 42 Treasurer	(32,500)	249,943	(33,606)	242,356	103%	97%
1 43 Asessor	(166,997)	830,499	(171,180)	818,620	103%	99%
1 44 Central Services	(7,493,247)	310,979	(7,690,128)	1,332,227	103%	428%
1 45 Motor Pool	(30,000)	53,261	(60,330)	55,551	201%	104%
1 49 Information Technologies	(800)	601,428	(851)	622,081	106%	103%
1 52 Administration/HR	0	398,957	0	397,096		100%
1 60 Elections	0	20,600	0	29,890		145%
1 100 Recorder	(239,231)	248,030	(224,260)	278,324	94%	112%
1 110 Courthouse Maint	(20,000)	366,051	(4)	332,725	0%	91%
1 111 Buildings	0	72,000	0	20,150		28%
1 120 VSO	(22,200)	93,490	(17,780)	99,355	80%	106%
1 121 HRA	0	1,600	0	1,785		112%
<b>Administration/General Gov't Depts Subtotal</b>	<b>(8,283,705)</b>	<b>4,160,539</b>	<b>(8,458,952)</b>	<b>5,115,811</b>	<b>102%</b>	<b>123%</b>

FY 2015 Year End Budget to Actual Review

February 23, 2016

Note - Negative numbers are net positive.

FundDept	2014 Bud		2014 Act		% of Budget	
	Rev	Exp	Rev	Exp	Rev	Exp
<b>Public Safety</b>						
1 12 Court Administration	(100)	85,100	(1,918)	93,459		110%
1 90 Attorney	(56,147)	931,141	(63,862)	920,557	114%	99%
1 123 Coroner	0	58,000	0	50,127		86%
1 200 Enforcement	(176,750)	2,099,117	(306,777)	2,110,637	174%	101%
1 201 Sheriff Contingency	0	0	(2,140)	0		
1 202 Boat and Water	(19,000)	83,346	(13,656)	74,900	72%	90%
1 203 Snowmobile	(6,175)	33,033	(6,191)	30,547	100%	92%
1 204 ATV	(14,212)	20,537	(14,212)	18,848	100%	92%
1 206 Forfeitures	0	0	(22,265)	35,430		
1 252 Corrections	(2,290,405)	2,358,067	(2,639,907)	2,545,915	115%	108%
1 253 Aitkin Co Community Corrections	(33,443)	298,401	(34,152)	304,662	102%	102%
1 254 Enhanced 911	(89,150)	331,700	(89,190)	110,942	100%	33%
1 255 Crime Victim	(43,607)	67,502	(43,161)	64,608	99%	96%
1 257 Sobriety Court	0	7,000	(11,190)	10,633		152%
1 280 Emergency Management	(22,000)	47,223	(41,742)	31,981	190%	68%
<i>Public Safety Subtotal</i>	<i>(2,750,989)</i>	<i>6,420,167</i>	<i>(3,290,363)</i>	<i>6,403,246</i>	<i>120%</i>	<i>100%</i>
<b>Culture and Recreation</b>						
1 500 Library & Historical Society	0	289,552	0	288,660		100%
1 520 Parks	0	0	0	0		
1 601 Extension	0	55,281	(800)	52,249		95%
<i>Culture and Recreation Subtotal</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>344,833</i>	<i>(800)</i>	<i>340,909</i>		<i>99%</i>

FY 2015 Year End Budget to Actual Review

February 23, 2016

Note - Negative numbers are net positive.

FundDept	2014 Bud		2014 Act		% of Budget	
	Rev	Exp	Rev	Exp	Rev	Exp
<b>Conservation of Natural Resources</b>						
1 122 Planning and Zoning	(285,006)	419,434	(349,440)	479,543	● 123%	● 114%
1 390 Environmental Health	(72,000)	76,724	(72,305)	68,726	● 100%	● 90%
1 391 Solid Waste	(264,778)	273,988	(271,697)	296,581	● 103%	● 108%
1 392 Water Wells	(6,150)	6,150	(13,406)	4,456	● 218%	● 72%
1 600 Ag Soc, Soil & Water, Ag	0	136,169	0	133,991		● 98%
1 603 Wetland Value Repl Fund	0	0	(3,534)	0		
<i>Conservation of Natural Resources Subtotal</i>	<i>(627,934)</i>	<i>912,465</i>	<i>(710,382)</i>	<i>983,297</i>	● 113%	● 108%
<b>Economic Development</b>						
1 700 Promotion, Tran, Airport,	0	41,807	0	38,251		● 91%
1 711 Economic Development	(1,000)	38,817	(11,138)	48,938	● 1114%	● 126%
<i>Economic Development Subtotal</i>	<i>(1,000)</i>	<i>80,624</i>	<i>(11,138)</i>	<i>87,189</i>	● 1114%	● 108%
<b>General Fund</b>	<b>(11,663,628)</b>	<b>11,918,628</b>	<b>(12,471,634)</b>	<b>12,930,452</b>	● 107%	● 108%
<b>Road and Bridge Fund</b>						
3 0	(4,183,722)	0	(4,062,663)	0	● 97%	
3 301 Administration/HR	0	470,550	0	474,085		● 101%
3 302 Engineering/Construction	0	501,571	0	477,092		● 95%
3 303 Highway Maintenance	0	3,313,940	0	3,072,711		● 93%
3 307 Capital Infrastructure	(5,061,600)	8,954,800	(9,535,376)	8,045,341	● 188%	● 90%
3 308 Equipment and Facilities	(497,300)	497,300	(497,300)	456,545	● 100%	● 92%
3 310 232 Turnback	0	0	(55,815)	800,000		
<b>Road and Bridge Fund</b>	<b>(9,742,622)</b>	<b>13,738,161</b>	<b>(14,151,154)</b>	<b>13,325,775</b>	● 145%	● 97%

FY 2015 Year End Budget to Actual Review

February 23, 2016

Note - Negative numbers are net positive.

FundDept	2014 Bud		2014 Act		% of Budget	
	Rev	Exp	Rev	Exp	Rev	Exp
<b>Health and Human Services Fund</b>						
5 0	0	0	(74,394)	74,394	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
5 400 Public Health	(679,163)	714,805	(664,574)	823,804	98%	115%
5 420 Income Maintenance	(1,595,020)	1,742,982	(1,822,051)	1,858,042	114%	107%
5 430 Social Services	(3,497,368)	3,713,764	(3,475,825)	3,698,406	99%	100%
<b>Health and Human Services Fund</b>	<b>(5,771,551)</b>	<b>6,171,551</b>	<b>(6,036,845)</b>	<b>6,454,646</b>	<b>105%</b>	<b>105%</b>
10 921 County Development	(250,000)	313,110	(331,316)	246,564	133%	79%
10 923 Forfeited Tax Sales	(1,455,000)	1,465,365	(1,834,218)	1,649,295	126%	113%
	<b>(1,705,000)</b>	<b>1,778,475</b>	<b>(2,165,534)</b>	<b>1,895,859</b>	<b>127%</b>	<b>107%</b>
11 924 Forest Resource	(142,500)	200,457	(145,395)	220,471	102%	110%
11 925 Reforestation	(207,838)	252,267	(278,886)	278,885	134%	111%
11 934 Memorial Forest	(94,575)	134,282	(146,986)	90,584	155%	67%
11 935 Forest Road	(37,000)	46,963	(39,238)	69,365	106%	148%
	<b>(481,913)</b>	<b>633,969</b>	<b>(610,505)</b>	<b>659,305</b>	<b>127%</b>	<b>104%</b>
19 521 LLCC Administration	(57,700)	237,163	(54,569)	201,451	95%	85%
19 522 LLCC Education	(625,610)	221,962	(527,010)	229,067	84%	103%
19 523 LLCC Food	(4,500)	161,525	(4,426)	160,128	98%	99%
19 524 LLCC Maintenance	0	91,087	(2,767)	99,566		109%
19 525 LLCC Capital Improvement	0	0	(25,000)	20,859		
	<b>(687,810)</b>	<b>711,737</b>	<b>(613,772)</b>	<b>711,071</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>21 520 Parks</b>	<b>(564,000)</b>	<b>567,519</b>	<b>(500,513)</b>	<b>446,851</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>79%</b>

1 For the purposes of analysis, transfer of 1,996,408 from Fund 01-44 (central services) to 01-252 (jail)

Handout  
5B

## AITKIN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION

**Aitkin County Courthouse**  
**Nathan Burkett, Administrator**  
217 Second Street N.W. Room 130  
Aitkin, MN 56431  
218-927-7276  
Fax: 218-927-7374

TO: County Board  
FROM: Nathan Burkett NB  
CC: Liz Deryuck  
DATE: February 22, 2016  
RE: Probation Delivery Systems Options and Analysis

\*\*\*This is a working document, the best information known at this time has been used to prepare it, guidance from the Board as to other information to gather, or other analysis to be performed is appreciated\*\*\*

The MN Department of Corrections (DOC) has requested that Aitkin County (a) join a joint powers agreement under MN Statute Chapter 401 (Community Corrections Act) or (b) notify DOC of Aitkin County's intent to adopt the Department of Corrections or County Probation Officer model of probation services delivery by March 15, 2016 (see Attachment A). Attachment B is a draft letter in response to Attachment A which requests that the DOC agree to wait until March 22<sup>nd</sup> to receive our notice.

MN Statute Chapter 401.16 states:

*Any participating county may, at the beginning of any calendar quarter, by resolution of its board of commissioners, notify the commissioner of its intention to withdraw from the subsidy program.*

According to the statute above, Aitkin County would need to make notice by March 31, 2016. It is reasonable to presume that DOC should accept March 22<sup>nd</sup> as a middle ground; however it is unknown what DOC's response will be.

The information within this memo and its attachments is intended to help the Board make a decision related to probation delivery systems. Our hope is to ask the Board to make that decision on March 22, but depending on circumstances; it may need to be made on March 8 (or a special board meeting sometime thereafter).

### **Options**

As of today, the options that the Board has are to choose to contract with DOC for probation services or to establish a County Probation Office. Should the Board wish to make a final determination today, it must be one of those two options.

I am currently working, as directed by the Board at the last Board meeting to find a willing partner to engage in a joint powers agreement to remain a CCA. I believe it is possible that by March 22<sup>nd</sup>, an additional option – to remain a CCA county will be available to the Board.

It is important that the Board is prepared to make the decision between all three options, as well as between the options of DOC contract and CPO only. My goal is to ensure that the Board is prepared to make a decision whether there are two options or three.

Attached to this memo as Attachment C is a document outlining the structure of each of the options.

The following is prepared for analysis purposes, including the recommendation of the County Administrator.

### **Criteria for Consideration**

#### *1. Cost projections – How much will each option cost?*

See attachment D updates on documents previously sent to the County Board via email for detail on projected costs.

I must still caution that DOC Contract and CPO projected expenses are a best estimate. CCA projected expenses are also an estimate; but fairly close to the budget that would be proposed to the County Board.

Generally speaking – I would anticipate that the cost of all three options is similar. The County Board has the greatest control over the cost in a CCA model. However, I cannot reasonably make a recommendation on a cost only basis without more information. It is likely the only way to definitely know the cost of the DOC or CPO model is to choose one and find out.

#### DOC Contract

I have obtained further evidence that DOC contract costs are unpredictable. I contacted 10 other counties with similar population to Aitkin County that use the DOC contract model. I have not received complete information from all of them, and am still waiting for the DOC to provide me with caseload numbers to create context; what I can say is that DOC contract costs can vary widely.

Part of the reason that this research is taking a longer period of time than usual is to ensure I am making an apples to apples comparison. A sample of the information I have received thus far:

County	County Cost	Population
Redwood	198,613	16,410
Renville	117,000	17,154
Faribault County	149,714	14,842
Houston County	213,250	19,653
Martin County	369,015	21,377

I do not have the formal detail yet; but through informal conversations with each of these counties it appears they all have caseloads that are on average, lower than Aitkin County. Higher caseloads will increase the County's costs, as the DOC will have higher staffing levels. DOC staffing guidelines are based on risk, as opposed to level of offense as follows:

DOC Standards		
Caseloads	Low	High
Low Risk		300
Moderate Risk	75	100
High Risk	30	40

Generally speaking; DOC seems to staff at a level of 1.5 agents per 300 cases. Once there are 4 or more agents, DOC will seek to add a second support staff.

I have a request in to DOC that they work with me on preparing estimates to provide to the Board.

### CPO

The projections for CPO are likely fairly close to the budget that would be presented by the County Board. The biggest variable is whether or not the DOC requires an additional administrative support staff. Based on the presumption that the DOC would have 2 – 3 felony agents; it is most likely that DOC would require one county paid support staff. Updates to the cost projection have been made to recognize this.

### CCA

These projections are at a fairly high level of confidence. The biggest variable is whether or not we would be able to continue administering electronic monitoring programs on staff.

- 2. Governance preferences – Who is responsible for approving a budget, determining programming and establishing operational policies?*

In my experience, the Aitkin County Board seems to value local control and the ability for the County Board to make decisions that impact the Aitkin County Community. It is also apparent that the Aitkin County Board does not appreciate circumstances where they are required to pay bills submitted by the State, particularly when those expenses are mandated and seemingly unaccounted for.

With regard to governance, I recommend that the County Board would prefer the CCA model because the County Board then has the option to control costs, and has the ability to add/delete programs based on the needs of Aitkin County.

### DOC

Under a DOC contract, the DOC is responsible for all aspects of governance. All policies and procedures are established by DOC. DOC determines the budget and bills the county for the portion of expense the County is statutorily accountable for.

In my conversation with other counties that use the DOC model, they relay frustration that they have no control over the expense decisions, and very limited ability to influence the programs that are offered through probation. There is also some frustration over the wide variations in cost from county to county and the support staff requirements of DOC do not seem to be very consistent.

### CPO

DOC is responsible for felony level offenders, but requires the County to provide support staff. The DOC establishes programming, policy and procedure for felony level offenders.

The judge supervises the county probation office and is responsible for programming, policy and procedure for gross misdemeanor, misdemeanor and juvenile offenders.

In my inquiries of counties using the CPO model there was a wide variety of opinions about the CPO model. Generally speaking, the counties using the CPO model where the county had a close connection with the judge, and a strong supervisor who generally served as the department head were more supportive of the CPO model. Those counties who did not support the CPO model had concerns about consistency between felony and lower level offenders, and the ability of the County Board to determine staffing, and concerns about the variabilities of the employment situation of the CPO agents.

### CCA

The County Board or executive board of a JPA is responsible for programming, policy and procedure for all offenders.

Those counties that are in a CCA generally support the CCA model because of the local control, the consolidation of services (as opposed to CPO), flexibility to add/change programming, the ability to work more closely with other county departments, and a general belief that the costs were lower than the other models.

- 3. Service delivery and outcomes – What are the advantages of each option related to service delivery? Which option has the best outcomes for the client base and community?*



Generally speaking, the outcomes of any probation system are going to be similar. Probation happens to be an area of social science and government service delivery where data is used very heavily to make decisions and to evaluate outcomes. The biggest factor which will impact the outcomes of a probation service delivery system is actually the entirety of the demographics of the population served. The Board could reasonably expect that a well run probation service delivery unit, whether in the DOC, CPO or CCA model will achieve similar outcomes to each other.

The biggest difference is the ability to work across departmental borders with other county government departments and the ability (or lack of) to modify programming so that it makes more sense for the local community.

The CCA model is going to be more flexible in this manner. Some counties using the CCA model include probation as a unit within a health and human services department. Others have probation as a standalone department or through joint powers, but the overarching theme is the ability to share information and to work collaboratively on programs across departmental borders.

## Attachment A

February 12, 2016

Nathan Burkett, County Administrator  
Aitkin County Administration  
217 Second Street NW, Rm 134  
Aitkin, Minnesota 56431

Dear Mr. Burkett:

The Minnesota Department of Corrections has approved the Interim Plan for Central MN Community Corrections which is in effect through June 30, 2016 at which time Central MN Community Corrections, as it is currently structured, will dissolve.

While I understand that Aitkin County is interested in remaining a Community Corrections Act (CCA) entity when the current joint powers agreement ceases on June 30, 2016, MN Statute Chapter 401 reads as follows:

Subdivision 1. Qualification of counties states: One or more counties, having an aggregate population of 30,000 or more persons, may qualify for a grant as provided in section 401.01 by the enactment of appropriate resolutions creating and establishing a corrections advisory board, designating the officer or agency to be responsible for administering grant funds, and providing for the preparation of a comprehensive plan for the development, implementation and operation of the correctional services described in section 401.01, including the assumption of those correctional services, other than the operation of state facilities, presently provided in such counties by the department of corrections, and providing for centralized administration and control of those correctional services described in section.

In order for Aitkin County to remain in CCA as a single county member, a change pertaining to the population threshold in MS 401 must occur and the legislative session will not be finished until May 23, 2016. In the event such legislation is not enacted, the timelines required for the Department of Corrections to assume correctional supervision responsibilities in Aitkin County require the DOC to begin the process of corrections data migration, hiring staff and leasing office space no later than March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016. Given the challenges presented by these logistics and the need to ensure continuity of correctional services in Aitkin County, I am requesting that Aitkin County move forward with one of the options that exist under current statute.

Aitkin County may elect to:

- Enter into a new joint powers agreement with an existing CCA county/jurisdiction to take effect on July 1<sup>st</sup> 2016 and provide a copy of the agreement to the DOC by March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016.
- Notify the DOC of the intent to withdraw from CCA upon dissolution of current joint powers agreement and the Minnesota Department of Corrections will assume supervision of all felony level offenders in Aitkin County. This process will need to begin as of March 15th 2016. Under this scenario Aitkin County could elect to provide supervision to all juveniles and adult misdemeanants as a County Probation Office (CPO) or contract with the DOC for these services.

Submission of a County Board Resolution to my office with your selected option should occur no later than March 15, 2016.

I recognize that if Aitkin County is successful in its request for a change in statute you will then be eligible to remain in the Community Corrections Act as a single county. At that time you could dissolve your new joint powers agreement which would allow for this to occur. While this may seem somewhat cumbersome it ensures that the Department of Corrections is able to fulfil its obligation under statute to ensure the provision of community supervision in Aitkin County.

Development of a Comprehensive Plan will also need to occur. Aitkin County will need to begin work on a plan to be effective July 1, 2016 and that the plan be submitted to my office by June 1, 2016. You can contact our Grants and Subsidies Unit Director Mary Dombrovski at [mary.dombrovski@state.mn.us](mailto:mary.dombrovski@state.mn.us) to obtain information on what should be included in the Comprehensive Plan or for technical assistance as needed.

I have attached a copy of The Delivery Systems Change Process document which while not completely applicable may be helpful to you as you move forward with planning.

Sincerely,

Ron Solheid, Deputy Commissioner  
Minnesota Department of Corrections

C: Elizabeth Dyruck, Central Minnesota Community Corrections  
Ron Solheid, Deputy Commissioner, DOC Community Services  
Al Godfrey, Field Services Director  
Mary Dombrovski, Director Grants and Subsidies  
Vic Moen, DOC District Supervisor  
Heidi Heinzl, Grants and Subsidies Unit  
Julie Harrison, DOC Financial Services

## AITKIN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION

**Aitkin County Courthouse**  
**Nathan Burkett, Administrator**  
217 Second Street N.W. Room 130  
Aitkin, MN 56431  
218-927-7276  
Fax: 218-927-7374

February 23, 2016

Deputy Commissioner Ron Solheid  
Minnesota Department of Corrections  
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Deputy Commissioner Solheid,

Thank you for your letter of February 12, 2016. Aitkin County understands and appreciates DOC's concerns related to time for planning and preparation. In the event all or part of probation service delivery is transferred to DOC you can count on us for support and assistance. In fact, we have already assisted the Department of Administration

We appreciate that time is of the essence and that there are many arrangements DOC would need to make to take over probation in Aitkin County.

The primary purpose for this letter is to propose an alternate date for Aitkin County to inform you of our decision. I request that we agree to March 22, 2016 as the date by which DOC will be informed of Aitkin County's chosen delivery model. It appears that this date would be within the timeline required by MN Statute Chapter 401.16.

We are working on establishing a joint powers agreement under the Community Corrections Act. While we are proceeding in our efforts with due haste, we also want to make sure what we do is well thought out and purposeful. By agreeing to March 22, you will be giving us time to continue our attempts to enter in to a joint powers agreement, and giving the Aitkin County Board one additional meeting time to analyze and consider options.

It is Aitkin County's goal for us to be mutually supportive through this transition. While we would rather have the full month of March to work through our processes, we are willing to be flexible; and ask you to consider this reasonable middle ground.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nathan Burkett, County Administrator  
Aitkin County

Cc: Aitkin County Board of Commissioners  
Rep. Dale Lueck  
Sen. Carrie Ruud  
Ryan Erdman, AMC Policy Analyst  
Liz Deruyk, Director  
Aitkin County Community Corrections Advisory Board

## APPENDIX A: THREE PROBATION DELIVERY SYSTEMS - COMPARISON

	COUNTY PROBATION SYSTEM (M.S. 244.19)	COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ACT (M.S. 401)	DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS (DOC) CONTRACT (M.S. 244.19)
ADMINISTRATION	Local courts in collaboration with county boards	County board (single county) or corrections executive board (multi-county) per comprehensive plan approved by the DOC	DOC
STAFF	Appointed by court with approval of county board; staff serves at pleasure of court	Hired in accordance with county board or corrections executive board policy	Provided by DOC
SUPERVISION	By director/chief probation officer; appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the court	Director responsible to county board or corrections executive board	By DOC supervisor
FUNDING	State reimburses counties up to 50% of probation officer salaries and fringe benefits	Block grant by state augmented with continued level of local spending; block grant is based upon a five factor-based formula	County reimburses state for probation officer salaries in accordance with the same formula as county system
SERVICES PROVIDED	Determined by court Served and approved by the county board as it relates to funding	Range of services as determined by the board and authorized by the comprehensive plan; may include local correctional facilities	As requested by the court and approved by the commissioner of corrections
OFFENDERS SERVED	County supervises: Juveniles, misdemeanors, and most gross misdemeanor offenders  DOC supervises: Adult felons and supervised releasees from prison	All offenders, adult and juvenile; may also serve offenders in local correctional institutions	DOC contract agents supervise juveniles, misdemeanants, and most gross misdemeanants  DOC supervises adult felons and supervised releasees from prison
PERSONNEL POLICIES	Established by court along with local personnel policy	As set by county board or corrections executive board and/or negotiated by union contracts	By DOC as may be impacted by union contracts
PROFESSIONAL SALARIES	Set by court at no less than the state salary scale	Set by county board or corrections executive board and/or negotiated per union contract	State classified civil service per negotiated union contracts
SUPPORT STAFF	Provided locally at county wage and expense	Provided locally from block grant and local funds	May be either state or county employee per negotiated contract; expense paid by county

**DOC Standards**

Caseloads	Low	High
Low Risk		300
Moderate Risk	75	100
High Risk	30	40

**Aitkin County**

	2016 Jan	2016 Feb
Felony	499	532
Gross Misdemeanor	287	292
Misdemeanor	218	230
Petty Misdemeanor	14	17
Total	1018	1071

**Aitkin County Staffing Projections - CCA**

Projected

1 Probation Director	124,845	124,845
5 or 6 Agent	483,497	429,007
1 Probation Aide	58,024	58,024
	666,366	611,876

**Aitkin County Staffing Projections - CPO**

Low High Projected

1 Probation Director/Supervisor	107,781	136,350	124,845
2 or 3 Agent	108,980	301,770	186,566
2 Probation Aide (also supports DOC)	43,564	128,378	101,588
1 Sobriety Court Agent	54,490	100,590	89,481
	314,814	667,088	502,480

**DOC Staffing Projection - DOC**

Low High Projected

2 County - Probation Aide	43,564	64,189	97,441
4 or 5 State - Agents	217,959	502,950	360,455
	261,523	567,139	457,895

\*\*\*\*Staffing projections include benefit costs projected at 34%

\*\*\*\*Lows and Highs are based on the state wage grid for probation agents

\*\*\*Likely amounts are based on existing staff wage rates, County or DOC are likely to hire existing staff

\*\*\*Total staff numbers are projected based on state standards for caseloads

**DOC**

Non-Levy Revenues	High	Projected
<b>Expenditures</b>		
DOC Contract (agents)	214,257	153,554
Personnel (support)	97,441	97,441
Discretionary	10,000	10,000
Sobriety Court (if supported by DOC)	20,000	20,000
<b>County Cost</b>	<b>341,698</b>	<b>280,994</b>

**CPO**

Non-Levy Revenues	High	Projected
CPO Reimbursement	(193,456)	(145,719) @29% of Personnel Expenditures (2016 Projection)
Electronic Monitoring	(30,000)	(30,000) Projected by % of Gross Misd, Misd, Juv/Felony
Sobriety Court	(75,721)	(75,721) Projected at same
Supervision Fees	(17,307)	(17,307) Projected by % of Gross Misd, Misd, Juv/Felony
<b>Expenditures</b>		
Personnel	667,088	502,480
Discretionary	33,600	50,000
Sobriety Court	20,000	20,000
<b>County Cost</b>	<b>404,205</b>	<b>303,733</b>

**CCA**

Non-Levy Revenues	Proj #1	Proj #2	Proj #3
CCA Subsidy	(264,724)	(264,724)	(264,724)
Supervision Fees	(28,845)	(28,845)	(28,845)
Electronic Monitoring		(50,000)	(50,000)
Sobriety Court	(75,721)	(75,721)	(75,721)
Misc	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)
<b>Expenditures</b>			
Personnel	611,876	666,366	611,876
Discretionary	20,000	46,319	56,319
Sobriety Court	20,000	20,000	20,000
<b>County Cost (Levy)</b>	<b>276,586</b>	<b>307,395</b>	<b>262,905</b>

CCA Projection #1 - Eliminate electronic Monitoring, contract entirely or maybe work with jail

CCA Projection #2 - Add new agent position, keep electronic monitoring in house

CCA Projection #3 - Contract electronic monitoring hookups and monitoring



# AITKIN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION

**Aitkin County Courthouse**  
**Nathan Burkett, Administrator**  
217 Second Street N.W. Room 130  
Aitkin, MN 56431  
218-927-7276  
Fax: 218-927-7374

TO: County Board  
FROM: Nathan Burkett  
CC: Liz Deruyk  
DATE: February 16, 2016  
RE: Corrections Service Delivery Costing



Attached with this memo you will find cost projections comparing the DOC, CPO and CCA service delivery models.

As we discussed in the Board meeting, the reason that I have been hesitant to present this before is that there are many moving parts, and many elements that cannot be known.

The attached costing estimates provide an extreme high and what I believe the likely cost for the DOC and CPO options, and 3 different projections for the CCA option. All projections are provided given the information I have as of today and a combination of the best estimate of Liz and myself. Therefore, the CCA cost estimates include only the possibility of Aitkin County as a "stand-alone" Community Corrections department.

One of the advantages to the CCA model is that I can predict rather accurately what the expense to the County for corrections delivery would be, so I can say that those projections are accurate within approximately 5%.

The cost projections for the DOC and CPO model have a much lesser degree of confidence. We are putting our best guess on the staffing demands under each of those scenarios, the salaries of the staff that would be hired, and other expenses associated. We are essentially making these projections based on current staffing and caseload and best estimate based on what we have seen happen with other DOC and CPO counties.

With specific regard to DOC counties, AMC Policy Analyst Ryan Erdman has given me examples of counties that are contiguous, using the same model, and have similar populations that have vastly different expenses. I am very uncomfortable with the projection on DOC contract attached because of this major discrepancy.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Corrections Service Delivery Options Analysis  
 DRAFT - For Discussion Purposes only  
 20160210  
 DOC

Non-Levy Revenues	High	Projected
<b>Expenditures</b>		
DOC Contract (agents)	285,676	200,869
Personnel (support)	64,189	53,877
Discretionary	10,000	10,000
<b>County Cost</b>	<b>359,865</b>	<b>264,746</b>

**CPO**

Non-Levy Revenues	High	Projected
CPO Reimbursement	(193,456)	(133,086) @29% of Personnel Expenditures (2016 Projection)
Electronic Monitoring	(30,000)	(30,000) Projected by % of Gross Misd, Misd, Juv/Felony
Sobriety Court	(75,721)	(75,721) Projected at same
Supervision Fees	(17,307)	(17,307) Projected by % of Gross Misd, Misd, Juv/Felony
<b>Expenditures</b>		
Personnel	667,088	458,916
Discretionary	33,600	50,000
Sobriety Court	20,000	20,000
<b>County Cost</b>	<b>404,205</b>	<b>272,802</b>

**CCA**

Non-Levy Revenues	Proj #1	Proj #2	Proj #3
CCA Subsidy	(264,724)	(264,724)	(264,724)
Supervision Fees	(28,845)	(28,845)	(28,845)
Electronic Monitoring		(50,000)	(50,000)
Sobriety Court	(75,721)	(75,721)	(75,721)
Misc	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)
<b>Expenditures</b>			
Personnel	611,876	666,366	611,876
Discretionary	20,000	46,319	56,319
Sobriety Court	20,000	20,000	20,000
<b>County Cost (Levy)</b>	<b>276,586</b>	<b>307,395</b>	<b>262,905</b>

CCA Projection #1 - Eliminate electronic Monitoring, contract entirely or maybe work with jail

CCA Projection #2 - Add new agent position, keep electronic monitoring in house

CCA Projection #3 - Contract electronic monitoring hookups and monitoring

