



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

House of Representatives

State House, Boston

CHESTER G. ATKINS
33RD MIDDLESEX DISTRICT
BOX 986
ACTON 01720

May 16, 1972

Committee on Election Laws

§ § §

STATE HOUSE TEL.

727-4791

HOME - 369-3784

Dear Local Official:

Since the rising costs of Middlesex County Government ultimately come out of our local property tax funds, gathered by the various cities and towns, we are asking you as a local elected official to become actively involved in the efforts now under way to reduce the 1972 budget requests put in by the County Commissioners.

We are not suggesting that services performed by the County should be cut back but rather that the needless spending that serves only the interests of County officials should be stopped. This year we are seeing general austerity practiced in State Government (due to the slowing down of the economy) and we feel that the County's budget demands the same kind of **scrutiny** and reductions as the State's budget. The enclosed report examines certain aspects of the 1972 Middlesex County budget and recommends specific cuts that can and indeed should be made. Although we are not prepared to assert that these are the only or necessarily the best areas for reductions, we do feel that they should serve as both stimulation and example toward assisting the Joint Committee on Counties and the Legislature as a whole in reconsidering the Commissioners' appropriations requests.

Thus, we are asking you for your approval of our sample budget cut efforts so far and more specifically -- if you wish -- to support a major Middlesex County budget re-evaluation. To state that support, we would ask you to sign the attached card which we will forward

-2-

Local Official

for you to the Committee on Counties and to the legislators from your district. As you will see, we are endorsing a budget increase of 5%, an amount slightly above the cost of living increase last year.

We feel the time has come to end the purposeless and unchecked growth of County Government and will be grateful for any support or help you can give us.

Sincerely,

Chester G. Atkins
State Representative

Chet Atkins

Paul Guzzi
State Representative

Paul Guzzi

CGA:PG/hmh
enclosure

As an elected official in Middlesex County,
I feel it is imperative for the legislature to check
increasing but needless county expenditures.

A 5% increase from the 1971 County budget allows
a cost of living increase but prevents unnecessary
additional growth.

Signatures: _____

Please return to.

Rep. Chester G. Atkins
State House
Boston, Mass. 02133

A SAMPLE OF BUDGET CUTS FOR MIDDLESEX COUNTY

The growth trends in the Middlesex County budget are unmistakably clear. This year, like years in the past, the County Commissioners have asked the legislature to allow continued increase in expenditure levels in nearly every budget item and code group within those items. The Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation has already done an intensive study and has shown us that state-level taxes and expenditures are increasing at a greater rate than the economy in the state which has to produce the revenue. As a result of the Foundation's study, many items in the state budget were re-examined closely and several items were cut extensively. We feel that the budget for Middlesex County should also be given close examination by the whole legislature, should directly relate to the taxes and expenditures that our economy can this year bear, and thus should be trimmed substantially from the levels approved by the County Commissioners.

The legislature has not made it a practice to look at county budgets item-by-item when the budget is debated on the floor but this sample attempts to end that traditional practice. We have gone through the budget submitted by the Commissioners and looked at each item carefully. Some items -- specifically, the County Commissioners, the Highway Department, the Training School, and the Walden Pond Reservation -- seemed to require detailed examination and so, in those instances, each code within the item was considered separately and those costs or expenditures which seemed inappropriate or out of line with

the slowing economy in Massachusetts were suggested as cuts that should be made. In other items, including the budgets for the various county offices, broad percentage cuts were made relative to expenditures in years past and in certain instances according to potential future needs.

With the exception of the Highway Department, the County Commissioners, the Training School, and Walden Pond, few cuts have been suggested in Code 1 (personal services), but those cuts that are suggested are primarily in new positions and in temporary help. The bulk of the cuts have been made in codes 2, 3, and 5 (contractual services, supplies and materials, and equipment) and cover a broad range of percentages. In keeping with the austerity now being observed in this state, the total expenditures for equipment and services were at times brought down from the Commissioners' suggested levels to the 1971 levels but seldom, if ever, were they brought down below these.

In the case of the district courts, it will be observed that proposed cuts are based on the amount of business (as delineated by the Committee on Counties) and the Commissioners' proposed budgets.

Cutting back on a total budget and executing a program of austerity is perhaps one of the most difficult tasks for a politician to carry out. Last year, we saw wisdom and courage displayed by the House and Senate leaders of the Joint Committee on Counties, Rep. Flaherty and Senator Tully. This year we can

follow their examples and serve the interests of the people in Middlesex County.

It should be noted that this is simply a sample but one which we hope might be useful to the Committee as it begins its task and to the whole legislature when the budget comes before it for approval.

BUDGET ITEM #3 - Middlesex County Commissioners

CODE	PERSONAL SERVICES	'69	'70	'71	'72
.00	perm. employees	219,178.48	268,514.46	305,845.12	320,022.15 ^(a)
.10	temp. employees	37,521.08	39,988.08	26,456.18	20,000.00 ^(b)
	TOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES	256,699.56	308,502.54	332,301.30	340,022.15

- Eliminated all new positions and reclassifications
- Cut budget for temporary employees by 50%

Contractual

CODE: Services	'69	'70	'71	'72
TOTAL	2,614.35	40,715.19	4,807.32	7,400 ^(c)

- Eliminated contractual travel expense (#282); eliminated advertising and posting and posting (#291); eliminated data processing - Phase II (#299)

~~ITEM #3 continued~~

CODE:	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	'69	'70	'71	with cuts '72
	TOTAL	5,642.14	5,747.28	7,434.69	8,250.00 ^(d)

- Eliminated gasoline (#303), reduced postage request to \$3,000.00 (#361), reduced office supplies to \$3,500.00 (#362), reduced miscellaneous supplies and materials to \$1,750.00 (#399).

CODE:	CURRENT CHARGES & OBLIGATIONS	'69	'70	'71	'72
TOTAL		1,145.24	1,781.49	2,319.94	2,460.00 ^(e)

- This is same amount approved by county commissioners

CODE:	EQUIPMENT	'69	'70	'71	'72
TOTAL		1,807.90	1,676.40	--	1,695.00 ^(f)

f) Reduced request for typewriters by 50% -- from \$2,200.00 to \$1,100.00 (#564)

GRAND SUMMARY	'69	'70	'71	recommended '72
1. personal services	256,699.56	308,502.54	332,301.30	340,022.15
2. contr. services	2,614.35	40,715.19	4,807.32	7,400.00
3. supplies and materials	5,642.14	5,747.28	7,434.69	8,250.00
4. current chges. & obl.	1,145.24	1,781.49	2,319.94	2,460.00
5. equipment	1,807.90	1,676.40	--	1,695.00
6. structure & improvement	--	--	--	--
7. land & non-structural improvements to land	--	--	--	--
GRAND TOTAL	267,909.19	358,422.90	346,863.25	359,827.15 (g)

(g) This represents a savings of \$207,655.52 from budget approved by the Commissioners

CODE	PERSONAL SERVICES	'69	'70	'71	recommended '72
100	perm employees & reclassif.	732,993.32	898,916.55	1,137,105.33	1,084,854.91 (a)
110	temporary	94,769.56	118,753.83	15,929.77	15,929.77 (b)
	TOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES	827,762.88	1,017,652.38	1,153,035.10	1,100,784.68

- a) Eliminated two Sr. Civil Engineers @13,000 (±) two asst. Civil Engineers @11,000 (±), two Jr. Civil Engineers @9,500 (±), one Head Admin. clerk @9,500, two Sr. Engineer aides @8,000, two junior engineer aides @6,500. Total cut back in code 100 = \$105,000
- b) Code 110 cut back to 1971 level.

CODE:	CONTRACTUAL SERVICE	'69	'70	'71	'72
	TOTAL #2	24,608.84	31,256.51	29,977.67	13,650 (c)

- c) Eliminated land damage appraisals (#231), reduced recording (#242) by 50%, reduced abstracting (#243) i.e., title searching by 50% eliminated sheriff fees (#244) reduced travel (#282) by 50%, eliminated printing standards (#297)

CODE:	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	'69	'70	'71	'72
	TOTAL #3	19,705.66	21,489.06	19,602.25	18,890 (d)

- d) Reduced anti-freezes, timers, etc. by 50% (#309), reduced spikes, tacks, etc. by 50% (#319) eliminated postage (#361) eliminated letterhead and envelopes (#363) reduced bried cases, manila envelopes by 50% (#369) reduced operating supplies and materials by 50% (#393) and reduced miscellaneous supplies (#399) by 50%.

CODE	CURRENT CHANGES & OBLIGATIONS	'69	'70	'71	'72
	TOTAL #4	939.15	708.85	1,134.00	1,154.00 (e)

- e) This is same amount approved by the county commissioners

CODE	EQUIPMENT	'69	'70	'71	'72
	TOTAL #5	6,698.25	--	72.95	4,825 (f)

f) reduced survey truck expenses by 50% (#501) reduced indexes and maps (#590) by 50% and eliminated purchase of surplus equipment

GRAND SUMMARY	'69	'70	'71	'72
1. personal services	827,762.88	1,017,652.38	1,153,035.10	1,100,784.68
2. contractual services	24,608.84	31,256.51	29,977.67	13,650.00
3. supplies and materials	19,705.66	21,489.06	19,602.25	18,890.00
4. current changes & obligations	939.15	708.85	1,134.00	1,154.00
5. equipment obligations	6,698.25	-----	72.00	4,825.00
highway reserve		27,648.77		50,000.00 (g)
land damages		27,648.77	16,743.64	200,000.00 (g)
highway allotments	8,000.00	54,992.68	15,162.49	780,300.00 (g)
GRAND TOTAL	955,029.65	1,153,748.25	1,235,728.10	2,169,603.68 (h)

g) these are same figures as those approved by county commissioner

h) this is a savings of \$170,186.23 for the county

BUDGET ITEM 17 - TRAINING SCHOOL

GRAND SUMMARY	'69	'70	'71	'72 (a)	
1. Personal Services	604,279.84	706,600.00	812,849.98	411,260.58	(b)
2. Contractural Services	30,034.27	36,675.43	51,208.78	38,290.00	(c)
3. Supplies & Materials	158,556.66	167,858.65	164,693.66	87,270.00	(d)
4. Current Charges & Oblig.	11,933.43	14,119.93	20,054.44	29,366.00	
5. Equipment	7,557.79	4,967.37	4,093.45	-----	(e)
	812,361.99	930,361.99	1,162,024.55	566,186.58	(f)

- (a) The budget for this year represents no growth and the closing of the training^{school} after June 30, 1972.
- (b) Eliminated all new positions -- budget is for 6 months only.
- (c) Budget is for 6 months only (January 1 to June 30)
- (d) " " " " " " " " " "
- (e) No new equipment
- (f) This is a savings of 569,938.29 for residents of the county.

BUDGET ITEM 21 Walden Pond Reservation

1. Personal Services	'69	'70	'71	proposed '72
100	41,301.64	44,797.27	45,160.00	49,829.93 (a)
110	32,101.18	100,387.13	31,518.02	28,980.00 (b)
TOTAL	73,402.82	145,184.40	76,678.02	78,809.93

- a) Eliminated one of the laborer positions which is currently vacant
- b) Reduced budget for matrons by 50% (i.e., one matron for the summer), reduced budget for male and female lifeguards (total of 15 lifeguards instead of 20), reduced budget for laborers (total of 5 laborers instead of 14) and eliminated funding for (1) junior clerk, (2) graduate nurses, (2) police sargeants, and (14) police officers.

2. Contractual Services	'69	'70	'71	'72
TOTAL	2,992.03	2,569.72	2,318.64	3,325.00 (c)

- c) Eliminated Misc, repairs (#269), eliminated auto repairs (#271), eliminated cleaning (293), and eliminated lawns, misc. signs, etc. (#299).

3. Supplies & Materials	'69	'70	'71	proposed '72
	5,734.44	5,848.22	5,241.74	3,973.00 (d)

- d) Reduced batteries (#302) by 50%, reduced gas (#303) by 25%, reduced oil and grease (#304) by 50%, reduced misc. auto parts (#309) by 50%, reduced construction supplies and materials (#311) by 50%, reduced plumbing supplies (#312) by 50%, reduced stationary supplies (#362) by 50%, eliminated irrigation supplies (#382), reduced general operating supplies (393) by 50%, reduced non-automotive repair parts (#394) by 50%, reduced tools (#395) by 50%.

4. Current charges & obligations	'69	'70	'71	'72
	220	271	419.52	475 (e)

- e) This is the same amount approved by the county commissioners

5. Equipment	'69	'70	'71	'72
	--	499.39	285.39	1,040. (f)

f) eliminated new walkie--talkies (#582)

GRAND SUMMARY				
	'69	'70	'71	'72
1. PERSONAL SERVICES	73,402.82	145,184.40	76,678.02	78,809.93
2. CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	2,992.03	2,569.72	2,318.64	3,325.00
3. SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS	5,734.44	5,848.22	5,241.74	3,973.00
4. CURRENT CHARGES AND OBLIGATIONS	220.00	271.00	419.52	475.00
5. EQUIPMENT		499.39	285.56	1,040.00
GRAND TOTAL	82,351.29	154,372.73	84,943.48	87,612.93 (g)

g) This is a savings of \$56,829.28 from the budget approved by the commissioners

SAMPLES: PERCENTAGE AND AMOUNTS OF CUTS

Budget Item 4: Transportation and Expenses of County and Acting Commissioners

	<u>% cut</u>	<u>Amount Cut</u>
Code 2:	75%	\$ 600
Code 3:	50%	1,525
Code 5:	50%	3,750
TOTAL		\$5,875

Budget Item 5: Clerk of Courts

Code 1:	4.2%	32,703.50
Code 2:	39. %	46,931.00
Code 3:	28. %	13,800.00
Code 5:	50. %	2,100.00
TOTAL		95,534.50

Budget Item 8: Southern Registry of Deeds

Code 1:	8.3%	16,220.10
Code 2:	20. %	7,000.00
Code 3:	10. %	3,800.00
Code 5:	20. %	5,348.00
TOTAL		32,368.10

Budget Item 8a: Registry of Probate - Office Expenses

Code 2:	30 %	7,725.00
Code 3:	20 %	5,915.00
Code 5:	50 %	11, 160.00
TOTAL		24,800.00

Budget Item 12: Criminal Costs in Superior Court - D.A.'s Office

	<u>% Cut</u>	<u>Amount Cut</u>
Code 1:	11 %	14,745.90
Code 2:	50 %	92,950.00
Code 3:	--	-----
Code 5:	50 %	1,522.50
TOTAL		109,218.40

Budget Item 18-10: General Maintenance

Code 1:	4%	31,000
Code 2:	8 %	10,000
Code 3:	--	-----
TOTAL		41,000

	Rank in amount of caseload	Rank in amount of budget	% of total caseload	% of total budget	Raw totals for caseload in business units 1.	Totals for amount of Courts budget (including Maintenance and Operations) 2.
3rd East Middlesex-Cambridge	1	1	20.31%	18.13%	74,582	1,198,263.24
1st East Middlesex-Malden	2	6	17.04%	9.66%	63,882	637,695.45
Lowell	3	2	13.81%	11.38%	50,791	750,747.47
2nd East Middlesex-Waltham	4	8	8.06%	6.45%	31,751	429,845.96
Somerville	5	3	3.33%	10.65%	30,808	707,405.56
4th East Middlesex-Woburn	6	5	7.83%	9.86%	28,890	656,971.57
1st South Middlesex-Framingham	7	4	6.22%	10.17%	22,843	670,972.76
Central Middlesex-Concord	8	9	5.12%	6.15%	18,966	403,841.30
Newton	9	7	5.11%	6.71%	18,825	446,596.34
1st North Middlesex-Ayer	10	10	3.02%	5.24%	11,261	349,937.53
Marlborough	11	11	2.44%	3.74%	8,968	245,942.81
Natick	12	12	1.53%	2.05%	5,628	138,065.07

1. Based on material prepared by the Joint Committee on Counties
2. Based on Middlesex County budget requests for 1972 including items 14 & 18 for District Courts.

Courts in which budget

cuts are recommended (1)

Amount cut

New total

Somerville	154,603.44	552,802.12
Framingham	258,196.15	412,776.61
Woburn	137,350.85	656,971.57
Newton	107,482.44	339,113.90
Concord	64,063.77	339,777.53
Ayer	149,521.88	200,415.65
Marlborough	84,017.58	161,925.23
Natick	36,529.99	101,535.08
<hr/>		
TOTAL AMOUNT CUT	991,766.10	

(1) Those courts with a higher percentage in budget as compared to caseload cut back to equalize the percentage of caseload with the percentage of budget.

2

232

Communication from Chester G. Atkins
transmitting a sample of budget cuts
for Middlesex County

Refer to Finance
Copies