

General Turnback for Counties: Not a Grant Payment for state services administered at the county level

There ain't no such thing as a free lunch. That's a popular adage communicating the idea that it is impossible to get something for nothing. The "free lunch" refers to the once-common tradition of saloons in the United States providing a "free" lunch to patrons who had purchased at least one drink. Many foods on offer were high in salt, such as ham, cheese, salted crackers and salted nuts. You get the picture, don't you? Those who ate them ended up buying a lot of "beverage." In other words, "There ain't no such thing as a free lunch." Someone always pays the bill.

So, who pays the bills for county government operations in Arkansas? For the most part counties do. They pay the bills with revenues derived from property taxes, sales and use taxes, fees, fines, costs and other sources of revenue. However, the state of Arkansas does provide county aid, known at the local level as general revenue turnback, and a few other sources of revenue to help offset the costs of state mandates on the county. County aid is not a grant. It is payment for state services administered at the county level. The state should be paying for those services. Not partially — but fully.

Let me provide some history and background concerning this issue. I will be as open and honest as possible, giving the state of Arkansas credit where credit is due. But I also will

conclude that Arkansas is coming up short in its obligation and indebtedness to its 75 counties — and they are the state's counties, created to help the state deliver services.

Court cases down through the years have long settled the fact that counties in Arkansas are political subdivisions of the state created for the public convenience in the administration of government. ACA § 14-14-102 states, "A county is a political subdivision of the state for the more convenient administration of justice *and* the exercise of local legislative authority related to county affairs." The word that I consider the most important word in this Arkansas law is the conjunction "and." A word connecting two separate clauses and two separate functions: (1) the state function of justice conveniently administered in

accordance with law by county government, a political subdivision of the state; and (2) the local function of legislative and administrative authority relating to county affairs.

The Arkansas Supreme Court has previously opined, both in 1978 and 1980 after the passage of Amendment 55 — the Arkansas Constitutional amendment restructuring county government, that "It must be remembered that counties are still civil divisions of the state for political and judicial purposes and are the state's auxiliaries and instrumentalities in the administration of its government. They are political subdivisions of the state for the administration of justice. The word 'county' signifies a portion of a state resulting from a division of the state into such areas for better government thereof and the easier administration of justice. In these respects, we have clearly held that nothing in Amendment 55 changed the status of the county insofar as its primary purpose and functions are concerned." [*Beaumont, Judge v. Adkisson, Judge*, 267 Ark. 511 (1980);

Mears v. Hall, 263 Ark. 827 (1978)]

The state of Arkansas recognized decades ago the moral and legal obligation they had to counties. They realized that the state must provide financial assistance to counties in order for the state's citizens to have any equity and equality in services that counties are required to provide — state services. I doubt that at the time they had any clue how profoundly correct that was.

Act 386 of 1943 established the Cities and Counties Fund and found, "whereby it is impossible for municipalities and counties to efficiently and safely administer municipal and county statutory governmental functions without additional revenues for such purposes." Without the provision of adequate funding, the General Assembly of 1943 deemed the conditions created would "jeopardize the public health and safety of the citizens of the State, the Municipalities and the Counties." A decade later, Act 188 of 1953 created and funded a County

SEEMS
TO ME...



EDDIE A. JONES
County Consultant

The state of Arkansas recognized decades ago the moral and legal obligation they had to counties. They realized that the state must provide financial assistance to counties in order for the state's citizens to have any equity and equality in services that counties are required to provide — state services.

of justice. The word 'county' signifies a portion of a state resulting from a division of the state into such areas for better government thereof and the easier administration of justice. In these respects, we have clearly held that nothing in Amendment 55 changed the status of the county insofar as its primary purpose and functions are concerned." [*Beaumont, Judge v. Adkisson, Judge*, 267 Ark. 511 (1980);

Aid Fund. Counties still receive their “general turnback” funds each month from the County Aid Fund. Since the beginning of county aid, turnback dollars have very gradually increased, but the percentage of state general revenue the counties receive has declined sharply. In fact, the county aid appropriation in 1980 was \$18,875,249; the appropriation in 2015 was \$21,645,067 — a very small increase over a 35-year period.

The average inflation rate from 1980 through 2015 was 3.37 percent. If counties had received an inflation adjustment of only 3 percent during that time frame, the county aid appropriation for 2016-17 would be \$54,705,725. That would help counties immensely. County governments in Arkansas are currently subsidizing the state court system with county general funds to the tune of \$45.7 million as validated by a Special Report of Arkansas Legislative Audit on the State Court System issued in 2015.

For the sake of fairness, I must mention that the state of Arkansas made public defenders state employees. Until Jan. 1, 1998, county government had full responsibility for the financial operation of public defender offices, including salaries. That changed with the passage and enactment of Act 1341 of 1997 to “phase in the transfer of funding of the state trial court system from county government to the State of Arkansas.” This act of the General Assembly made public defenders state employees but left counties with the financial responsibility of funding public defender office operation — and took part of our revenue to help them fund the salaries of public defenders.

With the passage of Act 1341 of 1997, counties of Arkansas were required to relinquish 85 percent of the amount certified as having been collected during calendar year 1994 for the purpose of funding the office and operation of the public defender. This money had been available each year in the County Administration of Justice Fund for use in funding the public defender operation. County government gave up 85 percent of this funding source for the state to take over the salaries for public defender offices, and counties retained the other 15 percent to help pay for office operation.

Section 12 of that act, codified as ACA § 16-87-302, breaks down the responsibility for the funding of public defenders. Counties are responsible for the payment of the following: (1) the cost of facilities, equipment, supplies and other office expenses necessary to the effective and efficient operation of the public defender’s office; and (2) the compensation of additional personnel within the office of the public defender, when approved in advance by the quorum court. [Note: The state is responsible for the salaries of public defenders and the salaries of secretaries and other support staff of the public defender’s office.]

I must also let you know the state of Arkansas made deputy prosecutors state employees effective Jan. 1, 2000, with the passage and enactment of Act 1044 of 1999, an act that stated, “it is the intent of the General Assembly to transition to a state-funded deputy prosecuting attorney system.” Even though deputy prosecuting attorneys became state employees, counties remained responsible for 80 percent of what was budgeted and expended for deputy prosecutor salaries and associated fringe benefit costs in the calendar year 1999. That amount was ascertained to be \$5,459,621.28, and each

county’s share is withheld from its general turnback by the state each month. That deduction of more than \$5 million from county government’s gross “county aid” appropriation has happened every year since the year 2000 — and, without a change in law, it will continue to happen every year. So for more than 15 years there has been no continued “transition.”

In addition to the more than \$5 million that counties contribute toward salaries for deputy prosecutors — who are state employees — counties also are required to fund office operations. Act 1044 of 1999, Special Language, Section 10 requires each county or counties within a judicial district to bear the responsibility and expense of providing the cost of facilities, equipment, supplies, salaries and benefits of existing staff, *and additional personnel when approved by the quorum court* [ACA § 16-21-156]. Office operational costs have ballooned post-1999 since full-time deputy prosecutors are not allowed to conduct a private practice. Therefore the entire office operations cost is borne by the county.

Do counties have revenue sources that are dedicated to the court system? Yes, we do. But they are not sufficient to cover the costs. Here is a list of those revenues:

- Bail Bond Fee of \$20 is remitted to the Public Defender Commission. Of each \$20 fee, \$3 is remitted quarterly to the county to defray the operating expense of the public defender office [ACA § 17-19-301].
- Circuit Court Installment Fees are to be used to fund Circuit Court-related technology and to defray the cost of fine collection [ACA § 16-13-704].
- Court Costs, Fees, and Fines for the Juvenile Division of the Circuit Court are to be used to provide services and supplies to juveniles [ACA §§ 9-27-367 and 16-13-326].
- Program User Fees set by Drug Court judges are to be used for the administration of the Drug Court Program [ACA § 16-98-304].

1980	\$18,875,249
1985	\$18,515,744
1990	\$20,147,445
1995	\$21,552,313
2000	\$21,552,313
2005	\$19,741,546
2010	\$19,346,715
2015	\$21,645,067

