



MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ROOM 605, COUNTY COURTHOUSE
1021 S.W. FOURTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

GLADYS McCOY • Chair • 248-3308
PAULINE ANDERSON • District 1 • 248-5220
GRETCHEN KAFOURY • District 2 • 248-5219
RICK BAUMAN • District 3 • 248-5217
POLLY CASTERLINE • District 4 • 248-5213
JANE McGARVIN • Clerk • 248-3277

1989-1990 BUDGET HEARING SCHEDULE

The following is a schedule of the 1989-90 Budget Hearings by the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners sitting as the Budget Committee. All sessions will be held in Room 602 of the Multnomah County Courthouse, 1021 SW Fourth Avenue, Portland, with the exception of the evening hearing on April 24, which will be held at the Gresham City Hall Council Chambers, 1333 NW Eastman Parkway. The public is invited to all sessions.

Thursday, April 6	9:00 a.m.	Formal Meeting
	9:30 a.m.	Executive Budget Presentation
	10:00 a.m.	Opening Organizational Meeting; Revenue Overview
Monday, April 10	9:00 a.m.	Department of Justice Services (DJS); Sheriff's Budget
	1:30 p.m.	CBAC Report (See Note) Public Hearing and Work Session - DJS; Sheriff Budget
Tuesday, April 11	9:00 a.m.	Informal
	9:30 a.m.	DJS Budget, District Attorney, and Remainder of DJS Budget
	1:30 p.m.	CBAC Report Public Hearing and Work Session - DJS Budget; District Attorney and Remainder of DJS Budget
Wednesday, April 12	9:00 a.m.	Department of Human Services (DHS) Budget
	1:30 p.m.	CBAC Report Public Hearing and Work Session - DHS Budget

Thursday, April 13	9:00 a.m. 9:30 a.m.	Formal Meeting Nondepartmental Budget, Auditor, BCC, Chair, Tax Supervising, CIC, Library CBAC Report
	1:30 p.m.	Public Hearing and Work Sessions - Nondepartmental and Library Budgets
Friday, April 14	9:00 a.m.	Department of Environmental Services (DES) Budget CBAC Report
	1:30 p.m.	Public Hearing and Work Session - DES Budget
Monday, April 17	9:00 a.m.	Department of General Services (DGS) Budget CBAC Report
	1:30 p.m.	Public Hearing and Work Session - DGS Budget
Tuesday, April 18	9:00 a.m. 9:30 a.m.	Planning/Informal Work Sessions (if needed) DHS Budget and DJS Budget; (Sheriff)
	7:00 p.m.	EVENING MEETING/COURTHOUSE SERVICE DISTRICTS/PUBLIC HEARING ON ENTIRE COUNTY BUDGET
Wednesday, April 19	9:00 a.m.	Work Sessions (if needed) DJS and DGS Budgets
Thursday, April 20	9:00 a.m. 9:30 a.m.	Formal Meeting Work Sessions (if needed) Nondepartmental, Library, DES Budgets
Monday, April 24	9:00 a.m.	General Work Session (if needed)
	7:00 p.m.	EVENING MEETING/GRESHAM CITY HALL (1333 N.W. Eastman Parkway) PUBLIC HEARING ON ADOPTION OF THE BUDGET
Tuesday, April 25	9:00 a.m.	Adoption of Budget

NOTES:

1. Monday, Wednesday and Friday budget sessions will begin at 9:00 a.m.; Tuesday and Thursday budget sessions will begin at 9:30 a.m. Public hearings following work sessions will be held at 1:30 unless otherwise noted. Evening sessions will begin at 7:00 p.m. and are expected to end by 10:00 p.m.
2. Most budget deliberations for the following external organizations are now included with Departments according to this schedule:

<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>DEPARTMENT</u>
East Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation	DES
Extension Services	DES
Multnomah County Library	Chair
Oregon Historical Society	DES
PSU Urban Fellowship	DGS
Watermaster Districts	DES
West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation	DES
River East Progress, Inc.	DGS
Metropolitan Arts Commission	DGS
Metropolitan Human Relations Commission	DGS
Portland Multnomah Commission on Aging	DHS

3. Public testimony will be taken during public hearings which will begin at 1:30 p.m. Public testimony will also be taken at the two evening meetings (April 18 and April 24). Length of testimony will generally be limited to three minutes per person. Written testimony will be accepted at any session.
4. CBAC means the Citizen Budget Advisory Committee.
5. Work sessions scheduled April 18 or after may not be needed. Call the Clerk of the Board one day in advance to find out if a particular session will be held.

For additional schedule information, call the Clerk of the Board's Office - Phone - 248-3277

4/10/89 S.O.

① Multnomah County Employees Union
for Gladys McCoy

2. John Angell - FY 89-90 Chair's Proposes

April 5 - SALLY AND

4. 4/6 v/ Geo Jem.

PM

⑤ Statute authority of inmates.

⑥ 50 y - 094

4/10/89
①

MULTNOMAH COUNTY EMPLOYEES UNION LOCAL 88

AFFILIATED WITH
American Federation of State,
County and Municipal Employees
Oregon AFSCME Council 75
OREGON AFL-CIO
Multnomah Co. Labor Council

Chartered by American Federation of State, County and
Municipal Employees A.F.L.-C.I.O.
2325 E. Burnside
Portland, Oregon 97214
(503) 233-8817



April 10, 1989

Gladys McCoy, Chair
Multnomah County Commission
1021 S.W. 4th
Portland, Oregon 97204

Dear Chair McCoy:

It's time for the annual exercise of who gets the money. The social agencies want some, the departments want some and we want some for our members needs and safety.

We do have some thoughts on priorities for county services and the people who provide them. If we may, please let us make suggestions as they appear in the budget document.

HUMAN SERVICES:

We are pleased that no new services have been contracted out this year. We are disturbed that one of the most successful programs is being cut by one clinic and we refer to the Teen High School Clinics. With a commitment to the welfare of babies and teenage mothers, and as possibly the only health care that these teen agers will receive, we are shocked that you are considering closing one. We still believe that they should be increasing a rather than decreasing. We would also question a large increase in contracted out services for juveniles but no increase in the counseling staff at the Donald E. Long Home. In fact, we strongly challenge the lack of any increase, except in management, to the juvenile staff. Not only has the type of juvenile offender changed and even become younger, but to there is now much more violence in the juvenile population and it is brought into the Home. Weapons are an increasing problem at the Home and no one is dealing with it in this budget as relates to the safety of our employees.

Our senior citizens are being given the back of the hand by the City, and it appears that the County must make up the difference in services to those who cared about us earlier. We will need to keep Centers open for their welfare.

JUSTICE SERVICES:

We believe that a Department of Justice Services as now conceived is not called for. The District Attorney and the Sheriff are county-wide elected officials, prepare their own budgets, manage their own affairs so that a very expensive Director to supervise capable leaders is an expense that the County can ill afford. We suggest that a Justice Administration Department be instituted with the following under its umbrella: Probation Services, Community Corrections, Women's Alternative that would include the transition and prostitution programs, the Medical Examiner and Family Services. The pay of this director would be in proportion to the new span of control.

The District Attorney:

Essentially, the same staffing is budgeted for this year as last, with the addition of one D.D.A. Statistically, the workload of the office with the onset of gangs and juvenile offenders, can be proven to be much higher, but yet no increase in employees is planned. We believe that the District Attorney's budget additions should be seriously considered, especially in the Juvenile and Gang Units and for child abuse victims. Again, we are amazed that the leadership is concerned about children, but not to the extent of providing services that will help them in other areas.

The Sheriff:

Again, as in the D.A.'s office, there is not enough support staff. We hope that the Sheriff has budget additions that will alter this. And as you are serious about contracting out the deputies to the Housing Authority, will new deputies be needed?

Probation Services and Community Corrections:

Many discussions have been held about changing our corrections philosophy, but no mention of this is in the budget. What if it happens? Where is the contingency for such an event.

Community Corrections service many people and do a very good job, but we are concerned that under their Contract Services, almost \$400,000. dollars of undesignated services are budgeted. These funds should be accounted for before any approval is made.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES:

Again, a hold the line with no increase in any of the main services except for Facilities Management which always seems to increase their financial holdings. We have asked for some very basic requests through Labor Relations of Facilities Management but only one request seems to be included in the budget. We have asked for security hand holds on the 4th Street side of the Court House and that the inner security doors at Animal Control be repaired, neither are on the budget. The Hansen Building's heating system renovation is, but the Courthouse attic flooding

Letter to McCoy
Page 3

problem is not.

We still believe that the Multnomah County road crews are the best in the State and we laud their professionalism as we do the workers at Animal Control and other D.E.S. divisions.

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES:

Labor Relations:

Obviously Labor Relations and their administration is very important to us. We invite you to reread the proposal of former Commissioner Miller and County government and its responsibilities and also a section of the 1986-88 contract that was removed at your request from the 1988-91 contract. If you accept the proposal of Comm. Miller, then why was the contract section eliminated. We believe that there is a different mood in the management levels below the Chair and the Commissioners as we have reported before and that, once again, you need to reinforce mutual good will that is evident between the elected leaders of the County and the bargaining units amongst County management employees so that we can provide the best services for everyone.

Employee Services:

First, the classification plan is in the midst of development. It is almost on time and Colette Umbras is to be congratulated for her efforts and her cooperation. There are some glaring problems though with hiring practices. In a recent job announcement, the rules were changed in the middle of the recruitment period to the detriment of many applicants who had been accepted in the past. Consistency of the rules must be a constant in the search for excellence of applicants. Recruitment used to be heavy, now job announcements are almost a secret.

Once again, we must inform you that although the County has an excellent Affirmative Action plan, there are many problems county-wide concerning racial and sexual misunderstandings. This is not to be accepted at any time. Again, it is a lack of understanding and training of managers and then bad examples are set for employees.

Elections Division:

One of the County's best managed and most effective section and we applaud Vicki Ervin in her management style and and the ability to have the best elections division in the state.

NONDEPARTMENTAL:

The library is of great concern to us. At the last budget session, the librarian was told that the levy was to be used for employees in pay increases and benefits. What happened? The employees had to strike to get any kind of raise. The librarian had a newly redecorated office, there are new computers, but

we are worrying about a new roof for the main library. Where is the library's concern? And again, until the Library is accountable to the County from whence it receives its funds, we will not be favorable towards any increase or even continuing of any fund allocation.

SPECIAL CONCERNS:

One of our constant concerns in the contracted-out programs is our lack of control and responsibility for financial management by the County in getting any kind of information on what the County is getting for their money. Also contracted agencies preclude automatic restructuring when human needs demand change. For example the Detox Center is not ours anymore. Instead of being innovative, we can only do what Central Cities Concern tells we can do, so if more beds are needed for alcoholics, we can reinvent another Detox, or we will not have the beds that we need.

There are two special requests that we would propose this budget.

One: A special fund should be set aside so that when a bargaining unit member is required to attend a committee meeting, attend negotiations or any session that is either at the request of the County or a bargained event, the Department of that employee may be reimbursed for the lost time of the employee.

Two: Joint training sessions that were agreed to in the final days of the contract process, but have not been adhered to by Labor Relations. Instead, Labor Relations have been holding sessions that seem to be including ways to go around the contract.

The two attachments are included because we believe that they deserve your attention. We believe that our employees are professional, that there is good service delivery by those employees, but that this is not recognized by managers, nor is the expertise of County employees recognized when change is contemplated.

We appreciate Comm. Anderson's objective to acknowledge and cultivate County employees as our most valuable asset. We most heartily concur and hope that at the end of this budget process we see others with the same opinion.

Good luck in your endeavors, Gene Collins will be monitoring the session this year and we will be making comments. Arlene Collins will be our spokesperson.

In unity,

Joseph J. Devlaeminck
President

In unity,


Arlene Collins
Recording Secretary

cc: Commissioners Anderson
Kafoury
Bauman

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF
MULTNOMAH COUNTY

*Budget note
- 1988-89*

In the Matter of)
The Management of)
County Services)

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS since 1981 the management structure of county government has eroded because of continuing inflation; and

WHEREAS these reductions were made to preserve as many direct services as possible; and

WHEREAS the county has been unable to insure that services are provided at the highest level of efficiency because of these reductions; and

WHEREAS over time, resources allocated to county direct services have exceeded the funds allocated to manage and support them; and

WHEREAS services provided by the county should be in concert with good business practices; and

WHEREAS our current level of support has a negative impact on our ability to generate new dollars;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of County Commissioners supports strengthened management of county services and believes that the promotion of good business practices is fundamental to the provision of services; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that it is the planning and budgetary policy of the Board of County Commissioners to increase the level of funding for those programs which:

1. generate dollars
2. create internal efficiencies
3. reduce risks
4. reduce worker stress
5. improve services to the public
6. protect the county's capital investments
7. promote equity for both our employees and the public; and

In the Matter of
the Management of
County Services
page 2

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that it is the ongoing policy of the Board of
County Commissioners to adopt a funding formula which supports county
wide support services through its strategic planning process.

Gladys McCoy
Multnomah County Chair

Seal

Approved

Laurence Kressel
Multnomah County Counsel

1986-1988

AGREEMENT

between

Multnomah County, Oregon

and

Multnomah County Employees

Union Local 88

AFSCME

AFL-CIO



MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

t of monies made in error, or
 authority, shall be considered an
 payments shall be governed by

s relative to and governing
 ular nature are contained in
 Agreement, which are attached
 part hereof as though fully

ions Committee Meetings.

monious relations and to
 ons, the Union and the County
 lations Committee consisting
 from each party. The
 ular bi-monthly meetings
 and will so schedule such
 to avoid disruptions and
 oyees attending such meetings
 pay. The Committee shall
 to maintaining good
 ips including but not limited
 work loads, employee morale,

8. Participatory Management.

Multnomah County's mission and goal is to
 establish a strong Participatory Management concept to
 promote employee job satisfaction through employee
 participation. The County encourages and supports the
 philosophy, cooperation and programs to increase employee
 participation in management and operation decisions.

Further, the County recognizes that the
 business of any enterprise is to deliver efficient and
 effective service regardless of sector and that people
 provide that service to people. The intent behind the
 goal is to acknowledge that the County employees who
 provide the service are not nameless, faceless, uncaring
 individuals, but human beings with a deep need to
 contribute and to participate in management and operation
 activities and decisions and, to excel as valued employees
 as part of a County team.

Participatory Management concepts should be
 developed and adhered to by all County managers and
 supervisors. Disagreement as to the progress in
 implementing Participatory Management shall be resolved
 with the Employee Relations Committee, Article 24 of this
 Agreement.

4/10/89
2

FY 89 - 90 CHAIR'S PROPOSED BUDGET
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SERVICE
MAJOR CHANGES AND REVISIONS

INCREASES

SHERIFF	5 Deputies: Custody Bailiffs	205,000
	Additional inmate Capacity - MCDC	52,000
	Additional inmate Capacity - MCIJ (Jail Levy)	58,000
DISTRICT ATTORNEY	1 Deputy DA: Gang Prosecution	67,000
ADMIN & PLANNING	1 Program Evaluator	36,000
WOMEN'S TRANSITION SERVICES	1 Case Supervisor	39,000
PROBATION SERVICES	2 Staff Persons: Intercounty transfers	60,000
COMM CORR Alter Comm Service	1 Staff person: Case Screening	29,000

TOTAL ADDITIONS 546,000

REDUCTIONS

SHERIFF	Professional Services	(100,000)
	Motor Pool	(50,000)
	Capital Equipment	(50,000)
	Overtime	(100,000)

TOTALS REDUCTIONS (300,000)

NET CHANGE 246,000

Budget, April

Jane McGarvin

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SERVICES
CITIZENS' BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
1989 REPORT

CBAC MEMBERS

Morgan Dickerson
Randy Gross

Larry McCagg
Alex Pierce
Edna Pittman

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
1989 APR 10 PM 4:22
MULTNOMAH COUNTY
OREGON
Jorge Torres
Douglass Tracy

Justice Services in 1989 is still a new and evolving field. With a nation-wide explosion of crime and the resultant overcrowding of jails and prisons, new approaches to new conditions are no longer simply experiments but urgent needs. "We've never done it that way before" is no longer an adequate defense. Multnomah County is no exception.

The concept of Justice Services as an evaluation and planning unit of government is likewise a still-evolving field. Community Corrections programs are taking over more and more of the supervision and rehabilitation functions once left to the jails and the options available for handling individual offenders have become far more complex.

Multnomah County can neither afford to stand still nor can the County afford a haphazard approach to corrections, allocating its limited funds to programs on the basis of what sounds good or because one program director happens to be a better salesman than another. These are tempting solutions - and they may appear to work for awhile - but in the long run they are not good government. Justice Services is a single concept with many facets. That these facets should compete with each other for scarce dollars is a guarantee that those dollars will be less efficiently used than they could be.

This 1989 Citizens' Budget Advisory Committee, mindful of the above, has not looked for faults in individual programs. All presentations to the Committee have evidenced success in supervision or rehabilitation or both. We have found, however, that the hard data necessary to make recommendations for funding are just not available. What is the recidivism rate of "graduates" of one program as compared with that of another? Is there any profile-comparison between the offenders in one program and the other? Which is more cost-effective? The answers are not available. Most if not all are obviously doing good work but into which should the few available dollars be put? Without evaluation in depth by the Department of Justice Services no allocation of limited funds between competing programs can be made with confidence that the public is best served. Well served? Yes. But best served?

This Committee has therefore established as its first priority-request the increased support of program evaluation. Second, that Community Corrections (including Women's Transition Services) be enhanced not solely as alternatives to overcrowded jails but as preventive and rehabilitative programs which are effective in and of themselves. Both of these require the planning and coordination which can only be provided by a beefed-up Department of Justice Services. Our thinking and rationale follow:

- - - - -

In its 1988 Report, this Committee noted and supported the "positive steps toward the restoration of the Department [of Justice Services]" taken by the Board of County Commissioners "after years of continued reductions in funding and fragmentation of services". This Committee further approved, and strongly, the fact that "the changes will improve the ability of the Department to function as the coordinator and planner of justice services in our community". We concluded then, and still believe, that an integrated approach to this County's justice services is the best way to combat the growing problem of crime. At the same time we recognize that coordination and leadership of all Justice Services in a single Department is still evolving in Multnomah County.

There was a time in recent American history when "catch 'em, convict 'em and jail 'em" was possible. Those days required little more than a Sheriff's and a District Attorney's Departments. Without having to go into the causes of today's increases in crime this Committee understands that Justice Services has suddenly grown far more complex. That alternatives to incarceration and programs for rehabilitation of inmates received too little attention in past decades while true is really irrelevant today. The fact is that we are now forced to consider these alternatives and programs as a separate entity equal to the functions of Sheriff and District Attorney if only because resources for "old style" justice have been outstripped by crime. Community Corrections and other alternatives to incarceration are not just an adjunct, they have become a necessary third leg in the Justice Services tripod. This Committee's 1989 mission, then, has been to look carefully at the process of integrating modern concepts into the County's overall Justice Services. We find that there is still a long way to go.

We are unable to fathom the rationale behind many aspects of Multnomah County's Justice Services. Community Corrections, for instance, operates a number of programs under the guidance of an excellent - even expert - Citizens' Committee. Why is it, then, that Probation Services, Women's Transition Services and the program of the Restitution Center operate independently with neither the overall coordination which Community Corrections can provide nor the oversight of a Citizens' Advisory Committee? What is the mandate of Community Corrections if not to design and administer everything beyond "catch

'em, convict 'em and jail 'em"? The County Commissioners have made themselves very clear in their January (1989) "Resolution in the Matter of a Policy for Justice Services". Why, then, are these obvious consolidations of alternative/rehabilitation services not under a single planning and administration? It seems to this Committee that the dollar savings of such consolidation would be considerable. And the simple efficiency of a single administration of programs would go a long way toward achieving the stated goals of the County Commissioners.

Another puzzlement is the absence of a Research and Planning unit in the office of the Director of Justice Services. That the Sheriff's Department and the District Attorney's office have planning units is commendable but modern concepts of integrated Justice administration have demonstrated, both academically and in practice, that all aspects of Justice Services are inter-related and that for the best service to our community we need the best overall planning, not just the best planning of fragmented and often competing divisions. It is axiomatic that a single division's planning must be limited to the work and goals of that single division. Integrated justice services requires overall planning.

Again it appears to this Committee that the long-range dollar savings of such overall planning would be considerable. And the ability of Justice Services to provide the most cost-effective mix of sanctions and rehabilitative programs would be enhanced.

In conclusion, we find that Justice Services has three separate and distinct "legs", The District Attorney, the Sheriff's Department and Alternative/Rehabilitative Programs. It would be inappropriate for the District Attorney's office to administer a drug rehabilitation program. It would be inappropriate for Community Corrections to arrest offenders. It would be inappropriate for the Sheriff's Department to prosecute cases. The work of each is obviously not the work of the other two but all three are necessary to the goals of this County. Each department has its own expertise and each has a unique and equally vital role in Justice Services.

We find that these legs are in some areas inappropriately mixed causing inefficiency, fragmentation and unnecessary competition for limited funds. At the same time, modern concepts of Justice Services demand that these three "legs" function as a coordinated whole. This means that each must be responsible for the tasks for which each is best qualified and that the planning, integration and evaluation of overall Justice Services be the task of a Director with an adequate staff. We believe that both the administration of justice and the County Budget would be served.

- - - - -

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' RESOLUTION IN THE MATTER OF A POLICY FOR JUSTICE SERVICES - A RESPONSE:

This Committee has read and discussed the County Commissioners' Resolution in depth. We have found it to be of particular interest because it clearly states the goals with which we agree. As of this writing, we have the following response:

To "facilitate understanding of the nature, causes, extent and relative seriousness of delinquency and crime" is the ongoing work of the Department. The Commissioners have hired an expert in this field to be the Director. We find, however, that because of limited funds the County is in the position of slapping ever-more-expensive bandaids on problems as they arise instead of building integrated plans for immediate and future needs. With virtually no staff support for overall planning in the office of the Director, how can the Commissioners know whether more jail beds or increased Community Corrections is the highest and best use of the dollars available? Planning based on evaluation of programs is vital to the County Commission's decision making. Given this Committee's limited role, we cannot judge whether or not increased support for planning and evaluation personnel is available from the County's Budget but we can note that Department-wide planning will produce budgetary efficiencies.

We recognize that to "prevent delinquency, crime and civil disorder" is far more than a Justice Services work. The Sheriff's Department does its part superbly - the recently announced program of prevention in public housing projects being an example - but after an offender has entered the Justice Services net, we must provide a mix of detention and rehabilitative sanctions in order to "prevent . . ." No single division of Justice Services can do this alone yet prevention is the most cost-effective way to cope with crime.

To "support adequate local policing and provide essential supplementary law enforcement services" really hinges on the word, "adequate". This Committee recognizes the difficulty of defining this word and applauds the Commissioners' balancing of limited funds to accomplish the best possible result. We ask again, however, that funds for program evaluation be increased in order that the Commissioners' decisions may be based on hard data rather than on salesmanship or on what sounds good.

To "promote and facilitate the efficient, effective administration of justice" needs more work. We find that the "administration of justice" is still fragmented between divisions of the Department and that it must, for the sake of the people's control through their elected Commission, be brought under the planning and leadership of the Director.

To "rehabilitate and reintegrate offenders into society" is not the role of the District Attorney or of the Sheriff. Theirs is to apprehend, convict and administer the detention facilities. Rehabilitation and reintegration are the province of the Alternatives "leg" of Justice Services and this cannot be effective without coordination at the Director's level.

"Organizing and maintaining information systems which serve criminal justice operational, management and research needs" is far behind the ability of available technology. This Committee has been told that the several computer systems [State Police, DA, Sheriff, etc.] are unable to interface with each other. While we recognize that to correct this unfortunate situation overnight would require far more dollars than are available, we urge the Director to explore the possibility of establishing separate [if necessary] workstations tied into each of these different computer systems in order to access the information stored in each. We can see no other way in which the Office of the Director of Justice Services can begin the research required to accomplish the goals of the Commissioners' Resolution.

"Initiating measures preventing crime and delinquency and rehabilitating offenders" continues to be done by Justice Services and others. The Women's Transition Services is only the currently most outstanding example of newly initiated measures. This Citizens' Committee looks to the Director with confidence that more programs of this kind will be initiated in the future. Rehabilitation and Community Corrections are both the more cost-effective solutions and [today] the only solutions to overcrowding in jails and prisons.

"Supplementing and supporting the law enforcement efforts of local communities and other governmental entities operating within the County" is an area into which this Committee has not looked at all. That the Sheriff's Department has moved into public housing projects sounds like a preventive measure which will help all citizens and we look forward to reading an evaluation of this program in 1990.

"Using the least restrictive criminal sanction consistent with protection of public safety, administration of appropriate punishment, rehabilitation of an offender, and cost-effectiveness of the sanctions" only demonstrates again the need for accountable [to the County Chair] planning for Justice Services as a whole. The steps to accomplish this Resolution are perhaps more political than budgetary but this Committee urges the Commissioners to continue their thrust into bringing the whole of Justice Services under the planning of the accountable, hired Director.

"Placing responsibility for provision of the various justice services with the jurisdiction or organization which is most reasonably capable of achieving the highest quality, most cost-effective results" we find to be a two-edged sword. It can be read to mean either that the

administration of Justice Services shall continue to be fragmented into separate "responsibility" for the three identified "legs" of overall Justice Services or that the Commissioners intend that a unified Department of Justice Services under its Director be responsible for planning and allocating resources to the present and future needs of the County. Again, this is perhaps more a political than a budgetary question but we, as citizens, believe that overall administration from the Office of the Director will result in more efficient use of funds in the future. A relatively small investment now will bring economies down the road.

Lastly . . .

"Be it further Resolved, the County shall maximize the effectiveness of the administration of justice by providing planning, coordination, cooperation, law enforcement, prosecution, prevention, corrections and criminal justice support services. Objectives of programs in these areas will be defined and measurable, and resources for the justice system will be allocated and evaluated by objective criteria." This Citizens' Committee concludes that "the County" has entrusted the realization of this Resolution to the Department of Justice Services. We have also concluded that the Director does not have the staff adequate to accomplish this Commissioners' goal. The County has three strong and effective "legs" supporting its overall Justice Services but it does not have the research and planning personnel needed at the top to accomplish the Commissioners' own planning and evaluation goals. Either the Director plans and directs or he is an empty figurehead over fragmented sub-divisions which compete on each other's turf. The first, that the Director directs, requires a research and planning staff and the Commissioners' authority to allocate resources. The second would ensure that this County continues with the ever-more-expensive bandaids approach to government. Justice demands the first.

- - - - -

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS:

Director of Justice Services - Administration & Planning

Strongly and unanimously we urge the Commissioners to fund the Director's request for two [2] FTE Evaluation positions and the proposed Student Intern project.

As noted above, the administration of justice cannot be efficient if the relative efficiency of its parts is not known. And knowing requires evaluation. And evaluation requires evaluators. The information is available.

One or more student interns would have the double advantage of helping with the workload and linking the University to County Government. Both for efficiency and for citizen involvement we recommend the program's funding.

Sheriff's Department

[See Sheriff's CBAC Report]

District Attorney's Office

[See District Attorney's CBAC Report]

Community Corrections

This Committee is in favor of the requests for additional funding from Community Corrections in the following order of priority: First, one FTE Clerical position. (State funding) Second, one FTE Program Development position. (State funding) Third, one FTE Screening [for alternative community service] position.

Probation Services [Misdemeanant]

This Committee favors the additional funding of one [1] FTE Mental Health PO position. On the request for one Inter-county Transfer PO position we recommend that Multnomah County limit the number of transfers received to that which the current staff can handle. On the request for an additional Clerical position, see "General Recommendations" below.

Women's Transition Services

This Committee strongly and unanimously favors the additional funding of two [2] FTE Case Manager positions.

Medical Examiner

This Committee favors the ME's request for changing from a part-time to a full-time Pathologist's Assistant. We recognize that this Department is short in both personnel and facilities and that major improvements must occur soon.

Family Services

As this is a self-funding unit operating under the Court, this Committee takes no position on their request for additional personnel.

General Recommendations

First: That Misdemeanant Probation, Women's Transition Services and the program of the Restitution Center be incorporated into Community Corrections for more efficient administration, better coordination of services and to bring them under the oversight of the Community Corrections Advisory Committee. All Community Corrections, belong in the same basket for efficiency of operation.

Second: That last year's request for joint sessions of the three CBACs [DJS, DA & Sheriff] be implemented. At minimum all three CBAC Reports need to be circulated before they are presented to the County Commissioners in order that each may benefit from the others' thinking.

L.H.McC.
04/10/89

(4)
4/10/89

4/6/89

SHERIFF'S OFFICE OVERTIME APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

General fund dollars excluding Levy

In thousands

YEAR	APPROPRIATION		EXPENDITURES	
	<u>OT</u>	<u>OT/FG</u>	<u>OT</u>	<u>OT/FG</u>
1986-87	1,222	1,686	2,068	2,853
1987-88	764	1,054	1,423	1,963
1988-89	1,085	1,503	1,257	1,734 Projected
1989-90	1,070	1,476		
OPERATIONS BRANCH				
1986-87	385	531	357	493
1987-88	317	437	382	527
1988-89	323	469	407	562 Projected
1989-90	439	605		
CORRECTIONS BRANCH				
1986-87	837	1,155	1,711	2,361
1987-88	447	617	1,041	1,437
1988-89	761	1,035	850	1,172 Projected
1989-90	631	871		

Note - In computing fringe amounts, an average rate of 38% was used.

5
4/10/89

STATUTE AUTHORITY TO SUPERVISE INMATES

Local correctional facilities in the State of Oregon are governed by Oregon Revised Statutes.

- ORS 169.030 Requires a local correctional facility for the reception and confinement of prisoners committed thereto.
- ORS 169.076 Requires that sufficient staff to perform all audio and visual functions involving security, control, custody and supervision of all confined detainees and prisoners.
- ORS 169.077 Requires twenty four (24) hour supervision when persons are confined.

JSG/dld/0143X/27A

STAFFING FACTORS

5 Day Post (no fill behind)	1.00
5 Day Post (fill behind)	1.30
7 Day Post 1 Shift	1.82
7 Day Post 2 Shifts	3.64
7 Day Post 3 Shifts	5.46

JSG/d1d/0143X/27A

4/05/89

Standard Report

Page 1

POST NAME	POST NO.	RU	DAY (C)	SWING (E)	GRAVE (G)	TOTAL POSTS	RELIEF FACTOR	REQ. STAFF	CLASS.	REMARKS
MCDC FAC. COMMANDER	1	MCDC	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CAPT	
CORR-SHIFT COMMANDER	2	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	LT	
INTAKE SGT	3	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	SGT	
SPEC. HOUSING(4 FL)	4	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	SGT	
HOUSING SGT	5	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	SGT	
INTAKE FLOOR CNTL	6	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
SEARCH 1	7	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
SEARCH 2	8	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
HOLDING 1	9	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
HOLDING 2	10	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
TRANSFER	11	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
MASTER CONTROL 1	12	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MASTER CONTROL 2	13	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
RELEASE OFFICER	14	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
VISITING OFFICER	15	MCDC	1	1	-	2	.52	1.04	CO	SAT & SUN ONLY
COURT FLOOR CONTROL	16	MCDC	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	CO	MON-FRI ONLY
COURT ESCORT 1	17	MCDC	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	CO	MON-FRI ONLY
COURT ESCORT 2	18	MCDC	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	CO	MON-FRI ONLY
4TH FLOOR CONTROL	19	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
4A MODULE	20	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
4D MODULE	21	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
4TH FLOOR ESCORT	22	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MEDICAL OFFICER	23	MCDC	1	-	-	1	1.56	1.56	CO	MON-SAT ONLY
5TH FLOOR CONTROL	24	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
5A MODULE	25	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
5 B/C MODULE	26	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
5D MODULE	27	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
5TH FLOOR ESCORT	28	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
6TH FLOOR CONTROL	29	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
6A MODULE	30	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
6B MODULE	31	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
6C MODULE	32	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
6D MODULE	33	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
6TH FLOOR ESCORT	34	MCDC	-	-	1	1	1.82	1.82	CO	
7TH FLOOR CONTROL	35	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
7A MODULE	36	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
7 B/C MODULE	37	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
7D MODULE	38	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
7TH FLOOR ESCORT	39	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
8TH FLOOR CONTROL	40	MCDC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
8A MODULE	41	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
8 B/C MODULE	42	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
8D MODULE	43	MCDC	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
8TH FLOOR ESCORT	44	MCDC	-	-	1	1	1.82	1.82	CO	
10TH FLOOR CONTROL	45	MCDC	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	CO	MON-FRI ONLY
INDOOR RECREATION	46	MCDC	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	CO	MON-FRI ONLY
MCHJ FAC. COMMANDER	47	MCHJ	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	SGT	
MCHJ CONTROL CENTER	48	MCHJ	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MCHJ HOUSING 1	49	MCHJ	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MCHJ HOUSING 2	50	MCHJ	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MCCF FAC. COMMANDER	51	MCCF	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	LT	

4/05/89

Standard Report

Page 2

POST NAME	POST NO.	RU	DAY (C)	SWING (E)	GRAVE (G)	TOTAL POSTS	RELIEF FACTOR	REQ. STAFF	CLASS.	REMARKS
MCCF SHIFT SGT	52	MCCF	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	SGT	
MCCF CONTROL CENTER	53	MCCF	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MCCF HOUSING	54	MCCF	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MCCF ESCORT 1	55	MCCF	1	-	-	1	1.82	1.82	CO	0500-1300
MCCF ESCORT 2	56	MCCF	-	1	-	1	1.82	1.82	CO	1300-2100
MCRC FAC. COMMANDER	57	MCRC	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	LT	
MCRC SGT	58	MCRC	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	SGT	
MCRC CONTROL CENTER	59	MCRC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MCRC HOUSING/ESCORT	60	MCRC	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MCRC LAB PROCESSING	61	MCRC	1	-	-	1	.26	.26	CO	1 DAY PER WEEK
MCRC COMMUNITY SVC	62	MCRC	1	-	-	1	.26	.26	CO	SATURDAY ONLY
MCRC VISITING OFF.	63	MCRC	-	1	-	1	.26	.26	CO	1000-1800 SUN.
PORT/ADV MED WARD	64	MCRC	*	*	*	*	-00-	-00-	CO	OT-AS REQUIRED
PORT/ADV PSY WARD	65	MCRC	*	*	*	*	-00-	-00-	CO	OT-AS REQUIRED
CLASSIFICATION 1	66	CLAS	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	CO	
CLASSIFICATION 2	67	CLAS	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	CO	
CLASSIFICATION 3	68	CLAS	1	-	-	1	1.82	1.82	CO	
CLASSIFICATION 4	69	CLAS	-	1	-	1	1.82	1.82	CO	
CLOSE STREET SGT	70	CSS	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	SGT	
CLOSE STREET OFF 1	71	CSS	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
CLOSE STREET OFF 2	72	CSS	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
CLOSE STREET OFF 3	73	CSS	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
CLOSE STREET OFF 4	74	CSS	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
CLOSE STREET OFF 5	75	CSS	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
CLOSE STREET OFF 6	76	CSS	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
CLOSE STREET OFF 7	77	CSS	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
CLOSE STREET OFF 8	78	CSS	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
ADMINISTRATIVE SGT	79	ADMN	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	SGT	
ACCRED/PROCEDURES	80	ADMN	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
LIFE SAFETY	81	ADMN	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
TRAINING SGT	82	TNG	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	SGT	
TRAINING OFFICER	83	TNG	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
EQUIPMENT SGT	84	EQU	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	SGT	
EQUIPMENT OFFICER	85	EQU	1	-	-	1	1.30	1.30	CO	
INTERNAL AFFAIRS SGT	86	IAU	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	SGT	
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
TOTAL POSTS	86						TOTAL	256.3		
*****	***	****	*	*	*	*	*****	*****	*****	*****
INVERNESS JAIL										
ADDITIONS:										
MCIJ FAC. COMMANDER	87	MCIJ	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	LT	
MCIJ SHIFT SGT	88	MCIJ	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	SGT	
MCIJ CENTRAL CONTROL	89	MCIJ	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MCIJ PROCESSING OFF	90	MCIJ	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MCIJ ESCORT 1	91	MCIJ	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MCIJ ESCORT 2	92	MCIJ	1	1	1	3	1.82	5.46	CO	
MCIJ DORM 1	93	MCIJ	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
MCIJ DORM 2	94	MCIJ	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
MCIJ DORM 3	95	MCIJ	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
MCIJ DORM 4	96	MCIJ	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
MCIJ DORM 5	97	MCIJ	1	1	-	2	1.82	3.64	CO	
MCIJ 1 & 2 INDIRECT	98	MCIJ	-	-	1	1	1.82	1.82	CO	

4/05/89

Standard Report

Page 3

POST NAME	POST NO.	RU	DAY (C)	SWING (E)	GRAVE (G)	TOTAL POSTS	RELIEF FACTOR	REQ. STAFF	CLASS.	REMARKS
MCIJ 4 & 5 INDIRECT	99	MCIJ	-	-	1	1	1.82	1.82	CO	
MCIJ WRK CREW SGT	100	MCIJ	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	SGT	
MCIJ WRK CREW OFF 1	101	MCIJ	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
MCIJ WRK CREW OFF 2	102	MCIJ	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
MCIJ WRK CREW OFF 3	103	MCIJ	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
MCIJ WRK CREW OFF 4	104	MCIJ	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
MCIJ WRK CREW OFF 5	105	MCIJ	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
MCIJ WRK CREW OFF 6	106	MCIJ	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
MCIJ WRK CREW OFF 7	107	MCIJ	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
MCIJ WRK CREW OFF 8	108	MCIJ	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
MCIJ WRK CREW OFF 9	109	MCIJ	1	-	-	1	1.00	1.00	CO	
===== -(TOTAL POSTS)----->	109						TOTAL	316.4		

WFC: 4/5/89

UNPLANNED OVERTIME EXPENDITURES

On many occasions unplanned events or circumstances arise requiring additional personnel and overtime funds. These include but are not limited to:

1. Construction; a corrections officer needed for security of equipment and persons.
2. Medical Requirements
 - A. Hospital
 - B. Suicide prevention observation.
3. Emergencies
 - A. Fire
 - B. Escape
 - C. Contraband Shakedowns
4. Officers off duty due to long term illness or injury.
5. Incident reports required by officers.
6. The need for added security posts for short duration due to population.
 - A. Security
 - B. Transfer
 - C. Transport
 - D. Recreation

ADDITIONAL REQUIRED STAFF ON OVERTIME

To ensure that Multnomah County Sheriff's Office was in compliance with the Oregon Revised Statutes, and because of restrictions and additional requirements placed upon us by the Federal Court order the need for additional positions was seen and implemented on an overtime basis as follows:

<u>Position</u>	<u>Relief Factor</u>	<u>Required Staff</u>
1. One transfer officer post per shift	1.82	5.46 = 5.00

JSG/dld/0143X/27A

(6)
4/10/89

4/6/89

SHERIFF'S OFFICE OVERTIME APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

General fund dollars excluding Levy

In thousands

YEAR	APPROPRIATION		EXPENDITURES	
	OT	OT/FG	OT	OT/FG
1986-87	1,222	1,686	2,068	2,853
1987-88	764	1,054	1,423	1,963
1988-89	1,085	1,503	1,257	1,734 Projected
1989-90	1,070	1,476		

OPERATIONS BRANCH

1986-87	385	531	357	493
1987-88	317	437	382	527
1988-89	323	469	407	562 Projected
1989-90	439	605		

CORRECTIONS BRANCH

1986-87	837	1,155	1,711	2,361
1987-88	447	617	1,041	1,437
1988-89	761	1,035	850	1,172 Projected
1989-90	631	871		

Note - In computing fringe amounts, an average rate of 38% was used.