

ANNOTATED MINUTES

Tuesday, June 18, 1991 - 9:30 AM  
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

BOARD BRIEFINGS

1. Update on Childrens Justice Task Force. Presented by Hank Miggins and Elaine Cogan.

DISCUSSION ON DRAFT REPORT AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS. CONSULTANT RICH GABEL TO BRIEF BOARD AT 10:00 AM ON FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1991.

2. Briefing on Proposed Resolution to Establish City and County Joint Meetings to Examine Service Provision and Efficiencies for Possible Adoption on June 27, 1991. Presented by Maureen Leonard.

STAFF TO REDRAFT PROPOSED RESOLUTION IN RESPONSE TO BOARD SUGGESTIONS.

---

Tuesday, June 18, 1991 - 10:45 AM  
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

AGENDA REVIEW

3. Review of Agenda for Regular Meeting of June 20, 1991

R-8 BOARD BRIEFING AND DISCUSSION WITH GARY SMITH, BILL PROWS, MICHAEL MORRISSEY AND CHILDREN AND YOUTH SERVICES COMMISSION MEMBERS OPAL CHANCELLOR-MOORE, MURIEL GOLDMAN AND MIMI GRAY.

R-7 STAFF ADVISED A RELATED ORDER WILL BE SUBMITTED FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION NEXT WEEK. STAFF UPDATE ON DISSOLUTION EFFORTS FOR DUNTHORPE RIVERDALE SANITARY SERVICE DISTRICT NO. 1. PAUL YARBOROUGH ADVISED THAT DICK HOWARD IS RETIRING SOON AND COMMENDED HIM FOR HIS EXCELLENT WORK.

R-9 HANK MIGGINS AND DAVE WARREN SUBMITTED AND DISCUSSED PROPOSED ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE CHANGES, ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS AND FINANCIAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE. BOARD DISCUSSION ON MERITS OF \$75,000 RESTORATION TO CHAIR'S BUDGET. CHAIR STAFF TO PROVIDE CLARIFICATION CONCERNING BUDGET RESTORATION.

R-10 BOARD DISCUSSED AMENDMENTS TO RESOLUTION LANGUAGE CONCERNING POSSIBLE RELOCATION OF OFFICES WITHIN COMMISSION DISTRICTS OR OTHER COUNTY OWNED SPACES AND VACATING COUNTY OFFICES IN ROOM 605 OF THE COURTHOUSE BY JUNE 30, 1992. COURT ADMINISTRATOR DOUGLAS BRAY

DISCUSSED NEED FOR COURT TO ACQUIRE 3  
ADDITIONAL COURTROOMS BY JANUARY 1, 1993.  
STAFF SUBMITTED A LIST OF COUNTY OWNED AND/OR  
LEASED BUILDINGS BY COMMISSION DISTRICT,  
DISCUSSED EFFORTS TOWARDS SECURING BOARD  
MEETING AND COMMISSION OFFICE SPACE AND UPDATED  
BOARD ON RELOCATION OF COMMISSIONER BAUMAN AND  
STAFF TO THE MEAD BUILDING BY SEPTEMBER 1,  
1991.

---

Tuesday June 18, 1991 - 1:30 PM  
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

BOARD BRIEFINGS

4. Briefing on Critical Issues: Multnomah County Mental  
Health Administration. Presented by Commissioner Sharron  
Kelley and Directors of the Major Mental Health Centers.

CHAIR McCOY INTRODUCED ED WASHINGTON, ACTING  
CHAIR OF THE MENTAL HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE.  
DIRECTORS DIANE HANCOCK, REV. JAMES FAULKNER,  
GARY WITHERS, ROBERT CALKINS, JOE DEAN, ORRIN  
BOLSTAD AND LIAM CALLUM DISCUSSED ISSUES AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS IDENTIFIED IN JOINT WHITE PAPER  
DRAFT. CHAIR McCOY DIRECTED THAT GARY SMITH  
AND STAFF COLLABORATE WITH INTERESTED MENTAL  
HEALTH DIRECTORS TO PREPARE RESPONSE  
IDENTIFYING COMMON SET OF ISSUES AND  
IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED TO COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH  
SYSTEM TO ASSIST BOARD WITH STRATEGIC PLANNING  
PROCESS. TO BE SUBMITTED BY WEDNESDAY, JUNE  
26, 1991.

---

Thursday, June 20, 1991 - 9:30 AM  
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

10-YEAR EMPLOYEE AWARD RECOGNITION CEREMONY  
RECEPTION TO FOLLOW

COUNTY EMPLOYEES NEDRA BAGLEY, DALE CAWLEY,  
KATHERINE CHARTIER, MARY COSBY, F. WAYNE  
GEORGE, CHAN LE, JUDITH MAY, SANDRA McFARLAND,  
HANK MIGGINS, ELLEN MUELLER, TERRY RUDD, TERESA  
RUTLEDGE, DUANE SPERL, HARRIET WEBER, BETSY  
WILLIAMS, LAUREN ARMSTRACHAN, DUANE BIGONI,  
BETSY BLOTZER, BART BONNEY, GARY BURDA, PAUL  
CONNELLY, JOHN DORST, JANIS ELLISON, CHARLES  
FRENCH, RICKIE GILMORE, GARY GUNDERSON, MARILYN  
GUNSUL, CHET HERZBERG, PATRICIA HOBBS, DELETTE  
HUFFMAN, MICHAEL HUFFMAN, MOLLY JACKSON, THOMAS  
JEPPESON, SANDRA KELLY, ELLEN KOCH, SUSIE  
LAHSENE, JOHN LOCKHART, CRAIG LYTS, N. LEE  
MATTHEWS, LINDA METZ, SHARON MIDDLETON, LISA  
MOORE, SHARON MOORE, DAVID NICHOLLS, GREGORY  
PETESZ, EDGARDO RIVERA, DOLORES SCHMIDT,

MICHAEL SCHRUNK, JOAN SMITH, TIMON THOMPSON AND KRISTINE LEE WALKER WERE HONORED. BOARD RECOGNITION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FOR SOON TO RETIRE DES EMPLOYEES EDMOND DILLEY - 27 YEARS, JAMES RHODES - 31 YEARS, GENE HOWELL - 18 YEARS, AND RICHARD WESTRUP - 34 YEARS.

---

Thursday, June 20, 1991 - 9:30 AM  
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

REGULAR MEETING

CONSENT CALENDAR

JUSTICE SERVICES

SHERIFF'S OFFICE

- C-1 Ratification of Renewal of Existing Intergovernmental Agreement Between Multnomah County and the City of Wood Village Enabling the Sheriff's Office to Provide General Law Enforcement Services and Additional Patrols within the Corporate Limits of the City of Wood Village

APPROVED.

- C-2 Ratification of Intergovernmental Agreement with U.S. Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, to Continue the Lease of Biddle Butte Property Microwave Radio Station Site, Effective Date 7-01-91, Termination Date 6-30-92

APPROVED.

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

- C-3 In the Matter of Appointment of Gregory J. Wolley to the Parks Advisory Committee - Term Expires 12/93

APPROVED.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

- C-4 Ratification of Amendment #2 Revenue Intergovernmental Agreement Between Aging Services Division and State Senior and Disabled Services Division which Adds \$63,640 to Achieve a new Contract Level of \$8,769,192 in Federal, Federal/State, and State Funding for Aging Services Division Administration, Long Term Care Case Management, In Home Services, Meals, District Service Centers, Legal Assistance, Transportation, Mental Health Services, and Minority Services

APPROVED.

- C-5 Ratification of Amendment #1 Intergovernmental Agreement with Tri Met and Aging Services Division Adding \$25,000 in Federal Older Americans Act Funds for the Purchase of

an Additional 6,544 Rides to Doctors, Grocery Stores, and Meal Sites for Transportation of Handicapped Elderly

**APPROVED.**

- C-6 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement Between Portland Community College, Portland Employment Project and Multnomah County Developmental Disabilities Program as Identified in FY 91-92 Budget for \$24,888

**APPROVED.**

- C-7 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Gresham School District and the Multnomah County Youth Program Office as Identified in the FY 91-92 Budget for \$16,670

**APPROVED.**

- C-8 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement Between Portland Public School District #1 and the Multnomah County Youth Program Office as Identified in the FY 91-92 Budget for \$172,354

**APPROVED.**

- C-9 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Multnomah Education Service District and the Multnomah County Youth Program Office as Identified in the FY 91-92 Budget for \$11,907

**APPROVED.**

- C-10 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement Between the City of Portland Parks and Recreation Bureau and Multnomah County Developmental Disabilities Program as Identified in the FY 91-92 Budget for \$18,790.80

**APPROVED.**

- C-11 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Oregon Commission for the Blind and Multnomah County Developmental Disabilities Program as Identified in the FY 91-92 for \$287,322.60

**APPROVED.**

- C-12 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Oregon Health Sciences University, Child Development Rehabilitation Center and Multnomah County Developmental Disabilities Program as Identified in the FY 91-92 Budget for \$31,591.68

**APPROVED.**

C-13 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement Between Tri Met and Multnomah County Developmental Disabilities Program as Identified in FY 91-92 Budget for \$360,000

APPROVED.

REGULAR AGENDA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

R-1 PUBLIC HEARING and Board Review in the Matter of ORDER 91-75 Approved by the Board May 16, 1991 Requesting Approval to Transfer 60 Tax Foreclosed Properties to Northeast Community Development Corporation

STAFF ADVISED OF DISCREPANCIES IN SUBMITTED LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS, LOCATIONS AND ASSESSED VALUES. FOLLOWING STAFF AND BOARD DISCUSSION, PUBLIC TESTIMONY AND A RECESS, STAFF PROVIDED CORRECTED LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS, LOCATIONS AND ASSESSED VALUES FOR 10 PROPERTIES. THE BOARD AMENDED AND APPROVED RESOLUTION 91-85 IN THE MATTER OF APPROVING A REQUEST TO TRANSFER 60 TRACTS OF LAND TO NORTHEAST COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION FOR THE NEHEMIAH HOUSING OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM.

R-2 In the Matter of Request for Adoption of Procedures and Criteria to Enact Ordinance 672: Housing Affordability Demonstration Project

STAFF EXPLAINED STATUTORY TIMELINE FOR SALE OF TAX FORECLOSED PROPERTIES AND ADVISED NOVEMBER, 1991 IS THE EARLIEST A SHERIFF'S SALE COULD BE HELD. STAFF DESCRIBED EFFORTS TOWARDS SETTING UP ENHANCED MAINTENANCE PROGRAM AND DISCUSSED COST OF MAINTENANCE FOR FORECLOSED PROPERTIES. VICE-CHAIR BAUMAN ADVISED HE WILL BE SUBMITTING AN AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE 672 WHICH PROPOSES TO EXEMPT COMMERCIAL PROPERTY AND NON-RESIDENTIAL LOTS TO ALLOW COUNTY TO SELL SMALL LOTS AND PROVIDE REVENUE FOR MAINTENANCE. DEPARTMENT STAFF TO MEET WITH VICE-CHAIR BAUMAN STAFF TO DISCUSS PROPOSED APPEAL PROCESS TO ALLOW CASE BY CASE EXEMPTION FLEXIBILITY DURING DEMONSTRATION PERIOD. REQUEST APPROVED.

R-3 First Reading of an ORDINANCE Related to a Change in Fees and Amending Chapter 8.10 of the Multnomah County Code

FIRST READING APPROVED. SECOND READING SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1991.

R-4 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Metropolitan Services District and Multnomah County for the Transfer of \$16,000 to Metro as Multnomah County's Share of Phase 3 Costs of the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program

**APPROVED.**

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

R-5 ORDER in the Matter of Cancelling Uncollectable Personal Property Taxes, 1981 through 1987

**ORDER 91-86 APPROVED.**

R-6 RESOLUTION in the Matter of Endorsing HB 3559, a 2 cent Increase in Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax for the Next Four Years to Meet Projected Long-Term Transportation Needs

**LEGISLATION PASSED, ITEM TABLED.**

SERVICE DISTRICTS

(Recess as the Board of County Commissioners and convene as the Governing Body of the Central County Service District No. 3)

R-7 ORDER in the Matter of Setting a Date for Election to Consider the Dissolution of Central County Service District No. 3

**ORDER 91-87 APPROVED.**

(Recess as the Governing Body of the Central County Service District No. 3 and reconvene as the Board of County Commissioners)

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

R-8 RESOLUTION in the Matter of Implementation of the Multnomah County Community Children and Youth Services Commission Comprehensive Plan for FY 1991-1993

**RESOLUTION 91-88 APPROVED.**

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

R-9 First Reading of an ORDINANCE Relating to Abolishing the Department of General Services, Repealing MCC 2.30.450, Amending MCC 2.30.200, and Assigning Certain Functions to the Department of Environmental Services and to the County Chair's Office

**STAFF TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL AMENDMENT CONCERNING \$75,000 RESTORATION TO CHAIR'S BUDGET. FIRST READING APPROVED. SECOND READING SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1991.**

R-10 In the Matter of a RESOLUTION to Adopt Dates Certain to Accommodate the Space Needs of the Courts

**RESOLUTION 91-89 APPROVED AS AMENDED. STAFF DIRECTED TO FOLLOW COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES MANUAL RULES CONCERNING NUMBERING**

AND DATING PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS, ORDERS AND ORDINANCES.

---

VICE-CHAIR BAUMAN ADVISED HE AND STAFF WILL RELOCATE TO OFFICE SPACE ON THE SECOND FLOOR OF THE MEAD BUILDING.

---

Thursday, June 20, 1990 - 1:30 PM  
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

PUBLIC HEARING

Review and Hearing Before the Multnomah County Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission on the 1991-92 Annual Budgets for Multnomah County and the Multnomah County Service Districts

REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND PUBLIC HEARING HELD PURSUANT TO ORS 294.605-705.

0152C/1-7/dr



# MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
ROOM 606, COUNTY COURTHOUSE  
1021 S.W. FOURTH AVENUE  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

GLADYS McCOY •	CHAIR	• 248-3308
PAULINE ANDERSON •	DISTRICT 1	• 248-5220
GARY HANSEN •	DISTRICT 2	• 248-5219
RICK BAUMAN •	DISTRICT 3	• 248-5217
SHARRON KELLEY •	DISTRICT 4	• 248-5213
CLERK'S OFFICE •		• 248-3277

## AGENDA

### MEETINGS OF THE MULTNOMAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

#### FOR THE WEEK OF

June 17 - 21, 1991

- Tuesday, June 18, 1991 - 9:30 AM - Board Briefings. . . .Page 2
- Tuesday, June 18, 1991 - 10:45 AM - Agenda Review . . . .Page 2
- Tuesday, June 18, 1991 - 1:30 PM - Board Briefings. . . .Page 2
- Thursday, June 20, 1991 - 9:30 AM - Regular Meeting . . . .Page 2

Thursday Meetings of the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners are recorded and can be seen at the following times:

- Thursday, 10:00 PM, Channel 11 for East and West side subscribers
- Friday, 6:00 PM, Channel 27 for Paragon Cable (Multnomah East) subscribers
- Saturday 12:00 PM, Channel 21 for East Portland and East County subscribers

Tuesday, June 18, 1991 - 9:30 AM  
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

BOARD BRIEFINGS

1. Update on Childrens Justice Task Force. Presented by Hank Miggins, Elaine Cogan. TIME CERTAIN 9:30-10:30 AM
  2. Briefing on Proposed Resolution to Establish City and County Joint Meetings to Examine Service Provision and Efficiencies for Possible Adoption on June 27, 1991. Presented by Maureen Leonard. TIME CERTAIN 10:30-10:45 AM
- 

Tuesday, June 18, 1991 - 10:45 AM  
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

AGENDA REVIEW

3. Review of Agenda for Regular Meeting of June 20, 1991
- 

BOARD BRIEFINGS

Tuesday June 18, 1991 - 1:30 PM  
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

4. Briefing on Critical Issues: Multnomah County Mental Health Administration. Presented by Commissioner Sharron Kelley and directors of the major mental health centers. TIME CERTAIN 1:30 - 3:00 PM
- 

Thursday, June 20, 1991 - 9:30 AM  
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

10-YEAR EMPLOYEE AWARD RECOGNITION CEREMONY

TIME CERTAIN 9:30 AM

RECEPTION TO FOLLOW

---

Thursday, June 20, 1991 - 9:30 AM  
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

REGULAR MEETING

CONSENT CALENDAR

JUSTICE SERVICES

SHERIFF'S OFFICE

- C-1 Ratification of Renewal of Existing Intergovernmental Agreement between Multnomah County and the City of Wood Village enabling the Sheriff's Office to Provide General Law Enforcement Services and Additional Patrols within the Corporate Limits of the City of Wood Village.

SHERIFF'S OFFICE - continued

C-2 Ratification of Intergovernmental Agreement with U.S. Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, to Continue the Lease of Biddle Butte Property Microwave Radio Station Site, effective date 7-01-91, termination date 6-30-92.

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

C-3 In the Matter of Appointment of Gregory J. Wolley to the Parks Advisory Committee - term expires 12/93.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

C-4 Ratification of Amendment #2 Revenue Intergovernmental Agreement between Aging Services Division and State Senior and Disabled Services Division which adds \$63,640 to Achieve a new Contract level of \$8,769,192 in Federal, Federal/State, and State funding for Aging Services Division administration, long term care case management, in home services, meals, district service centers, legal assistance, transportation, mental health services, and minority services.

C-5 Ratification of Amendment #1 Intergovernmental Agreement with Tri Met and Aging Services Division adding \$25,000 in Federal Older Americans Act Funds for the Purchase of an Additional 6,544 Rides to Doctors, Grocery Stores, and Meal Sites for Transportation of Handicapped Elderly.

C-6 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement between Portland Community College, Portland Employment Project and Multnomah County Developmental Disabilities Program as Identified in FY 91-92 Budget for \$24,888.

C-7 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement between the Gresham School District and the Multnomah County Youth Program Office as Identified in the FY 91-92 Budget for \$16,670.

C-8 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement between Portland Public School District #1 and the Multnomah County Youth Program Office as Identified in the FY 91-92 Budget for \$172,354.

C-9 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement between the Multnomah Education Service District and the Multnomah County Youth Program Office as identified in the FY 91-92 Budget for \$11,907.

C-10 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Portland Parks and Recreation Bureau and Multnomah County Developmental Disabilities Program as Identified in the FY 91-92 Budget for \$18,790.80.

C-11 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement between the Oregon Commission for the Blind and Multnomah County developmental Disabilities Program as Identified in the FY 91-92 for \$287,322.60.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES - continued

- C-12 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement between the Oregon Health Sciences University, Child Development Rehabilitation Center and Multnomah County Developmental Disabilities Program as identified in the FY 91-92 Budget for \$31,591.68.
- C-13 Ratification of Renewal of Annual Intergovernmental Agreement Between Tri Met and Multnomah County Developmental Disabilities Program as Identified in FY 91-92 Budget for \$360,000.

REGULAR AGENDA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

- R-1 PUBLIC HEARING and Board Review in the Matter of ORDER 91-75 Approved by the Board May 16, 1991 Requesting Approval to Transfer 60 Tax Foreclosed Properties to Northeast Community Development Corporation. (Continued from June 13, 1991) TIME CERTAIN 10:15 AM
- R-2 In the Matter of Request for Adoption of Procedures and Criteria to Enact Ordinance 672: Housing Affordability Demonstration Project. (Continued from June 13, 1991)
- R-3 First Reading of an ORDINANCE Related to a Change in Fees and Amending Chapter 8.10 of the Multnomah County Code
- R-4 Ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Metropolitan Services District and Multnomah County for the Transfer of \$16,000 to Metro as Multnomah County's Share of Phase 3 Costs of the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program. (Continued from June 13, 1991)

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

- R-5 ORDER in the Matter of Cancelling Uncollectable Personal Property Taxes, 1981 through 1987
- R-6 RESOLUTION in the Matter of Endorsing HB 3559, a 2 cent Increase in Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax for the Next Four Years to Meet Projected Long-Term Transportation Needs

SERVICE DISTRICTS

(Recess as the Board of County Commissioners and convene as the Governing Body of the Central County Service District No. 3.)

- R-7 ORDER in the Matter of Setting a Date for Election to Consider the dissolution of Central County Service District No. 3.

(Recess as the Governing Body of the Central County Service District No. 3 and reconvene as the Board of County Commissioners)

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

R-8 RESOLUTION in the Matter of Implementation of the Multnomah County Community Children and Youth Services Commission Comprehensive Plan for FY 1991-1993.

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

R-9 First Reading of an ORDINANCE Relating to Abolishing the Department of General Services, Repealing MCC 2.30.450, Amending MCC 2.30.200, and Assigning Certain Functions to the Department of Environmental Services and to the County Chair's Office.

R-10 In the Matter of a RESOLUTION to Adopt Dates Certain to Accommodate the Space Needs of the Courts.

0103C/50-54  
cap



# MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
ROOM 606, COUNTY COURTHOUSE  
1021 S.W. FOURTH AVENUE  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

GLADYS McCOY • CHAIR • 248-3308  
PAULINE ANDERSON • DISTRICT 1 • 248-5220  
GARY HANSEN • DISTRICT 2 • 248-5219  
RICK BAUMAN • DISTRICT 3 • 248-5217  
SHARRON KELLEY • DISTRICT 4 • 248-5213  
CLERK'S OFFICE • 248-3277

## SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

Thursday, June 20, 1990 - 1:30 PM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

## PUBLIC HEARING

Review and Hearing on the 1991-92 Annual Budgets for the Multnomah County and County Service Districts Before the Multnomah County Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission.

0103C/55  
cap



June 7, 1991

**MULTNOMAH COUNTY CHILDREN'S JUSTICE TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEE  
DRAFT REPORT**

**Background**

In October, 1990, Multnomah County Chair, Gladys McCoy, convened a Children's Justice Task Force consisting of the following:

Gladys McCoy, Chair; Judge Linda Bergman, Arlene Collins, Paul Duong, Don Fraizer, David Fuks, Muriel Goldman, Bonnie Hays, Darlene Hooley, County Commissioner Sharron Kelley, Wally Mehrens, Don Rocks, District Attorney Mike Schrunk, Sheriff Bob Skipper, Fred Stickle, Maria Tenorio, Bruce Watts and Don Welch. The consultant for the Task Force is Elaine Cogan, partner, Cogan Sharpe Cogan.

The previous month, the voters had defeated a proposed \$23.4 million County general obligation bond measure to build new juvenile detention quarters and facilities for courts, district attorney, programs and administration on the site of the present Donald E. Long Home.

The ballot measure followed an evaluation of the JDH complex by consulting architects and engineers that was coordinated by County staff. Their unanimous conclusion was to recommend that a new building complex replace the existing 41 year-old facility. The charge to the Task Force from Chair McCoy was as follows:

1. Consider the immediate situation the County faces and the options offered. Develop and select short-term option(s).
2. Discuss and develop recommendations concerning how to deal with the intermediate JDH situation (2-5 years). Issues to consider: how to make JDH safer; how to provide convenient and most effective delivery of services.
3. Discuss and develop a process to explore long-term solutions concerning children's justice issues in Multnomah County.

After meeting on October 16, November 14, December 6, December 13, 1990; and January 9, January 16, January 23, and February 13, 1991, the Task Force made these findings:

## Current Uses

The original facility, built in 1949-50 and remodeled in 1964, houses the following:

Three detention units, with a total capacity of 62, including nine beds leased by Clackamas and Washington Counties. Detainees are housed for these purposes:

- ♦ Pre-adjudication: hold pending trial; as many released as possible, but alternative facilities in community not always available.
- ♦ Parole/probation violation

One unit, with a capacity of 20, is set aside for the Multnomah County AITP 30-day program for chronic parole violators.

Two units, capacity 40, are for state programs, Project Picture and Juvenile Correction Reception Center (may be removed July 1).

Other uses of JDH are:

- ♦ Courts: average 155 cases/week dependency and delinquency cases; 1 judge, 2.5 referees
- ♦ District attorney: 18 employees, including 7 attorneys
- ♦ Counseling including probation, adjudication, intake
- ♦ Programs: schooling, medical, alcohol & drug treatment, employment, restitution/community services
- ♦ Administration: intake, court services, dependency

## Deficiencies

The Task Force found numerous inadequacies in the present structure and its systems that cannot be corrected by remodeling.

1. Detention facilities do not meet either the standards required by Oregon Revised Statutes or standards for housing juveniles of the American Corrections Association.
2. Repeated grand jury reports have noted many detention-related inadequacies over the last decade and more.
3. Heating, cooling, electrical and plumbing systems serving the detention units are in many instances beyond the point of maintenance or effective repair.
4. Any substantive change in these systems or partial remodeling to address deficiencies in detention would necessitate wholesale refurbishment to meet present codes at a cost comparable to new construction.

5. Even if such extensive remodeling were to be undertaken, detention facilities and the complex as a whole would retain the programmatic deficiencies and limitations inherent in the existing long linear footprint. Among other problems, this configuration compromises the physical security of both the juvenile clients and the staff.
6. A class action civil rights suit challenging the conditions of detention and requesting the courts to take over the facility and order Multnomah County to make physical and structural changes has been filed in the United States District Court. While intervention by the courts is always a possibility, it may be deterred by evidence that Multnomah County is aware of the problems and taking steps to ameliorate them.
7. All the other users of the building ... courts, district attorney, programs and administration ... are in crowded, inadequate space.
8. The present 10-acre site can accommodate the new detention facilities designed for the 1990 bond measure. Detention can be operated independently of the other users.

#### Subcommittee

In March, 1990, Chair McCoy appointed a Children's Justice Task Force Subcommittee to look into the matter further and make findings and recommendations. Members include Muriel Goldman, Hank Miggins, Bob Nilsen, Don Rocks, Fred Stickel, Bruce Watts, and Don Welch. Elaine Cogan is consultant/facilitator.

The subcommittee agreed to endorse these principles of the children's justice system in the three-county area; a humane and rehabilitative system that safeguards the rights and well-being of juveniles in custody, consistent with the safety and protection of the detainees, staff and the general public. During regular meetings between March and May, the subcommittee reviewed the aforementioned findings and submits the following recommendations to the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners:

#### Short-term (June - September, 1990)

1. Due to the clear and present need to replace the juvenile detention portions of the JDH complex, expenditures to maintain the present facilities should be no greater than necessary to temporarily and humanely house and care for the needs and safety of juvenile detainees and institutional staff.
2. Multnomah County should initiate the framework for a children's justice master planning process that includes all

the key individuals and interests in the tri-county area -- youth serving organizations, law enforcement, plaintiffs, governments and the citizenry.

3. Retain the contributed consulting services from the National Center for Juvenile Justice for help in developing the planning process and timetable and monitoring its programs.

#### Intermediate (September, 1991 - March, 1992)

1. Undertake the planning process noted above.
2. During the absence of a long-range planning process, expend only the minimum amount of funds necessary to keep the present detention facility operable, safe and secure. However, in the time schedule for action, give priority to new or remodeled detention over other services.
3. The children's justice planning process should be the vehicle for determining whether the facility should a) serve detention needs only; or b) have additional room for the courts, district attorney's staff, juvenile court counsellors, and other services.

#### Long-range (March - May, 1992)

1. Present to the voters a comprehensive plan for children's justice services related to JDH with a budget that is the least costly and most practical and politically feasible. The first funding priority should be the detention facilities.
2. Explore the possibility of some funding from Metro and/or Washington and Clackamas Counties in addition to Multnomah County's obvious contribution.
3. Increase the general awareness that detention facilities at JDH serve Clackamas and Washington Counties as well as Multnomah by re-naming the facility the Donald E. Long Regional Juvenile Home or a semantically acceptable equivalent.

Meeting Date: JUN 18 1991

Agenda No.: B #2

(Above space for Clerk's Office Use)

AGENDA PLACEMENT FORM  
(For Non-Budgetary Items)

SUBJECT: City County Joint Meetings

AGENDA REVIEW/  
BOARD BRIEFING Tuesday, June 18, 1991 REGULAR MEETING \_\_\_\_\_  
(date) (date)

DEPARTMENT Nondepartmental DIVISION Board of County Commissioners

CONTACT Maureen Leonard TELEPHONE 248-5076

PERSON(S) MAKING PRESENTATION Maureen Leonard

ACTION REQUESTED:

INFORMATIONAL ONLY  POLICY DIRECTION  APPROVAL

ESTIMATED TIME NEEDED ON BOARD AGENDA: 20 minutes

CHECK IF YOU REQUIRE OFFICIAL WRITTEN NOTICE OF ACTION TAKEN: \_\_\_\_\_

BRIEF SUMMARY (include statement of rationale for action requested, as well as personnel and fiscal/budgetary impacts, if applicable):

Briefing on proposed Resolution to establish city and county joint meetings to examine service provision and efficiencies for possible adoption on June 27, 1991

(If space is inadequate, please use other side)

SIGNATURES:

ELECTED OFFICIAL Rick Bauman

Or

DEPARTMENT MANAGER \_\_\_\_\_

(All accompanying documents must have required signatures)

**DRAFT**

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

In the matter of calling for )  
joint meetings with the City of ) RESOLUTION  
Portland to decide on local )  
government services )

WHEREAS, Multnomah County and the City of Portland have mutual interests in providing services in an efficient and cost-effective manner; and

WHEREAS, the budgets for fiscal year 1991-92 include one time only appropriations of approximately \$16 million for the city and \$2 million for the county; and

WHEREAS, the county intends to enact an increase in the Business Income Tax that will sunset in two years; and

WHEREAS, "Resolution A," dated March 15, 1983 began but did not complete the process of identifying the most appropriate provider of services as between the city and the county; and

WHEREAS, immediate and foreseeable fiscal constraints present the opportunity to move forward with an examination and identification of how, how much and by whom government services best may be provided;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that:

(1) The Board of County Commissioners and the City Council will meet in joint session on Wednesday, September 4, 1991 to begin the process of identifying city and county services that should be merged, transferred or discontinued;

(2) The Board of County Commissioners and the City Council will complete this effort at a final meeting on Wednesday, December 4, 1991. Decisions resulting from this effort will be incorporated into the budgets of the respective governments to be prepared for fiscal year 1992-93;

(3) An outside consultant, mutually agreed upon by the two governments, will facilitate the joint government meetings.

(4) This effort will be staffed by a work group of six members as follows: one delegate from the budget office, the executive's office and one commissioner's office from each of the governments.

Page 2 - Resolution re: City/County Joint Meetings

(5) Prior to the initial meeting on September 4, each commission will meet to develop its agenda for the joint government meetings.

(6) Any costs associated with this decision-making process will be shared equally by the city and the county.

ADOPTED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gladys McCoy, Chair  
Multnomah County, Oregon

REVIEWED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Laurence Kressel, County Counsel  
of Multnomah County, Oregon

Commissioner  
Anderson 6/18/91  
Submission

DRAFT 5- 10- 91 SUPPORT SERVICES

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
OF MULTNOMAH COUNTY

In the Matter of Efficiencies in ) RESOLUTION  
Local Government Support Services )

WHEREAS, voters approved Ballot Measure 5 authorizing a limit on property taxes for state and local governments.

WHEREAS, the County Commission and Portland City Council have approved budgets for the 1991-2 fiscal year which incorporate reductions in administration, programs, and materials and services, fee increases, and the use of one time only money.

WHEREAS, fiscal prudence and policy considerations dictate that local governments continue to seek efficiencies in government operations.

WHEREAS, the Chair and Board endorsed the joint recommendations of the Managers and Bureau Directors, and the Chair directed Managers to implement the suggestions. These suggestions will be incorporated in the 1991-92 budget.

WHEREAS, in areas of support services where City and County government perform the same functions or offer similar services, efficiencies through consolidation or joint operations are possible.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County and interested Cities will work with Portland State University and the business community to develop a Local Government Efficiency Committee to study the most cost effective method to provide services. The areas to study are those where more than one local government now provides the same or similar function. Those Support Services include:

- Personnel/Employee Relations
- Purchasing
- Contract Administration
- Records Management and Police and Corrections Records
- Facilities Management
- Fleet
- Data Processing
- Distribution
- Printing

The County and participating cities will review the recommendations of the Group by December 31, 1991. The governments will attempt to realize savings in these areas through attrition, rather than laying off current staff.

ADOPTED THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF MAY, 1991.

(SEAL)

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

By \_\_\_\_\_

Gladys McCoy, Chair

REVIEWED

\_\_\_\_\_  
Laurence Kressel, County Counsel

2290 1/2

5-7 91



B-4 6/18/91  
Submission

# DRAFT

JUNE 5, 1991

TO: GLADYS McCOY, CHAIR  
 MULTNOMAH BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
 PAULINE ANDERSON  
 RICK BAUMAN  
 GARY HANSEN  
 SHARON KELLEY

FROM: THE BOARDS OF DIRECTORS OF:  
 GARLINGTON CENTER, N/NE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH  
 CENTER FOR COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH\*  
 DELAUNAY MENTAL HEALTH CENTER\*  
 MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES WEST  
 MORRISON CENTER FOR YOUTH AND FAMILY SERVICES  
 MT. HOOD COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTER  
 SOUTHEAST MENTAL HEALTH NETWORK  
 METRO EMERGENCY SERVICES

SUBJECT: CRITICAL ISSUES: MULTNOMAH COUNTY  
 MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

Over the past two months, the Boards of Directors of the major mental health centers which contract with Multnomah County have been meeting to identify common concerns. The result is the enclosed position paper which we submit to you in the hope that it will begin a process of dialogue and result in real and specific improvements in the mental health system of Multnomah County.

Our Boards have endorsed this position paper, representing some 150 individuals who are actively involved in mental health leadership in our community. We represent a broad range of interests including mental health professionals, consumers and community.

We are submitting this paper at a time when the County is reviewing the leadership and the organization of its Department of Human Resources. We think that this document will be helpful to this review. It is also a time of budgetary cutbacks and this forms the background to our recommendations.

In summary our key points are:

1. There are structural problems in the current overlap of administrative levels of management. We recommend a review to determine the best way to structure mental health services administration in the County.
2. In the current system there exists much confusion of role definition in the "partnership" relationship that was mandated by the Board of County Commissioners. We recommend that a collaborative partnership model be re-established.
3. A number of immediate problems exist which undermine the integrity and efficacy of the mental health system. Specific recommendations are made.

\*Board approval of this white paper is pending but will be determined prior to June 12, 1991.

To Multnomah Board of County Commissioners  
June 5, 1991

page two--

4. There are long-term, unresolved issues. These lead to our recommendation for a strategic planning process to address, in depth, the mission, values and goals of our community mental health system.

We have asked to be on the informal agenda of the Board of County Commissioners as soon as possible to discuss these issues with you.

Our hope is that the Board of County Commissioners will review the issues presented and direct a formal process to resolve these issues. We are prepared to commit our resources (staffing, Board involvement and funding) to this process.

cc: Gary Smith  
Rex Surface

**DRAFT**

**CRITICAL ISSUES**

**MULTNOMAH COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION**

A White Paper  
prepared for the Multnomah  
Board of County Commissioners

by

The Boards of Directors  
and Staff  
of Community Mental Health Centers

Garlington Center, N/NE Community Mental Health  
Center for Community Mental Health\*  
Delaunay Mental Health Center\*  
Mental Health Services West  
Morrison Center for Youth and Family Services  
Mt. Hood Community Mental Health Center  
Southeast Mental Health Network  
Metro Emergency Services

\*Board review and possible approval  
of this white paper is scheduled  
for June 12, 1991.

**JUNE 1991**

## STRUCTURAL ISSUES

A series of critical issues call for policy review by the Multnomah Board of County Commissioners. It is our intention to identify critical issues and recommendations for collaborative problem-solving between provider agencies and the County Social Services Administration.

### I. ADMINISTRATIVE LAYERS:

#### COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH FUNDING PASSES THROUGH THREE LAYERS OF ADMINISTRATION: STATE, COUNTY, AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS.

In Multnomah County, state general funds pass through three administrative and cost layers which attempt to manage community mental health services: the State Mental Health Division, the County Social Services Division and Community Mental Health Centers. County general funds also pass through the latter two layers. This is inefficient and leads to conflict.

There are several options which should be considered.

#### Model A: Centralize Administration from Community to County.

In the early 1980's, Multnomah County divested itself of direct mental health services delivery and established quadrant community mental health centers to manage mental health care on a decentralized basis (D. Lawrence White Paper, 1981). In the past five years, the intended role of core service agencies has been vitiated and eroded. The county continues to provide direct services and, in some areas, has significantly expanded direct services. The county has added staff to manage care and to expand children's mental health services. Contrary to the original concept, county administration also has expanded.

If the county elects to expand administration or resume direct delivery of services, it has the authority to do so. However, this revision in role should be done by deliberate policy rather than bureaucratic accretion. Furthermore, a full cost impact study should occur before this alternative is adopted since county salary and benefit packages would add to the cost of services.

#### Model B: Reduce County Administration

Multnomah County spends more than a million dollars to administer mental health services. Essentially, there is a layer of county administration between state and community mental health centers. Two cost-savings alternatives should be considered:

1. The first alternative would have the county retain its role as the mental health authority, but with a more focused role. In this model the county would retain responsibility for contracting and contract compliance. However, in the areas of planning, quality assurance, and mental health policy the county would work cooperatively with the community through the non-profit Boards and their appointed leadership.

2. A second alternative would be to create a separate mental health authority. This non-profit entity would be appointed by the Board of County Commissioners with representation from community mental health program Boards, consumers, mental health professionals and citizens-at-large. It would be responsible for overall planning, allocation of state/county resources, and contracting for services.

### **Model C: Reduce State Administration and Regulation:**

In a concept paper called a "trial balloon" the state mental health division suggests block granting mental health funds to the counties. This seductive idea would deregulate much of mental health services, giving major control over service delivery to the counties. Deregulation would save the 30% of staff time that is spent on state required paperwork.

On the negative side, block granting could absolve the state of responsibility for cutting services and leave full responsibility for service priorities in the hands of the counties who have little taxing authority. Multnomah County could suffer more severely than others. We are most at risk of seeing block grants cut and an increasing demand for services. The state has legal responsibility for funding and regulating mental health services .

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. We recommend the Commission staff and provider Boards examine the three policy options identified above and formulate recommendations for consideration by the Multnomah County Commission.
2. We recommend Model B, as producing the greatest savings without adverse effect on the mental health system.

### **II. ROLE DEFINITION:**

#### **UNCLEAR ROLE DEFINITION HAS ERODED WORKING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN COUNTY STAFF AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS**

Although both sides have good intentions, there is recurrent conflict and mistrust. The acute care planning process in early 1990 illustrated a conflict in relationship between county staff and community mental health center management. The Board of Commissioners intervened and an excellent plan eventually was developed. Despite that one positive outcome the problem of relationship remains.

At the culmination of the acute care planning process the Board of Commissioners re-asserted that the relationship between county and community mental health centers should be one of *partnership*. However, the partnership exists in name only. Although County staff solicit input from individual providers and many meetings and work groups are organized, key management and planning decisions are made unilaterally. Provider agencies are put in the frustrating position of objecting and seeming to obstruct progress.

There are three areas which illustrate difficulties in relationship.

1. County social services need a clear, explicit vision of their mission and role. The absence of a clear delineation of the county's and the providers' roles, the county's recent effort to hire "care managers" creates a potential conflict with community providers who already are involved in *managing care* within the communities they serve. The county should reconsider its recent emphasis on managed care in collaboration with providers to clarify appropriate roles and minimize duplication.
2. County staff often refer to providers as contractors driven by self interest, as though providers are for-profit businesses rather than community agencies. We have directing Boards which represent communities and consumers. In fact our Boards and advisory committees represent a broad range of advocates and consumers.
3. It is evident that there are clear lines of disagreement about what kind of relationship should exist between county and community mental health centers. The county administration's view of the relationship is as a simple contract relationship wherein the county sets the course and providers deliver the service. The alternative view is a collaborative partners relationship. Centers should be considered an extension of the County Mental Health Program and trusted colleagues. Such a relationship should be characterized as mutually supportive, collaborative and flexible in delivering and improving services.

The community mental health centers are concerned that the county approach discounts the valuable impact of our agencies' clients as consumers and our Board members as citizens.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

A collaborative partnership needs to be re-established between county administration and the community mental health centers. The Board of Commissioners declared that this was their intent when quadrants and community mental health centers were established; this intention has been recently reaffirmed. Unless the Board of County Commissioners plans to change this philosophy, the county administration should be held accountable to follow previous Board intent.

### **SYSTEM PROBLEMS**

#### **III. IMMEDIATE PROBLEMS:**

##### **AS A RESULT OF STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS, CRISES ARE NOW EMERGING WHICH CAN SERIOUSLY DESTABILIZE THE SYSTEM.**

- A. The Acute Care System Plan needs to be re-examined in light of Measure 5. The acute care service system as originally visualized can no longer be implemented because budget cuts must be expected. A revised plan is needed.
- B. Increasing demand for Dammasch hospital beds and the failure of the state's plan to buy local beds for hospital diversion has created a threat to community mental health funding. Because the state has not been able to control spending

for Dammasch diversion beds, they have now laid the problem in the lap of Multnomah County, threatening to cut community mental health outpatient funds if high bed utilization is not stopped. In effect, the state seems to be saying that community mental health centers must manage state hospital utilization. Since neither the county nor the providers can control the hospitals, this is an impossible task.

- C. There is a growing problem of inequity in salaries and benefits between county and provider staff. Non-profit agency salaries are determined by slot rates set in state service contracts. These slot rates are reinforced by the county in children's mental health because the county uses some of its general funds to duplicate the state slot rate system. We are not suggesting that salaries and benefits should be equal between county and non-profit agencies. However, the extent of the current inequity is intolerable, especially for comparable positions.
- D. Multnomah County's policy of re-issuing contracts periodically (five years) for competitive bid needs to be re-examined. In our estimate, the county should clearly state its purpose(s) in reissuing contracts for all social services and devise a plan to fulfill that purpose(s) in collaboration with existing providers and potential bidders. It has been asserted by county mental health administration that this is a state requirement. Oregon Revised Statutes do not require periodic reissuing of RFP's (ORS 279.015); this statute simply gives authority to counties to issue RFP's. Different purposes have been offered as the rationale for reissuing at different times. The most recent reason for re-issuing was that opportunities must be made available for potential bidders. If this issue of fairness is the true rationale for reissuing, it follows logically that county direct services should be reissued for RFP also. However, county administration has indicated that it will exempt county direct services from this requirement.

Also in collaboration with existing providers and potential bidders, the county administration should consider strategies to ameliorate the serious costs involved in reissuing contracts for periodic bidding. These costs include:

- Disruption in continuity of client care;
- Time taken away from direct service to clients to produce RFP applications; time and dollars from county staff to implement RFP;
- Increased competition among providers (including county) and the corresponding loss of needed collaboration;
- Lost incentive for long-term investments by agencies in program development, capital expenditures, and staff training;
- Destabilization of provider agencies;
- Reduction in staff morale for the professionals serving our clients; increased turnover.

Finally, the county should weigh these and other potential costs against the benefits of periodic rebidding. Any analysis of potential benefits will require an articulation of the intended purpose or rationale for periodic rebidding.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

We recommend that the County, the providers, and potential bidders review the entire contract management issue and make recommendations as to how the issues involved can be addressed in order to build a stable and accountable ~~contracting process.~~

*human service system*

**IV. UNRESOLVED LONG-TERM ISSUES**

In addition to immediate problems, there are long-standing issues that must be resolved.

1. Should the county be a direct provider of services?
2. Is county committed to community-based service?
3. How should citizen input be operationalized?
4. What is the appropriate role of consumers in planning and maintaining mental health services?
5. How should the county contract for services?
6. What is the authority of the County Purchasing Department relative to the Social Service Division?
7. How is the quality of services assured and according to what standards? What is a constructive county role in this area?
8. How can the utilization of state hospital beds be managed?
8. How can we balance regulatory requirements with provision of services?

**RESOLUTION OF ISSUES**

**V. PLANNING RECOMMENDATIONS**

The many systems problems identified in Section III, IV, V can best be resolved by collaborative planning. Better planning is needed, not more planning. Although there have been many attempts at planning efforts initiated by state agencies and county administration, these efforts have lacked depth, focus, inclusiveness and commitment. The focus typically is not on core or primary issues of structure, mission or goals; rather, the focus is on secondary issues such as target populations and gaps in service. Often, it appears that the planning process is perfunctory, designed to fulfill an obligation.

We urge the county to commit to a formal *strategic planning process*. Several of the provider agencies have initiated such processes within their agencies recently. A formal strategic planning process, widely used in corporate America, is substantially different from what has occurred in our county. Such a model requires a commitment in time, energy and money. The process itself

is challenging because it raises fundamental questions which often threaten the status quo.

A strategic planning process begins by assembling an inclusive audience to address, in depth, the mission, the values, and the goals. These are fundamental issues that largely have been avoided in this county with respect to social services. When these issues are unclear, it only can be expected that unnecessary controversy and costly inefficiencies will occur. Once we have formalized the mission, values, and goals, we need to address role definition for county administration and provider agencies, as well as implementation strategies.

A national consultant with knowledge of mental health systems and with a long-term perspective on system development should be brought to Multnomah County to review our service system. The consultant should be asked to identify strengths and weaknesses and recommend a process for strengthening the system.

B-4 6/18/91  
Submission

MEMORANDUM

18 June 1991

TO: Multnomah County Commissioners  
FROM: Doug Montgomery, Ph.D. and  
member of several Department of Human Services  
boards and committees/task groups

RE: Mental Health Services Working Session today

I applaud the interest of the more than 150 private citizens who serve as members of Boards of Directors of current county mental health provider contractor groups. The fact that they want to improve mental health services and to participate in this work is to be lauded.

I plan to encourage sending our Child and Adolescent Mental Health group's final report to each Board member and request their individual advocacy in seeking additional funding from all governmental levels, federal, state, and local, for improved mental health services for children and adolescents and their families.

I hope you will thank them for their support and also seek their additional talents to serve human services programs in the county. I would like to challenge them to participate in this important public-private partnership.