

# Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

P.O. Box 1318  
Merlin, Oregon 97532  
541-471-8271

Email: [hugo@jeffnet.org](mailto:hugo@jeffnet.org)

Web Page: <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/>  
PSS Archives Index #48

September 23, 2016 Letter/Email

Arthur O'Hare, Budget Officer, &  
Josephine County Budget Committee  
500 NW 6th Street  
Grants Pass, OR 97526  
541-474-5255  
Email: [aohare@co.josephine.or.us](mailto:aohare@co.josephine.or.us)



Subject: Share Information About Josephine County's (JO CO's) Budget Process & Justice System & Public Safety Services (JS&PSS) Problem/Issue (i.e., public safety issue)

Dear Author:

This is a continuing effort to meet with you since our January 20, 2016 letter/email to the JO CO Management Team (JOCOMT) as stakeholders in understanding JO CO's public safety issue (Appendix A). This time we specifically contact you as the Budget Officer, JO CO Budget Committee (JOCOBC), rather than as the Finance Director, JO CO Finance Department, because we have progressed in our research from seeking information to asking non-allocation and non-accounting budget process questions. We are still interested in meeting with you and the budget committee with an agenda of understanding the county's public safety issue's relationship with the budgeting process, and any budget public participation programs to improve public trust in government. We believe this would work best with the JOCOBC in the role of a standing fiscal advisory committee, rather than its approximately two-month budget approval committee role during the annual budget process.

As background, the Hugo JS&PSS Exploratory Committee has been actively studying the public safety issue since 2013. In 2015 we asked some specific PSS questions. *"What is Josephine County's Justice System & Public Safety Services Problem, . . . or Issue? First, What are the public safety services being referred to? Second, What is the issue? The third and final question, perhaps the most important question, is "Or, is there a problem, and if so, judged by what standards?"* We have been actively studying the JO CO budget process for about six months. Our preliminary budget process issues are documented in *Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process* (Walker & Whalen 2016; Appendix B). Some sample issues are provided in Appendix B2.

Our research effort on the public safety issue, as it evolved to include the budget process, started with the JOCOMT's August 19, 2014 recommendation for "Strengthening County Services." Part of that recommendation was a proposed strategy of identifying solutions to financing county services through a collaborative process involving the public and private sectors. This process had some specific tasks to accomplish, including the identification of State mandated county services at level of services (LOS) optimal, appropriate, and sustainable. Another task was to identify elective county services desired by the citizens of the county at LOS appropriate and sustainable. We were interested in the mandated and elective PSS programs and their LOS for the purpose of developing a minimally acceptable level of public safety services (MALPSS) analysis. The JOCOMT's recommendation was impressive backed up with its thoughtful rationale (Appendix D). Our interest resulted in a January 20, 2016 communication to the JOCOMT and our eventual March 7, 2016 meeting with it, which, unfortunately, you were not available to attend. At the meeting we were informed by the participating managers that any mandated,

necessary, and elective programs and associated LOS for their work units had been identified in the county's annual budget documents. The MT members had not offered any supplemental documentation to the JO CO Board of County Commissioners (BCC) as a result of Commissioner Cheryl Walker's urging of August 19, 2014 (Appendix D).

After studying the JO CO budget process, we found the county can be proud of its budget program to produce its annual budgets. Thank you JO CO: the budgets are legal, balanced, and the JO CO leaders of the budget process are a professional and honest team as evidenced by the county receiving the Government Finance Officers Association's (GFOA) Distinguished Budget Presentation Award.

We also think the JO CO budget leadership (i.e., BCC, other elected officials, JOCOBC, and JOCOMT), and the public will find some of our research facts on the budget interesting and, hopefully, useful (Appendix B). The analysis of the budget process lead to the identification of the budget issues, and our questions (Walker & Whalen 2016; Appendix B2). We view our requested meeting as an opportunity for you, the Budget Officer, and the JOCOBC, to correct us if we have inaccurately interpreted the JO BO budget process, the relationship of the annual budgets to the public safety issue, and/or budget process impacts to citizens wishing to participate in the process. This opportunity is for a meeting, or meetings, sometime in the next month for us to review the specific issues, and as needed to review the supporting analysis for you. It will take approximately two hours or more. After that time period we will move to finalize and publish our research (Walker & Whalen 2016).

Our preliminary conclusion is that we are no closer to answering two of our research questions: "*What is the issue? And "Or, is there a problem, and if so, judged by what standards?"*" The context of this position is about facts and standards, or in our opinion, the lack of them in defining the PSS. What are the major public safety issue facts? We believe the major known facts are the following: 1. JO CO's O&C passthrough revenue source has been significantly reduced, 2. there has been a significant reduction in county personnel, and 3. there has been a significant reduction in public services.

Of critical importance to us are publically available vetted facts for public issue processes and standards, which are used to make informed decisions by the public decision-makers, and their elected officials. The only vetted facts we are aware of on the public safety issue and public preferences and priorities are from Davis' research – *Citizen Perceptions of Public Safety Levies in Josephine County, Oregon: A Test of Group Engagement Theory* (Appendix C). For example, the JO CO budgets' and Bill Hunker's information on crime, county jail, Oregon State Police, etc. are all informative, and it would be outstanding if these position facts had vetted supporting studies.

It is bewildering to us why the JOCOBC and the BCC have not recommended or secured a grant(s) for a public safety study(s), through the budget process, to confirm JO CO government's professional and political opinions that there is a county public safety issue. While nothing is guaranteed, our sources indicate many political entities, including the State of Oregon, desire public solutions for the county, and grant funding is there for well thought-out, one-time, study proposals. For example, why hasn't the county corroborated its position as identified by the JO CO Local Public Safety Coordinating Council's (LPSCC) March 17, 2016 "opinion vote," without vetted facts, that a MALPSS either existed or one was imminent. Perhaps it is correct, perhaps not; we can not verify either position from the evidence. However, the majorities of JO CO citizens, that voted in the last four proposed levies from 2012 - 2015, probably do not believe, or trust the JO CO LPSCC's opinion as valid, nor supported by facts.

Understanding the MALPSS process and applying it for JO CO would help the voters of the county address the public safety issue. A scientific study to determine whether JO CO is providing a MALPSS would help answer the question, "*Is there a problem?"*" Answering this question is not about implementing HB 3453 by turning over PSS to the State which we do not support. It is about an

independent MALPSS grant study analysis as an educational tool to assist citizens understanding in a scientific documented way, versus relying solely on professional and/or political government opinions.

What are some facts that our budget process analysis revealed to us? The Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) identify some mandated PSS programs. However, we have come to the conclusion that there are very few ORS mandatory LOS, and therefore, very few identified in county budgets. From the JO CO FY 2007-08 - FY 2016-17 budget program summaries, it is difficult to impossible to verify which programs are mandatory, or elective. However, the majority of LOS in the PSS program budget summaries appear to be elective as determined by JO CO departments, even though the budget summaries suggest many are mandatory. A mandatory LOS might be a MALPSS, but we are not even sure of that. Therefore, we are also very interested in meeting with you and the JOCOBC to learn what can be shared about the budget process for the purposes of understanding mandated PSS programs versus mandated PSS LOS. Four of our web pages are very specific to our proposed meeting topics (Appendix B).

In summary, perhaps the most important idea to share with you is that the JOCOMT's August 19, 2014 recommended strategies for "Strengthening County Services" had correctly identified some significant budget process issues worth pursuing. First, and foremost, was the strategy of identifying solutions to financing county services through a collaborative process involving the public and private sectors. We feel the JOCOMT's recommendation has merit and should be comprehensively considered by the JOCOBC acting as a standing fiscal budget advisory committee through a strategic planning process applicable to future budgets (Appendix D).

Sincerely,

Mike and Jon :)

Mike Walker, Chair  
JS&PSS Exploratory Committee  
Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society  
P.O. Box 1318  
Merlin, Oregon 97532  
541-471-8271  
Email: hugo@jeffnet.org



Jon Whalen, Member  
JS&PSS Exploratory Committee  
Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society  
326 NE Josephine Street  
Grants Pass, Oregon 97526  
541-476-1595  
Email: bear46@charter.net



#### Appendices

- Appendix A. Web Published Communications
- Appendix B. Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015
- Appendix B2. Sample Issues From *Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process*
- Appendix C. Recommendation For Researching JO CO Citizens' Preferences And Priorities
- Appendix D. History Of Budget Research Per Recommendation Of JO CO Management Team

#### Copies:

JO CO BCC; Other Elected Officials; JO CO Management Team; The Grants Pass Daily Courier; and Finance, Taxation and Exemptions Unit, Oregon Department of Revenue

## Appendix A. Web Published Communications (Web)

Budgets: Josephine County, Oregon  
Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015  
Justice System Exploratory Committee  
Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society  
<http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/budgets.htm>

The following are the official communications to Arthur O'Hare, Finance Director, or copies to him on budget matters from the Exploratory Committee since January 20, 2016. As of September 22, 2016 he had been busy with other matters and could not meet with the Committee.

- January 20, 2016 Letter/Email to Arthur O'Hare, Finance Director, JO CO Finance Department, From Committee. Subject: Share Information About JO CO's JS&PSS Problem/Issue.
- May 26, 2016 Letter to Josephine County Board of County Commissioners from Exploratory Committee on Citizen's Guides To The Budget. O'Hare copied.
- June 4, 2016 Letter to Josephine County Budget Committee from Exploratory Committee on Citizen's Guides To The Budget & Participating in FY 2017-18 Budget Process.
- June 10, 2016 Letter to Oregon Department of Revenue from Exploratory Committee on Clarifying Oregon Local Budget Law. O'Hare copied.
- September 22, 2016 Letter/Email to Arthur O'Hare, Budget Officer, and Josephine County Budget Committee from Exploratory Committee on *Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process*.

## Appendix B. Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015

Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015  
Justice System Exploratory Committee  
Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society  
<http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/justicesystemexploratorycommittee.htm>

The following separate topic web pages are at the above parent web page.

- Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015
- Public Outreach
- Appendices to Study Design
- Press Releases
- Letters-To-The-Editor
- Guest Opinions
- Media Articles
- Voters Pamphlets
- **Studies & Information**
  - June 10, 2016 Citizen Perceptions of Public Safety Levies in Josephine County, Oregon: A Test of Group Engagement Theory (Davis 2016).  
Davis, Nathan. Presented June 10, 2016, Commencement June 11, 2016. *Citizen Perceptions of Public Safety Levies in Josephine County, Oregon: A Test of Group Engagement Theory*. Masters of Public Policy Essay, Submitted to Oregon State University In partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of Master of Public Policy. Corvallis, OR.
- **Minimally Acceptable Level Of Public Safety Services**
- **Public Safety Services (PSS)**
  1. Adult Jail.
  2. Juvenile Justice Program.
  3. District Attorney's Office.
  4. Sheriff Rural Patrol Deputies.
  5. Criminal Investigations & Related Sheriff's Office Support Services.
  6. Animal Control/Protection.
- Public Meeting Presentations
- City of Grants Pass Public Safety Project Reports
- **Josephine County Budgets**
- **Citizen Participation in Local Budget Process**
  - September 2016 Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process (Walker & Whalen 2016)  
Walker, Mike; Whalen, Jon, Members of Hugo Justice System & Public Safety Services Exploratory Committee, HNA&HS. September 2016. *Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process*. Hugo, OR.
  - September 2016. Chapter V: Elements And Components Of Citizen Participation In Budgeting Process  
Walker, Mike & Jon Whalen. September 2016. *Chapter V: Elements And Components Of Citizen Participation In Budgeting Process, Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process*. For Hugo Justice System & Public Safety Services Exploratory Committee, Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. Hugo, OR.
  - September 2016 Appendices For Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process  
Walker, Mike; Whalen, Jon, Members of Hugo Justice System & Public Safety Services Exploratory Committee, HNA&HS. September 2016. *Appendices For Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process*. Hugo, OR.
- Courts

## **Appendix B2. Sample Issues From *Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process***

Hopefully, the JO CO budget leadership (i.e., BCC, other elected officials, JOCOBC, and JOCOMT), and the public will find our research on the budget interesting and, useful. The analysis of the budget process lead to the identification of the budget issues, and our questions (Walker & Whalen 2016: *Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process*; Appendix B). The following sample issues are on citizen involvement (CI)/citizen participation (CP) in the JO CO budget process.

- New Budget Archives: Web budgeting reference links at *Citizen Involvement In Josephine County Budget Process*, <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/ci.htm>.
- Budget Issues (BI): Dozens and dozens of budget issues are identified in the working draft Chapter VI “Budget Process Issues” in, *Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process* (Appendices A and B). A sample of these preliminary issues follows.
  - BI: One-way flow of information of ‘review and comment’ methodology from minimum requirements of Oregon Local Budget Law (LBL) is a poor educational vehicle for complex budget topics, not to mention grossly inadequate as CP, persuasion, and government trust tools.
  - BI: LBL’s ORS 294.321(6) purpose to enable the public to be “Apprised” is inadequate.
  - BI: Technocratic Expert Model For Accounting & CI/CP In Budgeting. Preparation of better, friendlier public budget materials is a technical solution narrative that requires only that budget officers operate to meet minimum requirements of LBL.
  - BI: Timeliness - If one of the budget purposes is to inform citizens of proposed budget decisions and to seek JOCOBC and citizen feedback, policy information should be provided to the public at the beginning point in the process, when the proposed budget’s fiscal policies are being developed, and when public and budget committee input could affect allocation outcomes.
  - BI: Zero scheduled days to review proposed budget document before potential comment time is pathetic.
  - BI: Temporary “approve” budget committee could be a standing JOCOBC - a fiscal advisory committee if it was delegated the authority and provided the resources.
  - BI: Members of JOCOBC Do Not Have Equal Authority - It is quite obvious that the elector citizens are not equal to the BCC members of the committee, and if they try to be independent thinkers versus followers of BCC member leads, they are labeled by the media as being disruptive (i.e., *"The Board (of Commissioners) already knows we are putting our money in the most important places."*).
  - BI: Budget message goals and directives are without supporting facts or analysis for fiscal policies in the budget (e.g., sustained plans, mandatory programs, public preferences and priorities, budgeting for outcomes, etc.).
  - BI: JO CO Does Not Know Citizen Preferences - Only bald political statements indicate that the BCC knows citizen preferences and priorities.
  - BI: JO CO Officials Do Not Follow Their Own Standards - GFOA recommends that local governments incorporate public participation efforts in planning, budgeting, and performance management.
  - BI: JO CO has received the GFOA DBPA for several years with its award applications being judged by GFOA’s 27 BPA “performance” criteria, and JO CO has not shared or involved the JOCOBC, or the public, with these budget performance criteria as policies.
  - BI: There is no known county public participation program plan, handbook, or guide for the budgeting process and/or Budgeting For Outcomes (BFO).
  - BI: There is no evidence that JO CO conducted focus groups, online surveys, public hearings, or any specific citizen outreach mechanisms for the purpose which “*incorporates citizen input on service levels they are willing to fund*” into the budget process.
  - BI: Per the *Manual*, the budget message’s financial policies are part of the complete budget document versus the interpretation that the only complete budget is the adopted budget. The county provides an opportunity for public input to the local budget process at three final evolutions of the complete budget: proposed, approved, and adopted. How the county could provide an opportunity for the public to provide input on the proposed budget’s financial policies without providing the message in the proposed budget.
  - BI: JO CO badly needs the vision and guidance of formal strategic and financial plans for its budget process.

## **Appendix C. Recommendation For Researching JO CO Citizens' Preferences And Priorities**

The JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society, recommends that the Josephine County Board of County Commissioners (JO CO BCC) aggressively address the lack of trust issue in government. Improving public trust over the long-term should be covered by formal public policy on many fronts and with many strategies by the BCC, as this is the key to the county public safety issue and other public issues. For example, the BCC should strongly demonstrate sincerity in seeking to understanding why the majority of voting citizens do not trust JO CO government (i.e., you can't meaningfully fix the unknown). The BCC should also identify what the citizen preferences and priorities are for budget allocations with meaningful public displays, written and oral, that the citizens know they have been heard). In summary, it would be prudent for the BCC to take Davis (2016) up on his challenge for future research to test his conclusions about public trust in government and citizen preferences with several citizen participation mechanisms (e.g., surveys, standing JO CO Budget Committee, focus groups, JO CO Fiscal Advisory Committee, workshops, etc.).

Davis wrote: Josephine County residents appear to want certain policies from their County government. Supporters would like to see proper funding for law enforcement, opponents would prefer that a property tax not be used to raise that funding, and opponents would also like a more trustworthy process for making a delivering policy. Josephine County should seek to accomplish all three of these items if it truly wants to pass legislation to fund public safety services. Many Josephine County residents oppose the levy proposed by the County, but that is not the problem that Josephine County faces. Some residents resent the decisions made by the County government because they feel disconnected from the process of policymaking and policy delivery and distrust the officials in charge of making policy decisions. If the County wants to resolve issues regarding citizen disenfranchisement from County processes, the County should seek to incorporate more citizen voices into the decision-making process (Davis 2016, p 48).

Davis wrote: The current system in Josephine County is very similar to the traditional model. Josephine County residents have some control over budgeting as it concerns property tax issues, but for the most part, decisions are made by the County Commissioners. Since this system appears to be inadequate at ensuring procedural justice, Josephine County should seek to change its mechanisms of service provision to allow for more citizen voices (Davis 2016, p 48).

Davis wrote: Opposition mistrust of government is a clear obstacle to ensuring citizen engagement with government. If Josephine County wishes to ensure the funding of County law enforcement, the County will have to overcome any barriers to citizen trust. This paper's recommendation is that the County should seek to gain trust through increased citizen involvement in policy planning and delivery through co-production policies (Davis 2016, p 51).

Davis wrote: Future Research - This research provides a first take at documenting the views of the citizens of Josephine County and placing them within a framework to understand how County residents make decisions to engage with government. This was not meant to completely understand all of the opinions held by Josephine County residents, nor was the theoretical framework used the only way to look at citizen opinions. Research utilizing a completely different framework could result in different results. Further research should look to apply other theories of public opinion to the Josephine County case to further understand where citizen opinions come from and how these opinions inform behavior (Davis 2016, p 50).

More research should also be done to determine the viability of the policy recommendations made within this paper. Approaches to coproduction should be analyzed, weighed, and sorted by applicability to the Josephine County model of government. From there, further research could look into the amount of citizen engagement that Josephine County residents would be interested in possessing. This research should then point to possibilities of coproduction of policy within Josephine County (Davis 2016, p 51).

The Committee agrees with Miller and Evers (2002) when they suggested that *the government must want to seek participation as much as the participants want to give it, and citizens are less likely to participate if the political environment is not positive and accepting of input.*

---

1. Davis, Nathan. Presented June 10, 2016, Commencement June 11, 2016. *Citizen Perceptions of Public Safety Levies in Josephine County, Oregon: A Test of Group Engagement Theory*. Masters of Public Policy (MPP) Essay, Submitted to Oregon State University In partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of Master of Public Policy. Corvallis, OR (Davis 2016).

## **Appendix D. History Of Budget Research Per Recommendation of JO CO Management Team (JOCOMT)**

The history of the budget research by the JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society, per the recommendation of the JOCOMT, is its relationship to the Justice System & Public Safety (JS&PSS) Issue (i.e., JO CO public safety issue), and to the Authors' 2015 *Study Design* project. First, the basic purpose of *Study Design* is to promote citizen involvement (CI) and citizen participation (CP) for informed decision-making. Stated another way, the purpose is to provide grass roots opportunities to county citizens for active CI/CP, accessibility to information and education, and to better understand the public safety issue as the decision-makers. If even as few as five percent of the voters in the last four JO CO public safety levies changed their votes, pro or con, it would make their final vote a more informed vote.

**Josephine County Public Safety Issue**  
Justice System Exploratory Committee  
Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015  
<http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/justicesystemexploratorycommittee.htm>

On January 20, 2016 the Co-Authors of *Study Design* contacted the members of the JOCOMT as stakeholders in defining the county's public safety issue, and in seeking solutions for it as managers; the Authors wanted to get together and brainstorm ideas. They believe that the JOCOMT's August 19, 2014 recommended strategy elements to identify mandated and elective programs and services to the JO CO Board of County Commissioners (BCC) was an outstanding strategic planning approach to involve the public in future budgets, part of which follows.

*"While it is the prime responsibility of the Commissioners to propose solutions; as your county managers, we share in this responsibility. In recognition of the impending situation and challenges that lie ahead, we believe;"*

- *There is an urgent need to focus on the problem solving process now, to allow maximum time for problem solving and the possibility of placing one or more taxing measures on the May 2015 ballot.*
- *It is imperative that the problem solving process be open and inclusive of all segments of our community. **The problem of diminished county government services cannot be solved exclusively from within county government. Proactive citizen involvement is crucial as we all work together to chart the course for our future.***
- *As the managers of county services, many of which would be directly affected by the impending loss of general fund support, we continue to offer our support and knowledge base in coming up with possible solutions."*

*"The lack of sufficient, quality public services detracts from the county's desirability as a place to live and do business. The overall quality of life suffers, as does the county's economic and social vitality. Something must be done to reverse this downward trend of reduced services. The citizens of Josephine County need to be clearly shown the benefit (and potential loss) of county services. It is up to all of us in leadership positions to initiate efforts setting the county on a path to a better future."*

*A Proposed Strategy - We are proposing a problem solving strategy that focuses on both the immediate problem and also one that will offer solutions for the long term. We believe it is imperative that solutions to the problem of financing county services must be arrived at through a collaborative process involving the public and private sectors.*

The minutes reflect the thoughtful context of the issue that members of the JOCOMT considered.

*"Rob Brandes, Public Works Director explained that the genesis of this document was that they, as Department Heads and Program Managers wanted to show their support for the Board and encourage them to take broad steps. He said they were behind the Board with their professional expertise and suggested a good strong first step would be to prepare a draft budget for next year so they were not scrambling in March. He felt the Board needed a lot of institutional knowledge so they would be making a conscious effort to supply the Board with data. The Managers felt there was a need for citizen input because the budget shortcomings would affect the citizens. They will do as much as they can to reach out to those businesses that are affected."*

*"Abe Huntley, Community Corrections Director, emphasized that the spirit with which the letter was written was not a political paper; they felt it was their duty as they see this crisis coming. He said if they go into the next budget season 5 million in the hole it was their duty to offer suggestions and start early."*



*“Diane Hoover, Public Health Administrator explained the process in which the letter was drafted and said they were coming to the Board open handed and were there to help, asking what they needed from the Managers. Dennis Lewis, Planning Director said they wanted to emphasize their perception that significant issues were facing the County and they felt it was important to involve the community to validate the information that is generated. People need to have confidence that the information the County is generating is correct and need to decide what services are needed, what are mandated, what is the community interested in having the County provide and how they could be funded. The Managers felt that it would take credible information, widely disseminated to turn the situation around. Diane said they would welcome participating in the problem solving process with the Board.”*

The Authors feel that the JOCOMT had accurately identified many of the significant budget process issues worth addressing, first and foremost the use of strategic planning and the development of a strategic plan for developing future budgets.

- Early outreach to stakeholders probably affected (i.e., public, businesses, government, etc.).
- Early involvement of the JO CO department heads in the budget process.
- Early involvement of citizens in budget process for purpose of obtaining their preferences and priorities on services needed.
- Some kind of program outreach to demonstrate to citizens they were being heard.
- Importance of demonstrated validated budget information that would inspire county voters to have confidence and trust in government.
- Coordinated department-wide project to identify mandated programs and/or mandated level of services.
- Identify what county services are mandated by state law and what level of those services is optimal. Determine what it would cost to provide these mandated services at an appropriate and sustainable level.
- Identify what other county services may be desired by the citizens of the county. Determine what it would cost to provide these elective services at an appropriate and sustainable level.
- Evaluate and assess the current organizational structure of the county and determine if reorganization of the structure could result in more efficient, more effective, and less costly delivery of services.
- Receive input from the County Commissioners on the probability of receiving any federal or state funding which could alter the revenue outlook for FY 2015- 2016 and beyond.
- Receive input from the County Budget Committee on the current fiscal status of the county and the projected decrease in general funds for FY 2015- 2016, along with the estimated loss in services for each department that will occur due to the decrease in funding.
- Issue a report that outlines what near-term and longer-term actions the county should take to bring about reversal of the current decline in county services.
- Many more great ideas - check out original.

The Authors were interested in any necessary or mandated services the JOCOMT’s work units had identified. A conclusion of a March 7, 2016 meeting between the JOCOMT members and the Authors was that any necessary or mandated services the JOCOMT’s work units had identified were in their submitted budget documents, and they had not offered any supplemental documentation to the BCC as a result of Commissioner Cheryl Walker’s urging of August 19, 2014. At that point the Authors made a commitment to study the JO CO FY 2015-16 budget in order to better understand MALPSS issues as they related to the county’s public safety issue. This project grew to include the JO CO FY 2010-11 budget for PSS and 10 budgets from FY 2007-08 - FY 2-17-16 for their fiscal policies, goals, and directives. The conclusion of this research eventually lead the Authors to an almost overwhelming effort to document their research in the draft September 2016 publication, *Citizen Participation In The Josephine County Budget Process* (Appendix B).

JO CO Management Team. August 19, 2014. Exhibit A. *Managers Recommendation on Strengthening County Services*. September 3, 2014 *Approved Minutes of August 19, 2014 JO CO BCC’s Weekly Business Session*. Grants Pass, OR.  
[http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/JSPSS\\_Studies.htm](http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/JSPSS_Studies.htm)

Josephine County Management Team Meeting With Exploratory Committee: March 7, 2016  
Budgets: Josephine County, Oregon  
Justice System Exploratory Committee  
Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015  
<http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/budgets.htm>

In summary, what the Authors heard from the MT was that any mandated, necessary, or elective programs and associated level of services their work units had identified were in their submitted budget documents, and they had not offered any supplemental documentation to the BCC.