

Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

P.O. Box 1318
Merlin, Oregon 97532
541-471-8271
Email: hugo@jeffnet.org
Web Page: <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/>
PSS Archives Index #21

June 14, 2016 Letter/Email

Ryan Mulkins, District Attorney
Josephine County Courthouse
500 NW 6th St., Dept. 16
Grants Pass, OR 97526
541-474-5200
Email: da@co.josephine.or.us



Subject: June 8, 2016 Meeting Minutes Between the Josephine County's (JO CO's)
District Attorney (DA) and the Exploratory Committee

Dear Ryan:

We can not express our appreciation enough in your seeing us to share information about the JO CO DA's Office as part of a project to research JO CO's six major public safety services (i.e., 1. Adult Jail, 2. Juvenile Justice, 3. District Attorney's (DA) Office, 4. Sheriff Rural Patrol Deputies, 5. Criminal Investigations & Related Sheriff's Office Support Services, and 6. Animal Control/Protection) identified in the four 2012 - 2015 county levies and city sales tax proposal.

What was refreshing to us at our June 8, 2016 meeting was your almost overpowering posture of listening and trying to understand. We complimented this to you at our meeting and you shared a story about you and your previous supervisor and mentor, DA Stephen Campbell. You informed us that Stephen had told you to always be transparent and true and you would not get in trouble.

Per the direction of the JO CO Management Team at our March 7, 2016 meeting, the Committee is researching the county's budget for mandated, essential, necessary, and/or elective public safety services (PSS; *Josephine County District Attorney's Office, Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget: FY 2015-16*). The budget "word" quotes found for the DA's Office are identify in Appendix B.

The Committee assumes JO CO's three goals and three directives in the FY 2015-16 budget message are the 'standards and budget parameters' (S&BP) required by the governing body in the budget message (*Local Budgeting in Oregon (LBIO)*; Appendix A). They are financial policies, evidently without the force of local JO CO law (i.e. ordinances and resolutions).

Meeting topics discussed at our June 8, 2016 meeting follow.

1. Departments Addressing County Goals And Clearly Define Program Purpose and Expected Outcomes
2. Departments Develop a Sustainable Plan for All Mandated and Essential County Government Programs - Budget Only for Mandatory And/or Self-supporting Programs.
3. Levels Of Service (LOS)
4. Citizen's Guide to the Budget
5. District Attorney Office's PowerPoint Presentation Handout To JO CO Budget Committee

Recommendations to the JO CO BCC with copies to the PPS departments follow.

• May 26, 2016 Letter to Josephine County Board of County Commissioners from Exploratory Committee on Citizen's Guides To The Budget.

1. Understanding Staffing Analysis (Committee did not discuss)
2. Department Descriptions & Relationships
3. Professional Web Page for JO CO PSS Departments
4. Use Of References & Links
5. Flow Chart of Josephine County Juvenile Justice Department
6. Citizen's Guide To The Budget

After extensively studying the DA's FY 2015-16 budget and information learned at our meeting, we are not yet confident in explaining its programs to our neighbors, including the differences between mandated, essential, necessary, and elective programs, and levels of service (Appx. A).

We look forward to continue working with you. For instance we are studying the handout you gave to both of us - District Attorney Office's PowerPoint Presentation To JO CO Budget Committee For FY 2016-17. We will definitely get back to you on this. We are hoping that the "facts" supporting the PowerPoint slides are some of the information that would be valuable for supporting "outcomes" of the budget programs, or for us the significant beneficial and adverse impacts of the budget to citizens (i.e., Citizens Guide to the DA's Budget?).

Sincerely,

Mike & 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
Web Page: <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/justicesystemexploratorycommittee.htm>



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
Web Page: <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/justicesystemexploratorycommittee.htm>



Appendices

Appendix A. June 8, 2016 Minutes of Information Sharing Meeting Between Ryan Mulkins, Josephine County District Attorney, And Jon Whalen and Mike Walker, Members, JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, HNAHS

Appendix B. Josephine County District Attorney's Office, Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget: FY 2015-16

Appendix A. June 8, 2016 Minutes of Information Sharing Meeting Between Ryan Mulkins, Josephine County District Attorney, And Jon Whalen and Mike Walker, Members, JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, HNAHS

Outline

- I. MEETING
- II. PURPOSE
- III. JOSEPHINE COUNTY BUDGET MESSAGE GOALS AND DIRECTIVES:
FY 2015 -16
- IV. EXPLORATORY COMMITTEE'S BACKGROUND STUDIES
 - A. JOSEPHINE COUNTY ADOPTED BUDGET: FY 2015 -16
 - B. MANDATORY PROGRAMS AND MANDATORY LEVEL OF SERVICES
- V. MEETING DISCUSSIONS
 - A. Discussion #1. JO CO PSS Departments Addressing County Goals And Clearly Define Program Purpose and Expected Outcomes
 - B. Discussion #2. JO CO PSS Departments Develop a Sustainable Plan for All Mandated and Essential County Government Programs - Budget Only for Mandatory And/or Self-supporting Programs.
 - C. Discussion #3. Levels Of Service (LOS)
 - D. Discussion #4. Citizen's Guide to the Budget
 - E. Discussion #5. District Attorney Office's PowerPoint Presentation Handout To JO CO Budget Committee For FY 2016-17
- VI. RECOMMENDATIONS
 - 1. Understanding Staffing Analysis (Committee members did not discuss)
 - 2. Department Descriptions & Relationships
 - 3. Professional Web Page for JO CO PSS Departments
 - 4. Use Of References & Links
 - 5. Flow Chart of Josephine County PSS Departments
 - 6. Citizen's Guide To The Budget
- VII. OFFERS TO ASSIST
- VIII. CONCLUSION
- IX. MINUTES APPROVED

C:\Users\Mike\Documents\AAA Applications\Hugo_Neighborhood_Association\Community_Issues\JO CO Public Safety Services
2015\Communications\StateholderLettersOnStudyDesign\JO CO District Attorney\JSPSS DA
21_JOCODAMulkinsFmWalker_061416_LetterH.wpd

I. MEETING

Date: June 8, 2016
Time: 10:00 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.
Place: JO CO DA's Office
Participants: Ryan Mulkins, Josephine County District Attorney, and Jon Whalen and Mike Walker, Members, JS&PSS Exploratory Committee

II. PURPOSE

See March 28, 2016 Letter/Email to Ryan Mulkins, Josephine County District Attorney, From Exploratory Committee. <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/da.htm>.

See June 10, 2016 Letter/Email to Finance, Taxation and Exemptions Unit, Oregon Department of Revenue, From Exploratory Committee. Subject: Request Assistance Clarifying Oregon Local Budget Law's Application To Josephine County Budget Process (draft at time of June 8, 2016 meeting). <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/budgets.htm>

The purpose of the meeting was understanding the JO CO District Attorney's Office public safety services (PSS) as expressed in the *Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget: FY 2015-16*, including identified mandated, essential, necessary, and/or elective programs as policy. The descriptions and the standards for these services could become part of a range of alternative solutions to be analyzed in the socio-economic impact *Study*. These descriptions could also act as the affected conditions analyzed for direct and indirect impacts from the *Study* alternatives.

Per the direction of the JO CO Management Team to the Exploratory Committee at their March 7, 2016 meeting, the Committee is researching the *Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget: FY 2015-16* for elective, necessary, and/or mandated PSS. It is also focusing on the budget text of a PSS program's purpose, rather than the extensive table lists of FTEs and costs of a program. These budget tables were extensive, but they do not describe the purpose of programs required under Oregon Budget Law, and the required budget message which provides the 'standards and budget parameters' (S&BP) for developing the budget. Goals and directives were certainly in the budget message. The JO CO Board of County Commissioners (BCC) Directive 3 follows.

*Directive 3. Address County goals
and clearly define program purpose and expected outcomes.*

The 'text' of what the Committee found for the DA's Office is in Appendix B which for the Exploratory Committee is the context for any mandated, essential, necessary, and/or elective DA PSS, including other descriptive information and studies. In fact, from the Exploratory Committee's point of view, the text of a program's description in the budget is the only thing that counted in describing the DA's programs (i.e., FTE and costs are not purposes).

From the Committee's point of understanding the budget and its programs, the information had to be found in the purpose sections of the budget, and without specific references to other applicable information, they, in effect, did not exist. The text in the budget was almost like a legal appeal before a panel of judges. If the important information was not in the appeal it, in effect, did not exist because the judges could not consider it.

Does the Committee understand the DA's PSS programs from the purpose text sections of the budget, especially about the requirements from the JO CO BCC's goals and directives and Oregon Local Budget Law (ORLBL)?

- Do the reviewers understand the JO CO DA Office's programs?
- Do they know the value/significance of the DA's Office beyond their own private opinions?
- Would they be confident in explaining the DA's programs to their neighbors?

At the beginning of the meeting Whalen and Walker did not understand the text of the DA's budget in terms of mandatory and essential programs and levels of service (LOS), and would not be confident in explaining the DA's programs to their neighbors. Overcoming this deficiency would be the focus of Whalen and Walker study questions from the DA's text budget (Appendix B).

Whalen and Walker had talked prior to the meeting with Mulkins and wondered how long the meeting would go and settled on an estimate of from 30 minutes to 1 hour. He was a busy man and their previous meeting with him and Legal Counsel Wally Hicks had been 30 minutes when the topic was *Study Design*. The agenda's focus for this meeting was for Mulkins to explain the DA's programs defined in the budget, and the time he took was up to him. They knew their method of trying to understand the programs was to ask questions from the DA's budget (Appendix B). They were very pleased when their meeting went beyond 30 minutes and became embarrassed that they were taking up too much of the DA's valuable time at 1.5 hours.

What was refreshing to Whalen and Walker was Mulkins' almost overpowering posture of listening and trying to understand. They complimented this to him at their meeting and he shared a story about him and his previous supervisor and mentor, District Attorney Stephen Campbell. Mulkins informed Whalen and Walker that Stephen had told him to always be transparent and true and he would not get into trouble. That sounded good combined with Mulkins' natural way of interacting with the world.

For this topic of listening the three JO CO BCC FY 2015-16 budget message goals in the budget message (see following Chapter III) took on new meaning, especially Goal #3.

Goal #3. Provide access to County services to the citizens of Josephine County in a transparent, open, and professional manner.

Goals like Goal #3 usually have little meaning. This type of goal sounds good, but in fact is usually defined elsewhere by other more specific sub-goals and directives, which can be very meaningful or almost valueless. Without the specific defining regulations, being transparent, open, and professional with the public is almost like beauty, you know it when you see it. Whalen and Walker identify Mulkins as providing an A+ service as evaluated by compliance with Goal #3 because they knew it when they saw it. Thank you Ryan.

III. JOSEPHINE COUNTY BUDGET MESSAGE GOALS AND DIRECTIVES: FY 2015 -16

Budget Message Goals and Directives: FY 2015 -16 (pages 14 - 17*). The following are quotes from the budget.

The Board of County Commissioners set goals to provide direction related to the “big picture” rather than listing individual actions or activities. Each department has detailed in their budget how their programs meet the following goals approved by the Board of County Commissioners on 02-12-2015:

1. Improve community outreach and communication to the public by investing in technology that will improve efficiencies within County departments and provide enhanced service to citizens.
2. Develop a sustainable plan for all mandated and essential County government programs.
3. Provide access to County services to the citizens of Josephine County in a transparent, open, and professional manner.

The Board of County Commissioners also provided several directives to be used in preparing department budgets. As you review the narratives, you will see how the directives are being addressed by the individual programs. Main directives are:

1. Budget at a level consistent with current operational service levels.
2. Budget only for mandatory and/or self-supporting programs.
3. Address County goals and clearly define program purpose and expected outcomes.

The Committee feels these goals and directives are ‘standards and budget parameters’ (S&BP) required by the governing body in the budget message (*Local Budgeting in Oregon (LBIO)*; Oregon Local Budget Law (ORLBL)). Further they identified them as financial policies, without the force of local JO CO law (i.e. ordinances and resolutions).

* *Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget: FY 2015-16.*

IV. EXPLORATORY COMMITTEE'S BACKGROUND STUDIES

A. STUDY OF JOSEPHINE COUNTY ADOPTED BUDGET: FY 2015 -16

The details of this Section, IV.A., were not available to JO CO District Attorney Ryan Mulkins at the meeting. They were in the minds of Whalen and Walker and shaped their questions about the DA's FY 2015-16 budget (Appendix B).

1. Budgets: Josephine County, Oregon

<http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/budgets.htm>

- 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.
 - 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.

 - **August 19, 2014. Josephine County Managers Recommendations On Strengthening County Services, Including Public Safety Services**
<http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/budgets.htm>
- . Josephine County Board of County Commissioners (BCC). September 3, 2014. Minutes of BCC August 19, 2014 Weekly Business Session. Including August 19, 2014 Memo Recommendation From JO CO Managers to BCC on Strengthening County Services (e.g. proactive citizen involvement., benefits and loss of CO services, mandatory and elective PSS, etc.). Grants Pass, OR.
- **Josephine County Management Team Meeting With Exploratory Committee: March 7, 2016** (<http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/budgets.htm>)

On August 19, 2014 the Josephine County Management Team (JOCOMT) recommended strategy elements to the JO CO Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for the purpose of identifying mandated and elective services.

1. January 20, 2016 Invitation Letters/Emails to JOCOMT
2. Example Invitation Letters
 - Authur O'Hare, Finance Director, JO CO Finance Department
 - Rob Brandes, Director, JO CO Public Works Department
3. Minutes of March 7, 2016 Meeting

The JOCOMT members stated at the meeting that any necessary or mandated services their work units identified were in their submitted budget documents, and they had not offered any supplemental documentation to the BCC as a result of JO CO Commissioner Cheryl Walker's urging of August 19, 2014. The JOCOMT recommendations were not implemented.

2. JO CO Public Safety Services Departments

- Josephine County Sheriff's Office (i.e., Adult Jail, Sheriff Rural Patrol Deputies, and Criminal Investigations & Related Sheriff's Office Support Services)
- Josephine County Juvenile Justice Department
- District Attorney's Office
- Animal Control/Protection

a) Josephine County Sheriff's Office (i.e., Adult Jail, Sheriff Rural Patrol Deputies, and Criminal Investigations & Related Sheriff's Office Support Services)

<http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/sheriff.htm>

- August 24, 2015 Letter/Email To Dave Daniel, Sheriff, JO CO Sheriff's Office, From Committee
Subject: Share Information About JO CO's JS&PSS Problem/Issue
- March 28, 2016 Letter/Email To Dave Daniel, Sheriff, JO CO Sheriff's Office, From Committee
Subject: Learn About Josephine County's (JO CO's) Sheriff's PSS Budget Program
- May 9, 2016 Letter/Email To Lieutenant Travis Snyder, JO CO Sheriff's Office, From Committee
Subject: Learning About JO CO Sheriff Office's PSS Budget Program

b) Josephine County Juvenile Justice Department

<http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/juvenile.htm>

- January 20, 2016 Letter/Email To Jim Goodwin, Director, JO CO Juvenile Justice (JJ), From Committee
Subject: Share Information About JO CO's JS&PSS Problem/Issue
- March 28, 2016 Letter/Email To Jim Goodwin, Director, JO CO JJ Dept., From Committee
Subject: Learn About JO CO's Juvenile Justice Budget Program
- May 14, 2016 Letter/Email To Jim Goodwin, Director, JO CO JJ Dept., From Committee
Subject: Observations After Studying JO CO JJ Dept. Adopted Budgets: FY 2015-16 & FY 2010-11
- **Josephine County Juvenile Justice Public Safety Services**
. Whalen, Jon & Walker, Mike, Members, JS&PSS Exploratory Committee. First Draft - April 27, 2016. Josephine County Juvenile Justice Public Safety Services. Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. Hugo, OR. (This Document).
- **Understanding The Juvenile Justice Josephine County Budget: FY 2015-16**
. Whalen, Jon & Walker, Mike, Members, JS&PSS Exploratory Committee. First Draft - April 27, 2016. Understanding The Juvenile Justice Josephine County Budget: FY 2015-16. Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. Hugo, OR.
- **Purpose, Conceptual Prototype, Chapter VI Recommendations, Part of "Understanding The Juvenile Justice Josephine County Budget: FY 2015-16"** (Conceptual Prototype)
. Whalen, Jon & Walker, Mike, Members, JS&PSS Exploratory Committee. First Draft - April 27, 2016. Purpose, Conceptual Prototype, Chapter VI Recommendations (Voter Educational Outreach Projects), Part of Understanding The Juvenile Justice Josephine County Budget: FY 2015-16. Conceptual Prototype. Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. Hugo, OR.
- **Recommendations to All PSS Departments**
 1. Understanding Staffing Analysis
 2. Department Descriptions & Relationships
 3. Supplemental Web Page for JO CO JJ Department
 4. Use Of References & Links
 5. Flow Chart of Josephine County Juvenile Justice Department
 6. Citizen's Guide To The Budget
- **Josephine County Juvenile Justice Standards: FY 2015-16** (May 9, 2016 - A Work In Progress)

c) District Attorney's Office (<http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/da.htm>)

- September 30, 2015 Letter/Email to Ryan Mulkins, JO CO District Attorney, From Committee
Subject: Share Information About JO CO's JS&PSS Problem/Issue
- March 28, 2016 Letter/Email to Ryan Mulkins, JO CO District Attorney, From Committee
Subject: Learn About JO CO District Attorney's Office's Budget Program
- June 14, 2016 Letter/Email to Ryan Mulkins, JO CO District Attorney, From Committee
Subject: June 8, 2016 Meeting Minutes Between Committee and JO CO District Attorney

d) Animal Control/Protection

- November 23, 2015 Letter/Email Diane Hoover, Director, Josephine County Public Health;
Josephine County Animal Protection, From Committee
Subject: Share Information About JO CO's JS&PSS Problem/Issue
- January 20, 2016 Letter/Email to Diane Hoover, Director, Josephine County Public Health, From
Committee
Subject: Share Information About JO CO's JS&PSS Problem/Issue
- March 28, 2016 Letter/Email, Diane Hoover, Director, Josephine County Public Health;
Josephine County Animal Protection, From Committee
Subject: Learn About JO CO's Animal Control/Protection Budget Program
- Diane Hoover, Director, Josephine County Public Health, felt she had provided what the Committee had
requested.

B. MANDATORY PROGRAMS AND MANDATORY LEVEL OF SERVICES

As part of the public safety issue, the Committee has been studying the local budget process by studying the JO CO FY 2015-16 Budget with the goal of understanding. The following ideas and positions were the understanding and assumptions of the Committee going into the Mulkins' meeting. This understanding changes everyday as the Committee studies and learns. The big change for the Committee as a result of the meeting was its understanding of levels of service (LOS), versus LOS consistent with current operational service levels, versus mandated LOS.

Going into the meeting the Exploratory Committee suspected that mandatory programs meant mandatory services and mandatory level of services (LOS). It now understands mandatory programs are distinct from current operational LOS. It assumes these are some of the 'standards and budget parameters' (S&BP) required by the governing body in the budget message - financial policies (*Local Budgeting in Oregon* (LBIO)).

One of the Committee's main questions is about the required S&BP financial policies from the ORLBL procedures for preparing a local budget, specifically as they are applicable to the responsibilities of a local government in defining the purposes of activities and/or program appropriations. It appears from the definitions of "Organization Unit" and "Program" (e.g., Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 294.311(31) charged with carrying on one or more specific functions; ORS 294.311(33) accomplish a major service or function for which the local government is responsible, etc.) that a local budget is required to identify the purposes and/or responsibilities of its programs, including their LOS authorities (e.g., mandated, essential, necessary, elective services, etc.). That is our present assumption.

In 2014 the Josephine County Management Team (JOCOMT) recommended strategy elements to the JO CO Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for the purpose of identifying mandated and elective services. The JOCOMT recommendations were not implemented. However, for the FY 2015-16 budget, the BCC directed managers to budget for programs at a level consistent with current operational service levels (i.e., similar to the FY 2014-15 year), and directed that those programs only be those that are 'mandated' or self-supporting. The Committee assumes the BCC 'mandated' services and LOS are part of the S&BP established by the governing body (LBIO).

It is not understand how the JOCOMT could followed the BCC's direction to budget for only 'mandated' or self-supporting programs when its recommended strategy elements to identify mandated and elective services were not implemented. How could the JOCOMT do the assigned job without the tools? Just as importantly was the conflict between the JO CO BCC's directives for mandatory programs consistent with current operational service levels.

Goal 2.	Develop a sustainable plan for all mandated and essential County government programs.
Directive 1.	Budget at a level consistent with current operational service levels.
Directive 2.	Budget only for mandatory and/or self-supporting programs.

Directives # 1 and #2 were apples and oranges. Mandated programs and mandated LOS is understood, but "current operational service levels" have no obvious relationship to mandatory, essential, necessary, or elective LOS. They are just a continuance of what is present.

The Committee's review of the FY 2015-16 PSS budgets (i.e., sheriff, juvenile justice, district attorney, and animal control/protection) finds that there are legitimate PSS LOS budget questions from the ORS and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) that are identified as mandating PSS. However, it has come to the conclusion that there are very few ORS/OAR mandatory "LOS," and therefore, very few identified in the FY 2015-16 budget. The majority of LOS in the budgets appear to be "essential," "necessary," or "elective," even though they are also "current operational service levels." A mandatory LOS might be the "minimally adequate level of public safety services" (MALPSS).

To further the confusion, beyond the variety of LBIO and ORS/OAR terms, is that most local news articles in The Grants Pass Daily Courier on the JO CO public safety issue state, or strongly imply, that JO CO budget programs priorities are mandated by the State of Oregon, or are self-supporting. This is in line with the FY 2015-16 budget message. However, a 2016 news article, *Budget Committee Member Bashes Budgeting Process* reported that Margaret Goodwin, Member, JO CO Budget Committee, stated that *"In county budgeting, the 'must haves' are the mandated services, but the level at which you fund them is also important."*

The Committee evaluates the JO CO FT 2015-16 PSS budgets as good in identifying some ORS defining mandatory programs in its program summaries, but the budgets for all PSS programs are deficient.

1. For not being comprehensive in addressing all applicable mandated and related ORS and OAR program services,
2. For not identifying what portions of the identified ORS/OAR are specifically applicable, and
3. For not identifying the type of county responsibility priorities and LOS authorities (e.g., mandated, essential, necessary, elective, etc.).

In summary, the Committee continues to study the relationship of the ORLBL and budget message directives from the JO CO BCC for requirements to identify in local budgets the purposes and responsibilities of functions and/or programs. The Committee believes that what would assist is a breakdown of programs where the public, budget committee, governing body, and the media can better understand the mandatory programs and LOS in terms of priorities (e.g., mandated, essential, necessary, elective, etc.). What is a budgeted mandated program and a mandated funding LOS as required by ORLBL? What are the detailed requirements of ORLBL in identifying a budgeted mandated service and/or a mandated funding LOS beyond professional opinion and political decisions?

V. MEETING DISCUSSIONS

The following minutes of the meeting cover the discussion topics of the meeting clarified by Whalen and Walker with information that may have not been specifically covered at the meeting. This clarification was in line with the spirit of Mulkins' request for providing any additional information to assist him in understanding Whalen and Walker's "understanding" of the DA's programs.

The meeting started with Whalen and Walker sharing with Mulkins that after extensively studying the DA's FY 2015-16 budget, they would not be confident in explaining the DA's programs to their neighbors, including mandated, essential, necessary, and elective levels of service (LOS). Mandatory programs and LOS are two separate topics, each just as complicated as the other.

Whalen and Walker's questions were not about the proposed DA's budget in terms of FTE and costs. Those were covered extremely well in terms of the DA's budget. Their budget questions were about understanding the program's purposes as they related to mandatory programs and LOS.

The following meeting discussion topics and recommendations apply to all JO CO PSS departments identified in the four 2012 - 2015 county levies, and the city sales tax proposal.

JO CO PSS Departments

1. Adult Jail.
2. Juvenile Justice.
3. District Attorney's Office.
4. Sheriff Rural Patrol Deputies.
5. Criminal Investigations & Related Sheriff's Office Support Services.
6. Animal Control/Protection.

Meeting Discussion Topics

1. Departments Addressing County Goals And Clearly Define Program Purpose and Expected Outcomes
2. Departments Develop a Sustainable Plan for All Mandated and Essential County Government Programs - Budget Only for Mandatory And/or Self-supporting Programs.
3. Levels Of Service (LOS)
4. Citizen's Guide to the Budget

Recommendations (see Section IV.A.1.a))

1. Understanding Staffing Analysis (Committee members did not discuss)
2. Department Descriptions & Relationships
3. Professional Web Page for JO CO PSS Departments
4. Use Of References & Links
5. Flow Chart of Josephine County PSS Departments
6. Citizen's Guide To The Budget

A. Discussion #1. JO CO PSS Departments Addressing County Goals And Clearly Define Program Purpose and Expected Outcomes

In the opinion of Whalen and Walker there is a significant problem in the budget message from the JO CO BCC when it required departments to address all county goals and clearly define program purpose and expected outcomes ('standards and budget parameters'), but did not explicitly define "program purpose" or a impact methodology to determine "outcomes."

1. What is the definition of a purpose as defined by the Oregon Budget Law?
2. What is the definition of an outcome as defined by the Oregon Budget Law?

Oregon Local Budget Law (OLBL) Purpose. "Organization Unit" and "Program" (e.g., Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 294.311(31) charged with carrying on one or more specific functions; ORS 294.311(33) accomplish a major service or function for which the local government is responsible, etc.) that a local budget is require to identify the purposes and/or responsibilities of its programs.

The JO CO BCC in the FY 2015-16 budget message directed all department to implement three goals and three directives in their budgets (i.e., BCC Directive 3. "*Address County goals and clearly define program purpose and expected outcomes.*"). Providing 'standards and budget parameters' (S&BP) is an excellent fiscal policy. The biggest problem with this S&BP is that there were no companion financial policies to define the "purpose" and a methodology to identify "outcomes."

What are the components of purpose? There are all kinds of ideas in OLBL about defining a purpose (see June 10, 2016 Letter/Email to Finance, Taxation and Exemptions Unit, Oregon Department of Revenue <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/budgets.htm>, From Exploratory Committee). The Committee supports the purpose to develop a sustainable plan for all '*mandated and essential*' county government programs (BCC Goal #2). However, again the major missing component is standard financial policies for all departments to define a "*sustainable plan*", and a methodology to identify "*mandated and essential programs*" and LOS. Without these financial policies all the public observes in the budgets is each department sincerely developing a wide range of individual plans based on their own professional individual judgements. The Committee observes that many don't look like plans, but summaries of issues and solutions. They always anticipated a budget reference to a plan which had a plan's detail.

The Exploratory Committee does not yet have an idea what the OLBL requires in a budget for "outcomes" and continues to study the OLBL. However, it has long-term reasoned recommendations of what outcomes should be. Outcomes to the Committee are significant beneficial and adverse impacts to programs and the public. It strongly recommends that these impacts tell a story to the public, if not in the budget, than in a companion Citizen guide to the budget.

1. What is the difference between emergency, adequate, normal, and optimal levels of PSS? How far will people go to get the best available outcomes. What will one sacrifice for the best? Many things in life are relative, and to achieve the best in one thing, usually means giving something else up.

A normative level of PSS might be considered to be the normal or correct way of doing something (i.e., perhaps a compromise between adequate and optimal?). However, defining normal is difficult . . . normal today, or normal yesterday? Normal prior to 2012 or normal in 2015? Knowing what is correct is even more difficult. Correct according to whom? Whose professional experience opinion, and/or facts, determine the definition of “correct.”

2. What is a MALPSS Analysis Compared To A Professional Opinion? A professional opinion from an experienced practitioner is usually very good, but it is also normally without documentation, and publically available comprehensive facts, inventories, or analysis. It is more about trusting the practitioner, rather than understanding the facts.

The Committee is proposing a MALPSS research project that goes beyond the valuable work of the Lane County Public Safety Coordinating Council in defining a PSS rating system, including its ratings for over 70 sub-components of their services. The research project will include an analysis for determining the applicable alternative levels of PSS in a scientific, documented, and publically accessible way. The project’s analysis model has five elements.

MALPSS

Hugo Exploratory Committee

<http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/malpps.htm>

- Element 1. Publically Identified Problems/Issues.
- Element 2. Publically Identified Range of PSS Alternative Solutions.
- Element 3. Indicators for PSS. An indicator is a variable, either singly or in combination with another variable, which is taken as an indication of the condition of the overall issue (e.g., unemployment as an indicator for a community’s employment situation, particulate matter in air as an indicator for air pollution, and spotted owls as an indicator for forest health).
- Element 4. Standards for Indicators. A standard is the measurable aspect of an indicator. It is the level, point, or value above which something will take place, or below which it will not take place. It provides a baseline against which a particular condition, or change, can be judged by the informed voter and the decision-maker as acceptable or not.
- Element 5. Significance Determinations (Outcomes). To determine significance, impacts are compared to standards beyond which the impacts, including cumulative, become significant

The Committee’s five element MALPSS analysis model could be adapted by JO CO PSS departments to identify outcomes, and the Committee so recommends.

B. Discussion #2. JO CO PSS Departments Develop a Sustainable Plan for All Mandated and Essential County Government Programs - Budget Only for Mandatory And/or Self-supporting Programs.

The JO CO BCC in the FY 2015-16 budget message directed all the departments submitting budgets to implement three goals and three directives (i.e., BCC Directive 3. “*Address County goals and clearly define program purpose and expected outcomes.*”). Providing ‘standards and budget parameters’ (S&BP) is a good idea. The biggest problem with the S&BP is there were not standard methodologies to implement them. For example, the BCC provided the direction of 1. Goal #2 - Develop a sustainable plan for all ‘*mandated and essential*’ county government programs, and 2. Directive #2 - Budget ‘*only for mandatory*’ and/or self-supporting programs. However, the BCC and the departments have not defined a standard methodology to identify ‘mandated or essential programs’ in any systematic or scientific way, essentially making the budget purpose statements professional opinions without vetted facts supporting the PSS.

The Committee’s five element MALPSs analysis model could easily be adapted as a systematic and standard classification methodology by departments to identify ‘mandated and essential’ programs. See the 01/12/2016 presentation to the Grants Pass Chapter of John Birch Society “*Explain Minimally Adequate Level Of Public Safety Services Research Project.*” It has an example for the local air quality index and rural patrol coverage which partially follows.

The Grants Pass’s Air Quality Index reports daily air quality. The AQI tells us how clean or polluted our air is. It can be calculated for five major air pollutants. For each of these pollutants, national air quality standards have been developed to protect public health. Particulate matter is one of the five air pollutants used to calculate the Grants Pass air quality index (AQI). It has six air pollution levels.

1. The Comparison of rural patrol coverage and the Grants Pass AQI in terms of problems, indicators, and standards.
2. For the comparison of problems, we will use *rural patrol coverage* as the PSS problem and Air Pollution as the air quality problem.
3. The indicator for rural patrol coverage is *response time* and the indicator for air pollution is *PM 2.5 particulate matter*. PM2.5 is fine particulate matter that has a diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less.
4. The standard for rural patrol coverage is *number of minutes to response* and the standard for air pollution is an “X” amount of *PM 2.5 particulate matter* (i.e., one of six levels) in micrograms per cubic meter.

The standards and criteria for the JO CO DA’s Office programs are most appropriately identified by the DA’s Office. The significant idea is that standards and criteria are clearly the responsibility of the county department that is accountable for the accuracy and comprehensiveness of their budget purpose statements and associated information.

C. Discussion #3. Levels Of Service (LOS)

The Committee's review of the FY 2015-16 PSS budget LOS finds that there are legitimate PSS LOS budget questions from the ORS and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) that are identified as mandating PSS. However, the Committee has come to the conclusion that there are very few ORS/OAR mandatory "LOS," and therefore, very few identified in the FY 2015-16 budget. The majority of LOS in the budgets appear to be "essential," "necessary," or "elective." A mandatory LOS might be the "minimally adequate level of public safety services" (MALPSS), but the Committee is not sure. A few example PSS mandatory services and LOS from the ORS follow.

- ORS requires one sheriff and a jail, but does not require any deputy sheriffs, or that the jail have one bed or 280 bed usage levels. For emphasis we repeat that the LOS for beds is about usage; it is not about the bed capacity of the jail.
- ORS requires one or more persons as counselors of the juvenile department. If more than one person is appointed, one may be designated as director.
- ORS does not provide any statutory requirement to have a juvenile detention and/or shelter facility, this is left up to the governing body to decide on. The program of providing facilities is a county decision; it is not a state mandated requirement

Mulkins arguments for mandated DA LOS included his moral standards of what was right. This statement from Mulkins fit well with Whalen and Walker as part of his transparent and open character. However, the BCC's financial policies were actually tricky. They addressed mandated county government programs and LOS consistent with current operational service levels. The programs to be addressed were mandatory, but the LOS of the current operations service level has nothing to do with mandated, essential, necessary, and elective LOS. The BCC's Goal 2 and LOS Directive 1, and program Directive 2 follow.

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| Goal 2. | Develop a sustainable plan for all mandated (i.e. above examples) and essential County government programs. |
| Directive 1. | Budget at a level consistent with current operational service levels. |
| Directive 2. | Budget only for mandatory and/or self-supporting programs. |

The Committee's recommended LOS approach is that the DA tackle the job like it is going to court.

1. What does federal, state or local law require?
2. What has the law been interpreted by court opinion precedents?
3. What legal applicable DA issues have been studied and are available as supporting vetted analysis and reference papers?

The Committee believes the MALPSS analysis model could be adapted for departments to identify an "essential" LOS for any budget program, and it is not limited to an "essential" LOS. The methodology can be used for any LOS (e.g., mandated, essential, necessary, elective, etc.).

See the following example MALPSs analysis model that can be used by all PSS departments.

- Analysis 1. Identify PSS department program issues.
- Analysis 2. Indicators for DA department. An indicator is a variable, either singly or in combination with another variable, which is taken as an indication of the condition of the overall program. What are the indicators for the DA's three budget programs: 1. Criminal Prosecution, 2. Victim Assistance, and 3. Support Enforcement?
- Analysis 3. Standards for DA PSS Indicators. A standard is the measurable aspect of an indicator. It is the level, point, or value above which something will take place, or below which it will not take place. It provides a baseline against which a particular condition, or change, can be judged as acceptable or not.
- Analysis 4. DA PSS Outcome (Significance) Determinations. To determine significance, impacts are compared to the standards beyond which the impacts, including cumulative, become significant.

The Committee wonders if budgeting at a level consistent with current operational service levels is an essential LOS. There is no way to know from the budget. Perhaps the Lane County Public Safety Coordinating Council's (PSCC) approach should be considered for determined an essential LOS for PSS.

- Lane County Public Safety Coordinating Council. December 1, 2011 *Status of the Public Safety System in Lane County as per Senate Bill 77*. Report to the Board of County Commissioners. Eugene, OR.

The Lane County PSCC identified five levels of MALPSS for its services. Its adequate level of service does not seem to reach an "essential" LOS. It all depends on the definitions and criteria. Perhaps Lane County PSCC's minimally adequate level of service is what JO CO would consider essential.

- 1. Adequate Level of Service
- 2. Minimally Adequate Level of Service
- 3. Less than Adequate Level of Service
- 4. Inadequate Level of Service
- 5. Emergency Level of Service

Regardless, the Committee's point is to get beyond bald professional opinions in identifying and establishing "essential" LOS, or any LOS. Assume the PSS department is going to court, and/or use the scientific method for determining a range of LOS. The BCC would approve the applicable financial policy.

D. Discussion #4. Citizen's Guide to the Budget

A citizen's guide to the budget is a fascinating idea that the Committee hopes JO CO will consider, and/or individual PSS departments will implement. The big picture is the need for the local government to explain its budget proposals and the public finances in simple, plain language documents – often referred to as a “citizens’ guide to the budget.” JO CO used to have “Reader’s Guides.” Some Oregon local governments use the “budget message” to cover topics in a citizen’s guide to the budget.

The annual budget is the key instrument by which JO CO translates its policies into action, therefore, presenting the budget in a way that makes sense to the general public is central to its accountability. A few ideas covered follow.

- Publication of a citizens’ guide allows JO CO to explain in plain language the objectives of its budget. It also helps citizens to assess the impact on their own circumstances and on specific groups in society, including the effects of the burden of taxation, service provision and employment prospects.
- Broadening understanding of JO CO’s public finances can help to frame more realistic citizen expectations and to build support for difficult policy choices.
- JO CO explains what is in the annual budget proposals and what their effects are expected to be.
- Its distinguishing feature is that it is designed to reach and be understood by as large a segment of the JO CO population as possible.
- Information should be presented in layman’s terms that are easy to understand, avoiding technical jargon and making full use of simple and effective charts and diagrams.
- Key fiscal risks should be discussed. These include the fiscal impacts of deviations in key economic variables from the forecasts (e.g., declining federal payments to counties, etc.).
- Citizens will wish to know how the JO CO budget will affect their own standards of living, their security interests, and the nature and significance of the budget’s impact on groups in society that are of particular policy interest (e.g., the poor and vulnerable, different groups of taxpayers, etc.). The guide should therefore provide some indication of the budget’s potential impact on take-home pay for different income levels, income support and service provision in the coming year, and on possible implications for the medium term.
- JO CO should briefly explain what it is doing to improve overall service delivery and the social impacts of its spending programs.

E. Discussion #5. District Attorney Office’s PowerPoint Presentation Handout To JO CO Budget Committee For FY 2016-17

Mulkins felt his FY 2016-17 presentation to the JO CO Budget Committee would provide some clarification and facts that Whalen and Walker seem to be were seeking, and/or could be used to help in identifying outcomes/impacts. They each received a copy and promised to study it and share their observations to Mulkins.

These minutes do not include the study conclusions of the “presentation” paper. That effort is a short-term near-term future project.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

In the opinion of the Exploratory Committee, JO CO government is plagued by a lack of trust by a majority of county voters, and by ineffective informed voter outreach, especially educational program descriptions of public safety services. The county is not unique in this characterization, many governments, at all levels, are in this same predicament.

Public outreach activities are targeted to provide information to groups of current or potential clients and/or to network partners and other community partners regarding available services or benefits. The target audience is the average group of voters who generally could be better informed. The Committee also feels that rational ignorance by some voters is refraining from acquiring knowledge when the cost of educating oneself on an issue exceeds the potential assumed benefit that the knowledge would provide. In other words, if community leaders want change, they need to provide many educational opportunities to the voting public.

To put it bluntly most voters are encouraged to be better informed when many possible low-growing fruits of information formats are made easily accessible to them. The Committee provided six educational outreach recommendations for all PSS departments. Except for recommendation #1, it believes they can all be developed with the existing knowledge and expertise currently available in the JO CO DA's Office.

Committee information accessibility recommendations to the JO CO BCC with copies to the PPS departments follow.

• May 26, 2016 Letter to Josephine County Board of County Commissioners from Exploratory Committee on Citizen's Guides To The Budget.

1. Understanding Staffing Analysis
2. Department Descriptions & Relationships
3. Professional Web Page for JO CO PSS Departments
4. Use Of References & Links
5. Flow Chart of Josephine County PSS Departments
6. Citizen's Guide To The Budget

VII. OFFERS TO ASSIST

Whalen and Walker offered to assist Mulkins in reviewing and making recommendations on a draft Citizen's Guide To The DA's Budget, if a guide became a DA commitment.

Mulkins offered to do whatever he could to make Whalen and Walker's *Study Design* project a success.

VIII. CONCLUSION

At the end of the meeting Whalen and Walker did not understand the text of the DA's budget in terms of mandatory and essential programs and LOS, and would not be confident in explaining the DA's programs to their neighbors.

IX. MINUTES APPROVED

These minutes were reviewed and approved on June 13, 2016 by Whalen and Walker for what they heard, as clarified by specific discussion topic information of concern to them.

Appendix B. Josephine County District Attorney's Office, Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget: FY 2015-16

- Josephine County (JO CO) Board of County Commissioners (BCC). June 17, 2015. *Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget FY 2015-16*. JO CO BCC Resolution Number 2015-026. Grants Pass, OR.

PUBLIC SAFETY FUND (PSF), JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OREGON (PSF, pages 158/764 - 223/764)

- I. PUBLIC SAFETY FUND DESCRIPTION (PSF, page 160/764)
- II. BUDGET – RESOURCES AND REQUIREMENTS
- III. PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS AND BUDGETS
 - A. Sheriff (n/a; PSF, pages 164/764 - 199/764)
 - B. District Attorney (PSF, pages 200/764 - 216/764)
 - 1. Program: Criminal Prosecution
 - 2. Program: Victim Assistance
 - 3. Program: Support Enforcement
 - 4. Elective, Necessary, And/or Mandated District Attorney's Office PSS
 - C. Juvenile Justice (n/a; PSF, pages 217/764 - 223/764)

PUBLIC HEALTH FUND (PHF), JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OREGON (n/a; PHF, pages 262/764 - 321/764)
Animal Protection and Regulation (PHF, pages 300/764 - 302/764)

ADULT CORRECTIONS FUND (ACF), JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OREGON (n/a; ACF, pages 224/764 - 261/764)

I. PUBLIC SAFETY FUND DESCRIPTION (PSF, page 160/764)

The Public Safety Fund was formed in 2006. It was comprised of three departments: Sheriff, District Attorney, and Community Justice, which had previously been in the General Fund. The Community Justice Department was further reorganized into Juvenile Justice and Adult Corrections. In 2007, Adult Corrections was moved to a separate fund. The Sheriff and District Attorney are elected officials. The manager of the Juvenile Justice Department reports to a liaison County Commissioner. The departments within this fund provide support for the criminal justice system utilized by city, county and state law enforcement. County wide services include court prosecution, civil services, the jail and juvenile facility.

The budget is in balance, which means that the budgeted requirements (expenditures and ending fund balance) are equal to the resources (beginning fund balance and revenues) that are estimated to be available during the budget year. The primary source of revenue to operate the departments in this Fund had been monies received under the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP) and a transfer from the General Fund. Additionally, programs operated by the three departments generate revenues for specific program purposes. The TARP "county payments" money replaced the O&C distributions that the County received for many years.

A summary of the Public Safety Fund (Resources and Requirements) is presented first in the *Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget FY 2015-16*, followed by sections for each of the three departments. The money available for them is equal to total resources of the fund, less the requirement for Internal Service Fund charges. Major reductions in programs occurred in FY 2012-13 due to the loss of funding and five percent reductions have been occurring annually since.

For each department, there is a summary of its programs (Schedule A), which in turn is supported by a Program Worksheet (Schedule B) for each program. Schedule B provides information about the purpose of the program, how much revenue it is expected to generate during the budget year, and a breakdown of its expenditure budget by the categories specified in Oregon Local Budget Law.

Schedules C, D, and E provide details of resources, personal services and other expenditures, respectively.

II. BUDGET – RESOURCES AND REQUIREMENTS (n/a)

III. PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS AND BUDGETS (n/a)

A. Sheriff (n/a)

B. District Attorney (PSF, pages 200/764 - 216/764)

1. Program: Criminal Prosecution (PSF, page 206/764)

Fund: Public Safety Fund (12)

Office/Division: District Attorney

Cost Center #: 1410

Purpose of Program Oregon Revised Statutes mandate that the District Attorney shall attend court and prosecute all offenses occurring in the District Attorney's county. ORS 8.660. Oregon Revised Statutes mandate that the District Attorney shall attend and advise the grand jury. ORS 8.670. Oregon Revised Statutes mandate that the District Attorney shall appear in juvenile court to assist the court in any matter within the juvenile court's jurisdiction. ORS 8.685. The goal of the criminal prosecution unit is to successfully prosecute offenders for all crimes occurring in Josephine County and obtain an appropriate sentence that both advances public safety and provides justice to the victim.

DESIRED OUTCOMES AND GOALS

Budget Goal #1 - Improve community outreach and communication to the public by investing in technology that will improve efficiencies within County Departments and provide enhanced services to citizens.

The District Attorney's Office serves citizens by incarcerating the most dangerous offenders in state prison, holding accountable and encouraging reformation of lesser offenders, protecting children from physical and sexual abuse, lowering the crime rate, instilling a sense of safety in the community, and helping to provide our community with a business friendly environment.

The District Attorney's Office meets Budget Goal #1 by employing attorneys to represent the interests of the community in criminal court. Deputy District Attorneys openly communicate with victims when appropriate. The District Attorney's Victim's Assistance Unit constantly updates all victims on the status of their case whenever a victim requests such notification.

Budget Goal #2 - Develop a sustainable plan for all mandated and essential County government programs.

The District Attorney's Office employs Deputy District Attorneys (lawyers) to attend court and prosecute all offenses in Josephine County. For lawyers to obtain successful outcomes in court, the assistance of support staff is required. Support staff are responsible for: arranging the appearance of witnesses in court; obtaining copies of police and lab reports; organizing files; assisting in preparing exhibits for trial; providing discovery to defense counsel; communicating with court staff; answering questions of the public when appropriate, etc. Together, the lawyers and support staff of the District Attorney's Office almost always obtain positive outcomes for victims and the community. The District Attorney's Office meets Budget Goal #2 by allocating 91% of its budget to personal services costs. Maintaining the employment of the skilled professionals in the District Attorney's Office ensures the citizens of Josephine County will have access to justice when victimized. Maintaining the employment of the skilled professionals in the District Attorney's Office ensures the safety of our community. The District Attorney's Office actively seeks reimbursements and grants for any of the work that qualifies for assistance.

Budget Goal #3 - Provide access to County services to the citizens of Josephine County in a transparent, open and professional manner.

Protecting ongoing investigations, victims, and informants can require the District Attorney's Office to withhold information from the public. Additionally, the Oregon State Bar Association places restrictions on the information prosecuting attorneys can make public in active cases. However, the District Attorney's Office meets Budget Goal #3 by, when appropriate, making information easily accessible to the public through communication with our attorneys, support staff, or victim's services office.

2. Program: Victim Assistance (PSF, page 210/764)

Fund: Public Safety Fund (12)

Office/Division: District Attorney

Cost Center #: 1420

Purpose of Program The District Attorney is required to advise victims of their Constitutional rights and to assist them in the exercise of their rights. ORS 137.106; ORS 147.417; Oregon Constitution, Article 1, § 42. The program's desired outcomes are to afford the victim meaningful participating in the criminal justice process so that the physical, emotional and economic impact of crime is minimized. Staff members provide victims access to information and resources in a compassionate, responsive and dedicated manner. They research, verify and request restitution from the offenders to the crime victim. They provide emotional support and educate crime victims during the course of their criminal cases, and assist them with filing restraining orders and no-contact orders. They keep the victim advised of the progress of their case and notify them of all court dates and outcomes.

The majority of the Victims Assistance Program is funded by Victims of Crimes Act (VOCA) grant funds and Unitary Assessment Funds received from the State for the express purpose of operating this program. The VOCA Non-Competitive Grant has been funding a Victim Assistance Specialist position for over 25 years. This grant now pays for 80% of this position. This staff member's primary function is to assist victims of crimes perpetrated by adults. The VOCA Competitive Grant currently completely funds a full-time Victim Assistance Specialist whose function is to assist victims of crimes perpetrated by both juvenile and adult offenders. Unitary Assessment dollars fund 90% of the Victim Assistance Director's position. The VA Director is responsible for overseeing the entire program, collecting and maintaining required statistics and reports, recruiting & training volunteers, and assisting all victims of crime in Josephine County.

The Victim Assistance Program goal is to provide victims of crime with information and services that support and enhance their understanding of and participating in the criminal justice system. Outcomes include 95% of victims self report a better understanding of their rights as a victim of crime, a better understanding of the criminal justice system as it relates to their case, and satisfaction with the results of the prosecution of their offender.

3. Program: Support Enforcement (PSF, page 213/764)

Fund: Public Safety Fund (12)

Office/Division: District Attorney

Cost Center #: 1430

Purpose of Program ORS 8.675 tells the District Attorney that except for criminal prosecutions he shall give priority to the enforcement of child support orders. The goal of the program is to enhance the well-being of children by providing child support services to families.

Desired outcomes are that the Support Enforcement Program helps more than 1,000 parents provide the financial and emotional support their children need while returning crucial funds to the community. The services it provides help children in need, reduce reliance on public assistance, encourage family self-sufficiency and save taxpayer money. Collecting child support is a vital job because it makes a major difference in the lives of children in Josephine County.

Program staff pursue delinquent parents and work with parents who want to support their children.

Contempt charges for non support are filed against delinquent parents who are willfully failing to pay their child support obligations, are seriously delinquent and owe large amount of back support.

They work with parents to increase and/or decrease the amount of support ordered when changes in financial circumstances warrant an adjustment.

Program outcomes of the Josephine County District Attorney's Support Enforcement Division include the annual collection of over \$3,000,000 in child support owed.

Approximately 85% of all costs associated with the Support Enforcement Program are reimbursed by the State of Oregon.

4. Elective, Necessary, And/or Mandated District Attorney's Office PSS

a) Oregon Revised Statutes

(1) Program: Criminal Prosecution

- Oregon Revised Statutes mandate that the District Attorney shall attend court and prosecute all offenses occurring in the District Attorney's county. ORS 8.660.
- Oregon Revised Statutes mandate that the District Attorney shall attend and advise the grand jury. ORS 8.670.
- Oregon Revised Statutes mandate that the District Attorney shall appear in juvenile court to assist the court in any matter within the juvenile court's jurisdiction. ORS 8.685.

(2) Program: Victim Assistance

- The District Attorney is required to advise victims of their Constitutional rights and to assist them in the exercise of their rights. ORS 137.106; ORS 147.417; Oregon Constitution, Article 1, § 42.

(3) Program: Support Enforcement

- ORS 8.675 tells the District Attorney that except for criminal prosecutions he shall give priority to the enforcement of child support orders.

b) Oregon Administrative Rules ??

c) Josephine County Policy/Law??

Budget Goals and Directives In Budget Message for FY 2016 -17 (pages 14 - 17) is probably not local law as it is not an ordinance or resolution. The Committee assumes these goals and directives are some of JO CO fiscal policies. The following are quotes.

The Board of County Commissioners set goals to provide direction related to the "big picture" rather than listing individual actions or activities. Each department has detailed in their budget how their programs meet the following goals approved by the Board of County Commissioners on 02-12-2015:

1. Improve community outreach and communication to the public by investing in technology that will improve efficiencies within County departments and provide enhanced service to citizens.
2. Develop a sustainable plan for all mandated and essential County government programs.
3. Provide access to County services to the citizens of Josephine County in a transparent, open, and professional manner.

The Board of County Commissioners also provided several directives to be used in preparing department budgets. As you review the narratives, you will see how the directives are being addressed by the individual programs. Main directives are:

1. Budget at a level consistent with current operational service levels.
2. Budget only for mandatory and/or self-supporting programs.
3. Address County goals and clearly define program purpose and expected outcomes