

**UNDERSTANDING
THE JUVENILE JUSTICE
JOSEPHINE COUNTY BUDGET: FY 2015-16**

Conceptual Prototype

Jon Whalen & Mike Walker, Members
JS&PSS Exploratory Committee

Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society



First Draft - April 27, 2016

**UNDERSTANDING THE JUVENILE JUSTICE
JOSEPHINE COUNTY BUDGET: FY 2015-16**

Outline*

PURPOSE

CONCEPTUAL PROTOTYPE

- I. PUBLIC SAFETY FUND (PSF): FY 2015-16
 - A. Public Safety Fund** (PSF) Description
 - B. Public Safety Fund Program Descriptions
 - 1. Sheriff (not covered)
 - 2. District Attorney (not covered)
 - 3. Juvenile Justice Department FY 2015-16 JO CO Budget
 - a) Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program
 - b) Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program
 - c) Rent Detention Beds

- II. JUVENILE JUSTICE SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2015-16
 - A. Special Revenue Funds***
 - B. Juvenile Justice Special Program Funds****
 - 1. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program
 - 2. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program
 - 3. Juvenile Justice Flex Program

- III. STANDARDS & CRITERIA FOR TEXT & CONTENT ANALYSIS
 - A. Conditions, Indicators, & Standards
 - 1. Appendix D2. Conditions, Indicators, & Standards
 - 2. Minimally Acceptable Level Of Pubic Safety Services (MALPSS)
 - 3. Producing a Citizens' Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How?
 - B. Brainstorming
 - C. Concepts
 - 1. Program Cost
 - 2. Text Length
 - 3. Text Content
 - 4. Understanding
 - D. Definitions of Understanding
 - 1. Understanding Definition # 1. Simple Definition
 - 2. Understanding Definition # 2. Dictionary
 - 3. Understanding Definition # 3. Wikipedia
 - 4. Understanding the Issue For Informed Decision-Making

- E. Elements of Being Informed
- F. Citizen's Guide To The Budget
- G. Standards & Criteria For JO CO JJ Programs
 - 1. JO CO JJ Programs
 - a) Public Safety Fund Description
 - b) Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program
 - c) Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program
 - d) Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program
 - e) Juvenile Justice Mediation Program
 - f) Juvenile Justice Flex Program
 - 2. JO CO JJ Department Is Accountable
- H. Modification/Consensus of Standards And Criteria

IV. TEXT & CONTENT ANALYSIS: JUVENILE JUSTICE JO CO BUDGET: FY 2015-16

- A. Juvenile Justice Public Safety Fund & Special Programs Funds: FY 2015-16
 - 1. Public Safety Fund Description
 - a) Program Cost
 - b) Text Length
 - c) Text Content
 - d) Understanding
 - e) Observations
 - f) Review Questions
 - 2. Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program
 - a) Program Cost
 - b) Text Length
 - c) Text Content
 - d) Understanding
 - e) Observations
 - f) Review Questions
 - 3. Juvenile Justice Shelter-Detention Program
 - a) Program Cost
 - b) Text Length
 - c) Text Content
 - d) Understanding
 - e) Observations
 - f-1) Review Questions
 - f-2) JJ Shelter Detention Program Review Questions: FY 2010-11

- B. Juvenile Justice JO CO Special Revenue Funds Budget: FY 2015-16
 - 1. Juvenile Justice Special Programs Fund (33)
 - 2. Juvenile Justice (JJ) Special Programs
 - a) Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program
 - (1) Program Cost
 - (2) Text Length
 - (3) Text Content
 - (4) Understanding
 - (5) Observations
 - (6) Review Questions
 - b) Juvenile Justice Mediation Program
 - (1) Program Cost
 - (2) Text Length
 - (3) Text Content
 - (4) Understanding
 - (5) Observations
 - (6) Review Questions
 - c) Juvenile Justice Flex Program
 - (1) Program Cost
 - (2) Text Length
 - (3) Text Content
 - (4) Understanding
 - (5) Observations
 - (6) Review Questions
- C. Major Observations For JJ Programs
- V. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FY 2010 - 11 AND FY 2015 - 16
 - A. JJ Public Safety Fund & JJ Special Programs Funds: Compared To FY 2010-11 & FY 2015-16
 - 1. Full-time Equivalent:
 - a) JJ Public Safety Fund
 - b) JJ Special Programs Funds
 - 2. Budgeted Costs
 - a) JJ Public Safety Fund
 - b) JJ Special Programs Funds
 - 3. Subjective Evaluation of JJ Programs' Text Length
 - 4. Subjective Evaluation of JJ Programs' Text Context
 - 5. Understanding of JJ Programs' Text Descriptions
 - B. Impacts Compared For FY 2010-11 & FY 2015-16 Budgets
 - 1. Academic Research On Impacts: 2008 - 2011
 - 2. Minimally Acceptable Level Of Pubic Safety Services (MALPSS)
 - 3. Budget Helps Citizens to Assess the Impact on Their Own Circumstances
 - 4. *Study Design*
 - 5. Pre-*Study* Projects
 - 6. Impact Audiences

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Voter Educational Outreach Projects

Recommendation 1. Understanding Staffing Analysis

Recommendation 2. Department Descriptions & Relationships

Recommendation 3. Professional Web Page for JO CO JJ Department

Recommendation 4. Use Of References & Links

Recommendation 5. Flow Chart of Josephine County Juvenile Justice Department

Recommendation 6. Citizen's Guide To The Budget

B. Summary

VII. SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

A. Purpose

B. Public Safety Fund (PSF): FY 2015 - 16

C. Juvenile Justice Special Revenue Funds: FY 2015 - 16

D. Standards & Criteria for Text & Content Analysis

E. Text & Content Analysis: Juvenile Justice JO CO Budget: FY 2015 - 16

F. Differences Between FY 2010-11 AND FY 2015-16

1. Budgets Compared For FY 2010-11 & FY 2015-16

2. Impacts Compared For FY 2010-11 & FY 2015-16 Budgets

G. Recommendations

VIII. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION (After April 27, 2016)

A. Oregon Juvenile Department Directors Association

1. Oregon Revised Statutes

2. Oregon Administrative Rules

APPENDICES

Appendix A.	Justice System Exploratory Committee's <i>Study Design</i>
Appendix B.	Citizen's Guide To The Budget
Appendix C.	Federal Payments, County Services, & Economic Impacts
Appendix D.	Supplemental Information
Appendix D1.	Oregon Juvenile Department Directors Association

TEXT TABLES

Text Table V.1.	Public Safety Fund For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V.2.	JJ Special Programs Funds For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V-3.	Public Safety Fund For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V-4.	JJ Special Programs Funds For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V-5.	Evaluation of Text Length: FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11

END TABLES

End Table IV-1.	Juvenile Justice FTE, Budget & Words: FY 2015-16
End Table IV-2.	Four (4) Juvenile Justice Programs For FTE, Budget & Words: FY 2015-16
End Table VI-1.	FTE & Budgeted For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
End Table VI-2.	Subjective Evaluation of Juvenile Justice Programs' Text Length
End Table VI-3.	Subjective Evaluation of Juvenile Justice Programs' Text Context
End Table VI-4.	Understanding of Juvenile Justice Programs' Text Descriptions

*This text and analysis is part of chapter IV, JJ JO CO BUDGET: FY 2015 - 16, in subsection IV.C of the Exploratory Committee's web page on the Josephine County Juvenile Justice Program.

Josephine County Juvenile Justice Program (web page)

JS&PSS Exploratory Committee

Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

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

** PUBLIC SAFETY FUND, JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OREGON (page numbers in this section refer to the Public Safety Fund (PSF) sub-document in the Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget FY 2015-16.

*** SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS (page numbers in this section refer to the Special Revenue Funds (SRF) sub-document in the Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget FY 2015-16.

**** JUVENILE JUSTICE SPECIAL PROGRAM FUNDS

UNDERSTANDING THE JUVENILE JUSTICE JO CO BUDGET: FY 2015-16

PURPOSE

Purpose of Text & Content Analysis The purpose of this paper is to research, study, and become informed about the Josephine County (JO CO) Juvenile Justice (JJ) Department through an analysis of the *Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget FY 2015-16*. This would be accomplished through an analysis of budget “text” for the JJ program. The budget, a product of a budget process, allows the county to make resource allocation decisions, including choices about staffing, technology, equipment and priorities to be addressed in the coming fiscal year.

- Josephine County Board of County Commissioners (BCC). June 17, 2015. *Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget FY 2015-16*. <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/budgets.htm>

The project included a comparison of the FY 2015-16 budget to an earlier year prior to the major reductions across the county in full-time equivalents (FTE) and budget dollars in FY 2012-13.

The Committee felt the annual budget documents were technical in their brevity and specialist acronym codes of each work unit within the parameters of the standard budget process (i.e., accounting and budget terminology). However, several JO CO department heads had recommended this approach culminating in the JO CO Management Team supporting this focus on the annual budget document as providing the answers. Coincidentally, except for the media, they was minimally information readily available on JO CO PSS from other sources.

Purpose of Study Design The budget analysis approach was part of a larger effort (*Study Design*; Appendix A) to understand the county’s present public safety services (PSS) which the Exploratory Committee had been cautious about as budget documents are normally not written to communicate with citizens. *Study Design* is all about an informed public and informed decision-making. Its very first question is about consensus of the problem and vetted information. What is Josephine County’s (JO CO) Justice System & Public Safety Services (JS&PSS) Problem, . . . or Issue? First, *What are the public safety services (PSS) 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?*”

Background An April 5, 2016 meeting between James Goodwin, Director, JO CO JJ Department, and Jon Whalen and Mike Walker, Members of the JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society resulted in an informed meeting. Whalen and Walker’s continued interest in learning more about the JO CO JJ resulted in an idea by Goodwin and a commitment by Whalen/Walker to study the FY 2015-2016 JJ JO CO Budget compared to the FY 2010-11 JO CO Budget. The idea was to research, study and compare the two JJ budgets to understand the historic JJ program and what we have today. What are the differences, including the adverse and beneficial impacts. What was gained and what was lost? The research results would be discussed with questions asked at a future meeting between Goodwin, Whalen, and Walker.

The idea evolved into two budget analysis comparison papers by Whalen/Walker:

1. Paper # 1. Text & Content Analysis of Juvenile Justice Jo Co Budget: FY 2015-16. This is the present and this paper.
1. Paper # 2. Text & Content Analysis of Juvenile Justice Jo Co Budget: FY 2010-11. This fiscal year serves as the baseline before the major reductions in program budgets.

The history of arriving at this project follows.

- November 23, 2015 Enquiry Letter to Goodwin with subject: Whalen/Walker Share Information About Josephine County's (JO CO's) Justice System & Public Safety Services (JS&PSS) Problem/Issue and their *Study Design* project.
- March 7, 2016 Meeting between Goodwin, Whalen, and Walker as part of a JO CO Management Team meeting. Per the direction of the Management Team at the March 7, 2016 meeting, Walker and Whalen are researching the county's budget document for elective, necessary, and/or mandated public safety services (PSS; *Josephine County Juvenile Justice Department, Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget: FY 2015-16*).
- March 28, 2016 Enquiry Letter to Goodwin with subject: Whalen/Walker Learn About JO CO JJ Department.
- April 5, 2016 Meeting between Goodwin, Whalen, and Walker was also informative. Whalen and Walker's continued interest in learning more about the JO CO JJ Program resulted in a commitment by Whalen/Walker to study the JJ FY 2015-2016 JO CO Budget to the FY 2010 - FY 2011 JJ JO CO Budget.
- Future Meeting The idea was to research and compare the two JJ budgets to discuss and ask questions at a future meeting with Goodwin.
- Future Meeting after next version of Committee's JJ web page published (purpose: comments and discussion from Goodwin, Whalen, and Walker)
- Future Visit opportunity for Whalen and Walker to visit JJ facilities (built in 1999)

Summary The purpose of this paper is to research, study, and become informed about the JO CO JJ Department through an analysis of the *Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget FY 2015-16*. The project included a comparison of the FY 2015-2016 JJ JO CO Budget to the FY 2010 - FY 2011 JJ JO CO Budget (prior to the major reductions across the county in FTE and budget dollars in FY 2012-13). The idea was to research, study and compare the two JJ budgets to understand the historic JJ program and what we have today. What are the differences, including the adverse and beneficial impacts. What was gained and what was lost?

The project was to conduct the comparison based on the record (i.e., evidence based). It was solely a comparison of the two budget documents, and any sources, references, and/or web links provided in those documents. It specifically did not include seeking experts to offer their opinions by interpreting the budget documents. The reviewers remember that after their April 5, 2016 meeting with James Goodwin, Director, JO CO JJ Department, they left feeling very informed and knowledgeable based on Goodwin's oral explanations.

CONCEPTUAL PROTOTYPE

Conceptual This paper is a conceptual prototype for the Exploratory Committee's analysis of JO CO budget documents for all public safety services programs. Testing a prototype/developed design process is a very important part of the design process. Testing and evaluation, simply confirms that the process will work as it is supposed to, or if it needs refinement. In general, testing a prototype allows the user to assess the viability of a design. Will it be successful? Testing also helps identify potential faults, which in turn allows the designer to make improvements.

- Of, relating to, or based on mental concepts, "philosophy deals with conceptual difficulties."
- Simple Definition of Conceptual: based on or relating to ideas or concepts. Full Definition of Conceptual: of, relating to, or consisting of concepts <conceptual thinking> (Merriam-webster).
- Conceptual. A definition in terms of concepts, such as the one found in a dictionary, instead of in terms of the results of measuring procedures.
- Conceptual Skill. The ability to think creatively about, analyze and understand complicated and abstract ideas.

Prototype A first, typical or preliminary model of something, from which other forms are developed or copied.

- A prototype is an early sample, model, or release of a product built to test a concept or process or to act as a thing to be replicated or learned from. It is a term used in a variety of contexts, including semantics, design, electronics, and software programming. A prototype is designed to test and try a new design to enhance precision by system analysts and users. Prototyping serves to provide specifications for a real, working system rather than a theoretical one. In some workflow models, creating a prototype (a process sometimes called materialization) is the step between the formalization and the evaluation of an idea (Wikipedia).
- Planning of the Prototype Process Description. A prototype is an unfinished and physical test version of a product, a service or a process and prototypes may be used in order to develop, test and communicate ideas and concepts.

Paper Status This paper is also likely to remain a draft in terms of addressing the review questions, standards and criteria. It is be the final for an understanding of the Juvenile Justice programs by the authors at the time they reviewed the applicable budget documents.

**UNDERSTANDING THE
JUVENILE JUSTICE JO CO BUDGET: FY 2015-16**

I. PUBLIC SAFETY FUND (PSF): FY 2015 - 16

A. PUBLIC SAFETY FUND DESCRIPTION (PSF, page 160/764 of JO CO budget)

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.

In the pages that follow, a summary of the Public Safety Fund (Resources and Requirements) is presented first 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.

B. Public Safety Fund Program Descriptions

1. Sheriff (not covered)
2. District Attorney (not covered)

3. Juvenile Justice Department FY 2015-2016 JO CO Budget

a) Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program

Fund: Public Safety Fund (12)

Office/Division: Juvenile Justice

Program: Court & Field

Cost Center# 2430

FTE: 8.6

Budgeted: \$1,019,700 (Schedule B)

Budgeted: Requirements: \$1,019,700; Net \$817,800 (Schedule A)

Table. Resources And Requirements (PSF, page 2)

Public Safety Fund (12)

Juvenile Justice Adopted By Governing Body: \$982,700

Purpose of Program: (PSF, pages 217/764 - 223/764).

Juvenile Court and Field Services are mandated in ORS 419A.010-020. Felony youth referrals are received from law enforcement, evaluated by the District Attorney's Office for legal sufficiency and the course of disposition is prescribed by Juvenile Justice. Misdemeanor referrals are evaluated by Juvenile Justice. The program promotes community protection through accountability for youth, opportunity for reformation and justice for victims. The course of action is driven by severity of offense and risk assessment with most services being directed to the medium to high risk offender. Lower risk, first time offenders are usually diverted from court with informal action which includes Community Service and restitution to victims when appropriate (PSF, page 218/764).

Outcomes include mandates that youth abide by their informal contracts or court ordered probation conditions. Victim restitution is collected or docketed as civil judgment in most cases. Caseload contacts are maintained according to the youth's level of risk and the severity of the crime. Youth violations result in a structured sanction process. The supervision of medium and high risk youth may include a mandate to attend Aggression Replacement Training and/or Functional Family Therapy (FFT), each are evidence-based programs (PSF, page 219/764).

A budget goal of community outreach is accomplished in the geographical assignment of caseloads. In compliance with law, schools are advised of youth pending court and final dispositions. Juvenile participates in quarterly meetings of law enforcement, schools and treatment providers. Options, Department of Human Services and Oregon Youth Authority consult with the program regarding out-of-home placements. Functional Family Therapy is partially funded by the Division and accepts family referrals from throughout the community. Funding revenue from the state, office rent and fees account for 20% of the budget. The balance is required from County public safety funds. The department maintains training standards and

accreditation through the Oregon Juvenile Department Director's Association (OJDDA; PSF, page 219/764).

b) Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program n/a

Except for the rental of three (3) youth detention beds, there was no JJ Shelter Detention Program in FY 2015-16.

FY 2015-16

FTE: 0.0 (Schedule B)

Budgeted: \$0.0 (Schedule B)

Budgeted: Requirements: 0.0 (Schedule A)

Three (3) youth detention beds rented from Douglas County, but cannot track the FTE and budget for this JJ service.

FY 2010-11

FTE: 23.7 (Schedule B)

Budgeted: \$1,674,600 (Schedule B)

Budgeted: Requirements: \$1,674,600; Net \$1,674,600 (Schedule A)

14 youth detention beds in Grants Pass

16 youth shelter beds in Grants Pass.

c) Rent Detention Beds The JO CO JJ Shelter-Detention Program is not identified in the FY 2015-16 budget, yet news articles continue to inform about a rental detention program. For example, see *'Status quo' budget proposed for coming year*. Where in the budget document is identification of the rental detention program (Section V.A.3)?

II. JUVENILE JUSTICE SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2015 - 16

A. Special Revenue Funds (SRF)***

Table. Resources And Requirements

Juvenile Justice Special Program Fund (SPF)/(33) (SPF, page 95)			
Juvenile Justice Adopted By Governing Body: \$181,000			
Fund: Juvenile Justice Special Program (33)/(SPF, page 96) Schedule A			
Child Advocacy - CAMI	FTE 0.60	Budget Requirements	\$55,100
Mediation - 2440	FTE 1.00	Budget Requirements	\$107,900
Flex - 2450	FTE 0.00	Budget Requirements	<u>\$18,000</u>
		Total	\$181,000

B. Juvenile Justice Special Programs Funds (33) (PSF, pages 442/764 - 456/764)

1. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program - CAMI (PSF, pages 447/764 - 449/764)

Fund: Juvenile Justice Special Programs (33)

Office/Division: Juvenile Justice

Program: Child Advocacy - CAMI

Cost Center #: 2420

FTE: 0.60 (Schedule B)

Budgeted: \$55,100 (Schedule B)

Purpose of Program

The Child Abuse Multidisciplinary team (MDT) is mandated under ORS 418.746-796. A non-competitive grant is offered counties to maintain a team to evaluate all cases of child abuse, neglect and fatality. Juvenile Justice oversees the Child Advocate (.6 FTE) who schedules and records all MDT staffings, conducts forensic interviews, maintains video evidence and coordinates the legal and treatment process for child victims.

Program objectives include providing a coordinated MDT approach to child abuse investigations, maintaining a trained team including the DA, law enforcement, Juvenile, Public Health, Mental Health, DHS, child treatment agencies and schools. Outcomes include advocating for all victims in legally substantiated cases and obtaining an 80% conviction rate when offender is charged with crimes against children.

2. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program (PSF, pages 450/764 - 452/764)

Fund: Juvenile Justice Special Programs (33)

Office/Division: Juvenile Justice

Program: Mediation

Cost Center #: 2440

FTE: 1.0

Budgeted: \$107,900

Purpose of Program:

ORS 107.775 mandates Court Mediation to assist families to develop child custody and parenting plans. The Mediator does not make recommendations to the court but, will work with parents to identify a mutually acceptable plan. The program leads to decreased court time and reduces future trauma to children. Parents are more likely to comply with their own mediated agreements. As an outcome, Court Mediation is to result in 100% of the applicable families having access to the program. A weekly orientation is afforded prior to mediation for all parents who have a parenting conflict.

3. Juvenile Justice Flex Program (PSF, pages 453/764 - 456/764)

Fund: Juvenile Justice Special Programs (33)

Office/Division: Juvenile Justice

Program: Flex

Cost Center #: 2450

FTE: -

Budgeted: \$18,000

Purpose of Program:

Juvenile Flex Funds are provided by Oregon Youth Authority and utilized for the purchase of treatment services and other barrier removal items for youth committed to OYA as well as youth under the supervision of Josephine County. This program is totally self-supporting.

III. STANDARDS & CRITERIA FOR TEXT & CONTENT ANALYSIS

Consider that since the 2000 Secure Rural Schools Act, Congress had repeatedly sent messages that federal payments would be phased out, and this was intended to give counties time to plan for the change. In light of the message and the local need, it is significant that information generated from a formal public planning process has not been tried. Why not? Probably because serious long-range planning involving the public requires time, and is not a quick fix. On the other hand, it has been over 15 years since the message began.

A standard or criteria for the text and content of the JO CO JJ Department could have been proportional to the degree and magnitude of a loss of federal payments to JO CO (i.e., the greater probability of loss results in a more comprehensive text educational effort to secure funding).

A. Conditions, Indicators, & Standards

1. Appendix D2. Conditions, Indicators, & Standards This appendix provides supporting material for the grant application as described in the draft document entitled *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015*. The study design project is itself part of a program to research the Josephine County (JO CO), Oregon Justice System & Public Safety Services issue (JS&PSS Issue; 2013 *Justice System & Public Safety Services Issue Scope Of Work*).

2. Minimally Acceptable Level Of Pubic Safety Services (MALPSS) The JO CO's MALPSS Standards project is summarized in its seven chapters.

- Mike Walker & Jon Whalen, Members JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. December 15, 2015. *Summary Highlights: JO CO's Minimally Adequate Level Of Public Safety Services (MALPSS) Research Project* (Public Outreach 5.5). Hugo, OR.
- Mike Walker & Jon Whalen, Members JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. December 15, 2015. *Executive Summary Of JO CO's Minimally Adequate Level Of Public Safety Services (MALPSS)* (Public Outreach 5.6). Hugo, OR.
- Mike Walker & Jon Whalen, Members JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. December 15, 2015. *Appendix B4. Josephine County's Minimally Adequate Level of Public Safety Services (MALPSS) Standards, Including Law Enforcement Staffing & Deployment*. Hugo, OR.

MALPASS - Minimally Acceptable Level Of Pubic Safety Services

Justice System Exploratory Committee

Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015

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

3. Producing a Citizens' Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How? (Appendix A)

What should a citizens' guide contain? - “. . . any performance indicators in relation to key spending programs.”

B. Brainstorming

Chapter III is considered brainstorming by the Exploratory Committee as of April 23, 2016. Brainstorming is a group creativity technique by which efforts are made to find a conclusion for a specific problem by gathering a list of ideas contributed by its members.

Brainstorming. From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brainstorming>

Osborn claimed that two principles contribute to "ideative efficacy," these being :

Principle # 1. Defer judgment
Principle # 2. Reach for quantity.

Following these two principles were his four general rules of brainstorming, established with intention to :

- Reduce social inhibitions among group members.
- Stimulate idea generation.
- Increase overall creativity of the group.

General Rule # 1. Go for quantity: This rule is a means of enhancing divergent production, aiming to facilitate problem solving through the maxim quantity breeds quality. The assumption is that the greater the number of ideas generated, the bigger the chance of producing a radical and effective solution.

General Rule # 2. Withhold criticism: In brainstorming, criticism of ideas generated should be put 'on hold'. Instead, participants should focus on extending or adding to ideas, reserving criticism for a later 'critical stage' of the process. By suspending judgment, participants will feel free to generate unusual ideas.

General Rule # 1. Welcome wild ideas: To get a good and long list of ideas, wild ideas are encouraged to have. They can be generated by looking from new perspectives and suspending assumptions. These new ways of thinking might give you better solutions.

General Rule # 1. Combine and improve ideas:As suggested by the slogan "1+1=3". It is believed to stimulate the building of ideas by a process of association.

C. Concepts

1. Program Cost is a comparison of full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions and the adopted budget. How expensive are the needed (requirements?), unwanted or desired public safety services? What is the understanding of the public concerning the need and its ability to pay (i.e., citizen priorities).

2. Text Length is a comparison of the budget documents to some qualitative standards.

- Are the documents too brief or too long?
- Should the JJ program descriptions reflect the uncertainty in the federal county O&C payments since 2000 (e.g., Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP))?
- Should the JJ program descriptions be proportionate in length to the size of the JJ budgets?
- Should the JJ program descriptions compare the number of words describing JJ programs to some local limiting standards (e.g., 250 word letters-to-the-editor (LTTE) and 1,000 word guest opinion limits for The Grants Pass Daily Courier (TGPDC), etc.).

3. Text Content is a judgement of comprehensiveness (e.g., history; program descriptions; standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances; resources and requirements; changes from previous year or some other range (3 - 5 year history); etc.).

4. Understanding Does the information in the Juvenile Justice JO CO Budget inform the voter with a better understanding for decision-making? The following elements of “inform” will be considered.

- a) Need/Requirements
- b) Significance (value)
- c) Change
- d) References/Vetted)

D. Definitions of Understanding

1. Understanding Definition # 1. Simple Definition

- The knowledge and ability to judge a particular situation or subject.
- A willingness to understand people's behavior and forgive them.

2. Understanding Definition # 2. Dictionary.

Noun: the ability to understand something; comprehension. "foreign visitors with little understanding of English"

Synonyms: comprehension, apprehension, grasp, mastery, appreciation, assimilation, absorption; knowledge, awareness, insight, skill, expertise, proficiency; informal know-how; formal cognizance

3. Understanding Definition # 3. Understanding, From Wikipedia. Understanding (also called intellection) is a psychological process related to an abstract or physical object, such as a person, situation, or message whereby one is able to think about it and use concepts to deal adequately with that object. Understanding is a relation between the knower and an object of understanding. Understanding implies abilities and dispositions with respect to an object of knowledge sufficient to support intelligent behavior.

An understanding is the limit of a conceptualization. To understand something is to have conceptualized it to a given measure. Examples follow.

- One understands the weather if one is able to predict (e.g. if it is very cloudy, it may rain) and/or give an explanation of some of its features, etc.
- A psychiatrist understands another person's anxieties if he/she knows that person's anxieties, their causes, and can give useful advice on how to cope with the anxiety.
- A person understands a command if he/she knows who gave it, what is expected by the issuer, and whether the command is legitimate, and whether one understands the speaker (see 4).
- One understands a reasoning, an argument, or a language if one can consciously reproduce the information content conveyed by the message.
- One understands a mathematical concept if one can solve problems using it, especially problems that are not similar to what one has seen before.

4. Understanding the Issue For Informed Decision-Making

<http://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/advocacy/advocacy-principles/understand-the-issue/main>

Why Do You Need a Thorough Understanding of The Issue?

- You'll need to have arguments at your fingertips that can convince your members that the issue is important and keep them fired up
- You'll need to persuade allies to join your cause by presenting them with facts that they won't be able to ignore or refute
- You'll need to know why your opponents are taking the side they take, and what financial or other interests they may have in continuing to take that side

- With research, you'll know better what needs to be done to correct a situation. Furthermore, you'll know which of the necessary steps are fairly easy to take, and which may be a major stretch for your organization.
- You'll know what strategic style is likely to work best, whether you're going to run an "in your face" type of initiative, or act behind the scenes, or something in between
- When and if the dispute becomes public - as you may want it to do - you will have the answers. If a reporter asks you for a reaction, or shoves a microphone in your face, you will be sure of your facts.
- You'll be ready with facts any time you are challenged by your opponent, by the establishment (such as local governments), or by the media
- Because you'll thoroughly understand the status quo from the beginning of your project, you will be able to plan your progress logically and, at the end, know just how far you have come
- The bottom line is that before you proceed with specific planning steps, you will need a nice, solid, comforting layer of knowledge on which to base your plans.

E. Elements of Being Informed

In seeking being informed, the following information should be considered. The Exploratory Committee will use one or more of the following elements that contribute to understanding: a feeling of being informed or not informed.

- Sufficient information to ensure an informed decision.
- A statement/explanation of the purpose (i.e., mission and objectives).
- A description of the procedures and experimental processes
- Procedures clearly explained.
- Statements of efficacy
- Claims of effectiveness.
- A description of any reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts (e.g., physical, psychological, social economic harm, etc.)
- A description of benefits expected from the program.
- The description of benefits to the voters should be clear and not overstated. If no direct benefit is anticipated, that should be stated. Potential societal benefits should also be included (i.e., direct, indirect, and cumulative).
- To enable a rational choice, voters should be made aware of the full range of options available. Any pertinent alternatives.
- For research involving more than minimal risk.
- An explanation of whom to contact for answers to pertinent questions

F. Citizen's Guide To The Budget

One important but relatively neglected aspect of fiscal transparency is the need for the local government to explain its budget proposals and the public finances in one simple, plain language document – often referred to as a “citizens’ guide to the budget.” Because the annual budget is the key instrument by which a [local] government translates its policies into action, presenting the budget in a way that makes sense to the general public is central to government accountability.

***Producing a Citizens’ Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How?* (Appendix A)**

- Petrie, Murray and Shields, Jon. 2010. *Producing a Citizens’ Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How?* OECD Journal on Budgeting, Volume 2010/2.

Why should governments publish a citizens’ guide to the budget?

- Publication of a citizens’ guide allows a government to explain in plain language the objectives of its budget and to supplement and complement other supporting material such as the budget speech, press releases, web pages, media appearances, etc. A guide provides a single place where the public can learn about the main features of the budget and gain access to more detailed reference sources. It also helps citizens to assess the impact on their own circumstances and on specific groups in society, including the effects on the burden of taxation, service provision and employment prospects.
- Governments need to pro-actively help the general public make sense of the budget. Non-expert audiences can easily be intimidated by technical language and by the volume of budget information presented to legislatures. Broadening understanding of the [counties] public finances can help to frame more realistic citizen expectations and to build support for difficult policy choices. It can also help to offset the influence of narrow special interest groups and to avoid public debates being conducted in jargon by those “in the know.”

What are the characteristics of a citizens’ guide to the budget?

- A citizens’ guide to the budget is an easy-to-understand summary of the main features of the annual budget as presented to the JO CO Board of County Commissioners (BCC). It should be a self-contained document that explains what is in the annual budget proposals and what their effects are expected to be. While containing links or references to more detailed documents, the guide should not require readers to refer to them, or to know their contents, in order to understand the guide.
- The guide should be written with the needs of the general public in mind, using everyday language, and it should be linked to more detailed explanations to provide a simple access point to those who want to know more. “A citizens’ budget can take many forms, but its distinguishing feature is that it is designed to reach and be understood by as large a segment of the population as possible”

- A citizens' guide to the budget should focus on the objectives and contents of the budget, not its process. While it is important that the public has a broad understanding of how the government puts the annual budget together, the main role of the guide should be to present the substance of the budget. Discussion of the budget process should mainly take the form of a brief overview, at the beginning of the guide, of the budget law and the annual budget process. More detailed information on the annual budget process and on the requirements of the budget law should be separately available to the public, and should be referenced in the guide or linked to it.
- 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.). Information should also be presented on other relevant specific fiscal risks (e.g., law suits, PEERs, etc.).
- New spending and revenue policies being introduced in the budget should be summarized. The guide should explain why these new measures are being introduced, their expected impact on revenues and spending, and how they will contribute to the government's priorities. Citizens will wish to know how the budget will affect their own standards of living, and the nature and significance of the budget's impact on groups in society that are of particular policy interest (such as the poor and vulnerable, or different groups of taxpayers). 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.
- The government should briefly explain what it is doing to improve overall service delivery and the social impacts of its spending programs.
- Any performance indicators in relation to key spending programs.

The document, *Producing a Citizens' Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How?*, and more examples of citizen guides to the budget, are available at the Committee's web page.

Budgets: Josephine County, Oregon

Justice System Exploratory Committee

Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015

Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

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

G. Standards & Criteria For JO CO JJ Programs

Identifying the standards and criteria for the JO CO JJ Department is most appropriately accomplished by the Department.

1. JO CO JJ Programs

- a) Public Safety Fund Description
- b) Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program
- c) Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program n/a
- d) Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program
- e) Juvenile Justice Mediation Program
- f) Juvenile Justice Flex Program

2. JO CO JJ Department Is Accountable An analogy why the JO CO JJ Department is the best entity to identify the standards and criteria for its programs is from the document, *Producing a Citizens' Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How?* (Appendix A). The significant idea is that standards and criteria are clearly the responsibility of the government agency that is accountable for the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the budget and associated information.

- A citizens' guide should be an objective and technical document, not a political tract. It should attempt to describe the budget in a neutral manner and meet recognized standards of comprehensiveness, reliability and relevance. It should not be seen as a partisan document to promote how well the government is managing fiscal policy. While the guide might contain a foreword by the finance minister or the president, the body of the guide should be clearly the responsibility of the government agency that is accountable for the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the budget and associated information. This will help to avoid cynicism that a citizens' guide is a purely political tool.
- A citizens' guide should generally be produced by the executive branch. The guide should be seen as helping to meet the government's responsibility to explain publicly how it is raising, spending, and managing public resources. It is an important part of the transparency and accountability of fiscal policy. Where the government does not produce such a guide, it may be appropriate for the legislature to produce one, especially in those countries where the legislature has substantial powers to amend the budget presented by the executive. Failing that, there would be a role for a citizens' guide produced by civil society. But this solution is second best. The government should explain its own budget to the general public. The media and civil society groups can then use the citizens' guide as an input to their own deliberation, dissemination or advocacy activities – or publish their own alternative guide if they wish.

H. Modification/Consensus of Standards And Criteria

The Exploratory Committee will create a new draft Chapter III prior to its next scheduled meeting with the public.

IV. TEXT ANALYSIS: JUVENILE JUSTICE JO CO BUDGET: FY 2015 - 16

Does the information in the Juvenile Justice JO CO Budget inform the voter for better understanding and decision-making?

A. Juvenile Justice Public Safety Fund & Special Programs Funds: FY 2015-16

The JJ PSF has three parts.

Part 1.	Public Safety Fund Description	350 words	
Part 2.	Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program	301 words	
Part 3.	Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program	n/a	(Rental of 3 beds from Douglas County?)
	Total	651 words	

1. Public Safety Fund (PSF) Description

a) Program Cost: n/a. Cost not provided as the PSF description is a summary of the JJ programs described latter.

b) Text Length: Number of textual words describing the JO CO JJ Department of “Public Safety Fund,” was 350 words.

c) Text Content: Overall summary of all the JO CO JJ programs. Some of the information in the PSF description was O.K. Other information needed clarification or improvement (see following section IVA.1.d)).

d) Understanding: The reviewers would not be confident in explaining the JJ programs to their neighbors.*

- (1) Program Cost - n/a
- (2) Text Length - 350 words (too brief)
- (3) Text Content - Met budget standards, but variable (see above).
- (4) Understanding: *
 - Change (from analyzed FY 2010-11 - FY 2015-16 budgets) - A three year change was identified (PSF, p. 2), which was FY 2012-13 as the baseline prior to major reductions in the budget.
 - Needs/Requirements(?) Budget resources and requirements’ standards were identified, but the definition of “requirements” was not understood.
 - Standards Minimal identification of standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances with much work needed (e.g., No OARs or JO CO ordinances, etc.).
 - Significance/Value Reviewers do not understand the value/significance of the JJ program in a scientific versus “feeling’ point of view (i.e., what actually will be lost or gained beyond identification of FTE and budget changes?).
 - References
 - Sources - References/Vetted Adequate references were not provided for the interested reviewer to gain an understanding.

- Web Links Adequate Web Links were not provided, and therefore, the interested reviewer was unable to gain an understanding of the JJ program. Many web links were found relating to the “Review Questions” identified in Chapter IV. They provided a general description and understanding of topics, but were not adequate in identifying how they were specifically applicable to the JO CO JJ Department.
- Professional Documents were professionally written, consistent with budget document standards.

e) Observations

- The text of this section was variable for understanding.
- References and web links were poor to non-existent.
- Some standards and criteria were adequate, but the lack of others did not support understanding.
- Many technical terms, phrases, and programs were not explained.
- The history of the public safety funding issue started in 2000, six years before the PSF was formed.

Consider that since the 2000 Secure Rural Schools Act, Congress had repeatedly sent messages that federal payments would be phased out, and this was intended to give counties time to plan for the change. In light of the message and the local need, it is significant that information generated from a formal public planning process has not been tried. Why not? Probably because serious long-range planning involving the public requires time, and is not a quick fix. On the other hand, it has been over 15 years since the message began.

f) Review Questions The need for the use of the abbreviation for “reference” (Ref.) is an acknowledgment that the reviewers did not understand how a word or phrase was being used.

- Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP). (Ref.)
- The TARP "county payments" money replaced the O&C distributions that the County received for many years. (Ref.)
- Summary [table] of the Public Safety Fund (Resources and Requirements; p. I-1) & Resources And Requirements Public Safety Fund (12) [Table at PSF, pps. 1 - 2 (Ref.)]
 1. “Requirements” (defined where?) (Ref.)
- What are the “requirements” of Schedule A (p. I-1)?
- What is the relationship of Schedule B to:
 1. Public Safety Fund (240) at page D4?
 2. Juvenile Justice Special Programs Fund (246) at page H49?
- Categories specified in Oregon Local Budget Law? (Ref.)

2. Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program

Resources And Requirements: PUBLIC SAFETY FUND (12) (p. 2)

Adopted by Governing Body; Budget for Next Year 2015-16: \$982,700

a) Program Cost:

FY 2015-16 (12)

FTE (12): 8.6 (Schedule B) (p.57)

Budgeted (12): \$1,019,700 (Schedule B) (p.57)

Budgeted (12): Requirements: \$1,019,700; Net \$817,800 (Schedule A) (p.56)

FY 2010-11

FTE: 8.0 (Schedule B)

Budgeted: \$817,800 (Schedule B)

Budgeted: Requirements: \$817,800; Net \$817,800 (Schedule A)

b) **Text Length:** 301 words

c) **Text Content:** Some of the information in the Court & Field Program description was O.K. Other information needed clarification or improvement (see following section IV.A.2.d)).

d) **Understanding:** The reviewers would not be confident in explaining the JJ programs to their neighbors.*

(1) Program Cost - \$817,800 or \$982,700? The rest of the analysis will assume \$817,800.

(2) Text Length - 301 words (too brief)

(3) Text Content - Meet budget standards, but variable (see above).

(4) Understanding: *

- Cost - \$817,800 or \$982,700?

- Change (from analyzed FY 2010-11 - FY 2015-16 budgets) - A three year change was identified (PSF, p. 2), which was FY 2012-13 as the baseline prior to major reductions in the budget.

The JJ Court & Field Program was the only JO CO JJ Dept program to increase from FY 2010-11 - FY 2015-16. The FTE increased from 8.0 to 8.6 and the budget increased from \$817,800 to \$1,019,700. However, the reviewers could not identify what services and community impacts improved.

- Needs/Requirements(?) Budget resources and requirements' standards were identified, but the definition of "requirements" was not understood.

- Standards Minimal identification of standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances with much work needed. The ORS 419A.010-020 standard was identified, but could not be found in the literature by the reviewers.

- Significance/Value Reviewers do not understand the value/significance of the JJ program in a scientific versus "feeling" point of view (i.e., what actually will be lost or gained beyond identification of FTE and budget?).

- Sources - References/Vetted Adequate references were not provided.
- Web Links Adequate Web Links were not provided.
- Professional Documents were professionally written, consistent with budget document standards.

e) Observations

- The text of this section was variable for understanding.
- References and web links were poor to non-existent.
- Some standards and criteria were adequate, but the lack of others did not support understanding. A big problem and stumbling block was that the referenced ORS 419A.010-020 standard could not be found in the literature by the reviewers.
- Many technical terms, phrases, and programs were not explained.
- The history of the public safety funding issue started in 2000, six years before the PSF was formed.

f) Review Questions

- What are the “requirements” of Schedule A (p. I-1)?
- What is the relationship of Schedule B to:
 1. Public Safety Fund (240) at page D4?
 2. Juvenile Justice Special Programs Fund (246) at page H49?
- ORS 419A.010-020 can not be found (Ref.). What about 419B?.
- Felony youth referrals are received from law enforcement (Ref.).
- Felony youth referrals are evaluated by the DA’s Office for legal sufficiency (Ref.).
- The course of disposition for Felony youth referrals are prescribed by JJ (Ref.).
- Misdemeanor referrals are evaluated by JJ (Ref.).
- The program promotes community protection through accountability for youth, opportunity for reformation and justice for victims (Ref.). What are the different outcomes if funded, or not?
- Severity of offense and risk assessment with most services being directed to the medium to high risk offender (Ref.).
- Lower risk, first time offenders are usually diverted from court (Ref.).
- Informal action which includes Community Service and restitution to victims when appropriate (Ref.).
- Outcomes include mandates that youth abide by their informal contracts or court ordered probation conditions (Ref.).
- Victim restitution is collected or docketed as civil judgment in most cases (Ref.).
- Caseload contacts are maintained according to the youth's level of risk and the severity of the crime (Ref.).
- Youth violations result in a structured sanction process (Ref.).
- The supervision of medium and high risk youth may include a mandate to attend Aggression Replacement Training (Ref.).

- The supervision of medium and high risk youth may include a mandate to attend Functional Family Therapy (FFT) (Ref.).
- Evidence-based programs (Ref.).

- A budget goal of community outreach is accomplished in the geographical assignment of caseloads (Ref.).
- In compliance with law, schools are advised of youth pending court and final dispositions (Ref.).
- Juvenile participates in quarterly meetings of law enforcement (Ref.) schools (Ref.) and treatment providers (Ref.).
- Options, Department of Human Services and Oregon Youth Authority consult with the program regarding out-of-home placements (Ref.).
- Functional Family Therapy is partially funded by the Division and accepts family referrals from throughout the community (Ref.).
- Funding revenue (Resources?) from the state, office rent and fees account for 20% of the budget. The balance (of what?) is required (meaning of required?) from County public safety funds (Ref.).
- The department maintains training standards and accreditation through the Oregon Juvenile Department Director's Association (OJDDA) (Ref.).

- WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENT OUTCOMES IF THIS JJ PROGRAM IS FUNDED, OR NOT, OR PARTIALLY FUNDED?
 1. Why is this program important?
 2. What does the county lose if not funded?
 3. What are the impacts (Section V.B)?

3. Juvenile Justice Shelter-Detention Program n/a: The JJ Shelter Detention Program was not identified in the FY 2015-16 budget.

a) Program Cost:

FY 2015-16

FTE: 0.0 (Schedule B)
Budgeted: \$0.0 (Schedule B)
Budgeted: Requirements: 0.0 (Schedule A)

Three (3) youth detention beds rented from Douglas County, but cannot track the FTE and budget for this JJ service.

FY 2010-11

FTE: 23.7 (Schedule B)
Budgeted: \$1,674,600 (Schedule B)
Budgeted: Requirements: \$1,674,600; Net \$1,674,600 (Schedule A)

14 youth detention beds in Grants Pass
16 youth shelter beds in Grants Pass.

b) Text Length: No text as local Shelter/Detention program not funded.

c) Text Content: There was no information. Some of the information in the FY 2010-11 Justice Shelter Detention Program description was O.K. Other information needed clarification or improvement (see following section IV.A.3.d)).

d) Understanding: No program/no text. However, based on the FY 2010-11 Shelter/Detention program budget, the reviewers would not be confident in explaining the programs to their neighbors.*

- (1) Program Cost - n/a
- (2) Text Length - FY 2015-16: No Text; FY 2010-11: 149 words (too brief)
- (3) Text Content - n/a.
- (4) Understanding: *
 - Change (from analyzed FY 2010-11 - FY 2015-16 budgets) - No program/no text. A three year change was identified (PSF, p. 2), which was FY 2012-13 as the baseline prior to major reductions in the budget.

The Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program was decimated between FY 2010-11 - FY 2015-16. The FTE decreased from 23.7 to zero (0), and the budget decreased from \$1,674.600 to zero (0). However, the reviewers could not identify what services were lost and what adverse community impacts resulted from losing local Grants Pass beds (i.e., 14 youth detention beds and 16 youth shelter beds).

- Needs/Requirements(?) No program/no text. FY 2010-11 budget resources and requirements' standards were identified, but the definition of "requirements" was not understood. For purposes of understanding the Shelter-Detention program should be divided and described in its two component parts: 1. Shelter and 2. Detention.
- Standards Minimal identification of standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances with much work needed in the FY 2010-11 budget. The ORS 419A.010-020 standard was identified, but could not be found in the literature by the reviewers.
- Significance/Value Reviewers do not understand the value/significance of the JJ program FY 2010-11 budget in a scientific versus "feeling" point of view (i.e., what actually will be lost or gained beyond identification of FTE and budget?).
- Sources - References/Vetted Adequate references were not provided.
- Web Links Adequate Web Links were not provided.
- Professional Budget documents were professionally written.

e) Observations (For FY 2010-11 JJ Shelter Detention Program)

- The text of this section was variable for understanding.
- References and web links were poor to non-existent.
- Some standards and criteria were adequate, but the lack of others did not support understanding. A big problem and stumbling block was that the referenced ORS 419A.012 standard could not be found in the literature by the reviewers.
- ORS 419C.145 was found (ORS 419C.145, Grounds for pre-adjudication detention).
- Many technical terms, phrases, and programs were not explained.
- The history of the public safety funding issue started in 2000, six years before the PSF was formed.

f-1) Review Questions

The Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program is not identified in the FY 2015-16 budget, yet news articles continue to inform about a rental detention program. For example, see *'Status quo' budget proposed for coming year*. Where in the budget document is identification of the rental detention program?

- Hall Shaun. April 20, 2016 'Status quo' budget proposed for coming year. Front Page News, The Grants Pass Daily Courier. Grants Pass, OR.

Juvenile Justice Director Jim Goodwin said accused felons were sometimes cited and released, rather than held in detention, due to closure of the county's youth detention facility.

Part of that public safety system is the county's juvenile department, which handles court cases, probation and counseling services for youth. Goodwin said the three youth detention beds that the county rents in Douglas County were used to the max last year.

"We used that completely," he said. "There were some (youths) we weren't able to detain because of the limitation."

He proposed the county rent another bed.

It would cost about \$1 million to reopen Josephine County's shelter and detention facility, which was closed due to budget cuts four years ago. It can hold 14 youths in detention and 16 in its shelter.

The facility, in downtown Grants Pass, previously held an average of six to eight youths in detention, with that number often dropping to three or four during the week, and up to capacity on weekends.

"We were oftentimes full," Goodwin said. "You'd hit a weekend, we'd be full."

The shelter had a waiting list, he said. The expected opening of the nonprofit Hearts With a Mission youth shelter in northeast Grants Pass will help, he said.

In the last year, the county's juvenile department received nearly 300 referrals from law enforcement agencies, down from about 400 before budget cuts hit four years ago, according to Goodwin.

- WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENT OUTCOMES IF THIS JJ PROGRAM IS FUNDED, OR NOT, OR PARTIALLY FUNDED?
 1. Why is this program important?
 2. What does the county lose if not funded?
 3. What are the impacts (Section V.B)?

f-2) JJ Shelter Detention Program Review Questions: FY 2010-11

Purpose of Program:

- ORS 419A.012 requires that juvenile department staff be present at all youth hearings and take charge of the youth following the hearing as directed by the court.
- Detention is often required pre/post hearing and serves to provide public safety.
- Shelter serves to provide care, assessment and evaluation of youth who are dependents of the court or on probation.
- The Department of Human Services contracts with Juvenile for shelter beds; resources and staff are shared between programs and, the revenue offsets the expense of operating a detention center.

- Quality healthcare, education and nutrition are provided to all youth.
- Detention outcomes include the provision of lodging all youth brought in by law enforcement for felony type offenses or other criteria listed under ORS 419C.145.
- The housing of measure 11 youth will be afforded to ease jail crowding and provide youth with a more appropriate custody environment.

B. Juvenile Justice JO CO Special Revenue Funds (SRF) Budget (33): FY 2015-16
(p. 95)

	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>
FY 2015-16	1.6	\$181,000

1. Juvenile Justice Special Programs Fund (33)

Resources & Requirements: JUVENILE JUSTICE SPECIAL PROGRAMS FUND (33) (p. 95)
Adopted by Governing Body; Budget for Next Year 2015-16: \$181,000

Program Cost & Text Parts:

FY 2015-16 (33)

FTE (33): 1.6 (Schedules B) (p. 97)

Budgeted (33): \$181,000 (Schedule B) (p. 97)

Budgeted (33): Requirements: \$181,000; Net: \$181,000 (Schedule A) (p. 96)

FY 2010-11 (246)

FTE (246): 2.85 (Schedule A) (p. H50)

Budgeted (246): Requirements: \$275,600 (Schedule A) (p. H50)

Budgeted (246): Requirements: \$275,600 (p. H49)

The FY 2015-16 SRF has three text parts.

	(Words)	(Budget)
Part 1. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program	121 words	\$55,100
Part 2. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program	97 words	\$107,900
Part 3. Juvenile Justice Flex Program	<u>45 words</u>	<u>\$18,000</u>
Total	263 words	\$181,000

2. Juvenile Justice Special Programs

a) Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program (33): FY 2015-16

(1) Program Cost:

FTE (33): 0.60 (Schedules A & B) (pps. 96 & 100)

Budgeted (33): \$55,100 (Schedule B) (p. 100)

Budgeted: Requirements (33): \$55,100; Net - (Schedule A) (p. 96)

(2) Text Length: 121 words

FTE: 0.60 0.60/121 = 0.005 FTE per word

Budgeted: \$55,100 \$55,100/121 = \$455.37 program cost per word

(3) Text Content: Some of the information in the Child Advocacy Program description was O.K. Other information needed clarification or improvement (see following section IV.A.2.d)).

(4) Understanding The reviewers would not be confident in explaining the JJ programs to their neighbors.*

(a) Program Cost - 0.60 FTE, \$55,100.

(b) Text Length - 121 words (too brief).

(c) Text Content - Met budget standards, but variable (see above).

(d) Understanding: *

- Change (from analyzed FY 2010-11 - FY 2015-16 budgets) A three year change was identified at the Special Revenue Funds (SRF) level of \$181,000 (SRF, p. 95), which was FY 2012-13 as the baseline prior to major reductions in the budget. No information was provided on the three year change at the JJ Special Programs Funds (SPF, p. 96).
- Needs/Requirements(?) Budget resources and requirements' standards were identified, but the definition of "requirements" was not understood.
- Standards Minimal identification of standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances with much work needed.
- Significance/Value Reviewers do not understand the value/significance of the JJ program in a scientific versus "feeling" point of view (i.e., what actually will be lost or gained beyond identification of FTE and budget?).
- Sources - References/Vetted Adequate references were not provided.
- Web Links Adequate Web Links were not provided.
- Professional Documents were professionally written, consistent with budget document standards.

(5) Observations

- The text of this section was variable for understanding.
- References and web links were poor to non-existent.
- Some standards and criteria were adequate, but the lack of others did not support understanding.
- Many technical terms, phrases, and programs were not explained.
- The history of the public safety funding issue started in 2000, six years before the PSF was formed.

(6) Review Questions

- What are the "requirements" of Schedule A (p. I-1)?
- What is the relationship of Schedule B to:
 1. Public Safety Fund (240) at page D4?
 2. Juvenile Justice Special Programs Fund (246) at page H49?

Purpose of Program (p. II-1)

- The Child Abuse Multidisciplinary team (MDT) is mandated under ORS 418.746-796.
- A non-competitive grant is offered counties to maintain a team to evaluate all cases of child abuse, neglect and fatality.

- Juvenile Justice oversees the Child Advocate (.6 FTE) who schedules and records all MDT staffings, conducts forensic interviews, maintains video evidence and coordinates the legal and treatment process for child victims.

Program Objectives (p. II-1)

- Program objectives include providing a coordinated MDT approach to child abuse investigations, maintaining a trained team including the DA, law enforcement, Juvenile, Public Health, Mental Health, DHS, child treatment agencies and schools.
- Outcomes include advocating for all victims in legally substantiated cases and obtaining an 80% conviction rate when offender is charged with crimes against children.
- WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENT OUTCOMES IF THIS JJ PROGRAM IS FUNDED, OR NOT, OR PARTIALLY FUNDED?
 1. Why is this program important?
 2. What does the county lose if not funded?
 3. What are the impacts (Section V.B)?

b) Juvenile Justice Mediation Program (33): 2015-16

(1) Program Cost:

FTE (33): 1.0 (Schedules A & B) (pps. 96 & 103)

Budgeted (33): \$107,900 (Schedule B) (p. 103)

Budgeted (33): Requirements: \$107,900; Net - (Schedule A) (p. 96)

(2) Text Length: 97 words

FTE: 1.0 1.0/97 = 0.010 FTE per word

Budgeted: \$\$107,900 \$107,900/97 = \$1,112.37 program cost per word

(3) Text Content: Some of the information in the Mediation Program description was O.K. Other information needed clarification or improvement (see following section IV.A.2.d)).

(4) Understanding: The reviewers would not be confident in explaining the JJ programs to their neighbors.*

(a) Program Cost - 1.0 FTE: \$107,900

(b) Text Length - 97 words (too brief)

(c) Text Content - Met budget standards, but variable (see above).

(d) Understanding: *

- Change (from analyzed FY 2010-11 - FY 2015-16 budgets) A three year change was identified at the Special Revenue Funds (SRF) level of \$181,000 (SRF, p. 95), which was FY 2012-13 as the baseline prior to major reductions in the budget. No information was provided on the three year change at the JJ Special Programs Funds (SPF, p. 96).
- Needs/Requirements(?) Budget resources and requirements' standards were identified, but the definition of "requirements" was not understood.
- Standards Minimal identification of standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances with much work needed.
- Significance/Value Reviewers do not understand the value/significance of the JJ program in a scientific versus "feeling" point of view (i.e., what actually will be lost or gained beyond identification of FTE and budget?).
- Sources - References/Vetted Adequate references were not provided.
- Web Links Adequate Web Links were not provided.
- Professional Documents were professionally written, consistent with budget document standards.

(5) Observations

- The text of this section was variable for understanding.
- References and web links were poor to non-existent.
- Some standards and criteria were adequate, but the lack of others did not support understanding.
- Many technical terms, phrases, and programs were not explained.
- The history of the public safety funding issue started in 2000, six years before the PSF was formed.

(6) Review Questions

- What are the “requirements” of Schedule A (p. I-1)?
- What is the relationship of Schedule B to:
 1. Public Safety Fund (240) at page D4?
 2. Juvenile Justice Special Programs Fund (246) at page H49?

Purpose of Program: (p. II-2)

- ORS 107.775 mandates Court Mediation to assist families to develop child custody and parenting plans.
- The Mediator does not make recommendations to the court but, will work with parents to identify a mutually acceptable plan.
- The program leads to decreased court time and reduces future trauma to children.
- Parents are more likely to comply with their own mediated agreements.
- As an outcome, Court Mediation is to result in 100% of the applicable families having access to the program.
- A weekly orientation is afforded prior to mediation for all parents who have a parenting conflict.

- WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENT OUTCOMES IF THIS JJ PROGRAM IS FUNDED, OR NOT, OR PARTIALLY FUNDED?
 1. Why is this program important?
 2. What does the county lose if not funded?
 3. What are the impacts (Section V.B)?

c) Juvenile Justice Flex Program (33): FY 2015-16

(1) Program Cost:

FTE (33): 0.0 (Schedules A & B) (pps. 96 & 106)

Budgeted (33): \$18,000 (Schedule B) (p. 106)

Budgeted (33): Requirements: \$18,000; Net: - (Schedule A) (p. 96)

(2) Text Length: 45 words

FTE: 0.0

n/a

Budgeted: \$18,000

$\$18,000/45 = \400.00 program cost per word

(3) Text Content: Some of the information in the Flex Program description was O.K. Other information needed clarification or improvement (see following section IV.A.2.d)).

(4) Understanding: The reviewers would not be confident in explaining the JJ programs to their neighbors.*

(a) Program Cost - 0.0 FTE; \$18,000

(b) Text Length - 45 words (too brief?)

(c) Text Content - Met budget standards, but variable (see above).

(d) Understanding: *

- Change (from analyzed FY 2010-11 - FY 2015-16 budgets) A three year change was identified at the Special Revenue Funds (SRF) level of \$181,000 (SRF, p. 95), which was FY 2012-13 as the baseline prior to major reductions in the budget. No information was provided on the three year change at the JJ Special Programs Funds (SPF, p. 96).
- Needs/Requirements(?) Budget resources and requirements' standards were identified, but the definition of "requirements" was not understood.
- Standards Minimal identification of standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances with much work needed.
- Significance/Value Reviewers do not understand the value/significance of the JJ program in a scientific versus "feeling" point of view (i.e., what actually will be lost or gained beyond identification of FTE and budget?).
- Sources - References/Vetted Adequate references were not provided.
- Web Links Adequate Web Links were not provided.
- Professional Documents were professionally written, consistent with budget document standards.

(5) Observations

- The text of this section was variable for understanding.
- References and web links were poor to non-existent.
- Some standards and criteria were adequate, but the lack of others did not support understanding.
- Many technical terms, phrases, and programs were not explained.
- The history of the public safety funding issue started in 2000, six years before the PSF was formed.

(6) Review Questions

- What are the “requirements” of Schedule A (p. I-1)?
- What is the relationship of Schedule B to:
 1. Public Safety Fund (240) at page D4?
 2. Juvenile Justice Special Programs Fund (246) at page H49?

Purpose of Program: (p. II-3)

- Juvenile Flex Funds are provided by Oregon Youth Authority and utilized for the purchase of treatment services and other barrier removal items for youth committed to OYA
- as well as youth under the supervision of Josephine County.
- This program is totally self-supporting.
- WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENT OUTCOMES IF THIS JJ PROGRAM IS FUNDED, OR NOT, OR PARTIALLY FUNDED?
 1. Why is this program important?
 2. What does the county lose if not funded?
 3. What are the impacts (Section V.B)?

C. Major Observations For JJ Programs

The Reviewers would not be confident in explaining the JO CO JJ Department's programs to their neighbors.

- JJ Programs' Cost - Voters generally don't have technical expertise to determine if costs are appropriate.
- Text Length - JJ programs text descriptions were generally too brief for the voter to understand.
- Text Content - Some content information good to adequate. Other information lacking, needed improvement, or clarification. Some issues were not addressed such as the history of the public safety funding issue starting in 2000, six years before the PSF was formed. Many technical terms, phrases, and programs were not explained. In summary, the text sections were variable for understanding.
- Understanding Change (from analyzed FY 2010-11 - FY 2015-16 budgets) - A three year change was identified at the Public Safety Fund (PSF) and Special Revenue Funds (SRF) levels, but not at the JJ program levels. For example, the SRF of \$181,000 (SRF, p. 95), which was FY 2012-13 as the baseline prior to major reductions in the budget. However, no information was provided on the three year change at the JJ Special Programs Funds (SPF, p. 96).
The Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program was decimated between FY 2010-11 - FY 2015-16. The FTE decreased from 23.7 to zero (0), and the budget decreased from \$1,674,600 to zero (0). However, the reviewers could not identify what services were lost and what adverse community impacts resulted from losing local Grants Pass beds (i.e., 14 youth detention beds and 16 youth shelter beds).
- Needs/Requirements(?) FTE and Budget resources and requirements' standards were identified, but the definition of "requirements" was not understood. For purposes of understanding, the Shelter-Detention program should be divided and described in its two component parts: 1. Shelter and 2. Detention.
- Standards Minimal identification of standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances with much work needed in the FY 2010-11 budget. Some standards and criteria were adequate, but the lack of others did not support understanding. A big problem and stumbling block was that the referenced ORS 419A.010-020 standard could not be found in the literature by the Reviewers.
- Significance/Value Reviewers do not understand the value/significance of the JJ program FY 2010-11 budget in a scientific versus "feeling" point of view (i.e., what actually will be lost or gained beyond identification of FTE and budget?).
- Sources - References/Vetted Adequate references were not provided. References and web links were poor to non-existent.
- Web Links Adequate Web Links were not provided. References and web links were poor to non-existent.
- Professional Budget documents were professionally written.

Summaries of following are being developed: End Table IV-1. Juvenile Justice FTE, Budget & Words: FY 2015 - 16 and End Table IV-2. Four (4) Juvenile Justice Programs For FTE, Budget & Words: FY 2015 - 16

V. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FY 2010-11 AND FY 2015-16

Chapter V is a work in progress for quality control of numbers and tables.

JO CO Annual Budget Documents The annual JO CO JJ budget documents do not change much in terms of the textual department information. However, the adopted FY 2010-11 and FY 2015-16 budgets for the JO CO JJ Department have a big difference of 24.35 FTE and \$1,402,400 (Text Table V.1 and End Table VI.1). Based on the budget documents, “Does the public understand the differences, if any, to the community?”

- JO CO Board of County Commissioners. June 17, 2015. *Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget FY 2015-16*. JO CO BCC Resolution Number 2015-026. Grants Pass, OR.
- JO CO Board of County Commissioners. 2010. *Public Safety Fund Adopted Budget FY 2010 - 11*. Grants Pass, OR.

A. JJ Public Safety Fund & JJ Special Programs Funds: Compared For FY 2010-11 & FY 2015-16

1. Full-time Equivalent:

FTE: Requirements: Net: (Schedule A); FTE Total Requirements (Schedule B)

Full-time equivalent (FTE) or whole time equivalent (WTE) is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person (or student) in a way that makes workloads or class loads comparable across various contexts. FTE is often used to measure a worker's or student's involvement in a project, or to track cost reductions in an organization. An FTE of 1.0 is equivalent to a full-time worker or student, while an FTE of 0.5 signals half of a full work or school load

a) JJ Public Safety Fund Without the JJ Shelter-Detention programs there was a significant decrease in the FTE in the JO CO Juvenile Justice Department (Text Table VI-1).

Full-time Equivalent : - 24.35 FTE (24.35/34.55 = 70% loss in FTE)

Need text descriptions of Text Tables.

- Text Table V.1. Public Safety Fund For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
- Text Table V.2. JJ Special Programs Funds For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
- Text Table V-3. Public Safety Fund For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
- Text Table V-4. JJ Special Programs Funds For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
- Text Table V-5. Evaluation of Text Length: FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11

b) JJ Special Programs Funds

Need text descriptions of five Text Tables.

Text Table V.1. Public Safety Fund For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11								
	FTE				Total Budgeted			
	FY 2015-16¹		FY 2010-11²		FY 2015-16¹		FY 2010-11²	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	\$	%	\$	%
JJ Court & Field	8.60	1.075%	8.00	100%	\$817,800	1.25%	\$652,900	100%
JJ Shelter-Detention	0.0 3 beds	0.0%	23.7 n/a	100%	\$0.0	0.0%	\$1,674,600	100%
Totals	8.6	0.270%	31.7	100%	\$817,800	0.351%	\$2,327,500	100%
Reference: End Table VI-1. FTE & Budgeted For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11								

1. FY 2015-16 Percentages are as compared to FY 2010-11.
2. FY 2010-11 Percentages are always 100% because the percentage change is from the baseline year of FY 2010-11.

Text Table V.2. JJ Special Programs Funds For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11								
	FTE				Total Budgeted			
	FY 2015-16¹		FY 2010-11²		FY 2015-16¹		FY 2010-11²	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	\$	%	\$	%
JJ Child Advocacy	0.60	32%	1.85	100%	\$55,100	48%	\$115,500	100%
JJ Mediation	1.00	100%	1.00	100%	\$107,900	75%	\$143,800	100%
JJ Flex	0.0	0%	0.0	0%	18,000	110%	\$16,300	100%
Totals	1.60	56%	2.85	100%	\$181,000	66%	\$275,600	100%
Reference: End Table VI-1. FTE & Budgeted For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11								

1. FY 2015-16 Percentages are as compared to FY 2010-11.
2. FY 2010-11 Percentages are always 100% because the percentage change is from the baseline year of FY 2010-11.

2. Budgeted Costs

a) JJ Public Safety Fund Without the JJ Shelter-Detention programs' budgets (i.e.,\$1,674,600) there was a significant decrease (64%) in the budget dollars in the JO CO Juvenile Justice Department (Table VI-A). At the same time there was an increase (25%) in the JJ Court & Field budget for a total department decrease of 38%.

The FTE and cost of renting three detention beds from Douglas County are not identified in the budget document. ???

Shelter-Detention programs' Budgets

Budget: - \$1,674,600 ($\$1,674,600/\$2,603,100 = 64\%$ loss in budgeted dollars)

JJ Court & Field Budget

Budget: + \$164,900 ($\$817,800/\$652,900 = 25\%$ increase in budget dollars)

Total JO CO JJ Department Budget (Text Table V-1)

Budget: \$2,603,100 - \$998,800 = 38% decrease in the JJ department's budget

Need text descriptions of Text Tables.

Text Table V.1. Public Safety Fund For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V.2. JJ Special Programs Funds For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V-3. Public Safety Fund For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V-4. JJ Special Programs Funds For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V-5. Evaluation of Text Length: FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11

b) JJ Special Programs Funds

Need text descriptions of Text Tables.

Text Table V.1. Public Safety Fund For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V.2. JJ Special Programs Funds For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V-3. Public Safety Fund For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V-4. JJ Special Programs Funds For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11
Text Table V-5. Evaluation of Text Length: FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11

Text Table V-3. Public Safety Fund For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11								
	Text Words				Total Budgeted Per Word			
	FY 2015-16¹		FY 2010-11²		FY 2015-16¹		FY 2010-11²	
	Words	%	Words	%	\$	\$	\$	\$
JJ PSF Description	350	54%	364	44%	\$0.0/350	0	\$0.0/364	0
JJ Court & Field	301	46%	316	38%	\$817,800/ 301	\$2,717	\$652,900/ 316	\$2,066
JJ Shelter-Detention	0	0.0%	149	18%	\$0.0	0	\$1,674,600/ 149	\$11,239
Totals	651	100%	829	100%	\$817,800	\$2,717	\$2,327,500	\$6,653 ³
Reference: End Table VI-1. FTE & Budgeted For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11								

1. FY 2015-16 Percentages are as compared to FY 2010-11.
2. FY 2010-11 Percentages are always 100% because the percentage change is from the baseline year of FY 2010-11.
3. Average

Text Table V-4. JJ Special Programs Funds For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11								
	Text Words				Total Budgeted Per Word			
	FY 2015-16¹		FY 2010-11²		FY 2015-16¹		FY 2010-11²	
	Words	%	Words	%	\$	\$	\$	\$
JJ Child Advocacy	121	46%	198	54%	\$55,100/ 121	\$455	\$115,500/ 198	\$583
JJ Mediation	97	37%	125	34%	\$107,900/ 97	\$1,112	\$143,800/ 125	\$1,150
JJ Flex	45	17%	42	12%	18,000/45	\$400	\$16,300/42	\$388
Totals	263	100%	365	100%	\$181,000	\$656 ³	\$275,600	\$707
Reference: End Table VI-1. FTE & Budgeted For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11								

1. FY 2015-16 Percentages are as compared to FY 2010-11.
2. FY 2010-11 Percentages are always 100% because the percentage change is from the baseline year of FY 2010-11.
3. Average

FY 2015-16

Public Safety Fund (PSF): FY 2015-16

	(Words)	(Budget)
Part 1. Public Safety Fund Description	350 words	0
Part 2. Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program	301 words	\$817,800
Part 3. Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program	<u>n/a</u>	<u>0</u>
(Rent for 3 beds fm Douglas CO	Total 651 words	\$817,800

Juvenile Justice Special Program Funds (SPF): FY 2015-16

	(Words)	(Budget)
Part 1. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program	121 words	\$55,100
Part 2. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program	97 words	\$107,900
Part 3. Juvenile Justice Flex Program	<u>45 words</u>	<u>\$18,000</u>
Total	263 words	\$181,000

FY 2010-11

Public Safety Fund (PSF): FY 2010-11

	(Words)	(Budget)
1. Public Safety Fund Description	364 words	0
2. Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program	316 words	\$652,900
3. Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program	<u>149 words</u>	<u>\$1,674,600</u>
Total	829 words	\$2,327,500

Juvenile Justice Special Program Funds (SPF): FY 2010-11

	(Words)	(Budget)
1. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program	198 words	\$115,500
2. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program	125 words	\$143,800
3. Juvenile Justice Flex Program	<u>42 words</u>	<u>\$16,300</u>
Total	365 words	\$275,600

3. Subjective Evaluation of JJ Program's Text Length: FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11 (Text Table V-5)

Text Table V-5. Evaluation of Text Length: FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11								
Fiscal Years	FTE/Words		FTE per Word		Budget/Words		Budget per Word	
	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010	2015	2010
PSF Description ¹	0/305	0/364	0	0	0/305	0		
Court & Field ²	8.6/301	8.0/ 316	0.029	0.025	\$817,800/ 301	\$652,900/ 316	\$2,717	\$2,066
Shelter ^{3.1}	-	23.7	-	-	-	\$1,674,600	-	-
Detention ^{3.2}	-		-		-			
Rent Beds ^{3.3}	3 beds	-	-		-		-	
Child Advocacy ⁴	0.6/121	1.85/ 198	0.005	0.009	\$55,100/ 121	\$115,500/ 198	\$455	\$583
Mediation ⁵	1.0/97	1.0/ 125	0.010	0.008	\$107,900/ 97	\$143,800/ 125	\$1,112	\$1,150
Flex ⁶	-/45	0.0/42		-	\$18,000/ 45	\$16,300/42	\$400	\$388
Totals ⁷								
Averages ⁸	10.2					\$		\$

Footnotes

1. Public Safety Fund (PSF) Description
2. Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program (JJ Court & Field)
3. Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program (JJ Shelter-Detention)
4. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program (JJ Child Advocacy)
5. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program (JJ Mediation)
6. Juvenile Justice Flex Program (JJ Flex)
7. Totals
8. Totals for four Juvenile Justice Programs, including PSF Description.

4. Subjective Evaluation of JJ Program's Text: FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11

The Exploratory Committee's determination was that in general the text context provided was adequate to minimally adequate (Text Table VI-3).

1. History. Consider that since the 2000 Secure Rural Schools Act, Congress had repeatedly sent messages that federal payments would be phased out, and this was intended to give counties time to plan for the change. In light of the message and the local need, it is significant that information generated from a formal public planning process has not been tried. Why not? Probably because serious long-range planning involving the public requires time, and is not a quick fix. On the other hand, it has been over 15 years since the message. How many more years are to go by before we have answers?

In the opinion of the reviewers there was a minimal identification of history with much work needed. There was not a description of history since 2000 that addressed the critical probability that federal payments to JO CO would cease.

2. Program Descriptions In the opinion of the reviewers there were program descriptions to meet budget standards.

3. Standards In the opinion of the reviewers there was a minimal identification of standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances with much work needed (i.e., not sure that all ORS identified, No OARs or JO CO ordinances identified). In some cases there was not an adequate identification of standards.

4. Resources and Requirements In the opinion of the reviewers the Resources and Requirements were identified. - If they understood these terms?

5. Changes A three year change was identified, but the Committee felt that a change from FY 2012-13 was also needed as the baseline prior to major reductions in the budget.

6. Professional In the opinion of the reviewers the documents were professionally written, consistent with budget document standards.

5. Understanding JJ Text Descriptions: FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11

Understanding of Text is a judgement. Understanding by Whalen and Walker was a subjective evaluation of how comfortable they were in understanding the JO CO JJ Department. Could the reviewers explain the JO CO JJ Department a few days later without notes?

The reviewers understanding for six categories follows (End Table VI-4)

1. Need - Budget Requirements. Reviewers noted a need was identified as an FTE and budget with a text description of the program.
2. Value - Significance. Reviewers do not understand the value/significance of the JJ program in a scientific versus “feeling’ point of view (i.e., what actually will be lost or gained beyond identification of FTE and budget?).
3. Change Reviewers do not understand Changes In Program.
4. Sources - References/Vetted. Adequate References were not provided in order for interested Reviewer to gain understanding. Adequate is the key as the Reviewers spent 60 hours plus researching and following references provided without feeling that they understood the program.
5. Web Links Adequate Web Links were not provided in order for interested Reviewer to gain understanding. Many web links were found relating to the “Review Questions” identified in Chapter IV. They provided a general description and understanding of topics, but were not adequate in identifying how they were applicable to the JO CO JJ Department. Adequate is the key as the Reviewers spent 60 hours plus researching and following the few web links provided without feeling that they understood the program.
6. Understand - Overall Understanding The reviewers would not be confident in explaining the JJ programs to their neighbors.

In general, the sought after understanding by the reviewers in over 60 hours of research and study did not materialize. They would not be confident in explaining the JJ programs to their neighbors.

The reviewers believe that a major improvement in understanding could occur if JO CO would develop a citizen’s guide to the budget (Appendix A) as a companion to the budget and implement several other recommendations of the Committee as well as (Chapter VI).

B. Impacts Compared For FY 2010-11 & FY 2015-16 Budgets

1. Academic Research On Impacts: 2008 - 2011 What are the different impacts from, in effect two alternatives: JO CO's FY 2010-11 & FY 2015-16 budgets? Much of the general results were identified by academic from 2008 - 2011 (Appendix B).

- Walker, Mike; Whalen, Jon, Members, Hugo Justice System & Public Safety Services Exploratory Committee, HNA&HS. Draft 2015. *Appendix B2. Studies & Information*. Supporting Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015. Hugo, OR.

2. Minimally Acceptable Level Of Pubic Safety Services (MALPSS) Identifying impacts from county budgets, and their standards and criteria, are identified in Section III.A., "Conditions, Indicators, & Standards" as part of the "Standards & Criteria For Text & Content Analysis." A big part of this focus is identifying the MALPSS.

3. Budget Helps Citizens to Assess the Impact on Their Own Circumstances The following is from the document, *Producing a Citizens' Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How?* (Appendix A)

- A guide provides a single place where the public can learn about the main features of the budget and gain access to more detailed reference sources. It also helps citizens to assess the impact on their own circumstances and on specific groups in society, including the effects on the burden of taxation, service provision and employment prospects.
- The macroeconomic and fiscal outlook is a key starting point. The prospects for the economy are an important determinant of resource availability in all local governments, and economic forecasts for at least the budget year should be presented.
- New spending and revenue policies being introduced in the budget should be summarized. The guide should explain why these new measures are being introduced, their expected impact on revenues and spending, and how they will contribute to the government's priorities. Citizens will wish to know how the budget will affect their own standards of living, and the nature and significance of the budget's impact on groups in society that are of particular policy interest (such as the poor and vulnerable, or different groups of taxpayers). 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.

4. Study Design In the long term, these impacts will be identified in *Study Design*. The proposed 2015 *Study Design* has three goals. The JS&PSS Exploratory Committee will accomplish Goal One in some form which is to complete the *Study Design*. Goal Two is to secure a grant for a professional independent impact *Study*. Goal Three is to develop and publish the impact *Study*.

- Hugo Justice System & Public Safety Services Exploratory Committee. Draft July 18, 2013. *Justice System & Public Safety Services Issue Scope Of Work* (Scope). Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. Hugo, OR.
- Hugo Justice System & Public Safety Services Exploratory Committee. Draft 2015. *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015*. Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. Hugo, OR.

5. Pre-Study Projects *Study Design* research projects prior to phase 3 contracted *Study* are encouraged. In this case, the Committee believes there is an opportunity for the JO CO JJ Department to perform this pre-*Study* look (see Chapter V, Recommendations).

- Mike Walker & Jon Whalen, Members, JS&PSS Exploratory Committee. Draft December 15, 2015; Updated January 1 & April 8, 2016. *Summary Highlights: Study Design Research Projects Prior To Phase 3 Contracted Study* (Public Outreach 5.3). Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. Hugo, OR.

Outreach
Justice System Exploratory Committee
Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015
http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/JSPSS_Outreach.htm

6. Impact Audiences Who are the impact audiences?

- a) Juveniles?
- b) Tax Payers?
- c) Communities?
- d) Government?

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Voter Educational Outreach Projects

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.

How can we be well-informed voters? And is there a way to sift through the noise and bluster of campaigns to get, as they used to say on Dragnet, “just the facts”?

Public Outreach. Outreach is targeted to provide information to groups of current or potential voters and/or to community partners regarding available public safety services (PSS) 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 the voter is refraining from acquiring knowledge of PSS when the cost of educating oneself exceeds the potential unknown benefit that the knowledge would provide.

Issue voting is often contrasted with party voting. This is when voters switch between issue voting and party voting depending on how much information is available to them about a given candidate. Low-information elections, such as those for congressional candidates, would thus be determined by party voting, whereas presidential elections, which tend to give voters much more information about each candidate, have the potential to be issue-driven. The Committee’s goal is issue voting.

Being an informed voter is tough as it means to be knowledgeable about the issues and positions of candidates when voting. However, knowledge is power even though most of us are busy with the day to day of work and responsibilities. It also means voters are able to make decisions without influence from outside factors intended to persuade those who may not fully understand an issue (e.g., PSS, etc.), and/or a candidate’s platform or ideas.

To put it bluntly most voters are assisted in being better informed when as many as possible low-growing fruits of information formats are available. The following recommendations by the Committee are intended to be some of those low-growing fruits.

Recommendation 1. Understanding Staffing Analysis The public needs to understand the needed staffing for the JO CO JJ Department, including its individual programs, especially during today's lack of trust environment. It is not enough to arrive at a budget in an open government setting (i.e., JO CO Budget Committee).

Budget Committee This committee is composed of three members of the public and the Board of Commissioners. The Budget Committee meets three or four times in a public setting each spring to review and approve proposed budget documents by the Budget Officer for the County. Budget Committee members should have an interest in County operations and an understanding of governmental budget processes

ORS Chapter 294 - <http://www.co.josephine.or.us/page.asp?navid=1730>

Oregon Local Budget Law ORS 294.305 Sections constituting Local Budget Law.

ORS 294.305 to 294.565 shall be known as the Local Budget Law. 12/19/2014 Josephine County Overview of Budget Process - <http://slideplayer.com/slide/9275522/>

What independent nongovernment documented staffing analysis has been completed for the JO CO JJ Department (MALPASS)?

MALPASS: Minimally Acceptable Level Of Pubic Safety Services

Justice System Exploratory Committee

Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

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

What organization's staffing standards were used for the staffing analysis (MALPASS)? See Chapters III and IV of *Standards For Public Safety Services*.

. Walker, Mike & Whalen, Jon. Very Draft February 1, 2016. *Standards For Public Safety Services* (Public Outreach 5.9), at Studies & Information. JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, HNAHS. Hugo, OR.

***Standards For Public Safety* 2016**

Studies & Information

JS&PSS Exploratory Committee

Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

Web Page: http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/JSPSS_Studies.htm

Chapter III. References on Public Safety Services Standards: Highlights

Chapter IV. More Detailed Bibliography on Public Safety Services Standards

Most of the staffing analysis papers are on police and fire/EMS services. However, the main point of this recommendation is that the present staffing conclusions are in the JO CO annual budget documents (but without the staffing analysis). The conclusions are identified as requirements (i.e., FTE and budgets) in Schedules A & B for each program. A little bit of additional clarification on needed/required staffing would have considerable effect or influence in helping voters understand the programs, their needs and benefits.

Recommendation 2. Department Descriptions & Relationships The descriptions of the JO CO JJ Department in the JO CO web pages and in the JO CO annual budget documents are not designed for easy consumption and understanding by the JO CO voters. The members of the Exploratory Committee are still trying to understand the JO CO JJ Department after approximately 80 hours of research. This county program is complex, especially its relationships with other juvenile programs.

Josephine County Juvenile Justice

<http://www.co.josephine.or.us/SectionIndex.asp?SectionID=163>

Budgets: Josephine County, Oregon

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

The JO CO JJ Department should consider developing standalone program documents summarizing its programs, including updated web pages, and flow charts. The goal is not legal requirements; the goal is public understanding moving toward public trust.

Recommendation 3. Professional Web Page for JO CO JJ Department The JO CO JJ Department's web page is a component of the JO CO's web page. It looks like the government, and it is brief in being helpful information toward public understanding. It communicates most effectively with JJ professionals.

Josephine County Juvenile Justice

<http://www.co.josephine.or.us/SectionIndex.asp?SectionID=163>

The JO CO JJ Department needs a supplemental web pages to promote and informed the public. For example, see the following.

- Washington County Juvenile Department - <http://www.co.washington.or.us/Juvenile/>
- Clackamas County Juvenile Department - <http://www.clackamas.us/juvenile/>
- Multnomah County, Dept of Community Justice (Dcj) Juvenile Services - <https://multco.us/dcj-juvenile>
- Marion County Juvenile Department - <http://www.co.marion.or.us/JUV>
- Benton County Juvenile - <https://www.co.benton.or.us/juvenile>

It is speculated that citizen groups (i.e., pro or con tax levies) would be willing to subsidize and/or secure volunteer services for supplemental web publications.

Recommendation 4. Use Of References & Links Reference and links to more detailed budget information should be provided. A greatly expanded use of "references" for opinions, issues, conditions, and programs would be valuable for voters that wish to know more after reading a JO CO program identified in the annual budget documents and JO CO's web pages.

Recommendation 5. Flow Chart of Josephine County Juvenile Justice Department The Exploratory Committee has not found any flow charts/diagrams depicting the JO CO JJ Department.

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. Flow diagrams are valuable in understanding the PSS, including the JJ. The bottom line, make full use of simple and effective charts and diagrams. For example, see the following.

- Juvenile Justice System Structure and Process Case Flow Diagram
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
- Yamhill County's Juvenile Justice System 2013
Yamhill County, Oregon Juvenile Justice Department
- Marion County Juvenile Department's Flow Charts
Marion County, Oregon Juvenile Department

Recommendation 6. Citizen's Guide To The Budget "For in the end, a budget is more than simply numbers on a page. It is a measure of how well we are living up to our obligations to ourselves and one another." Examples and references to citizen's guides to budgets follow. Except for *Producing a Citizens' Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How?*, they are not in any order of preference. They are arranged in the categories of federal, state, and local.

Producing a Citizens' Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How? (Appendix A)

Petrie, Murray and Shields, Jon. 2010.

OECD Journal on Budgeting, Volume 2010/2.

<https://www.oecd.org/gov/budgeting/48170438.pdf>

Citizen's Guide to the Fiscal Year 2014

Financial Report of the United States Government

<http://www.nmvoices.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/citizen-budget-guide-2014-update-web.pdf>

A Citizen's Guide to the Washington State Budget 2015

Senate Ways and Means Committee

<http://leg.wa.gov/Senate/Committees/WM/Documents/2015CGTB.pdf>

A Citizen's Guide to the Washington State Budget 2016

Senate Ways and Means Committee

http://leg.wa.gov/Senate/Committees/WM/Documents/Publications/2016/2016%20CGTB_Final_website.pdf

Citizen's Guide to the New Mexico State Budget: How the State Spends Money and Why it Matters, 2014

<http://www.nmvoices.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/citizen-budget-guide-2014-update-web.pdf>

Citizens' Guide to Local Budgets

Office of the New York State Comptroller

Division of Local Government and School Accountability

<https://www.osc.state.ny.us/localgov/pubs/releases/LocalBudgetGuide2010.pdf>

A local government budget can be difficult to understand for the average citizen who may not have a background in accounting or a familiarity with budgeting. However, with some basic knowledge about what budgets contain, why they are important, and how they are presented, every citizen of every local community in New York State should be able to decipher the budget document.

Citizen's Guide to the Adopted FY16 Budget

Sarasota County

<https://www.scgov.net/Finance/Budgets/2016%20Citizens%20Guide%20to%20the%20Budget.pdf>

City of Lewiston, Idaho

<http://www.cityoflewiston.org/index.aspx?NID=357>

Citizen's Guide to the New Mexico State Budget: 2014

<http://www.nmvoices.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/citizen-budget-guide-2014-update-web.pdf>

A Guide to Understanding Denver Public Schools' Budget

http://financialservices.dpsk12.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/DPS_CitizensGuide_final_web.pdf

A Citizen's Guide to the City's Budget Process

City of PalmBay, Florida

<http://www.palmbayflorida.org/home/showdocument?id=8646>

A Guide to Understanding the Budget: 2014 -15

Hamilton County Department of Education

http://www.pefchattanooga.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/HCDE_budget-guide_051515.pdf

A Citizens' Guide to the Clallam County Budget

<http://www.clallam.net/taxes/documents/Guide2002.pdf>

Reader's Guide to the Budget

Leon County Government, Fiscal Year 2007 Budget

http://www.leoncountyfl.gov/omb/budget06-07/budget/01-Readers_Guide/00-Readers_Guide.pdf

Budget User's Guide

Charleston County

<http://www.charlestoncounty.org/departments/budget/files/Budget%20Overview.pdf>

B. Summary

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. If community leaders want change, provide opportunities to the voting public.

The Committee provided six educational outreach recommendations. It believes they can all be developed with the existing knowledge and expertise currently available in the JO CO JJ Department, and/or available from volunteers.

1. Understanding Staffing Analysis
2. Department Descriptions & Relationships
3. Professional 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

VII. SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

- Do the reviewers understand the JO CO JJ Department?
- Do they know the value/significance of the department beyond their own private opinions?
- Would they be confident in explaining the JJ programs to their neighbors?
- Do they feel JJ programs should be reestablished at its level of service and funding prior to FY 2012-13, remain the same as today, or some other proposal?

A. Purpose

The purpose of this paper was to research, study, and become informed about the JO CO JJ Department through an analysis of the *Josephine County, Oregon Adopted Budget FY 2015-16*. The project included a comparison of the FY 2015-16 JJ JO CO Budget to the FY 2010-11 JJ JO CO Budget (prior to the major reductions across the county in FTE and budget dollars in FY 2012-13). The idea was to research, study and compare the two JJ budgets to understand the historic JJ program and what we have today. What are the differences, including the adverse and beneficial impacts. What was gained and what was lost?

This paper is likely to remain a draft in terms of addressing the review questions, standards and criteria. It is to be the final for an understanding of the JJ programs by the authors/Reviewers at the time they reviewed the applicable budget documents.

This paper is also intended to be a prototype for the Exploratory Committee's analysis of JO CO budget documents for all PSS programs.

B. Public Safety Fund (PSF): FY 2015-16

The information in Chapter I is a straight forward description of the Public Safety Fund and the FY 2015-16 JJ Department's two programs (i.e., 1. Court & Field Program, and 2. Shelter Detention Program) as described in the JO CO budget. What was not clear was how the rental of 3 detention beds from Douglas County was addressed in the budget.

C Juvenile Justice Special Revenue Funds: FY 2015-16

The information in Chapter II, like Chapter I was a description of the Special Revenue Funds and Juvenile Justice Special Program Funds, and the FY 2015-16 JJ Department's three programs (i.e., 1. Child Advocacy, 2. Mediation, and 3. Flex) as described in the JO CO budget.

D. Standards & Criteria for Text & Content Analysis

Chapter III on standards and criteria is a work in progress. It started with an introduction to the concepts of conditions, indicators, and standards, especially the idea of a minimally acceptable level of public safety services (MALPSS).

It established the framework for the chapter which was brainstorming ideas for analyzing text and their content, and retaining the ideas and concepts generated for later consideration. The same approach applied to the definition of “understanding” and the “elements of being informed” with a range of definitions provided.

A citizen’s guide to the budget was a fascinating idea that the Committee hopes JO CO will consider. The big picture is the need for the local government to explain its budget proposals and the public finances in one simple, plain language document – often referred to as a “citizens’ guide to the budget.” Because the annual budget is the key instrument by which JO CO translates its policies into action, presenting the budget in a way that makes sense to the general public is central to its accountability. A few ideas covered follow (see Section III.F. and Appendix A).

- 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 on 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, 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.

The standards and criteria for the JO CO JJ Department's programs are most appropriately identified by the JJ Department. 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 and associated information.

In conclusion, the chapter ended with the concept that this publication, *Understanding The Juvenile Justice Josephine County Budget: FY 2015-16*, is the initiation of a process; it is a work in progress. The Exploratory Committee will quality control this draft and create a new draft prior to it's next scheduled meeting with the public (i.e., anticipated to be with representatives of the JJ Department).

E. Text & Content Analysis: Juvenile Justice JO CO Budget: FY 2015-16

Chapter IV on text and content analysis evaluated the text and content of the Public Safety Fund (PSF) description and the JJ PSF and JJ Special Programs Funds (SPF) for the five individual JJ programs. The goal was understanding by the Reviewers.

1. Public Safety Fund Description
2. Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program
3. Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program
4. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program
5. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program
6. Juvenile Justice Flex Program

There were many differences, but the major observation across the six text sections was: "*The reviewers would not be confident in explaining the JJ programs to their neighbors.*" Several other key observations follow as the rationale for that position.

- The text of the six JJ program sections was variable for understanding.
- References and web links were poor to non-existent.
- Standards and criteria were sometimes adequate, but did not support a holistic understanding. One big problem and stumbling block was that the referenced ORS 419A.010-020 standard which could not be found in the literature by the reviewers.
- Many technical terms, phrases, and programs were not explained.

The significant observation was that budget document did not explain the value or significance of the JJ programs, and/or provide sources, references, or web links that did explain them. For example, the reviewers do not know the answer to the question: *What are the different outcomes if the JJ programs are funded, or not, or partially funded?*

1. *Why are the JJ programs important?*
2. *What does the county lose if these programs are not funded, or partially funded?*
3. *What are the impacts to individual citizens and the community?*

F. Differences Between FY 2010-11 AND FY 2015-16

Chapter V investigates the differences between the two JJ budgets based on the text and content of their six text sections.

1. Budgets Compared For FY 2010-11 & FY 2015-16 The annual JO CO JJ budget documents did not change much in terms of their six text sections (Section VII.E). However, the adopted FY 2010-11 and FY 2015-16 budgets for the JO CO JJ Department have a big difference of 24.35 FTE and \$1,402,400. Based on the budget documents, “Does the public understand the differences, if any, to the community?”

The Committee found that without the JJ Shelter-Detention programs’ FY 2010-11 budget (i.e., \$1,674,600) there was a significant decrease (64%) in the budget dollars in the JO CO Juvenile Justice Department. At the same time there was an increase (25%) in the JJ Court & Field budget for a total department decrease of 38%. The FTE and cost of renting three detention beds from Douglas County was not found in the FY 2015-16 budget.

There did not seem to be an obvious policy for the six text sections’ lengths (i.e., number of words). The Committee speculates that the lengths were somehow a function of the standards of the budget process.

What was missing in the two budget documents, in the opinion of the Committee, was a serious consideration that since the 2000 Secure Rural Schools Act, Congress had repeatedly sent messages that federal payments would be phased out, and this was intended to give counties time to plan for the change (Chapter III). However, in the opinion of the Reviewers, it did not seem that any comprehensive long-range planning had occurred, or was occurring, except for developing annual budgets that were balanced. The text did not significantly change when comparing the FY 2010-11 and FY 2015-16 JJ budgets, even after the FY 2012-13 cuts, except to show the major cut to JJ detention and shelter by way of FTEs and budgets.

The Committee had expected to find major text differences between the FY 2010-11 and FY 2015-16 JJ budgets. For example, it could have easily understood the amount of text proportional to the degree and magnitude of a loss of federal payments to JO CO (i.e., the greater probability of loss results in a more comprehensive text educational effort to secure funding). Or, perhaps the detail in the text length would correspond to the size of the proposed program in terms of the size of the FTE or budget. Those expectations did not happen.

The Exploratory Committee’s assumption was that in general the text “context” provided was adequate to minimally adequate to satisfy budget standards. However, there was the obvious lack of planning outside of the budget process, and the budget documents were not designed to be understood by the average voters (Section VI.A).

In the opinion of the Reviewers there were program descriptions to meet budget standards. However, there was a minimal identification of standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances, with much work needed (i.e., not sure that all ORS identified; no OARs or JO CO ordinances identified). In some cases there was not an adequate identification of standards. The Resources and Requirements were identified (If the Reviewers understood these terms, especially how “Requirements” was being used?).

A three year change was identified from FY 2010-11 - FY 2015-16 budgets at the Public Safety Fund (PSF) and Special Revenue Funds (SRF) levels, but not at the JJ program levels. For example, the SRF of \$181,000, which was FY 2012-13 as the baseline prior to major reductions in the budget. However, no information was provided on the three year change at the level of the JJ special programs funds.

Of significance, in the opinion of the Reviewers, the two budget documents reviewed were professionally written and consistent with budget document standards. They provided the much needed accountability of a balanced budget.

“Understanding” the JO CO JJ programs through their text descriptions was the major problem for the Reviewers. Understanding by the Reviewers, Whalen and Walker, was a subjective evaluation of how comfortable they were in understanding the JO CO JJ Department. Could the Reviewers explain the JO CO JJ Department a few days later without notes? The Reviewers understanding for six categories follows.

1. Need - Budget Requirements. Reviewers noted a need was identified as an FTE and budget with a text description of the program.
2. Value - Significance. Reviewers do not understand the value/significance of the JJ program in a scientific versus “feeling” point of view (i.e., what actually will be lost or gained beyond identification of FTE and budget?).
3. Change Reviewers do not understand changes in the JJ Program.
4. Sources - References/Vetted. Adequate References were not provided in order for the Reviewers to gain an understanding. Adequate is the key as the Reviewers spent significant time and effort researching, studying, and following references provided without feeling that they understood the JJ program.
5. Web Links Adequate Web Links were not provided in order for Reviewers to gain an understanding. Many web links were found relating to the “Review Questions” identified in Chapter IV. They provided a general description and understanding of topics, but were not adequate in identifying how they were specifically applicable to the JO CO JJ Department. Adequate is the key (see #4 above).
6. Understand - Overall Understanding The reviewers would not be confident in explaining the JJ programs to their neighbors.

In general, the sought after understanding by the Reviewers in over 80 hours of research and study did not materialize. They would not be confident in explaining the JJ programs to their neighbors.

The Reviewers believe that a major improvement in public understanding could occur if JO CO would develop a citizen's guide to the budget (Appendix B) as a companion to the budget, and implement several other educational outreach recommendations of the Committee (Chapter VI).

2. Impacts Compared For FY 2010-11 & FY 2015-16 Budgets What are the different impacts from, in effect two alternatives: JO CO's FY 2010-11 & FY 2015-16 budgets? A significant amount of the general economic results were identified by academic from 2008 - 2011 (Appendix B).

Identifying impacts from county budgets, and their standards and criteria, are identified in Section III.A., "Conditions, Indicators, & Standards" as part of the "Standards & Criteria For Text & Content Analysis." A big part of this focus is identifying the MALPSS.

The following is from the document, *Producing a Citizens' Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How?* (Appendix A)

- A guide provides a single place where the public can learn about the main features of the budget and gain access to more detailed reference sources. It also helps citizens to assess the impact on their own circumstances and on specific groups in society, including the effects on the burden of taxation, service provision and employment prospects.
- The macroeconomic and fiscal outlook is a key starting point. The prospects for the economy are an important determinant of resource availability in all local governments, and economic forecasts for at least the budget year should be presented.
- New spending and revenue policies being introduced in the budget should be summarized. The guide should explain why these new measures are being introduced, their expected impact on revenues and spending, and how they will contribute to the government's priorities. Citizens will wish to know how the budget will affect their own standards of living, and the nature and significance of the budget's impact on groups in society that are of particular policy interest (such as the poor and vulnerable, or different groups of taxpayers). 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.

In the long term, these impacts will be identified in *Study Design*. The proposed 2015 *Study Design* has three goals. The JS&PSS Exploratory Committee will accomplish Goal One in some form which is to complete the *Study Design*. Goal Two is to secure a grant for a professional independent impact *Study*. Goal Three is to develop and publish the impact *Study*.

Study Design research projects prior to phase 3 contracted *Study* are encouraged. In this case, the Committee believes there is an opportunity for the JO CO JJ Department to perform some of this pre-*Study* look (Chapter VI, Recommendations).

Who are the impact audiences?

- a) Juveniles and their Families?
- b) Tax Payers?
- c) Communities?
- d) Government?

G. 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.

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 the voter 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, provide 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. It believes they can all be developed with the existing knowledge and expertise currently available in the JO CO JJ Department.

1. Understanding Staffing Analysis
2. Department Descriptions & Relationships
3. Professional 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

VIII. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION (After April 27, 2016)

A. Oregon Juvenile Department Directors Association

The Exploratory Committee is especially grateful to Joe Ferguson, President Elect, OJDDA, for his assistance in helping the Committee understand the authorities and standards for Oregon's 36 county juvenile justice (JJ) departments (Appendix D1).

A major issue has been cleared up by OJDDA and/or the web on locating the referenced ORS 419A.010-020 standard on the web (Section IV.C).

- Standards Minimal identification of standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances with much work needed in the FY 2010-11 budget. Some standards and criteria were adequate, but the lack of others did not support understanding. A big problem and stumbling block was that the referenced ORS 419A.010-020 standard could not be found in the literature by the Reviewers.

Not understood by the Committee was its inability to locate ORS 419A.010-020 in several intensive research efforts over the last six months. Nevertheless, OJDDA identified the specific ORS relating to ORS 419A.010-020, including descriptive phrases of the topic, AND, much to the Committee's surprise, it could locate the ORS on the web (Appendix D1).

1. Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) (Appendix D1)

ORS 419A.010	County Juvenile Department, states that the governing body of any county shall appoint or designate one or more persons as counselors of the juvenile department.
ORS 419A.018	states that the juvenile department is a county agency and ORS 419A.020 states that the cost of maintaining a juvenile department and all expenditures are the responsibility of the county, even when two or more counties have an agreement.
ORS 419A.050	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.
ORS 419A.059	states that the juvenile court of each county shall designate the place or places in which youth are to be placed in detention or shelter care when taken into temporary custody.
ORS 419C.001	ORS 419C.001 states the purpose of the juvenile justice system in delinquency cases from apprehension forward are to protect the public and reduce juvenile delinquency and to provide fair and impartial procedures for the initiation, adjudication and disposition of allegations of delinquent conduct.

2. Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) (Appendix D1)

Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) do not apply to County operations in regards to juvenile departments. OARs established for the Oregon Youth Authority and Department of Human Services would only apply to County Juvenile Departments if they contract for residential programs and interstate compact for example.

OAR 416 are for the Oregon Youth Authority. OAR 413 are for the Department of Human Services – Child Welfare.

Appendices

- Appendix A. Justice System Exploratory Committee's *Study Design*
- Appendix B. Citizen's Guide To The Budget
- Appendix C. Federal Payments, County Services, & Economic Impacts
- Appendix D. Supplemental Information
- Appendix D1. Oregon Juvenile Department Directors Association

Appendix A. Justice System Exploratory Committee's *Study Design*

(Public Outreach 1.4: December 15, 2015)

What is Josephine County's (JO CO) Justice System & Public Safety Services (JS&PSS) Problem, . . . or Issue? First, *What are the public safety services (PSS) 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?"*

Web Page: *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015*

Justice System Exploratory Committee

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

- ***Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015***
- **Public Outreach**
- Outreach 1.1 What's the Problem?
- Outreach 1.2 Arguments For Supporting Study Design
- Outreach 1.3 Summary Highlights: Arguments For Supporting Study Design
- Outreach 1.4 Introduction To Justice System Exploratory Committee's Web Page
- Outreach 2.1 Interested In Becoming Involved?
- Outreach 3.1 Publicly Identified Problems/Issues
- Outreach 3.2 Summary Highlights: Publicly Identified Problems/Issues
- Outreach 4.1 Publicly Identified Range of Alternative Solutions
- Outreach 4.2 Summary Highlights: Publicly Identified Range of Alternative Solutions
- Outreach 5.1 Vetted Public Safety Facts
- Outreach 5.2 Summary Highlights: Vetted Public Safety Facts
- Outreach 5.3 Summary Highlights: Study Design Research Projects Prior To Phase 3 Contracted *Study*
- Outreach 5.4 Summary Highlights: Content Analysis Of JO CO's Recorded Public Safety Values
- Outreach 5.5 Summary Highlights: JO CO's Minimally Adequate Level Of Public Safety Services (MALPSS)
- Outreach 5.6 Executive Summary Of JO CO's Minimally Adequate Level Of Public Safety Services (MALPSS)
- Outreach 6.1 Study Design's Planning Horizon Is Flexible
- Outreach 6.2 Summary Highlights: Study Design's Planning Horizon Is Flexible
- Outreach 7.1 Table Talk Discussion Script
- Outreach 8.1 How To Communicate In Plain Language
- Outreach 9.1 JS&PSS Issue Overview Educational Brochure
- Outreach 10. Aspiration Letter From Authors Of Study Design
- Outreach 11. Enquiry Stakeholder Letters/Emails (Ongoing)
- ***Justice System & Public Safety Services Issue Scope Of Work*** (2013 Authority;)

JUSTICE SYSTEM EXPLORATORY COMMITTEE Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015

The Hugo Justice System & Public Safety Services Exploratory Committee's (JS&PSS Committee or Committee) was formed with a definition of its July 18, 2013 scope of work, *Justice System & Public Safety Services Issue Scope Of Work*. That year, and the next, it worked on understanding the issue, writing letters to the editor of The Grants Pass Daily Courier, and web publishing educational brochures on the issue.

- Hugo Justice System & Public Safety Services Exploratory Committee. Draft July 18, 2013. *Justice System & Public Safety Services Issue Scope Of Work* (Scope). Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. Hugo, OR.

The 2012 expiration of federal SRS payments to JO CO, used mostly for public safety services, resulted in four county tax levies and one city sales tax as solutions. They all failed. However, there is a high probability for another levy and/or tax proposal to be on a future ballot. This is reasonable, as public safety services are needed, even though the form and the cost are issues.

1. **May 15, 2012 JO CO-wide Primary Election Measure 17-43**, Criminal Justice System Operations Four Year Local Option Tax (i.e., \$1.99 per \$1,000 of assessed value), failed 57 - 43 percent, Voter Turnout - Total 52.59%; 25,405 votes for Measure 17 - 43/ 49,561 registered voters = 51%.
2. **May 21, 2013 JO CO-wide Special Election Measure 17-49**, Criminal Justice and Public Safety Three Year Local Option Tax (i.e., \$1.48 per \$1,000 of assessed value), failed 51 - 49 percent, Voter Turnout - Total 51.97%; 26,331 votes for Measure 17 - 49/ 50,944 registered voters = 52%.
3. **May 20, 2014 JO CO-wide Primary Election Measure 17-59**, Criminal Justice and Public Safety Three Year Local Option Tax (i.e., \$1.19 per \$1,000 of assessed value), failed 53 - 48 percent, Voter Turnout - Total 56.51%; 27,991 votes for Measure 17 - 59/ 50,655 registered voters = 55%.
4. **May 19, 2015 JO CO-wide Special Election Measure 17-66**, For Patrol, Jail, Shelter of Abused Youth; Five Year Levy (i.e., \$1.40 per \$1,000 of assessed value), failed 54 - 46 Percent, Voter Turnout - Total 50.65%; 25,824 votes for Measure 17 - 59/ 51,143 registered voters = 51%.
5. **November 3, 2015 Grants Pass City-wide Special Election Measure 17-67** 2 Percent Sales Tax for City Public Safety and Criminal Justice Services, failed 78 - 22 Percent.

After the 2th levy failure in as many years, the JS&PSS Committee asked the question, "What can we do to shed some light on the issues?" Members of the Committee believed that the first important step was the identification of the preliminary issues for why the levies failed. The reasons for the levy failures were complex and unknown as facts. However, it is believed that the identification of citizen problems/ issues is the most important step in developing a successful *Study Design*.

- Hugo Justice System & Public Safety Services Exploratory Committee. Draft 2015. *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015*. Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. Hugo, OR.

The purpose of *Study Design*, the proposed JS&PSS study grant, and *Study* is to provide grass roots opportunities, for JO CO citizens for active citizen involvement (CI), accessibility to information, and education, to better understand the JS&PSS issue, which is partially driven by the history of revenue sharing from the federal government.

Appendix B. Citizen's Guide To The Budget

Producing a Citizens' Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How?

- Petrie, Murray and Shields, Jon. 2010. *Producing a Citizens' Guide to the Budget: Why, What and How?* OECD Journal on Budgeting, Volume 2010/2.

Budgets: Josephine County, Oregon

Justice System Exploratory Committee

Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015

Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

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

Section 1. Introduction

- Since the late 1990s, there have been major efforts internationally to promote more effective public accountability for the way in which governments raise taxes, borrow, and spend public money.
- One important but relatively neglected aspect of fiscal transparency is the need for the [local] government to explain its budget proposals and the public finances in one simple, plain language document – often referred to as a “citizens’ guide to the budget”. Because the annual budget is the key instrument by which a [local] government translates its policies into action, presenting the budget in a way that makes sense to the general public is central to government accountability. However, very little has been written to date about what a citizens’ guide to the budget should be: either about what it should contain or what the current country practices are.

Section 2. Why should governments publish a citizens’ guide to the budget?

- Access to information is a precondition for citizens to: understand how a government is using its entrusted powers to tax, borrow, and spend public resources; become involved in informed public debate during the budget process; and hold a government properly to account. By reporting and explaining budget decisions and the state of the public finances with simplicity and clarity, the government can help to demystify the budget beyond the often necessarily technically complex detail in the budget documentation. Otherwise, the job is left to civil society or the media, who are not always adequately equipped. It is also a good discipline for policy makers to explain themselves in simple, everyday language.
- Publication of a citizens’ guide allows a government to explain in plain language the objectives of its budget and to supplement and complement other supporting material such as the budget speech, press releases, web pages, media appearances, etc. A guide provides a single place where the public can learn about the main features of the budget and gain access to more detailed reference sources. It also helps citizens to assess the impact on their own circumstances and on specific groups in society (including the effects on the burden of taxation, service provision and employment prospects).
- Governments need to proactively help the general public make sense of the budget. Non-expert audiences can easily be intimidated by technical language and by the volume of budget information presented to legislatures. Non-experts can also be confused by the role and extent of extrabudgetary activities. Most importantly, unpacking the budget requires the government

to explain itself, rather than hide behind technicalities. Broadening understanding of the country's public finances can help to frame more realistic citizen expectations and to build support for difficult policy choices. It can also help to offset the influence of narrow special interest groups and to avoid public debates being conducted in jargon by those "in the know".

Section 3. What are the characteristics of a citizens' guide to the budget?

- **3.1. Purpose and coverage** A citizens' guide to the budget is defined here as an easy-to-understand summary of the main features of the annual budget as presented to the legislature. It should be a self-contained document that explains what is in the annual budget proposals and what their effects are expected to be. While containing links or references to more detailed documents, the guide should not require readers to refer to them, or to know their contents, in order to understand the guide.
- Additional plain-language documents may be produced at other points in the budget cycle. For instance, the United States government publishes a guide to the financial report at the end of the fiscal year. In those countries where the budget is significantly amended by the legislature, there is also a strong case for a document or supplement to the citizens' guide that explains the budget after it is passed by the legislature. However, such documents should be seen as complements rather than as substitutes for a citizens' guide to the budget presented by the executive. Best practice would in fact be to publish several guides at different points in the budget cycle, and to link the analysis in them. Indeed, a useful first step for many countries would be to complement their citizens' guide to the budget with a "citizens' guide to the end-of-year financial statements".⁶
- The guide should be written with the needs of the general public in mind, using everyday language, and it should be linked to more detailed explanations to provide a simple access point to those who want to know more.⁷ "A citizens' budget can take many forms, but its distinguishing feature is that it is designed to reach and be understood by as large a segment of the population as possible" (International Budget Partnership, 2009). The guide should not be aimed at the needs of legislators, whose specific requirements should (in principle, at least) already be reflected in the way the public finance law stipulates that the budget is to be presented to the legislature, and who should have access to technical experts in either the legislative or executive branch for advice. However, given the complexity of the budget documents in many countries, legislators may in practice find a citizens' guide helpful as an initial entry point to their consideration of the budget.⁸

- **3.2. Nature and qualities** A citizens' guide should be an objective and technical document, not a political tract. It should attempt to describe the budget in a neutral manner and meet recognized standards of comprehensiveness, reliability and relevance. It should not be seen as a partisan document to promote how well the government is managing fiscal policy. While the guide might contain a foreword by the finance minister or the president, the body of the guide should be clearly the responsibility of the government agency that is accountable for the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the budget and associated information, *e.g.* the Ministry of Finance. This will help to avoid cynicism that a citizens' guide is a purely political tool.
- A citizens' guide should generally be produced by the executive branch. The guide should be seen as helping to meet the government's responsibility to explain publicly how it is raising, spending, and managing public resources. It is an important part of the transparency and accountability of fiscal policy. Where the government does not produce such a guide, it may be appropriate for the legislature to produce one, especially in those countries where the legislature has substantial powers to amend the budget presented by the executive.⁹ Failing that, there would be a role for a citizens' guide produced by civil society, such as the budget briefings produced by the DISHA movement in Gujarat.¹⁰ But this solution is second best. The government should explain its own budget to the general public. The media and civil society groups can then use the citizens' guide as an input to their own deliberation, dissemination or advocacy activities – or publish their own alternative guide if they wish.
- A citizens' guide to the budget should focus on the objectives and contents of the budget, not its process. While it is important that the public has a broad understanding of how the government puts the annual budget together, the main role of the guide should be to present the substance of the budget. Discussion of the budget process should mainly take the form of a brief overview, at the beginning of the guide, of the budget law and the annual budget process. More detailed information on the annual budget process and on the requirements of the budget law should be separately available to the public, and should be referenced in the guide or linked to it.
- A citizens' guide should meet a range of quality standards, including comprehensiveness, objectivity, relevance, reliability, ease of understanding, and timeliness. The guide should focus on substantive budget issues, and should not contain extraneous or irrelevant material that confuses or obscures the key issues. This will help to keep the guide short and accessible. The data should be accurate, reliable and credible.¹¹
- 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 – including comparative information for the estimated out-turn for the year prior to the budget year. Finally, the guide should be disseminated at the same time that the government presents the annual budget to the legislature, so that the public can fully understand what is being proposed and can engage in discussion in time to have a potential impact on the legislature's deliberations on the budget.

Section 4. What should a citizens' guide contain?

- **4.1. Core substantive elements** Citizens' guides should contain a common core of information. The discussion in Section 3 above suggests a set of common topics that are likely to feature in a good citizens' guide in any country. However, the relative emphasis of the topics, and the level of detail, should reflect country circumstances and capacity. One important contextual factor is the pre-existing general level of understanding of government budgeting in the country; another is the related level of coverage of these issues by the media.
- A brief introduction should explain why the guide is being published, and place it in context. The government should indicate its objectives in publishing the guide. It should briefly set out the key role the budget plays in public financial management, in the context of any requirements in the constitution or in the budget law. The guide should very briefly describe the budget process, including the roles of the executive branch in preparing the budget and of the legislature in authorizing government taxation, borrowing and expenditure.
- The macroeconomic and fiscal outlook is a key starting point. The prospects for the economy are an important determinant of resource availability in all countries [countries], and economic forecasts for at least the budget year should be presented. Medium-term projections of the fiscal aggregates (revenues, spending, the deficit) should also be presented. The economic and fiscal forecasts are probably best presented in the form of a simple table or chart(s).
- There should be a brief description of the institutional structure and coverage of the budget.¹² This should explain whether the budget includes different types of accounts or funds, and what agencies are inside or outside the budget. Information on the government's extrabudgetary activities, and their impact on consolidated government accounts, should also be included. Where budget documentation identifies activities carried out by non-government agencies on behalf of government that are not reflected in the government's accounts ("quasi-fiscal activities"), these should be briefly summarized and explained.¹³ If relevant, high-level information should be provided on the aggregate distribution of revenues and spending between different levels of government, including any formulae used to determine the allocation of revenue or grants between sub-national governments.
- Where disaggregated multi-year expenditure forecasts are available, summaries of these should be included. Total spending may be broken down by function (or sector), by administrative agency, by economic category (*e.g.* wages and salaries, interest, capital expenditures) and, where applicable, by major programme. References and links to more detailed spending information should be provided.
- The guide should explain how the annual budget helps the government to meet its announced national development strategy, including in particular its fiscal policy strategy and objectives. The government's medium-term economic and social objectives should be summarised, and a brief explanation provided of how the next budget contributes to their achievement. The sustainability of the public finances and public debt, given a continuation of current policies, should be specifically addressed.

- The realism of the budgeted levels of revenues and expenditures and the fiscal balance should be briefly discussed in terms of trends in recent years, and the economic forecasts. It is important to provide some historical information for comparative purposes, and particularly to present the expected out-turn for the current year in comparison to its forecast in the previous budget.
- There should be a clear explanation of how the budget will be financed. The guide should provide a breakdown of the main revenue sources (“where the money comes from”), separately identifying domestic revenues and external grants. It should indicate the sources of funding of a deficit.
- Key fiscal risks should be discussed. These include the fiscal impacts of deviations in key economic variables from the forecasts (*e.g.* concerning [declining federal payments to counties], oil prices, the exchange rate, and interest rates). Information should also be presented on other relevant specific fiscal risks (*e.g.* loan guarantees being called), and the government should briefly explain how it will meet unexpected spending needs that may arise during the year, for example through a budget contingency appropriation.
- New spending and revenue policies being introduced in the budget should be summarized. The guide should explain why these new measures are being introduced, their expected impact on revenues and spending, and how they will contribute to the government’s priorities. Citizens will wish to know how the budget will affect their own standards of living, and the nature and significance of the budget’s impact on groups in society that are of particular policy interest (such as the poor and vulnerable, or different groups of taxpayers). 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.
- The government should briefly explain what it is doing to improve overall service delivery and the social impacts of its spending programs. Where relevant, this should be linked to the Millennium Development Goals. The guide should also contain references and links to programme-level information, and to any information that is available on performance and evaluations.
- **4.2. Possible additional information** Additional information would depend on country circumstances and capacity. It would generally include details of projected transfers and other fiscal relations with subnational governments, especially in federal states or in countries where sub-national governments play a significant role in public spending or revenue collection. Other topics to be covered include: the available breakdowns of aggregate general government expenditure; the incidence of taxes; and any performance indicators in relation to key spending programs. For countries [counties] where the public sector’s net worth and government revenues are heavily affected by its endowment of exhaustible natural resources, the implications for the fiscal outlook should be covered explicitly in the guide.¹⁴

Appendix C. Federal Payments, County Services, & Economic Impacts

Studies & Information

Justice System Exploratory Committee

Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015

Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/JSPSS_Studies.htm

Adams, V., & Gaid D. M. 2008. Federal Land Management and County Government: 1908-2008 - A Report of the "Changing Federal County Payments Policy and Rural Oregon Counties: Impacts and Options" Project. Rural Studies Program Working Paper Series. Corvallis, OR.

Gaid, Dawn Marie, October 2009. Changing Federal County Payments and Rural Oregon Counties: Analysis of Policy Impacts and Responses from Loss of Secure Rural School Funding in Selected Oregon Counties. RSP 09-04. OSU's Rural Studies Program. Working Paper Series. Corvallis, OR.

Oregon Governor's Task Force. Final Report January 2009. Governor's Task Force On Federal Forest Payments And County Services. Governor Theodore R. Kulongoski. 148 pages. Salem, OR.

Sorte, Bruce; Lewin, Paul; and Weber, Bruce. December 2008. Economic Impacts on Oregon Counties of the Termination of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act (P.L. 106 393). Rural Studies Program Working Paper Series, Number RSP 0805. Corvallis, OR.

Sorte, B., Lewin P., & Weber B. February 2009. Economic Impacts on Oregon Counties of the Termination of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act: An Update. A Report of the "Changing Federal County Payments Policy and Rural Oregon Counties: Impacts and Options" Project. Corvallis, OR.

Weber, B., Lewin P., & Sorte B. November 2011. Economic Impacts on Oregon of the Termination of Secure Rural Schools Payments to Counties: 2011 Update. A Report of the "Changing Federal County Payments Policy and Rural Oregon Counties: Impacts and Options" Project. Corvallis, OR.

Appendix D. Supplemental Information
Appendix D1. Oregon Juvenile Department Directors Association

Appendix D. Oregon Juvenile Department Directors Association (OJDDA)

The Exploratory Committee is especially grateful to Joe Ferguson, Deputy Director/President Elect, OJDDA, for his assistance in helping the Committee understand the authorities and standards for Oregon's 36 county juvenile justice (JJ) departments.

Joe Ferguson, Deputy Director
Jackson County Juvenile Services
609 W 10th Street
Medford, Oregon 97501
Phone: (541) 774-4833
Fax: (541) 774-4888
joe.ferguson@jacksoncounty.org

1. Exploratory Committee & OJDDA Communications

April 18, 2016	Committee to OJDDA
April 26, 2016	OJDDA to Committee
May 5, 2016	Committee to OJDDA
May 5, 2016	OJDDA to Committee

2. Email Text

April 18, 2016 Committee to OJDDA

From: Mike [mailto:hugo@jeffnet.org]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 9:22 AM
To: Ferguson Joe Pres OJDDA 1 <info@ojdda.org>; Joe Ferguson <FergusJW@jacksoncounty.org>
Cc: Goodwin Jim JO CO Juvenile Justice <jgoodwin@co.josephine.or.us>; Whalen Jon CoAuthor Study Design <bear46@charter.net>; Walker Mike, JCHS/HNAHS/RA/G1/OCTA <hugo@jeffnet.org>
Subject: Understand The Authorities and Standards For Oregon's 36 County Juvenile Justice (JJ) Departments

Joe Ferguson, President
Oregon Juvenile Department Directors Association (OJDDA)

Subject: Understand The Authorities and Standards For Oregon's 36 County Juvenile Justice (JJ) Departments

Dear Joe:

We contract the OJDDA for information about the authorities and standards for JJ departments in Oregon as they relate to Josephine County's (JO CO's) Justice System & Public Safety Services (JS&PSS) Problem/Issue (i.e., public safety issue). The Hugo JS&PSS Exploratory Committee has been trying to understand our county's public safety issue since 2013. Too that end we are working with Jim Goodwin, Director, Josephine County Juvenile Justice, and other JO CO public safety leaders in understanding the issue, and in seeking solutions for it. In this case, we are asking for OJDDA's assistance in understanding JJ (see attachments).

We assume all county JJ departments have the same authorities and standards which is the main reason we contract OJDDA. For this enquiry we are specially interested in understanding the applicable Oregon Revised Statutes, Oregon Administrative Rules, and/or court opinions pertinent to Oregon's 36 county JJ departments. Our research on applicable court opinions is in its infancy.

Thank you in advance for any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Mike & Jon :)

Mike Walker, Co-Author
JS&PSS Study Design
JS&PSS Exploratory Committee
Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

Jon Whalen, Co-Author
JS&PSS Study Design

JS&PSS Exploratory Committee
Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

Email copy: Jim Goodwin, Director, Josephine County Juvenile Justice Department

Attachments:

- Attachment 1. April 18, 2016 Letter/Email to Joe Ferguson, President, OJDDA, From JS&PSS Exploratory Committee
- Attachment 2. April 4, 2016 Letter/Email To Josephine County Board of County Commissioners On Minimally Acceptable Level Of Public Safety Services, From JS&PSS Exploratory Committee

April 26, 2016 OJDDA to Committee

From: Joe Ferguson
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 8:41 AM
To: <mailto:hugo@jeffnet.org> ; <mailto:bear46@charter.net>
Subject: Understand The Authorities and Standards For Oregon's 36 County Juvenile Justice (JJ) Departments

Mike and Jon,

Thank you for reaching out to OJDDA for information on the authorities and standards for Oregon County Juvenile Departments. I have referred to several Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) below that discuss statutory requirements of counties pertaining to juvenile departments:

ORS 419A.010 – County Juvenile Department, states that the governing body of any county shall appoint or designate one or more persons as counselors of the juvenile department. The governing bodies of two or more contiguous counties may jointly appoint one or more persons as counselors. If more than one person is appointed one may be designated as director.

There is a statutory requirement to have a local juvenile department that has at least one person who is designated as a counselor or that two or more counties may pursue an agreement to establish a juvenile department within the two or more counties. A director would be chosen and shall be the administrator of the juvenile department.

ORS 419A.018 states that the juvenile department is a county agency and ORS 419A.020 states that the cost of maintaining a juvenile department and all expenditures are the responsibility of the county, even when two or more counties have an agreement.

County funds budgeted and levied for this purpose are to be used to fund the juvenile department.

ORS 419A.050 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.

ORS 419A.059 states that the juvenile court of each county shall designate the place or places in which youth are to be placed in detention or shelter care when taken into temporary custody.

Even if a county does not have their own detention facility, they must have funds to pay another facility to hold youth when needed and approved.

ORS 419C.001 states the purpose of the juvenile justice system in delinquency cases from apprehension forward are to protect the public and reduce juvenile delinquency and to provide fair and impartial procedures for the initiation, adjudication and disposition of allegations of delinquent conduct. The system is founded on the principles of personal responsibility, accountability and reformation within the context of public safety and restitution to the victims and to the community. The system shall provide a continuum of services that emphasizes prevention of further criminal activity by the use of early and certain sanction, reformation and rehabilitation programs and swift and decisive intervention in delinquent behavior.

To be able to meet the purpose of this statute there must be a system in place to provide public safety, needed services to youth, and services to victims.

Through the partnership of the Oregon Youth Authority and the 36 counties in Oregon, there has been established basic and diversion funding that goes to each county through a formula based on the number of youth ages 0 to 17 in each county. This funding is meant to provide those basic services (detention, shelter, treatment services, graduated sanctions and aftercare services – youth 10 to 17 years of age) and diversion services (community based services to divert commitment of youth from OYA close custody

facilities – youth 12 to 18 years of age). These funds assist with the continuum of services available to youth who enter the juvenile justice system and provides for services to be accessed at the “front end” of the system rather than youth being pushed further into the juvenile justice system which is much more costly.

Remaining statutory requirements are around processes within the juvenile departments regarding court proceedings, detention, reports, etc.

I hope that this helps provide some information you are looking for. Please let me know if you have additional questions or need clarification on any of this information.

Thank-you,

Joe Ferguson, President Elect
Oregon Juvenile Department Directors' Association
Phone: (541) 774-4833
Fax: (541) 774-4888
joe.ferguson@jacksoncounty.org

May 05, 2016 - Committee to OJDDA

From: "Mike" <hugo@jeffnet.org>
To: "Joe Ferguson" <FergusJW@jacksoncounty.org>
Cc: "Whalen Jon CoAuthor Study Design" <bear46@charter.net>; "Walker Mike, JCHS/HNAHS/RA/G1/OCTA" <hugo@jeffnet.org>; "Goodwin Jim JO CO Juvenile Justice" <jgoodwin@co.josephine.or.us>
Subject: Re: Understand The Authorities and Standards For Oregon's 36 County Juvenile Justice (JJ) Departments
Date: Thursday, May 05, 2016 2:42 AM

Dear Joe:

Thank you for responding. We are studying your respond and will get back to you.

Thanks again.

Mike & Jon :)

p.s., What OARs are applicable to the ORSs you provided?

May 05, 2016 OJDDA to Committee

From: Joe Ferguson
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2016 4:36 PM
To: 'Mike'
Cc: Whalen Jon CoAuthor Study Design ; Goodwin Jim JO CO Juvenile Justice
Subject: RE: Understand The Authorities and Standards For Oregon's 36 County Juvenile Justice (JJ) Departments

Mike and Jon,

Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) do not apply to County operations in regards to juvenile departments. OARs established for the Oregon Youth Authority and Department of Human Services would only apply to County Juvenile Departments if they contract for residential programs and interstate compact for example.

For your information: OAR 416 are for the Oregon Youth Authority. OAR 413 are for the Department of Human Services – Child Welfare.

Thanks,

Joe Ferguson
Deputy Director
Jackson County Juvenile Services
609 W 10th Street
Medford, Oregon 97501
Phone: (541) 774-4833
Fax: (541) 774-4888
joe.ferguson@jacksoncounty.org

End Tables

End Table IV-1.	Juvenile Justice FTE, Budget & Words: FY 2015 - 16
End Table IV-2.	Four (4) Juvenile Justice Programs For FTE, Budget & Words: FY 2015 - 16
End Table VI-1.	FTE & Budgeted For FY 2015 - 16 Compared To FY 2010 - 11
End Table VI-2.	Subjective Evaluation of Juvenile Justice Programs' Text Length
End Table VI-3.	Subjective Evaluation of Juvenile Justice Programs' Text Context
End Table VI-4.	Understanding of Juvenile Justice Programs' Text Descriptions

End Table IV-1. Juvenile Justice FTE, Budget & Words: FY 2015 - 16				
Program¹⁻⁶	Total FTE⁷	Total Words	Total Budget	Total Words
JJ Program Averages ⁸	10.20/4 = 2.55	869/5 = 174	1,200,700/4 = \$300,175	869/5 = 174
Public Safety Fund Descrip ⁹	-	305	-	305
JJ Court & Field	8.60	301	\$1,019,700	301
JJ Shelter-Detention	- rent 3 beds?	-	-	-
JJ Child Advocacy	0.60	121	\$55,100	121
JJ Mediation	1.00	97	\$107,900	97
JJ Flex	-	45	\$18,000	45
Totals¹⁰	10.20	869	\$1,200,700	869

Footnotes

1. Public Safety Fund (PSF) Description
2. Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program (JJ Court & Field)
3. Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program (JJ Shelter-Detention)
4. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program (JJ Child Advocacy)
5. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program (JJ Mediation)
6. Juvenile Justice Flex Program (JJ Flex)
7. Full-time equivalent (FTE) or whole time equivalent (WTE) is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person (or student) in a way that makes workloads or class loads comparable[1] across various contexts. FTE is often used to measure a worker's or student's involvement in a project, or to track cost reductions in an organization. An FTE of 1.0 is equivalent to a full-time worker or student, while an FTE of 0.5 signals half of a full work or school load
8. Average FTE, budget, and word totals for all four JJ programs.
9. Summary Public Safety Fund Description for all JJ Programs, without a budget.
10. Totals for four Juvenile Justice Programs, including PSF Description.

End Table IV-2. Four (4) Juvenile Justice Programs For FTE, Budget & Words: FY 2015 - 16				
Program¹⁻⁶	FTE⁷/Words	FTE per Word	Budget/Words	Budget per Word
JJ Program Averages ⁸⁷	10.2/4 = 2.55	869/5 = 174	1,200,700/4 = \$300,175	869/5 = 174
Public Safety Fund Descrip ⁹	34.55/830	.	\$2,603,100/830	\$
JJ Court & Field	8.60/301	.029	\$1,019,700/301 ¹⁰ \$817,800/301 ¹⁰	\$3,387.71 ¹⁰ \$2,716.94 ¹⁰
JJ Shelter- Detention	- rent 3 beds?	-	-	-
JJ Child Advocacy	0.60/121	.005	\$55,100/121	\$455.37
JJ Mediation	1.00/97	.010	\$107,900/97	\$1,112.37
JJ Flex	-/45	-	\$18,000/45	\$400.00
Total ¹¹	10.2/564	.018	\$1,200,700/564 \$998,800/564	\$2,128.90 \$1,770.92

Footnotes

1. Public Safety Fund (PSF) Description
2. Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program (JJ Court & Field)
3. Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program (JJ Shelter-Detention)
4. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program (JJ Child Advocacy)
5. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program (JJ Mediation)
6. Juvenile Justice Flex Program (JJ Flex)
7. Full-time equivalent (FTE) or whole time equivalent (WTE) is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person (or student) in a way that makes workloads or class loads comparable[1] across various contexts. FTE is often used to measure a worker's or student's involvement in a project, or to track cost reductions in an organization. An FTE of 1.0 is equivalent to a full-time worker or student, while an FTE of 0.5 signals half of a full work or school load
8. Average FTE, budget, and word totals for all four JJ programs.
9. Summary Public Safety Fund Description for all JJ Programs, without a budget.
10. The budgeted amounts under Schedule B turn out to be the requirements in Schedule A which may not be met if the net is less than the requirements.
 - JJ Court & Field FTE: 8.6 (Schedule B)
 - JJ Court & Field Budgeted: \$1,019,700/301 (Schedule B)
 - JJ Court & Field Budgeted Requirements: \$1,019,700/301; Net: \$817,800/301 (Schedule A)
11. Totals for four Juvenile Justice Programs, including PSF Description.

End Table VI-1. FTE & Budgeted For FY 2015-16 Compared To FY 2010-11				
	FTE¹		Total Budgeted	
Programs²⁻⁷	FY 2015-16	FY 2010-11	FY 2015-16	FY 2010-11
PSF Description	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
JJ Court & Field	8.60	8.00	\$1,019,700/301 ⁸ \$817,800/301 ⁸	\$652,900
JJ Shelter-Detention	0.0 rent 3 beds?	23.7	0 rent 3 beds?	\$1,674,600
JJ Child Advocacy	0.60	1.85	\$55,100	\$115,500
JJ Mediation	1.00	1.00	\$107,900	\$143,800
JJ Flex	0.0	0.0	\$18,000	\$16,300
Totals⁹	10.20	34.55	\$1,200,700 \$998,800	\$2,603,100

Footnotes

1. Full-time equivalent (FTE) or whole time equivalent (WTE) is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person (or student) in a way that makes workloads or class loads comparable[1] across various contexts. FTE is often used to measure a worker's or student's involvement in a project, or to track cost reductions in an organization. An FTE of 1.0 is equivalent to a full-time worker or student, while an FTE of 0.5 signals half of a full work or school load
2. Public Safety Fund (PSF) Description: Summary Public Safety Fund Description for all JJ Programs, without a budget.
3. Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program (JJ Court & Field)
4. Juvenile Justice Shelter Detention Program (JJ Shelter-Detention)
5. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program (JJ Child Advocacy)
6. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program (JJ Mediation)
7. Juvenile Justice Flex Program (JJ Flex)
8. The budgeted amounts under Schedule B turn out to be the requirements in Schedule A which may not be met if the net is less than the requirements.
 - JJ Court & Field FTE: 8.6 (Schedule B)
 - JJ Court & Field Budgeted: \$1,019,700/301 (Schedule B)
 - JJ Court & Field Budgeted Requirements: \$1,019,700/301; Net: \$817,800/301 (Schedule A)
9. Totals for four Juvenile Justice Programs, including PSF Description.

End Table VI-2. Subjective Evaluation of Juvenile Justice Programs' Text Length												
Fiscal Years	Uncertainty ¹		Proportionate ²		Letters ^{3.1}		Opinions ^{3.2}		Brief/Long ⁴		Expert ⁵	
	F15	F10	F15	F10	F15	F10	F15	F10	F15	F10	F15	F10
PSF Description ¹					√	√			√	√	√	√
Court & Field ²									√	√	√	√
Shelter ^{3.1}									√	√	√	√
Detention ^{3.2}									√	√	√	√
Rent Beds ^{3.3}									√	√	√	√
Child Advocacy ⁴									√	√	√	√
Mediation ⁵									√	√	√	√
Flex ⁶									√	√	√	√

Second to Top Row Footnotes Text Length is a comparison of the budget documents to some standard.

1. Uncertainty Should the JJ program descriptions reflect the uncertainty in the federal county O&C payments since 2000 (e.g., Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP))? √= Yes they were; [blank] = No.
2. Proportionate Should the JJ program descriptions be proportionate in length to the size of the JJ budgets? √= Yes they were; [blank] = No.
3. Comparison Should the JJ program descriptions compare the number of words describing JJ programs to some local limiting standards (e.g., 250 word letters-to-the-editor (LTTE) and 1,000 word guest opinion limits for The Grants Pass Daily Courier (TGPDC), etc.). √= Yes they were greater than the local limits; [blank] = No, they were less than the local limits.
 - 3.1. Letters 250 word Limits Comparison
 - 3.2. Guest Opinion 1,000 word Limits Comparison
4. Too Brief/Too Long Are the documents too brief or too long for understanding by the reviewers? √= Yes they were too brief for understanding by the reviewers. Therefore, the reviewers believe a large number of citizens/voters would also have difficulty understanding the documents; [blank] = Yes they were too long for understanding by the reviewers.
5. Professional Were the documents professionally/expertly written, consistent with budget document standards. √= Yes, it is the opinion of the reviewers that the documents were written, consistent with budget document standards; [blank] = No, they were not.

Left Column Footnotes

1. Public Safety Fund Description (PSF Des)
2. Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program (Court)
- 3.1. Juvenile Justice Shelter Program (Shelter)
- 3.2. Juvenile Justice Detention Program (Detention)
- 3.3. Juvenile Justice Detention (Rent Beds) Program (Rent Beds)
4. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program (Child Advoc)
5. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program (Mediation)
6. Juvenile Justice Flex Program (Flex)

End Table VI-3. Subjective Evaluation of Juvenile Justice Programs' Text Context												
	History ¹		Program Description ²		Standards ³		Resources & Needs ⁴		Changes ⁵		Professional ⁶	
	15	10	15	10	15	10	15	10	15	10	15	10
PSF Description ¹	√-	√-	√	√	√-	√-	√	√	√-	√-	√	√
Court & Field ²			√	√	√-	√-	√	√	√-	√-	√	√
Shelter ^{3.1}			√	√	n/a	√-	√	√	√-	√-	√	√
Detention ^{3.2}			√	√	n/a	√-	√	√	√-	√-	√	√
Rent Beds ^{3.3}			√	√		√-	√	√	√-	√-	√	√
Child Advocacy ⁴			√	√	√-	√-	√	√	√-	√-	√	√
Mediation ⁵			√	√	√-	√-	√	√	√-	√-	√	√
Flex ⁶			√	√			√	√	√-	√-	√	√

Second to Top Row Footnotes Text Content is a judgement of comprehensiveness.

- History. Consider that since the 2000 Secure Rural Schools Act, Congress had repeatedly sent messages that federal payments would be phased out, and this was intended to give counties time to plan for the change. In light of the message and the local need, it is significant that information generated from a formal public planning process has not been tried. Why not? Probably because serious long-range planning involving the public requires time, and is not a quick fix. On the other hand, it has been over 15 years since the message. How many more years are to go by before we have answers? √ = means that in the opinion of the reviewers there was an description of history since 2000 that addressed the critical probability that federal payments to JO CO would cease. √- = means that in the opinion of the reviewers there was a minimal identification of history with much work needed. [blank] = No, means that in the opinion of the reviewers there was not a description of history since 2000 that addressed the critical probability that federal payments to JO CO would cease.
- Program Descriptions. √ = means that in the opinion of the reviewers there was an description to meet budget standards. [blank] = No, means that in the opinion of the reviewers there was not a description meeting budget standards.
- Standards, including ORS, OARs, JO CO ordinances. √ = means that in the opinion of the reviewers there was an adequate identification of standards. √- = means that in the opinion of the reviewers there was a minimal identification of standards with much work needed. [blank] = No means that in the opinion of the reviewers there was not an adequate identification of standards.
- Were the Resources and Requirements identified? √ = means that in the opinion of the reviewers the Resources and Requirements were identified; [blank] = No, = means that in the opinion of the reviewers the Resources and Requirements were not identified
- Were changes from the previous year or some other range (e.g., 3 - 5 year history, etc.) identified. √ = Yes; [blank] = No.
- Were the documents professionally written, consistent with budget document standards? √ = means that in the opinion of the reviewers the documents were professionally written, consistent with budget document standards. [blank] = No, means that in the opinion of the reviewers the documents were not professionally written, consistent with budget document standards.

Left Column Footnotes

- Public Safety Fund Description (PSF Des)
- Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program (Court)
1. Juvenile Justice Shelter Program (Shelter)
2. Juvenile Justice Detention Program (Detention)
3. Juvenile Justice Detention (Rent Beds) Program (Rent Beds)
4. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program (Child Advoc)
5. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program (Mediation)
6. Juvenile Justice Flex Program (Flex)

End Table VI-4. Understanding of Juvenile Justice Programs' Text Descriptions												
	Need ¹		Value ²		Change ³		Sources ⁴		Links ⁵		Understand ⁶	
Fiscal Years	15	10	15	10	15	10	15	10	15	10	15	10
PSF Description ¹	√	√										
Court & Field ²	√	√										
Shelter ^{3.1}	√	√										
Detention ^{3.2}	√	√										
Rent Beds ^{3.3}	√	√										
Child Advocacy ⁴	√	√										
Mediation ⁵	√	√										
Flex ⁶	√	√										

Second to Top Row Footnotes Understanding of Text is a judgement. Understanding by Whalen and Walker was a subjective evaluation of how comfortable they were in understanding the JO CO JJ Department. Could the reviewers explain the JO CO JJ Department a few days later without notes?

1. Need - Budget Requirements. √ = Identified Need; [blank] = No, does not identify Need.
2. Value - Significance. √ = Reviewer understands Value; [blank] = Reviewer does not understand Value.
3. Change. √ = Reviewer understands Changes in Program; [blank] = Reviewer does not understand Changes In Program.
4. Sources - References/Vetted. √ = Adequate References provided in order for interested Reviewer to gain understanding; [blank] = Adequate References were not provided in order for interested Reviewer to gain understanding. Adequate is the key as the Reviewers spent 60 hours plus researching and following references provided without feeling that they understood the program.
5. Web Links √ = Adequate Web Links provided in order for interested Reviewer to gain understanding; [blank] = Adequate Web Links were not provided in order for interested Reviewer to gain understanding. Adequate is the key as the Reviewers spent 60 hours plus researching and following the few web links provided without feeling that they understood the program.
6. Understand - Overall Understanding. Could the reviewers explain the JO CO JJ Department a few days later without notes? √ = Yes, they would be confident in explaining the program to their neighbors; [blank] = No, they would not be confident in explaining the program to their neighbors.

Left Column Footnotes

1. Public Safety Fund Description (PSF Des)
2. Juvenile Justice Court & Field Program (Court)
- 3.1. Juvenile Justice Shelter Program (Shelter)
- 3.2. Juvenile Justice Detention Program (Detention)
- 3.3. Juvenile Justice Detention (Rent Beds) Program (Rent Beds)
4. Juvenile Justice Child Advocacy Program (Child Advoc)
5. Juvenile Justice Mediation Program (Mediation)
6. Juvenile Justice Flex Program (Flex)