

October 30, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: LPSCC Executive Committee

FR: Peter Ozanne,
Executive Director

RE: **Action Item for the November 6, 2012 LPSCC Meeting:**
An Intergovernmental Public Safety Planning and Budgeting Process

Questions Presented

1. At the November 6, 2012 meeting of the LPSCC Executive Committee, should the Executive Committee support the development of an intergovernmental public safety planning and budgeting process under the auspices of LPSCC, which would include, but not necessarily be limited to, Multnomah County, the City of Portland and the City of Gresham?
2. If so, should the Executive Committee ensure a commitment to this process by recommending, as a condition to proceeding with this effort, that (a) the governing bodies of the participating local governments adopt formal resolutions endorsing the process and (b) affected elected officials and agencies enter into written intergovernmental agreements, which commit all the parties to the agreements to support and participate in the process?

Introduction

At its recent meetings, the Executive Committee has reviewed and discussed the public safety budgets of the City of Portland and Multnomah County. In the course of the discussions, members of the Executive Committee expressed support for the establishment of a permanent public safety planning and budgeting process to promote more cost-effective and coordinated public safety services and operations. As a result, the Co-Chairs of the Executive Committee directed me to investigate the feasibility and methods of establishing such a process.

On August 29, I met with a group of senior managers, executive staff and budget officers with relevant planning and budgeting expertise to serve as advisors to the Executive Committee.¹ The group discussed approaches to developing a local public safety planning and budgeting process, past efforts to develop such a process, and the factors contributing to the success or failures of these efforts. The group also reached consensus over important points for the Executive Committee to consider in addressing the foregoing two questions.

Discussion

My advisors and I believe that the development of intergovernmental public safety planning and budgeting process is worthy of the Executive Committee's support, and time and effort involved in developing such a process, subject to the following points:

- In a joint resolution authorizing the development of a public safety planning and budgeting process involving Portland and Multnomah County in 2005, the City Council and the Board of County Commissioner concisely presented the reasons for such a process, which are applicable to the Executive Committee's current deliberations:
 - The City of Portland and Multnomah County share the responsibility of providing a public safety system for citizens of Portland and Multnomah County.
 - Citizens of Multnomah County do not draw distinctions between services provided by the County or those provided by the City; they look for services to fulfill community needs.
 - Jurisdictions across the country seek innovative and cost effective ways of serving their populations in the face of rising taxes, a slowly reviving economy, and a reduction of state and federal funding.
 - The public safety services provided by the City and County are interconnected and require a balance of prevention, enforcement, incarceration, supervision and treatment.
 - Multnomah County citizens want to feel and be safe in their homes, neighborhoods and communities.
- In accordance with this joint resolution, the City and County formed a Joint Public Safety Collaborative sponsored by their elected officials and the Citizens Crime Commission, with The Public Strategies Group serving as Project Consultant. The Collaborative issued a lengthy and detailed report in 2006. The report established a framework for joint budgeting, along with statements of citizens' public safety priorities, key outcomes and performance measures, the goals of the process and strategies to achieve

¹ Eric Chambers, Assistant to Mayor Bemis, City of Gresham; Joanne Fuller, Chief Operating Officer, Multnomah County; Suzanne Hayden, Executive Director, Citizens' Crime Commission; Karyn Kieta, Deputy Director, Department of County Management, Multnomah County; Clay Neal, Director of Public Safety and Peacekeeping, Office of Mayor Sam Adams, City of Portland; Andrew Scott, Manager, Financial Planning Division, City of Portland; Peter Ozanne, Executive Director, Multnomah County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council.

those goals. (A copy of Report of the City of Portland – Multnomah County Joint Public Safety Collaborative accompanies this memorandum.)

- This most recent effort to develop an intergovernmental public safety planning and budget process may also have been the most comprehensive. However, like all the other past efforts in Multnomah County, the 2005-06 process was not implemented and, therefore, produced no meaningful results.
- While there has always been widespread support among local elected officials for the concept of intergovernmental planning and budgeting processes, that support has dissolved in the face of the realities of the kinds budget issues or operational problems calling for resolution through these processes. As a result, LPSCC's support or recommendation for an intergovernmental planning and budgeting process should be conditioned upon the establishment of written commitments by the governing bodies of participating local governments, as well as the other elected officials and agencies responsible for the administration of public safety operations in the County. Furthermore, those written commitments should acknowledge examples of the kinds of issues and problems that the process is designed to address.
- Examples of the kinds of issues and problems that an intergovernmental planning and budgeting process should be designed to address include, but would not be limited to:
 - Integrating the administrative functions of public safety agencies such as training, employee recruitment and hiring;
 - the allocation of responsibilities and services to address local quality of life conditions and criminal offenses;
 - the most cost-effective method of administering River Patrol;
 - the most cost-effective approach to delivering policing services in unincorporated areas of Multnomah County; and
 - balancing policing priorities and strategies with corrections capacity and resources.
- Although it produced no tangible results, the 2006 Report of the City of Portland – Multnomah County Joint Public Safety Collaborative represented a thorough and comprehensive approach to intergovernmental planning and budgeting, a substantial expenditure of public resources, and an effort guided by one of the leading public policy consulting firms in the country. Therefore, this report should serve as the starting point for any new effort supported and sponsored by LPSCC.
- Like the effort that led to the Report of the City of Portland – Multnomah County Joint Public Safety Collaborative, any approach to developing an intergovernmental planning and budgeting process must include representatives of all the affected local governments, agencies, communities and citizens.

Conclusion

The development of an intergovernmental public safety planning and budgeting process is worthy of LPSCC's support and sponsorship. In light of the history of unsuccessful efforts to develop or implement such a process, however, the Executive Committee should ensure the commitment of local elected officials and affected agencies before directing the development of this process and the expenditure of the necessary time and resources.