

47

Metro Charter Committee
P O Box 9236 - Portland, OR 97207

PHASE



MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

STRATEGY PLAN REPORT

Current Status
March 1990



In early 1988, the Multnomah County Board of County Commissioners considered how they reviewed major issues facing the County. They concluded that their primary method, the annual budget process, was inadequate. First, the budget process did not help the Commissioners adopt a policy perspective. Second, it did not direct a look at the long-range effects of budget decisions. Finally, it did not ensure that County resources were focused on the priorities of the Community or the Board.

The County Chair, Gladys McCoy, asked County staff to propose a method for correcting these deficiencies. The recommended approach approved by the Commissioners was to use strategic planning, with budgeting incorporated as a final step in the process. Strategic planning will become the County's primary policy making, program planning, and budgeting vehicle by July 1, 1990.

INTRODUCTION

From the old days, when it was merely an arm of state government, the County has developed into...it's sometimes hard to say just what. To most people, it is an indistinct "something," in between City and State. The reality is that Multnomah County is big business, employing 2500, soon to be 3000 with the inclusion of the Library, and managing the distribution of more than \$350 million of local, state and federal money into the community.

Until recently, the County hadn't considered its state of evolution or probable direction very carefully. But that's changing. The County has embarked on a major effort to take stock of its present state and to chart its own future.

To do that, it has borrowed a management tool from the business world, *strategic planning*, to use as its main program-planning and budgeting vehicle. Our County is one of only a small handful of U.S. governmental entities to have employed this approach.

Our first year's involvement with the process has been an intense get-acquainted session. The experience has been eye-opening and rewarding. It has provoked some difficult thinking about and talking through of our problems. It has also challenged our old assumptions.

Strategic planning itself has proven very difficult. But then, if it were easy, everyone else would have done it.

One reason the old days seem so rosy may be that our recollections of them are so fuzzy. At any rate, it seems like in days past things were simple. County functions were straightforward, and pretty much distinct from one another: Collecting taxes, keeping the peace, handling public records...

Today the problems facing a county are complex and very much interrelated. They no longer fit into neatly defined categories, or lend themselves to being "handled" by this department or that one. Increasingly, a traditional government structure has seemed to be a square peg in a round hole.

Departments have arisen and grown to each address loosely connected issues. There has seemed to be different needs for planning, and almost no requirement to plan in a coordinated way.

Planning as a County function at first involved only financial matters and early farm-to-market road systems. (Later, as urbanization increased, land-use planning was added.) The budgeting process and its annual review of planned activities and expenditures provided the only overall review.

But that process fell short. Budgeting tends to be reactive, caught up in issues of the moment or the very near future. It often tends to departmentalize complex interrelated matters, rather than encourage a broad policy perspective. Budgeting has a one-year timebase; long-range planning, by definition, can't work within those constraints. The budget process does not always require that departments uniformly state the intended results of programs, nor provide ways to measure success or failure.

You either manage change or you get swept away by it. In 1988 the Board of County Commissioners decided to take another look at how the County planned its resource distribution. Citizen input, especially from the Citizen Involvement Committee, supported this action. Strategic planning was chosen as the process, having proved itself as a valuable tool for forecasting and managing change.

The board first undertook the planning process alone, but the scope of the effort soon revealed the need for broader participation. Strategic planning was expanded to include elected officials, department managers and relevant staff as a Policy Development Committee (PDC), which eventually comprised 12 persons.

It is true that major companies and a few governments have made excellent use of strategic planning. It is also true that almost none of them learned to do it in one year. Neither did we. As we got into it, we began to realize that strategic planning is a *major* effort, requiring depth of analysis, a change in mindset by many people, and a great deal of bootstrapping in the way of self-education.

We needed the latter. None of us were expert in strategic planning. We all learned together, the net result being a broad education for key members of County government. We have learned a lot—not only about how strategic planning should work, but also about how difficult it was. As the PDC got further into strategic planning, it soon realized that the planning model would have to be shaped specifically to fit Multnomah County.

Businesses tend to set specific operational goals—generally in terms of profit or market share and they usually operate in a competitive situation. But our County has no set of specific goals, although most officials—and citizens—share some general hopes about the future. So the PDC has had to work on two things at once: Setting long-range goals, and at the same time, working toward an enabling strategy to make them happen.

For that reason, a lot of the material in the following pages may not seem "strategic." Yet it is recommended reading because it synthesizes the hopes and intent of the framers for the years ahead.

The planning process has been highly productive--including in ways other than what we had expected. The successes of strategic planning to date are substantial:

- o For the first time in our County's history, elected officials and department heads met together--as individuals--in regular, frank sessions sharing perspectives on County needs and program directions. A team rather than a turf approach has emerged.
- o The County's services and activities were grouped into five functional areas, with no regard for current departmental jurisdictions. Each area was assigned to a committee, to analyze its issues, trends, impact and future funding requirements. The work of these functional committees has been invaluable to the PDC's deliberations.
- o Constituents' input was brought to bear early and effectively, in the form of the Citizen Involvement Committee, whose carefully thought-out 80-page "Visions" statement was influential on PDC thinking. Citizen representatives also sat on each of the five functional committees.
- o Within the five functional areas, County services were specifically defined. Lest that not seem like a major achievement, consider that previous such definitions have tended toward "soft" generalities, leading to citizen misunderstanding.

Much of the remainder of this report describes the PDC's position on each area of service, its long-range goals and its major issues. Because each committee was free to work independently, these areas are sometimes described in inconsistent terms, ranging from general to specific proposals.

- o A mechanism was set up to insure continuity of strategic planning, and--realizing that the future is bound to contain surprises--to allow for changes when needed.
- o Several "strategic initiatives" were developed, to improve County service levels or increase efficiency. The recently published *Multnomah County Operational Plan*, (December 1989) documents these along with other background material used to frame the 1990-91 Multnomah County budget.
- o The 1990-91 proposed budget incorporates those strategic initiatives that the PDC prioritized as important to accomplish within this next fiscal year.

There is work still to be done. A lot of work. So the process continues, and will serve us better as we gain more expertise.

Participants in the process--even those skeptical at the outset--have become enthusiastic about strategic planning. Managers and officials alike have shown great openness to change and to fresh insights. The strong citizen input will continue.

We are unmistakably on the move in the County.

The County must shape the disciplines of strategic planning to a different purpose than they may have traditionally served. But those disciplines--shared rather than fragmented responsibility for managing the future; broad, long-range policy-making; specific assignment of responsibility; priority setting, and measurement of results--all are directly applicable to our government and will benefit citizens for years to come.

What we are seeing evolve is a new process for County planning that will guide us into the future.

As to our first year with strategic planning: We've made a good start.....

STRATEGY PLAN REPORT—March 1990

BEGINNINGS

As the planning process started, it was apparent that the way the County was structurally organized was not necessarily the way to clearly group its functions. So, instead of using the existing Department definitions of functions, County business was sorted into five functional program areas:

- o Environmental Programs
- o Human Programs
- o Justice Programs
- o Support Services Programs
- o General Government Programs

What function each includes is noted later in the individual program area summaries.

To ensure a broad base of input to the process, two advisory functions were enlisted. One, the Multnomah County Citizen Involvement Committee (CIC), continued to supply valued contributions to the process. Their participation in planning discussions and their 80-page document, *Multnomah County Visions—The 1990's and Beyond*, reflect their commitment to strategic planning and to the County.

For a second view, five Functional Planning Committees were named, one for each of the program areas. Each committee was made up of at least one Commissioner, one Department manager, one or more County employees, and several interested citizens. Each committee was chartered to decide the

important issues in their program area, who needed to be involved to make things happen, and who would be affected by program changes. Each committee was also asked to review how their area might change over time.

Key to the success of the process was the formation of the team responsible for making it work in the County, the Policy Development Committee (PDC). This group is made up of the five County Commissioners, the District Attorney and the Sheriff, the County Chair's Executive Assistant and the managers of each of the four County operational departments (Environmental Services, General Services, Human Services, and Justice Services). These twelve people began with the findings of the five Functional Planning Committees and the CIC. They met regularly, and continue to meet, to share their expertise in identifying and documenting long-range issues facing the County and discussing programs to deal with the problems. Each individual is a contributor, and each has the opportunity to gain from exposure to the experience and knowledge of the others.

KEY SUCCESSES

Strategic Planning has so far produced several significant products. The first is a definition of the County's services to its constituents. The PDC has defined its position on the County's roles in each of the five functional areas. Long-range goals and major concerns of each functional area have been clarified and documented. The final

pages of this report are the essentials of that work.

Another key product is a series of *strategic initiatives*. Each strategic initiative describes a program to improve service levels or internal performance of the County. A strategic initiative may be a new program or an improvement to an existing function.

The 1990-91 Operational Plan was the second major step in the strategic planning process. Given direction by the PDC, the Departments documented the details (descriptions, mandates, interdependencies, objectives, costs, revenue sources) of current and proposed programs as they fit within a three-year window of the long-range plan. The included strategic initiatives are highlighted. The Operational Plan helped formulate the 1990-91 County Budget.

The PDC continues to also work on more immediate items and issues. Much effort has been recently put into issues as diverse as additional jail beds and library governance.

WHAT LIES AHEAD

The 1990-91 Budget is being prepared, with review, hearings and approval expected before the end of April.

The planning process continues. The PDC, using the strategic planning process, continues to examine:

- o Community-based services.
- o Partnering with the community
(government and business) on youth programs.
- o Keeping youth off drugs.
- o Space planning.

- o Funding capital equipment replacement.
- o Integrating similar Human and Justice services.
- o Regional cooperation on overlapping services.

In late summer of 1990, the process will pick up speed, aiming toward a complete five-year plan and updating the operational plan and the subsequent budget. We will add some refinements, but this past year's experience will make the process more clear-cut. Fewer groups will be formed. Those that are involved will meet on a tighter schedule to maintain the continuity. They will work toward developing a strategy plan which narrates the County's long-term direction with more specifics than was done this year.

The CIC will be encouraged to update their "Visions" document and there will be public hearings on the Operational Plan.

The following pages represent the essence of strategy planning to date. Each of the five program areas is defined in terms of its role within the County and the major goals within its authority.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

Role within the County

Environmental programs encompass the Exposition Center and County Fair, parks, land-use planning, community development block grants, animal and insect control, transportation engineering and survey, road and bridge maintenance, bicycle paths, and emergency management.

Multnomah County's tasks in providing environmental services have changed significantly over the last five years. Building inspections, neighborhood parks and the responsibilities for sewers have been shifted to the cities. County roads incorporated into the city of Portland are now maintained by Portland. Given these changes, the County should direct its environmental programs and services into areas available to all County residents, whether or not they live in a city.

The County should focus its environmental resources on:

- o Regional and local parks.
- o Recreation facilities other than parks.
- o Transportation methods within the County, more than roads, looking toward a regional role.
- o Roads and bridges.
- o Leadership in land-use-planning standards setting.
- o Land-use planning outside the Urban Growth Boundary.
- o Agricultural and wetland protection, including the Columbia Gorge.

- o Involvement with siting community facilities to meet needs.
- o Leadership in planning for "assisted and special-needs" housing.
- o Phasing out the use of Community Development Block Grants.
- o Environmental health--animal control, vector control.
- o Toxic material control and clean-up.
- o Helping create jobs, job training, and economic development--a cooperative role.
- o Aggressive recycling.

Major Goals

Provide all programs adequately and equitably to County residents.

Follow through on a coordinated effort to decide the County's specific role in planning, acquisition, and maintenance of roads, streets, and bridges.

Decide which environmental services are best performed regionally, and which locally; and work to resolve the regionalization issue.

Define and assign responsibility for carrying out the County's environmental health role (including pollution control).

Develop a strategy for "assisted and special-need" housing.

Specifically, the County will convene a "Housing Summit" of all parties involved -- agencies, governments, housing owners, contractors, etc.--

intended to increase the supply of available and dedicated housing stock. A detailed action plan for the Housing Summit is being developed. The results of the Summit will be presented to the Board of County Commissioners after completion.

Update the County's comprehensive land-use plan and regulations.

Work to finish the annexation of the urban unincorporated areas.

Define the County's role in economic development. Carry out an appropriate strategy.

Develop a vision for existing and future open spaces and parks. Develop a strategy for carrying out that vision.

Develop a plan for Sauvie Island (see *Multnomah County Operational Plan*, December 1989, page EP - 46 for the relevant Strategic Initiative), participate in the Columbia Gorge planning process, and identify other lands to be reserved for parks or open space (*op. cit.*, p. EP - 45).

Continue support for recycling.

HUMAN PROGRAMS

Role within the County

Human programs involve promoting the health and well-being of the County by providing community services, health, social and aging services to the indigent, handicapped, and aged, and juvenile detention, counseling and resource development.

The County should allocate its human program resources to:

- o Health care for low-income residents, with specialty health programs and clinics, *i.e.*, Teen Clinics.
- o Public health services for the general population.

- o Drug abuse control, treatment, and prevention.
- o Leadership in focusing resources on human programs needs.
- o Implementation of State human service programs.
- o Providing youth and juvenile justice and prevention services.
- o Being an advocate in the protection of the public's health, and in influencing State and Federal policies.
- o Prevention, through early intervention, instead of treatment.

- o Continuing treatment of established, critical-status situations.
- o Addressing needs at the local level by influence on and cooperation with others (City, State, Federal, private, non-profit, etc.).
- o Being the government of last resort when no other aid is available.

Major Goals

Evaluate current services provided. Set new or enhanced standards where necessary. Improve or discontinue activities not meeting established criteria.

Get resources redistributed so that more of them are available for solving problems at the local level, where they can best be focused.

Specifically, identify programs and services that should be provided by the County. Investigate and propose possible funding alternatives for existing programs and services. Identify funding gaps and present alternative funding strategies. This goal area will be examined by staff over the next year. The results will initiate next year's human programs' Strategy Planning process.

Lead in the creation of an integrated alcohol and drug strategy.

Select a target population where the probability of success is highest.

Improve the way services are provided to improve the success rate. (See *Multnomah County Operational Plan*, December 1989, HP - 87 through HP - 94 for the relevant Strategic Initiatives.) Continue to serve all populations at a fundamental level.

Define how human services and justice services are and should be integrated.

Identify populations served by both systems. Merge the service flow of both the Department of Human Services and the Department of Justice Services to identify shared and overlapped coverages. Identify opportunities for providing shared intensive services, such as alcohol and drug treatment. Set up an interdepartmental coordinating body that meets quarterly to review key program activities. This area will be reviewed by staff for introduction in next year's Strategy Planning process.

Re-examine the County's approach and policies concerning contracting for services. Examine existing contracts and explore opportunities for further contracting.

Explore the possibilities of using community centers (or other innovative approaches) for the delivery of human and justice services--the "caring community" approach.

JUSTICE PROGRAMS

Role within the County

Justice programs include those of the District Attorney and the Sheriff's office, and those relating to corrections, probation management, community corrections, women's and family services, and the medical examiner.

Programs considered as County justice programs have undergone a shift in focus in the last decade. Annexation has reduced the physical area where the Sheriff is responsible for public safety. This allows a shift of programs and resources to correction activities, both traditional and alternative procedures.

Justice program resources should be applied to:

- o Protecting the public by removing and housing the most dangerous lawbreakers.
- o Preventing crime.
- o Applying sanctions to lawbreakers.
- o Designing and operating programs that successfully return people to society.
- o Escalating or de-escalating sanctions based on results.

Major Goals

Increased coordination among law enforcement and corrections agencies about program options and available/effective sanction for criminals. A shift away from justice organizations working independently toward departments and agencies working together in

an integrated justice-services system. Linked responsibility between justice programs and human programs and systems. Allocation of resources to be planned from a systems viewpoint.

Specifically, the County will define the justice services continuum. This is the range of cultural, social, economic, political and legal factors that result in contact with justice programs. Standards will be determined for County responsibilities. The gap between current activities and desired standards will be assessed. This assessment will aid in identifying resource and structural implications and making recommendations for change. Defining the continuum will be addressed throughout the year. This information will be used for program development and as an input for next year's Strategy Plan.

Make available adequate sanctions for lawbreakers. Everyone who breaks the law gets put into an appropriate program. Develop more programs and methods for today's lawbreakers who are not now dealt with effectively.

Shift from an undefined responsibility for justice programs and results to a clear understanding of what the County's responsibilities are and take more responsibility for those programs.

Work toward a single police force for the County. Develop a consistent philosophy with

balanced, well-defined policies that recognize the needs of all elements of the County.

The County will take the leadership role in developing discussions with the City of Portland about coordinated law enforcement. The County will also seek to participate in the City of Portland's law-enforcement strategic planning. The intergovernmental Justice Coordinating Council will be expanded to include a member from the City of Gresham. The Justice Coordinating Council will be a policy advisory committee for all County jurisdictions.

Move toward community policing.

Develop the concept of "community policing." Describe how it applies to various areas--within the cities of Portland, Gresham, and Troutdale, unincorporated areas both in and out of the urban growth boundary--anywhere in the County. Determine what policies and strategies should be endorsed by the County in support of the community policing concept. (See *Multnomah County Operational Plan*, December 1989, page JP - 73 for the relevant Strategic Initiative.)

SUPPORT SERVICES PROGRAMS

Role within the County

Support Services programs include those necessary for supporting the County's operations. Included are facilities management, fleet, electronic services, labor relations, employee services, legal counsel, finance, planning and budget, information services, purchasing, central stores and records management.

Issues involved with Support Services include:

With current funding, revenues cannot fund added activities.

There are deteriorating facilities and scattered support services.

Some support systems appear to be designed for the support provider, not the customer. More attention should be paid to customer needs.

Support Services programs must focus on:

- o Centralizing County facilities as appropriate --deciding what should be centralized and what should not.
- o Developing an adequate funding base and financial resources.
- o Establishing more-accountable, more-efficient, less-expensive methods of mail, printing, and copy service.
- o Investing, enrolling, and enlisting County employees in the County vision.

Employees will be involved with vision development and implementation.

Major Goals

Establishment of capital reserves for replacement of the County infrastructure--buildings, facilities, computer hardware, and other capital equipment.

Specifically, the Planning and Budget Division will develop and coordinate the effort to develop a capital - improvement planning process. This will provide for reserves to fund major facilities projects and improvements. A capital-asset-inventory system will be developed to allow reserves to be established based on the useful life of the asset. (See *Multnomah County Operational Plan*, December 1989, page SP - 50 for the relevant Strategic Initiative.)

Development of funding for continuing data-processing and information management, and determining what should be funded.

The Data Processing Management Committee (DPMC) will be the primary planning vehicle for County

data management systems. The DPMC's annual report will address the required Personal Computer reserve fund development, as well as support services and standards supplied by the Information Services Division (*op. cit.*, SP - 50 and SP - 53).

The DPMC report will also address integration of data processing systems to maximize savings (*op. cit.*, p. SP - 52).

Development of proactive and meaningful Affirmative Action programs.

The Board of County Commissioners has asked for more frequent comprehensive Affirmative Action reporting (*op. cit.*, p. SP - 49).

Using value-based management.

When this Strategic Planning process is completed, the planning team will review and update the County "guiding principles" as a first step toward a values-based approach. The Department of General Services will work with Policy Development Committee members throughout the next year to develop a definition of this area.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Role within the County

General Government functions include those of the County Chair, the Board of County

Commissioners, the Auditor, citizens involvement, library, assessment and taxation, and elections; plus allotment of funds to non-County organizations.

In the General Government area, the County should focus on:

- o Separating and clearly defining the executive and legislative functions.
- o Defining its "general government" role and mission. Setting priorities for providing service to the public and to other governments.
- o Shifting the library system to a publicly operated facility.
- o Effectively communicating County views and philosophy to those employees and citizens who represent the County on Boards and Commissions.
- o Defining service boundaries--Metro's or the County's land-use plans.
- o Defining the level and timing of financial aid to cities to support annexation.
- o Deciding how, and to what level, urban services can be delivered to people within the urban services boundary.
- o Investigating active participation in the development of an area cultural plan.

Major Goals

Moving to an appropriate Assessment and Taxation system (modern, state-of-the-art, fair and accurate).

Specifically, the County will follow the mandates of the recent legislative bill to aggressively

improve statewide tax appraisal activities (See *Multnomah County Operational Plan*, December 1989, GG - 32 through GG - 35 for the relevant Strategic Initiatives.)

Establishing an integrated data base.

The Information Services Division is to study and present an integrated County database based on the linking of other information to the computerized mapping of County land (*op. cit.*, p. SP - 54).

Being a positive force toward regionalization of government services. Integrating State and Federal programs with those of the County.

The County will seek to gradually regionalize services or service delivery using existing governmental structures. Conduct a feasibility study with other governments to determine which services could be regionalized. Possibly start with the Juvenile Detention Project. This subject will be addressed during the year and re-evaluated when Strategy Planning is begun next year.

Reviewing alternatives for broadening the revenue base beyond increasing property taxes.

Alternative approaches to funding County programs and activities are to be proposed. The Planning and Budget Division has been directed to prepare a study by April 1990 for Board consideration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This is the first phase of Strategic Planning in Multnomah County. Strategy Planning has been the result of the efforts of many people. To be especially recognized are:

The citizens of Multnomah County and their input through the Citizen's Involvement Committee, Dennis Paine, Chair; with particular mention of John Miller, Sarah Lamb and Merlin Reynolds.

The five Functional Planning Committees:

Human Services

Pauline Anderson, Commissioner
Linda Crum, CIC appointee
Jeff Lewis, CIC appointee
Doug Montgomery, CIC appointee
Lorraine Santos, CIC appointee
Tom Zelenka, CIC appointee
Duane Zussy, Dept Manager
Facilitator, John Cronise

Justice Services

John Angell, Dept Manager
Pat Brothers, CIC appointee
Kurt Engelstad, CIC appointee
Gretchen Kafoury, Commissioner
Robert Skipper, Sheriff
Tanna Reynolds, CIC appointee
Roosevelt Robinson, CIC appointee
Mike Schrunck, District Attorney
Facilitator, Dave Warren

Environmental Services

Polly Casterline, Commissioner
Sheila Driscoll, CIC appointee
Dick Feeney, CIC appointee
Tom Griffith, CIC appointee
Nancy Loughmiller, CIC appointee
Ed Washington, CIC appointee
Paul Yarborough, Dept Manager
Facilitator, Ardys Craghead

Support Services

Linda Alexander, Dept Manager
Rick Bauman, Commissioner
Paul Eisenberg, CIC appointee
John Frewing, CIC appointee
Robert Gaudin, CIC appointee
Thomas Wright, CIC appointee
James Dusevoir, Sheriff's Office/MCCOA
Facilitator, Ben Buisman

General Government

Phyllis Cole, CIC appointee
Bud Farm, CIC appointee
Ned Look, CIC appointee
Terry McCall, CIC appointee
Gladys McCoy, County Chair
Caroline Miller, Commissioner
Joe Devlaeminck, ISD/Local 88
Facilitator, Tom Simpson

and the Policy Development Committee¹

Gladys McCoy	Chair of the Board
Pauline Anderson	Commissioner, District 1
Gretchen Kafoury	Commissioner, District 2
Rick Bauman	Commissioner, District 3
Sharron Kelley	Commissioner, District 4
Robert Skipper	Sheriff
Michael Schrunk	District Attorney
Hank Miggins	Exec Assistant to the Chair
Linda Alexander	Director, Dept of General Svcs
Duane Zussy	Director, Dept of Human Svcs
Paul Yarborough	Director, Dept of Environmental Svcs
Grant Nelson	Acting Director, Dept of Justice Svcs

¹By Ordinance, the Policy Development Committee is limited to the Chair and the Board. The other members sit at the pleasure of the Board as members of the working committee which has developed and maintained the strategic planning process since June of 1988.

Multnomah County strategic planning is coordinated by the:
Department of General Services, Linda Alexander, Director,
Planning and Budget Division, Jack Horner, Manager.
John Cronise was the Project Supervisor for Strategy Planning.