



Washington County Fiscal Year 2021-22 Proposed Budget

Washington County and Service District for Lighting No. 1 Budget Committee Questions and Answers

1. Question: What revenue losses other than TLT (including TLT that goes to General Fund uses) have been identified for “backfill from ARPA funding?” Road Fund Gas Taxes, what other fees?

- We are still trying to get more clarifications on the Treasury’s lost revenue calculation method. Our preliminary analysis with the County’s methods show the following areas of loss revenues:
 - Transient Lodging Tax
 - State Timber Receipt
 - Community Corrections Fund
 - State Motor Vehicle Appropriation
 - Vehicle Registration Fee
 - North Bethany SDC Revenue
 - State Mental Health Grant
 - Interest Earnings

Not all of these revenue losses will be eligible for American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (FRF). Further clarifications from Treasury and analysis is needed.

2. Budget Process Question: When will the WA Co Budget Committee be reconvened for supplemental budget work given the ARPA funding of \$58M this fiscal year?

- According to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) and the Local Budget Manual, the budget committee is not required to reconvene for the supplemental budget processes. The ORS does not direct a process for budget committee participations. If the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would like to involve the community members on the budget committee in the supplemental budget process, it would need to be advisory in nature without formal committee action.

3. PDF page , print page 17, Budget Message, subsection **Public Safety**

Text reads: “...(fifth line) The proposed budget increases the General Fund support to Community Corrections in order to maintain the current service level for misdemeanor cases, but the proposed one-time solution will not resolve the ongoing issue of chronic state underfunding. Additional discussion among the Board of County Commissioners and sustained advocacy in the Legislature will be required as the state finalizes its biennial budget later this year.” (recognizing text on print page 26 as well, Community Correction Section.)

Comment: I appreciate that this proposed budget maintains the existing misdemeanor case load. We have a growing trend of misdemeanor cases.

Comment: Later, in 2H2021, I propose that the Board have a policy discussion (after this budget adoption process) to discuss and make a budget policy decision on what misdemeanor case load we want to fund moving forward. This an unmet community need. Human potential is being dispensed with. The Board did receive the information back in February 2021 and charts prior (2019 & maybe 2020.) It may not be as fresh/readily available for all BCC members. Taking care of ill-advised behaviors “on the small stuff” can reduce the demand for “big stuff” (state level misdemeanors and felonies, as we see via law enforcement



patrol investments (Sheriff dept plus in city budgets for their patrol), and prosecution investments in the DA department.) I'm questioning that we have a reasonably a balanced system.

- The policy discussion will be scheduled for a work session in Quarter 3 of this year.

4. PDF page 34, Print page 26, Section **Community Corrections (188-5510)**

Text reads: It is worth noting, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the criminal justice system is currently facing a backlog of over 2000 criminal filings. The rate in which the local courts resolve these cases will impact the funded workload. Current funding from the state is based upon the existing caseload under supervision and will not be adjusted until the next biennium. The rate in which the courts resolve these cases will determine the unfunded workload and financial impact. If these cases are resolved at an accelerated rate, Community Corrections will receive an increased workload without financial compensation until the next biennium population forecast.

Question: Can we track so that there is "a forward loan" in order to cover a "paper loss of revenue" from the state due to the difference of what will be "actual" versus "state old forecast ("current caseload under supervision during covid")?

- In consult with Community Corrections Director, Steve Berger: The state recalibrates the population forecasts prior to the close of the legislative session; they just adjusted the population under supervision via the April forecast. The April population adjustment lowered the number and budget to reflect the lower population under supervision due to COVID.
- The Oct/Nov/Dec population snapshots in the odd numbered years are used to "build" the statewide budget. The snapshots in the even years are used to determine the % allocation each county receives.
- Further, as the rules currently apply, Mr. Berger doesn't believe we could cover a "forward loan" due to the schedule of the even/odd years associated with building the next biennium budget. The 2021 snapshots will only help build the budget via capitated rates and the 2022 snapshots determine the % allocation. We will not see a new state DOC budget kick in until FY 2023-24. That said, Mr. Berger has been advocating for the state to open a mid-biennium review in 2022 to adjust for what we anticipate will be growth year due to the COVID backlog of cases, no response or action to date on that proposal.

5. PDF page 36, print page 28, Section **Developmental Disabilities (191-7065)**

Text reads: The Developmental Disability Services program has grown dramatically over the past few years due to changes in eligibility requirements by the Oregon State Legislature which significantly increased the number of individuals eligible to be served. ... Alongside several years of dramatic growth due to client eligibility expansion, state funding levels are below that needed to effectively serve residents. ... If funding remains flat, the program will be forced to reduce staff in subsequent fiscal years.

Question: This last sentence just highlights reducing staff only, without mentioning case load service reductions. I assume we would also reduce the case load that we can service. Clarity is needed. This causes me to ask: What is the state funding formula (ex. per person rate?) At what point do we tell the State Legislature and Administrative Office, that "you only fund services for X number of people, so we will only service X number of people?"



- Washington County received funding from the State of Oregon to operate a Community Developmental Disabilities Program. The Community Developmental Disabilities Program (CDDP) funding allotments are based on a workload assessment (conducted by the state) and an average of state employee costs for the model. This amount is then reduced to meet budgeted amount by the Legislature, resulting in the program being funded at approximately 72% of the recommended staffing levels defined by the state. This increases caseload sizes for the county's program and strain on staff. The DD Division's budget uses carryforward funds to help staff manage workload.
 - Given the program growth and the need to call out the specific budget challenges faced by this program, the DD Program was separated from Behavioral Health and become its own division last year or on July 1, 2020. The division has continued to grow as new community members are deemed eligible for services due to expanded service opportunities. The County is adding one FTE in caseloads every two months; this has been consistent throughout the past three biennia. To effectively serve community members, the division has determined it needs to increase staffing using carryforward dollars. While the plan was to add two additional case management staff this past fiscal year, increased administrative overhead expenses and the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in the DD Division freezing the two positions. The increased carryforward is currently reflected in Fund 191, due to the hiring freeze during FY 20-21 and savings created by vacant positions.
 - The division currently has approximately \$1.5 million in carry forward. The division has budgeted the use of the entire carryforward balance. Give the size of the division, staff vacancies will result in savings at the end of the fiscal year, with will help to provide some fund balance going into the next fiscal year. The strategy is to continue providing services at the greatest possible level, hoping that the next biennium will bring additional funding to hire staff.
 - The state has changed how services are funded, using a random moment sampling process to assess funding needs. The state has determined through its evaluation that the County DD division should have 117 FTE to adequately serve the community for 2019-21. FTE allocations for the upcoming 2021-23 biennium were planned to be released in March 2021. However, the Legislature has opted to underfund the division. Current DD staffing is 85.1 total for FY 21-22. Should the revenue from the state remain flat or reduced, and administrative costs continue to rise, the program will be forced to lay off staff in FY 2022-23.
6. PDF page 39, print page 31, Section **Event Center (380-9820)**
Text reads: The Wingspan Event and Conference Center capital project nears completion and will move forward with closeout procedures during this budget cycle.
Question: Since the Wingspan Event and Conference Center was operational in FY20-21, can you share a bit about why is there still capital construction project close out happening in FY21-22?
- The project is in the close-out phase and although it is technically deemed complete with the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy, the close-out process will take some additional time. This is typical of any capital project but particularly one of this size and scope.
 - **Commissioning:** In the close-out phase, the project is going through commissioning to ensure each system is operating as designed. With COVID-19, some project aspects such as automated gates



connectivity (software and payment processing system) and EV charging stations were put on hold to align with the re-opening timeline to save on monthly fees for an underutilized facility. Artwork is being finalized for installation and should wrap-up by June 30th.

- **Warranty Periods:** The major building systems such as HVAC, solar, video wall etc., are nearing the one-year warranty period at the end of May. The project team is scheduled to carry-out the one-year warranty walk for these items on May 25th. If all these systems pass the warranty walk, this will trigger release of the associated retainage. The final landscape one-year warranty walk is planned for September after all plants are deemed established. Once approved, the final retainage release can be issued, and the project closed out. The CMGC close-out process includes a project reconciliation and will be complete with the retainage release.
- **Funding Close-Out:** As the project moves toward financial finalization, the process for closing the fund can also move forward. Capital project staff in collaboration with Finance will address any fund level requirements and develop a strategy for repurposing remaining funds. In the case of Wingspan Event and Conference Center, any remaining funds are anticipated to pay down the outstanding debt.

7. PDF page 123, print pages 104, Section **Community Corrections**

Budget Analysis, 5th paragraph on Personnel Services... As a result...

Question: Just checking... Are these all vacant staff positions that we are closing to balance this budget section (so we don't keep up with current case load demand) or are letting existing staff go? See comment below.

- There are 2 part-time FTE residential counselor positions at the Community Corrections Center that will be let go. The rest are vacant positions.

Question: Can you confirm that "As a result, program services for parole and probation are reduced to include mentor services, housing, treatment, polygraph, and other program subsidies" does not apply to misdemeanor cases handling?

- While state funding does help leverage resources, the reductions do not apply to misdemeanor cases.

8. **Comment (managing a concern that I have for our community services)** Below you will see that I have asked questions about how various discretionary dollars uses are directed in this proposed budget. I am quite concerned about perpetuating the unmet community needs, human investments here in Washington County, investments in mental health services, behavioral health, juvenile justice and community corrections, all standard county services. For example, I am concerned that the WA Co Community Correction department has a positive track record and this proposed budget reduces FTE, mentor opportunities and investment in skill development – which impacts people's lives and rehabilitation success directly. So, I am asking myself, why do I want to spread this limited discretionary revenue on less direct and potentially less human meaningful expenditures? It is a matter of Board budget priorities.

I hope that we will have a BCC conversation in the early part of the next year budget process on a potential different scheme for some discretionary dollars.

- See response to questions #10, 11, and 12 on this larger policy discussion.



- 9. PDF page 250-251, print pages 222-223, Section **County Fair Complex**
PDF page 254-255, print pages 226-227, **Event Center Operations**

Request: The Budget Analysis sections on pages 223 and 227 use the same explanation to outline the same operating and budgeting conditions and the same 1.0 FTE increase. Please inspire confidence by explaining this more clearly.

- The Event Center and Fair Complex have a shared staffing model, which is what causes the parallel justification between the org units. Here is a summary of the current FTE deployment:

FTE counts:	Fair Complex	Event Center	Total
Working	3.5	2.7	6.2
Redeployed	2.0	0.8	2.8
Held vacant	2.0	2.0	4.0
New (Janitorial)	1.0	1.0	2.0
TOTAL:	8.5	6.5	15.0

- 10. PDF page 261, print page 232: Section **Non-Departmental, Table under Budget Analysis**

Question: Is the “Special Projects” to support our TBD needs for consultancy or CBO needs for special projects (TBD) driven out of the BCC and CAO (ex. WA Co Strategic Plan, org planning...)? Please explain.

Question: Miscellaneous Membership Dues: What department is using this? What orgs?

Question: Housing Alliance?

Question: Animal Damage Control?

Overall Question: What is the consistent budget process for memberships to be in departments versus in non-department?

- Pending direction from the Board, we’ve left this budget unchanged the last two budget cycles except for small annual increases that come through every year for AOC dues, RACC, and the Animal Damage Control contract.
 - Miscellaneous Membership Dues is unspecified and is a placeholder for membership requests that come up during the year from BCC.
 - Housing Alliance dues have been part of this budget since 2007.
 - Through the Animal Damage Control contract, Washington County is contributing as a partner to the USDA Wildlife Services program. Coyote predation on livestock and similar issues are the primary focus. This program received attention recently due to a constituent issue, so more information will be coming to the Board from the CAO shortly.
 - Decisions about the Special Projects line item are driven by BCC and CAO priorities; it has typically covered unplanned BCC/CAO projects that emerge during the year.

- 11. PDF page 265, print page 235: Section **Community Network**

Comment: I hope these will be reviewed with the BCC this calendar year for future budget direction.



- We have received Board direction to develop a process for community investments that centers equity and is more transparent about how investments are made and expected outcomes. While we don't see that reflected in this year's budget, we are working on developing that process improvement. It is currently planned for an August work session discussion with the Board.

12. PDF page 335, print page 296, Section **Lottery Program, Table**

Question: Which Chambers? (of the set: Hillsboro, Beaverton, Tigard, Tualatin, Sherwood, Forest Grove-

Cornelius, North Plains.) Comment: We should be transparent on which Chambers there are memberships to.

Question: Why does the Five Oak Museum entry increase? I don't recall any BCC conversation.

Question: Miscellaneous, Why? And why did it increase? I don't recall any BCC conversation.

- The Board gave direction during last year's budget process to increase contributions to chambers from \$200 each to \$500 each. The list of funded chambers is below, and the budget narrative will be updated with this list before final adoption. For the Miscellaneous amount of \$2,646, this budget has to be fully appropriated (no contingency) and the Miscellaneous amount balances expected revenue against planned expenditures.
- Chamber list:
 - Banks Chamber of Commerce
 - Beaverton Chamber
 - Cornelius
 - Forest Grove
 - Hillsboro
 - North Plains
 - Sherwood
 - Tigard
 - Tualatin
 - Wilsonville
- The Five Oaks Museum has received a small increase each year. Since 2001, the County's financial support for the museum has increased. In FY 2019-20, the County provided \$200,000 in financial support for the museum's operations and an additional \$25,000 for maintenance and repair of the museum's building. Since FY 2019-20 small COLA increases have been provided to the museum while the building maintenance and repair amount has stayed the same at \$25,000 annually.

13. How was funding the police conversation considered related to citizen concerns raised last year?

- For the second time, Washington County held Community Investment Conversations prior to the beginning of the budget cycle to inform county priorities. While some called for a reduction in public safety spending, there was support directed towards increasing spending on affordable housing, health and human services. General fund investments aimed at affordable housing coupled with funding from the Supportive Housing Services Levy will significantly increase county



resources to address the housing crisis with a focus on equity. Looking comprehensively across multiple sources of funding, this represents community voices through engagement sessions, ballot/levy measures, constrained county general fund, and other strategic opportunities. Moving forward, racial equity and community engagement will become more significant aspects of the county budget process, with the expectation that budget decisions will address systemic inequities in access to and quality of county services, as well as a more intentional focus on equitable outcomes from county investments.

- Public Safety and Justice provides services for Washington County citizens to ensure the public's safety and welfare and provides a justice system that functions in a collaborative and cooperative effort between all areas of the justice system. This begins with early juvenile intervention, prosecution, incarceration, and reintegration into the community of other justice involved individuals. It may be helpful to note that these are county-wide services, and while each city employs their own police department; Countywide services include Sheriff's officer response and investigations, jail, district attorney, community corrections and juvenile. Countywide services also include the Mental Health Response Teams which pairs one deputy with a trained/licensed Mental Health Clinician and works as one part of the behavioral health continuum of crisis services offered in the County. Several other city jurisdictions are interested in partnering with Washington County to provide this level of service to their community. Other multi-agency teams include partnerships with cities to provide critical services such as the Westside Interagency Narcotics (WIN) Team, the Crisis Negotiation Unit (CNU), Forensics and other Multi-Disciplinary Teams convened with professionals around the county. Other important components of the County's system of service include the specialty treatment courts (i.e. Mental Health Court, Veteran's Court, Drug Court etc.). Community Corrections and the Juvenile Department include restorative and prevention services as part of their service response and delivery model.
- The Public Safety and Justice budgets show an overall General Fund growth of only one percent for fiscal year 2021-22 and includes a number of cuts to compensate for the decrease in allowed funding. The special funds show a zero growth for the functional area. The District Attorney and the Sheriff both requested General Fund positions that were not approved pending further discussion with the Board and community. The Sheriff's office and other Public Safety organizations within the County are funded by General Fund and two voter approved levies. These levies are the Public Safety Local Option Levy approved in May 2020 and the Enhanced Sheriff's Patrol District (ESPD) Levy approved in May 2017. Both of these levy's allow for limited growth each year to recognize the growing population of the County.
- The General Fund dollars provide a base level of service. Levies and special districts provide additional funding to ensure the community need is met. The Public Safety Local Option Levy was first passed by voters in 2001 and has been renewed or replaced in all subsequent levy



cycles. In May of 2020, Washington County voters approved the replacement of the Public Safety Levy at \$0.47 per \$1,000 of assessed value (a \$0.05 increase) through fiscal year 2025-26. This allows the current service level to continue and adds/enhances services for each of the public safety departments as well as increases funding & programming for the emergency shelters to include services to survivors of domestic violence.

- The Enhanced Sheriff's Patrol District (ESPD) Levy also ensures that adequate levels of community policing and services are provided for residents in urban unincorporated Washington County. That levy has been approved by voters since 1987. The current levy expires on June 30, 2023 and the Board has requested additional community engagement in planning for the next levy.

14. How was the Community Investment Conversation considered and included in the budget?

- Centering community needs and public interests is always the County's goal in financial planning and resource allocations. The Community Investment Conversations took place in November 2020 was very informative to the Board of County Commissioners' consideration and deliberations in budget priorities. While the County's financial planning and strategy is long term in nature and positive changes can take multiple budget years to carry out, a few immediate actions in the functional area of Housing, Health and Human Services were proposed in the FY 2021-22 proposed budget to start the process. These areas include:
 - Supportive Housing Services: The County is leveraging internal and external financial resources to ensure the timely implementation of this program. The County is anticipating \$38 million from the voter approved Metro Supportive Housing Measure in this fiscal year to fully develop and implement the program. While Washington County will not begin to receive the tax revenue until approximately the second quarter of fiscal year 2021-22, the County has invested \$1.14 million of general fund resources in the form of an interfund loan to support the startup and initial implementation of the program.
 - Housing Production Opportunity Fund: The County is maintaining its commitment to affordable housing without compromise. A new fund, Fund 245, has been created and dedicated general fund investment is established in the proposed budget. The total investment in this area over a period of 5 years or until the commitment of \$20 million is met.
 - The Center for Addiction Triage and Treatment: The County is actively developing a program to establish the Center for Addiction Triage and Treatment (CATT). The CATT would provide comprehensive services for the treatment of substance use disorders, with multiple levels of care on the same campus. The project is in the feasibility assessment stage and the project development and operating costs are fully known at this moment. The feasibility assessment is scheduled for the July 13th, 2021 Work Session.

15. Where is the County investing in housing services for seniors?

- The County has several programs that fund the development of affordable housing. Some of the affordable housing developments include units specifically for seniors. The four affordable housing



development programs are: (1) Metro Bond Affordable Housing Bond Program; (2) HOME Program, and, (3) Washington County Housing Authority housing development, primarily through public/private developments. And, lastly, (4), the Supportive Housing Services Program will provide housing for chronically homeless individuals, including seniors, and families.

- Several projects may have a combination of funding from the above-mentioned programs. During the budget presentation, a HOME funded project, the Tigard Senior Housing Project, was mentioned. This senior housing project will be built adjacent to the Tigard Senior Center.
- The Affordable Housing Bond Program has a goal of building 1,300 of permanently affordable housing units throughout the County. Washington County, Hillsboro and Beaverton are working together to achieve this goal within seven years. Currently, 1,180 affordable housing units in 13 affordable housing developments are in pre-development or under construction within Washington County. Of the 1,300 housing units, Washington County is responsible for building 814. Currently, 812 units are in pre-development in 10 affordable housing projects.