

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

THE PUBLIC SAFETY 2000 COMMITTEE

MEMBERS

Paul G. Lorenzini, Chairperson
Fred A. Stickel, Chairperson of Standards & Criteria Task Group
James B. Jeddeloh, Chairperson of Finance Task Group
Jim McKillip, Chairperson of Operations Task Group
Richard J. Brown - Appointed by Portland City Council
John Christensen, Ph.D. - Appointed by Wood Village City Council
Jeff Patterson - Appointed by Maywood Park City Council
Reuben "Pete" Peterson - Appointed by Gresham City Council
Pete Smith - Appointed by Multnomah County Board of Commissioners
Richard Stagg - Appointed by Multnomah County Board of Commissioners
Marshall M. "Mickey" Okell - Appointed by Fairview City Council
David Ripma - Appointed by Troutdale City Council
Laurie Ross - Appointed by Portland City Council
David Zollner - Appointed by Gresham City Council

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Don Dickinson, Vice President, Gerber Advertising
Donald S. McClave, CEO, Portland Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
Robin Montgomery, Special Agent in Charge, FBI, Oregon
Joan Pasco, Executive Director, Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce
Michael D. Schrunk, District Attorney, Multnomah County

STAFF MEMBERS

Patrick F. Donaldson, Executive Director, Citizens Crime Commission
Sgt. Merlin Juilfs, Multnomah County Sheriffs Office
Lt. Bob Kauffman, Portland Police Bureau
Detective Andrew Kirkland, Portland Police Bureau
Connie Ryba, Gresham Police Department

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS(Cont.)

CONSULTANTS TO THE COMMITTEE

Barney & Worth, Inc.

Don Barney
Brad Higbee

Portland State University

Rian S. Hamby

Public Safety Strategies

Todd H. Taylor
Gordon K. Zenk, Ph.D.

Richard Huneke & Associates

Richard Huneke

TH Research, Inc.

Tim Hibbitts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	E-1
SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS	E-1
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	E-2
2.0 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INPUT.....	E-4
3.0 CHANGES IN POLICE SERVICE DELIVERY FROM 1974 TO 1992	E-6
4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	E-7
SECTION I: BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 METHODOLOGY	2
SECTION II: CHANGES IN POLICE SERVICE DELIVERY: 1974 TO 1992	5
2.1 1974 POLICE CONSOLIDATION STUDY.....	5
2.2 MULTNOMAH COUNTY AND POLICE SERVICES IN 1974.....	6
2.3 CHANGES AND CHALLENGES IN 1992.....	8
SECTION III: ASSESSMENT OF POLICE SERVICE DELIVERY	21
3.1 PUBLIC PERCEPTION	
3.2 PUBLIC SAFETY 2000 EVALUATION	
3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS	
SECTION IV: STANDARDS & CRITERIA FOR POLICE SERVICE DELIVERY	39
SECTION V: ANALYSIS OF POLICE AGENCY CONSOLIDATION	43
5.1 SCOPE OF ANALYSIS	43
5.2 CONSOLIDATION ALTERNATIVES.....	43
5.3 SURVEY OF POLICE CONSOLIDATION MODELS	48
5.4 FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF SINGLE AGENCY OPTION.....	51
5.5 CONCLUSIONS ON SINGLE AGENCY CONSOLIDATION	52
5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	53

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

SECTION VI: FUNCTIONAL INTEGRATION OF POLICE SERVICES59

- 6.1 DESIGNATED FUNCTIONS FOR INTEGRATION 59
- 6.2 PROPOSED MODELS FOR ACHIEVING INTEGRATION..... 59
- 6.3 IMPLEMENTATION OF FUNCTIONAL INTEGRATION67

SECTION VII: CIVILIANIZATION AND PRIVATIZATION.....83

- 7.1 CIVILIANIZATION AND PRIVATIZATION OPPORTUNITIES 83
- 7.2 CIVILIANIZATION AND PRIVATIZATION SAVINGS..... 85
- 7.3 SAVINGS SHOULD BE REALLOCATED TO PRIORITY CRIME
PROBLEMS100

REFERENCE MATERIAL.....103

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS105

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Public Safety 2000 (the Committee) was charged by elected officials of local governments in Multnomah County with identifying ways in which police services could be delivered more effectively in Multnomah County. After several months of evaluations, which included: testimony from all major police agencies and support groups; public opinion polls and surveys; a study of police consolidations around the nation and in Canada; and in-depth assessments of local agency operating practices and budgets, the Committee recommends:

- (1) The consolidation of major non-patrol functions among the five city and County police agencies and the establishment of a Council of Law Enforcement Officials (CLEO) to provide initial, and ongoing oversight;
- (2) A realignment of patrol functions in the County which will facilitate more efficient use of resources and more effective police coverage;
- (3) The civilianization and privatization of functions in specific areas within police agencies in the County.

In addition to the above, the Committee is making other recommendations for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of police service delivery. All of these proposals will result in total net savings of at least \$3.7 million per year and will free up over 70 sworn officers for line police duty. The Committee believes these resources can be reassigned to provide enhanced police service in the County and has identified specific alternatives for achieving such an objective which the CLEO is encouraged to consider.

The Committee considered recommendations to consolidate all law enforcement in Multnomah County into a single agency. After considerable analysis, we concluded that a recommendation for a single agency would not be supportable at the present time. The Committee believes that the formation of a single agency would add to the costs of police service in Multnomah County by at least \$3.5 million per year. We also believe that potential savings and gains in effectiveness which might be achieved by a single-agency solution can be captured in other ways without a major restructuring and without incurring these costs. Thus, we could find no justification for proposing formation of a single agency. Yet, we believe that the option of a single agency should be retained for future consideration. The Committee has identified conditions under which consolidation into a single agency might be appropriate.

Public Safety 2000 believes the recommendations in this report should be seen as near-term actions directed toward a longer-term goal of improved delivery of police services in the entire urban Portland area, which now includes portions of Washington and Clackamas Counties. This may take the form of further functional consolidations in the manner recommended in this report, or, ultimately, the consolidation of all police services into a single metropolitan-wide police agency.

The consolidation of services proposed by **Public Safety 2000** will result in the law enforcement agencies within Multnomah County being amongst the most integrated of any urban county in the United States. The law enforcement functions that would then be totally integrated would include: Information Data Systems, Records, Emergency Communications, Training, Domestic Violence/Child Abuse, Mid and High-Level Narcotics Investigations, Personnel Recruitment, Corrections (Community Corrections & Jails), River Patrol, Special Emergency Response Teams, and Gang Enforcement Teams.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

In late 1991, the **CITIZENS CRIME COMMISSION** was asked by elected officials from the public jurisdictions within Multnomah County to conduct an evaluation of Police Services and identify methods to increase efficiency and effectiveness, with the goal of increasing the resources available to provide street-level policing. Each jurisdiction identified three individuals who might serve as potential members of a committee to conduct such a study. **Public Safety 2000** was formed by the **CITIZENS CRIME COMMISSION** from this list of nominees. Fourteen members were selected representing the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Multnomah County. The Committee initiated its efforts in May 1992.

1.2 MISSION

Public Safety 2000 set as its mission to:

“...conduct an independent, private sector, ‘outside of government’ examination of the services and structure of local police agencies; determine the efficiency of structure and services; and recommend a preferred future for police agency structure and service delivery in Multnomah County, Oregon, to ensure greater public safety for all citizens and businesses.”

1.3 METHODOLOGY

The Committee evaluated issues related to the delivery of police services from several perspectives:

- o Community input was gathered through **TH Research** public opinion polls, **Barney & Worth** structured interviews with more than 40 key community leaders, and public meetings.
- o Leaders from each of the law enforcement agencies in the County, representatives of police unions/associations, and representatives of ancillary agencies (e.g., Portland School Police, Portland Bureau of Emergency Communications, etc.) all appeared before the Committee to testify, submit information, and respond to questions.
- o A review of major police consolidations throughout the United States and Canada, including case studies, was conducted by Portland State University for the Committee.
- o Functional and financial analyses of current police agencies was conducted by subcommittees of Public Safety 2000, with the assistance of staff resources provided by the Gresham Police Department, Multnomah County Sheriff, and the Portland Police Bureau,
- o Public Safety Strategies, a consulting firm, was retained to assist the Committee in its analysis of issues and in the preparation of Committee reports.

Results of these evaluations were reviewed by the Committee at a two-day work session in late July. A consensus-building process during the work session, which was facilitated by Richard Huneke of **Richard Huneke & Associates**, identified a number of issues which led to the recommendations put forth in this Executive Summary and in the full Draft Report. The Draft Report was circulated for public comment and hearings. These final recommendations will be directed to a Council of Law Enforcement Officials, made up of elected officials in Multnomah County, for their assessment and action. They will be asked to provide the **CITIZENS CRIME COMMISSION** with implementation plans within 90 days. The **CITIZENS CRIME COMMISSION** intends to monitor the implementation process following the release of **Public Safety 2000's** Final Report.

2.0 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INPUT

2.1 RESULTS OF PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY

Highlights of the public opinion survey (conducted by **TH Research, Inc.**) include the following:

- o East County residents are more optimistic than residents of Portland about the general direction of things in their area. In Gresham, Troutdale, and Fairview, 64-66% believed things are moving in the right direction, whereas 47% of those in Portland felt this way.
- o Crime continues to be the top priority concern of citizens throughout Multnomah County.
- o A strong majority (56%) felt that effectiveness and efficiency could be improved by combining some services. While no specific proposal was offered by the survey, a similar majority favored combining of police agencies, although only 36% felt that police services would actually be improved by combining agencies.
- o Voters in East County (Gresham, Troutdale, and Fairview) felt that little money would be saved by consolidation, and that local police forces should be kept to maintain local control, service, and responsiveness. **TH Research** reported that "...local control issue weighs heaviest as a concern to East County voters."
- o There is strong opposition (60%) to consolidating police agencies throughout the Tri-County area, yet 61% supported consolidating jails in the three counties.

2.2 RESULTS OF COMMUNITY LEADER INTERVIEWS

In addition to the above opinion survey, the Committee commissioned **Barney & Worth, Inc.** to conduct interviews with key community leaders throughout Multnomah County. Highlights of their interviews include the following:

- o The most important result of **Public Safety 2000** should be improved effectiveness in the delivery of police services in Multnomah County rather than actual dollar savings. Any savings that might be achieved should be reallocated to improved police services.
- o "Community Policing" needs to be better defined.
- o There was unanimous belief that significant improvements in effectiveness are possible by eliminating duplication and that savings can be achieved by privatization and civilianization.

- o There was strong support for increasing efforts at cooperation between agencies and the sharing of services.
- o There was little consensus on what, if any, reorganization should occur, but there was some consensus that forming a new special service government to deliver police services was not desirable. The leaders concluded that "...a larger, consolidated law enforcement agency is not, in~ and of itself, an improvement."
- o The Committee was encouraged to propose changes that would be evolutionary, but in the context of a long-term vision that is comprehensive.

2.3 PUBLIC HEARINGS

In general, the findings from the opinion survey and the community leader interviews were consistent with the information received by the Committee during its public hearings. A major theme throughout the hearings was the concern over possible loss of identity and local control. Citizens, particularly in East County, expressed the concern that their department's values and service style might get lost in a consolidated county-wide police agency and see the potential for consolidated police resources gravitating toward inner-city problem areas.

2.4 STANDARDS & CRITERIA

The Committee identified six major Standards & Criteria against which the Committee's ultimate recommendations should be measured:

- o Effectiveness of police services must be improved.
- o Recommendations must be Economical - they should not increase overall costs of police services.
- o Local Control of police service delivery must be achieved and maintained.
- o Savings gained through improved Efficiency should be re-allocated to improving police service delivery.
- o Police Responsiveness to reported incidents and citizen-identified problems should be demonstrated..
- o Community Policing should be a guiding principle in police service delivery.

3.0 CHANGES IN POLICE SERVICE DELIVERY FROM 1974 TO 1992

Much of the current thinking about consolidating law enforcement in Multnomah County derives from a 1974 proposal and the extensive study which was done at that time to support it. The anticipated benefits and cost savings were quite speculative. The proposal was ultimately rejected by the voters in 1974, although many of the recommendations were implemented in the intervening years. The Committee considered the relevance of the 1974 study to the situation today and found that there have been many significant changes:

o Annexation and urban growth have changed County demographics and police service delivery

While the County population grew by 52,000, annexations decreased the unincorporated population of Multnomah County by nearly 100,000. This unincorporated population is the primary law enforcement responsibility of the Sheriff. The result has been a significant shift in patrol responsibilities from the Sheriff to municipal police agencies - particularly those of Portland and Gresham. Since 1974, Gresham has grown to become Oregon's 4th largest city and police department. In 1974, the primary consolidation issues focused on the Portland Police Bureau and the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office. Today, with Gresham and Portland accounting for 92% of all calls for police service in the County, and 95% of all reported index crimes (i.e., crime rate), consolidation of police services in Multnomah County involves different agencies and, therefore, must consider different issues.

o Much of the integration of services suggested by the 1974 study has already taken place

Since 1974, several important police functions have been integrated. These include: communications and dispatch, which has been integrated under BOEC; High-level narcotics and organized crime investigations, under ROCN; and, Gang Enforcement, under the State Youth Gang Task Force. These integration efforts not only have addressed some of the issues raised in 1974, but also have demonstrated the effectiveness of cooperative approaches short of full consolidation of law enforcement agencies.

o Significant civilianization within the law enforcement agencies has occurred

While the number of sworn police officers and deputies has increased about 40% since 1974, there has been a 60% reduction in the number of sworn personnel in support functions, a 35% reduction in administrative functions, and a 50% reduction in special operations. This has resulted in more officers on the street than the increase in numbers would indicate.

In short, Public Safety 2000 concluded that conditions since 1974 have changed sufficiently to require a fresh look at police service delivery and consideration of new approaches more appropriate to today's conditions.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Public Safety 2000 found no major deficiencies in the police service delivery in Multnomah County. However, the Committee did conclude that effectiveness and efficiency could be improved and believes that savings which would result could significantly enhance the current utilization of resources within the County. These improvements would involve:

- 1) The consolidation of major non-patrol functions;
- 2) A realignment of patrol responsibilities within the County; and,
- 3) The privatization and civilianization of several specific functions.

In addition, the Committee identified a number of specific actions which should be addressed.

The evaluation conducted by **Public Safety 2000** was focused on police service within Multnomah County. However, the broader issue is the delivery of urban police services in the Portland Metropolitan area which includes Multnomah and portions of Clackamas and Washington counties. The Committee developed its recommendations with a view toward how its proposals would permit a natural evolution to longer term approaches that might address this broader goal.

Although the issue of corrections was beyond the scope of this effort, **Public Safety 2000** believes the integration of corrections (community corrections & jails) in the Tri-County area should be reviewed to identify further potential efficiencies that may be available.

The major recommendations of **Public Safety 2000** are as follows:

4.1 IMPROVEMENTS IN EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY CAN BE ACHIEVED BY INTEGRATING MAJOR SUPPORT FUNCTIONS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTY.

There is wide agreement that improvement in the delivery of police services can be achieved by eliminating duplication, particularly in support services. The proposal suggested most often has been to eliminate these redundancies by consolidating all police agencies in Multnomah County into a single agency.

The Committee considered that alternative, along with several others. We concluded that desired benefits from total consolidation can most effectively be achieved in the near term by integrating the major support functions through cooperative efforts on the part of each police agency in the County. This is the preferred approach, because it:

- o Avoids the additional costs of total consolidation that the Committee identified (especially the cost of wage equalization);
- o Offers the greatest potential for gaining support from the major law enforcement agencies in the County;
- o Appears to have the potential of achieving all the major benefits of single agency consolidation;
- o Lays the foundation for longer term integration of police services which the Committee believes should include law enforcement outside Multnomah County;
- o Is consistent with the findings from a study of police agency consolidations in North America conducted for the Committee by Portland State University.

Public Safety 2000 identified at least eight major functional areas that can be integrated throughout the County to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of police service delivery. The functions suggested by the Committee are:

- o Information Data Systems
- o Records
- o Training
- o Personnel Recruitment
- o River Patrol
- o Special Emergency Response Teams (SERT)
- o Mid-level Narcotics Investigations
- o Gang Enforcement Teams

To achieve this integration, we propose formation of a Council of Law Enforcement Officials (CLEO) under Council of Governments Statutes, to oversee the integration of these functions under existing law enforcement agencies. The Council would be comprised of the following elected officials or the head law enforcement official who would serve as their designee: the Sheriff of Multnomah County, the District Attorney of Multnomah County, the Mayor/or Council President of each City within Multnomah County, and the County Executive of Multnomah County. It is suggested that the Multnomah County District Attorney serve as the

initial Chairperson of the Council.

We believe the Members of the Council and their technical staffs have the expertise and insight to best plan for feasible implementation of the recommended functions for integration. The Council will be charged with developing specific plans for implementing the recommended integration of functions within 90 days of the Final Report of **Public Safety 2000**. The **CITIZENS CRIME COMMISSION** will review the Council's implementation plan at the end of the 90-day period, and suggest continuing oversight by the **CITIZENS CRIME COMMISSION** to ensure that implementation achieves the desired outcomes.

4.2 CONSOLIDATION OF POLICE SERVICES INTO A SINGLE AGENCY SHOULD REMAIN AN OPTION, BUT CONDITIONS NOT PRESENT TODAY NEED TO EXIST.

Some leaders continue to believe that consolidation into a single agency is the most effective way to achieve long term efficiency and effectiveness. The Governor's Task Force on Local Government Services (GTFLGS) came to this conclusion. **Public Safety 2000** considered the option of consolidating all police service within Multnomah County into a single agency and concluded that it would not be an appropriate recommendation at this time for several reasons:

- o Formation of a single law enforcement agency involves added costs, both the cost of bringing all agencies together, and the cost of wage equalization. The Committee has proposed an approach that will achieve the major benefits of consolidating functions without incurring these costs.
- o There must be value (either reduced costs or added police service) for each jurisdiction, including those in East County, such as Gresham. With Gresham receiving approximately 50% more Calls-For-Service than the Sheriffs Office, consolidation must include Gresham. No value for Gresham was identified in any of the single agency proposals offered to the Committee.
- o With the cities of Portland and Gresham accounting for 92% of all dispatched Calls-For-Service within the County, major benefits can be achieved by insuring the inclusion of both of these agencies in any consolidation effort. The proposals recommended by **Public Safety 2000** have the greatest potential for capturing those benefits in the near term.

Just as important is the longer term vision for delivery of police services in the Portland Metropolitan Area. Consolidating police services in Multnomah County alone ignores the broader issue of integrating agencies that work closely with Portland, yet are located in Washington and Clackamas Counties. **Public Safety 2000** believes steps taken today should position the area for longer-term consolidations that might include such agencies. The proposal offered by **Public Safety 2000** creates a framework that can involve agencies outside of Multnomah County in a service consolidation effort, much as ROCN has already done. The ways in which this might be accomplished should be addressed after experience has been gained with the recommendations outlined in this study.

In the long term, evolution of these actions may, in fact, mean consolidation into a single police agency. In that sense, the Committee believes consolidation into a single police agency should remain an option for the future. But, if it is to be considered, we believe the following conditions not present today need to be satisfied:

- o Experience needs to be gained from the implementation of the recommendations outlined in this report. This experience will lay a foundation by: 1) providing lessons learned; 2) documenting cost benefits achieved; and 3) establishing a framework of trust which does not now exist.
- o Issues raised by the Committee relating to budgeting and staffing of the Multnomah County Sheriffs office need to be resolved.
- o There must be demonstrated value to all jurisdictions, including high confidence that benefits will not be neutralized by wage equalization.

Other conditions will also need to be satisfied, such as a provision for local control and accomplishing these steps under a General Purpose Government.

4.3 PATROL FUNCTIONS PROVIDED BY THE SHERIFF SHOULD BE REALIGNED TO PROVIDE MORE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE POLICE COVERAGE.

Public Safety 2000 believes some current patrol deployments of the Sheriff in Multnomah County provide ineffective coverage and inefficient use of resources. This conclusion was reinforced by testimony from Sheriff Robert G. "Bob" Skipper before the Committee in which he argued that significant efficiencies could be gained by realigning patrol responsibilities. Therefore, we believe the Sheriffs patrol functions should be re-assessed with the following factors in mind:

- o We do not believe it is effective for the Sheriff to provide patrol services to the unincorporated areas of West Multnomah County, e.g., Sauvie Island, Dunthorpe, and Forest Park. We believe these areas can be more effectively serviced by the Portland Police Bureau and/or other agencies in closer proximity.
- o The unincorporated areas of Mid-County are expected to be annexed over the next 2-3 years by either Portland or Gresham. These annexations will eliminate the patrol function of the Sheriff in these areas (4 patrol cars/20 deputies). We recommend that the Sheriff and the Chiefs of Portland and Gresham anticipate these annexations and begin planning now for transfer of patrol responsibilities.
- o The unincorporated areas of East County should continue to be patrolled by the Sheriff. Incorporated communities in the County which now rely upon the Sheriff for patrol services and other support should remain free to make whatever contract arrangements for law enforcement they consider appropriate.
- o The Sheriff should proceed with plans to increase patrol of Unincorporated East County, east of the Sandy River, consistent with a "basic rural level" of law enforcement. Patrol allocations should be based upon such factors as: population, Calls-For-Service, response times, geographical area, recreational areas, and officer safety.

4.4 OPPORTUNITIES FOR CIVILIANIZATION AND PRIVATIZATION COULD FREE UP 70 SWORN OFFICERS FOR REASSIGNMENT AND RESULT IN ANNUALIZED SAVINGS OF \$2.4 MILLION

The opportunities to free up sworn personnel and to realize significant savings through civilianization and privatization are not dependent upon any decision regarding integration or consolidation of functions. Most could be initiated in the current FY 92-93. Opportunities were identified in both the Sheriff's Office and the Portland Police Bureau.

Civilianization replaces police officers and deputies with non-sworn personnel (civilians or Corrections Officers) in positions and job tasks not requiring full law enforcement authority, skills, and training. Some examples include: precinct desk duties, property custody, facility safety, and training instructors.

Privatization draws on experiences elsewhere with the private sector successfully contracting functions at a lower unit cost. Some examples include: fleet maintenance, building security, court security, and prisoner transportation.

Both civilianization and privatization can free up sworn personnel for reassignment to critical law enforcement duties.

4.5 SAVINGS RESULTING FROM IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ABOVE RECOMMENDATIONS SHOULD BE RE-ALLOCATED TO PRIORITY CRIME PROBLEMS IN MULTNOMAH COUNTY

The Committee is concerned that savings may be achieved in one agency while high priority needs may exist in another. The Committee recommends that the Council of Law Enforcement Officials (CLEO), with community input, make specific efforts to insure that police officers and deputies made available by civilianization and privatization will be reallocated into areas where they will have measurable and positive impacts on crime in the County. Examples which CLEO might consider would include:

- o Filling the need for additional police officers required to implement community policing in Portland.
- o Assigning officers, through specially targeted “strike teams”, to high priority crimes, such as bias crime and car theft
- o Assigning officers to high crime areas under a community policing model, as has been successfully done with Safety Action Teams in Columbia Villa.
- o Providing additional patrol resources to East Multnomah County (East of the Sandy River).
- o Increasing the deployment of Deputies to the River Patrol to provide more support to local law enforcement agencies.
- o Assigning additional Deputies to the service of criminal warrants.

5.0 OTHER CONCERNS

In addition to the major proposals listed above, the Committee identified other specific areas of concern where recommendations have been made:

o Community Policing

There is a need to develop common definitions of community policing and implement effective evaluation systems, so the integrated functions under CLEO can effectively support these efforts.

o Cultural Diversity and Affirmative Action

Efforts to recruit ethnic minorities, women and other protected classes to ensure adequate and diverse representation of citizens on the area police agencies should continue to be emphasized. Appropriate training should also be given in all agencies so that officers will remain sensitive to cultural differences.

o Portland Police Bureau Detectives

In future labor negotiations, the City of Portland should try to eliminate the permanent rank of "Detective" and its pay differential (this was also recommended by the **CITIZENS CRIME COMMISSION** in their 1989 organizational analysis of the Portland Police Bureau). Detectives should be rotational assignments for officers to gain investigative expertise.

o Police Bureau Unfunded Pension Liability

The City of Portland should: 1) consider ways to pay down the unfunded liability of the Fire and Police Disability and Retirement Fund; 2) cease adding new employees to this program; and 3) shift to a funded program.

o Portland Police Bureau Telephone Reporting Unit

All 14 Officer positions in this Unit should be used for Limited Duty/Disabled Police Officers.

o Organizational Analysis of the Sheriff's Office

Public Safety 2000 deliberations raised concerns about the Sheriff's Office budgeting process and staffing practices (Subsections 2.3 & 3.2.2). To thoroughly evaluate these issues, Sheriff Bob Skipper recommends an independent organizational analysis of the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office to be commissioned by the **CITIZENS CRIME COMMISSION**, similar in scope and purpose to their previous organizational analysis of the Portland Police Bureau. Sheriff Bob Skipper agreed that he would cooperate fully with such an analysis.