



# CLACKAMAS COUNTY SHERIFF

**Sheriff Angela Brandenburg**

Jesse Ashby, Undersheriff

Lee Eby, Undersheriff

Brad O'Neil, Undersheriff

**To: Chair Roberts, County Administrator Schmidt**

**From: Sheriff Brandenburg**

**Date: February 20, 2025**

**Re: FY2025-26 Projected Budget Shortfall, \$13.1 million**

## **Sheriff's Introduction**

As my Office approaches the February 21<sup>st</sup> deadline to submit its requested FY2025-26 budget in OpenGov (the County's budget management software), it's important to understand the history behind why the Sheriff's Office will need an additional \$13.1 million over its FY2024-25 budget to meet the projected operational costs in FY2025-26.

For the first time in my history with the Sheriff's Office the County requested my Office submit a deficit budget for FY2024-25.<sup>1</sup> When the budget was approved the appropriations were not enough to run our Office and pay our bills including but not limited to, Jail medical costs, fuel for patrol vehicles and food for adults in custody.

Prior to the County approving a deficit budget for my office for fiscal FY2024-25, I informed the County Administrator that my true budget was underfunded by \$9.6 million.<sup>2</sup> He directed me to ask for funds when my budget ran out of money. Presumably, even though County funds had not been sufficiently appropriated, the County will pay the bills to meet Sheriff's Office operational expenses.

Historically, the County has never financially operated in this manner, because of its obligation under state law to balance its budget – that is, guarantee that it has the money to meet its true projected expenses.

The history below begins with the underfunding of the Sheriff's Office budget in FY2023-24, the reductions I recommended in that fiscal year to meet the budget deficit and pass a fully-funded budget, the unprecedented takeover of the Sheriff's Office budget by the County Administrator when I refused to

---

<sup>1</sup> See, email chain (March 20, 2024, March 19, 2024) Subject: *Follow Up March 5th Meeting Re: FY 23/24 Budget Information & One Page New Courthouse Staffing*

<sup>2</sup> See, email (April 10, 2024) Subject: *Budget Agreement* (from Administrator Schmidt)

*A Tradition of Service Since 1845*

**Office:** 9101 SE Sunnybrook Boulevard, Clackamas, Oregon 97015

**Mailing:** 2223 Kaen Road, Oregon City, Oregon 97045

**Phone:** 503-785-5000 **Fax:** 503-785-5190 **www.ClackCoSheriff.us**

submit what I believed was not a balanced budget,<sup>3</sup> and the County's direction to burden the Sheriff's Public Safety Levy with administrative overhead charges/indirect costs that were previously covered by the County general fund.

Next is FY2024-25 history which explains the \$9.6 million that was underfunded, and which forms the basis for the \$13.1 million deficit projected for FY2025-26. I also address the projected shortfall in the Sheriff's Public Safety Levy prior to the expiration of its term as a result of the County's direction to burden the Sheriff's Public Safety Levy with administrative overhead charges/indirect costs beginning FY2023-24 and the rise in personnel costs approved by the County.

Finally, I address the anticipated FY2024-25 shortfall to the Sheriff's Enhanced Law Enforcement District (ELED). CCSO previously notified the Budget Committee of concerns regarding the sustainability of the ELED without additional general fund support in lieu of reducing positions.

## **Budget Deficit History**

### **Clackamas County Sheriff's Office FY2023-24 Budget Summary**

The Clackamas County Sheriff's Office (CCSO) is funded primarily from property tax revenue which is the County general fund. Its second funding source is the Sheriff's Public Safety Levy which every 5 years requires voter approval for an additional property tax to support specific personnel and operations. The current Levy is funded through 2026.

The Sheriff's Office faced significant financial challenges for the FY2023-24 budget due to the County's decision to fund the construction of a new \$313 million courthouse using general fund dollars which reduced contributions from the general fund to many County departments, including the Sheriff's Office.<sup>4</sup> Despite previous assurances from the County Administrator that public safety funding would be protected, the Sheriff's Office faced a \$5.2 million shortfall to operate the Sheriff's Office.

### **Key Issues Contributing to the FY2023-24 Budget Deficit:**

- **Courthouse Costs:** The County committed to \$15 million annual payments for the new courthouse, without a clear funding plan, opting to reduce general fund budgets, including the Sheriff's Office.
- **Reduced General Fund Support:** The County's general fund contribution reductions made it impossible to cover increases in personnel and Materials and Services expenditures as well as the County updating its cost allocation methodology.
- **Increased Allocated Costs:** The new cost allocation methodology increased CCSO's internal service fees (e.g., technology, payroll, and communications) by \$2.6 million, a nearly 30% increase from

---

<sup>3</sup> See, email (April 20, 2023) Subject: *CCSO Proposed Budget FY 23 24 Budget*

<sup>4</sup> See, email, *Budget Preparation Guidance* (County Administrator Feb 2022 Budget Cuts)

the prior year. Additional increases in CCOM and C800 services (9% and 15% respectively) contributed to a projected \$3 million deficit.

- **Disputed Use of Levy Funds:** The County proposed using Sheriff's Public Safety Levy funds to cover general funded public safety operations. The Sheriff opposed this use of Levy funds because she believed the use of these funds were outside the intent and purpose of the Levy.

#### Impact on Operations and Personnel:

- **Budget Cuts:** CCSO had already reduced materials, services, and non-essential expenses to a minimum. With 73% of the budget allocated to personnel, the Sheriff's Office proposed a staffing reduction plan.
- **Personnel Reductions:** Executive and management positions, along with unfilled professional staff roles, were proposed to be eliminated first. However, as the County maintained the budget trajectory, sworn deputy positions were also at risk.

Position Name*	Incumbent Name	Salary	Supp	Deferred Comp	Health/Dental/Trust	PERS	Disability	Life	Other	Statutory	Total
Undersheriff to Captain		19,694	-	-	-	20,840	-	-	-	-	40,534
Policy, Perf & Research An, Sr		116,817	-	-	28,440	33,375	240	120	942	10,857	190,791
Human Services Coordinator 2		83,420	834	-	22,560	24,072	240	120	942	7,830	140,019
Pol, Perf & Research Analyst		98,327	1,475	6,258	13,797	28,513	240	384	942	9,275	159,212
Administrative Services Supv*		113,826	1,707	7,244	37,536	38,808	240	384	942	10,737	211,425
Community Service Officer	Vacant	49,742	-	1,990	28,966	16,594	231	165	864	4,623	103,175
SO Public Relations Specialist	Vacant	54,106	-	2,164	24,169	18,050	189	135	707	5,028	104,548
12 Jail Deputies	Vacant	767,450	-	30,698	348,611	256,021	2,730	1,950	10,208	71,325	1,488,993
Finance Temporary Employee		15,000									15,000
Total		1,318,384	4,016	48,353	504,079	436,273	4,110	3,258	15,547	119,676	2,453,696

The Sheriff was directed by the County Administrator not to reduce any personnel or positions other than those under her authority (i.e. Undersheriff or Captain).

#### Transparency and Accountability Concerns:

- **Lack of Budget Transparency:** The County prevented the Sheriff from presenting critical budget details to include the \$5.2 million-dollar shortfall to the Budget Committee. The County created its own budget for CCSO which did not reflect the true budget deficit.
- **Administrative Overhead/Indirect Cost Charges:** New overhead/indirect costs were transferred from the general fund to the ELED and Levy-funded programs, causing double charges without added services.

#### Sheriff's Position and Actions:

- **Commitment to Public Safety:** The Sheriff refused to use Public Safety Levy funds to cover general fund shortfalls, honoring a promise made to voters.

- **Personnel Accountability:** Cuts began at the top, including the reassignment of an Undersheriff to reduce executive costs.
- **Advocacy:** The Sheriff engaged directly with County Commissioners to reverse course and secure full general fund support for public safety services. The Sheriff remained steadfast in upholding budget laws, protecting public safety services, and ensuring that taxpayer dollars were used responsibly, while urging the County Commissioners to restore full general fund support for the Sheriff's Office.

#### **County's Position and Actions:**

- The Budget Committee requested that the Sheriff's Office participate in a financial performance audit.
- The Budget Committee directed the Sheriff to continue hiring and filling vacant sworn positions funded by the Public Safety Levy and the general fund.
- The County committed to a new CCPOA collective bargaining agreement, increasing personnel costs with an estimated total \$18 million over three years.

#### **Clackamas County Sheriff's Office FY2024-25 Budget Summary**

The Clackamas County Sheriff's Office (CCSO) worked with the County Administrator to address a \$5.2 million shortfall in the FY2023-24 budget. The County covered \$2 million, with the remainder requested through a supplemental budget in June 2024.<sup>5</sup>

The County proposed a general fund contribution of \$75.7 million for FY2024-25. CCSO could not submit a balanced budget and was instructed by the County Administrator to submit a deficit budget in OpenGov, the County's budget management software.

#### **FY2024-25 Budget Planning:**

To meet operational needs, CCSO requested a \$9.6 million increase in general fund support, driven in part by costs from a new CCPOA collective bargaining agreement and hiring and filling 52 sworn positions in 2023. The County Administrator agreed to provide \$6 million and directed CCSO to "reduce proposed budget by approximately \$3.6 million now with the intent to seek that funding back during the supplemental budget process in September, December and/or early 2025."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>See, email chain (May 1, 2024; April 22, 2024; April 19, 2024) Subject: *23-24 Budget* (County Administrator's direction to submit supplemental budget to address underfunding deficit at year end May 30 2024)

<sup>6</sup> See, email (April 10, 2024) Subject: *Budget Agreement* (from Administrator Schmidt)

There was a mutual understanding between the County Administrator and the Sheriff that this cut contained necessary funds required to provide services, CCSO reduced/cut \$3.6 million from Materials & Services as the County Administrator again did not authorize a reduction in personnel. The Sheriff provided testimony at the FY2024-25 Budget Hearing with concerns about this large funding shortfall.<sup>7</sup>

During the FY2024-25 Budget Committee hearings the CCSO was instructed to cut an additional \$3.5 million to both Materials & Services and Capital Outlay budgets, with a motion that required, “this funding level to not negatively impact any sworn staff.” This resulted in \$7.1 million in cuts to general fund Materials & Services and Capital Outlay.

The amount of general fund support for FY2024-25 was increased to \$78.2m, a 2.9% increase from the previous year. This level of funding was to cover a 4.1% Cost of Living (COLA) increase, increased Materials & Services costs and the additional increase in personnel wage costs as a result of the new CCPOA collective bargaining agreement.

#### **Courthouse Staffing Needs:**

CCSO identified the need for 13 additional staff (12 Deputies and 1 Sergeant) to ensure safety at the new courthouse, costing approximately \$3.2 million. In November 2024, the County Administrator approved adding these positions for immediate hiring and notified the Sheriff this would “go before the Board of County Commissioners in January for budget authority during the supplemental budget process, which I support.”<sup>8</sup>

A supplemental budget process in January 2025 did not occur. CCSO was notified by County Finance that as long there is funding in our current budget there will be no supplemental budgets presented to the Board.

#### **Audit and Accountability:**

A performance audit, completed during the FY2023-24 budget process, found no significant issues with CCSO operations. However, it recommended developing a new indirect costing model to be applied to all CCSO funding sources. CCSO worked collaboratively with County Finance and applied it to the FY2024-25 budget.

#### **Commitment to Public Safety:**

The Sheriff reaffirmed CCSO’s commitment to responsible management of Public Safety Levy and general fund tax dollars.

---

<sup>7</sup> See, May 29, 2024, Sheriff Brandenburg’s opening remarks before the Budget Committee, provided as written testimony

<sup>8</sup> See, email chain (November 19, 2024; November 13, 2024; October 21, 2024; October 2, 2024, September 30, 2024, September 18, 2024; September 17, 2024; September 11, 2024; September 10, 2024) Subject: *CCSO Courthouse FTE Positions*

### FY2024-25 Year End Projections:

CCSO began the FY2024-25 with a \$7.1 million deficit budget. As previously stated, essentially, a deficit budget means that our budget is underfunded, but operating as if it is a fully funded budget able to meet its projected operational expenses and pay its bills. For example, because we are operating with a deficit budget, by May 2025 the Sheriff's Office will not have the funds in its budget to pay the bills due for items including, but not limited to, Jail medical costs, fuel for patrol cars and food for adults in custody.

CCSO projects a \$9.1 million deficit at the FY2024-25-year end and will be requesting to be made whole through the supplemental budget process.

### FY2025-26 Budget Request

For FY2025-26 CCSO will be submitting a request for an additional \$13.1 million in general fund support. The main cost drivers are personnel costs, allocated costs, and Materials & Services costs related to hiring up personnel, and continued expenses such as CCOM/C800 (\$4m), Jail medical (\$4m), and Jail food costs (\$600K).

#### SHERIFF'S OFFICE FUND 100

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY23-24 ACTUALS	FY24-25 PROJECTIONS	FY25-26 BUDGET
Fund Balance - Restricted & Assigned	295,588	1,397,133	195,150
General Fund Support	76,055,612	78,216,704	81,412,726
Indirect Cost Revenue	3,314,307	5,446,795	5,667,388
Other Revenue	36,585,018	29,212,703	30,770,802
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>116,250,525</b>	<b>114,270,293</b>	<b>118,046,066</b>
**ELED Personnel	6,997,473	7,923,779	7,819,631
Personnel	81,963,339	89,501,070	96,312,941
Materials & Services (M&S)	16,464,381	19,642,425	20,739,613
Capital Outlay	1,887,486	2,830,452	3,135,856
Administrative Overhead/Indirect Costs*	784,201	2,495,728	1,761,891
Cost Allocations	6,605,323	7,494,624	7,724,763
Insurance Liability	1,474,261	1,419,293	1,547,629
<b>TOTAL EXPENSE</b>	<b>116,176,463</b>	<b>123,383,592</b>	<b>131,222,693</b>
<b>FISCAL YEAR END TOTAL</b>	<b>74,062</b>	<b>(9,113,298)</b>	<b>(13,176,628)</b>

\*Administrative Overhead/Indirect Costs show in Fund 100 because they were charged to Parole & Probation (FY2024-25) and the Contract Cities in (FY2024-25 & FY2025-26)

\*\*ELED Personnel was previously in Fund 100-21 and is included in the total expense for FY23-24. For FY24-25 on, the ELED personnel is charged to pass-through 100-80-800801 in a separate budget.

	FY23-24 ACTUALS	FY24-25 PROJECTIONS	FY25-26 BUDGET
% Increase in personnel costs (non-ELED) from prior year		9%	8%
% Increase in M&S Costs from prior year		19%	6%
% Increase in Cost Allocations from prior year		13%	3%

### Sustainability of Sheriff's Public Safety Levy

CCSO projects the Public Safety Levy will be unable to sustain voter approved services in the last year of the 2022-2027, 5-year Levy cycle in FY2026-27.

CCSO built the Levy using historical anticipated costs related to personnel Cost of Living (COLA) increases of 5% and Materials & Services of 3%.

Costs that were not anticipated when the Levy was built by CCSO include the increase in personnel costs as a result of the new CCPOA collective bargaining agreement, additional allocated costs, and the new administrative overhead/indirect costs that that were previously covered by the County general fund.

As a result of the County's direction to burden the Sheriff's Public Safety Levy with administrative overhead charges/indirect costs beginning FY2023-24, administrative overhead/indirect costs will total \$9,568,228 and the Levy cycle is projected to end in a negative ending balance of (\$4,920,081).

#### SHERIFF'S OFFICE OPERATING LEVY FUND 206

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY2023-24 ACTUALS	FY2024-25 PROJECTIONS	FY2025-26 BUDGET	FY2026-27 PROJECTIONS
Restricted Beginning Fund Balance	7,808,077	7,495,281	5,297,887	264,405
Current Taxes	22,034,875	22,999,372	23,689,353	24,400,034
Other Revenue	944,692	657,402	677,124	697,438
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>30,787,644</b>	<b>31,152,055</b>	<b>29,664,364</b>	<b>25,361,877</b>
Personnel	13,312,263	15,506,785	18,194,037	18,739,858
Materials & Services (M&S)	6,561,041	6,462,688	6,618,037	6,816,579
Cost Allocations	1,368,673	1,482,808	1,483,669	1,528,179
Administrative Overhead/Indirect Costs*	1,749,005	2,121,080	2,806,967	2,891,176
Insurance Liability	301,382	280,807	297,248	306,165
<b>TOTAL M&amp;S EXPENSE</b>	<b>9,980,101</b>	<b>10,347,383</b>	<b>11,205,922</b>	<b>11,542,099</b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENSE</b>	<b>23,292,363</b>	<b>25,854,168</b>	<b>29,399,959</b>	<b>30,281,958</b>
<b>FISCAL YEAR END TOTAL</b>	<b>7,495,281</b>	<b>5,297,887</b>	<b>264,405</b>	<b>(4,920,081)</b>

\*Administrative Overhead/Indirect Costs include personnel and materials & services in Line of Business 2101 (Admin) & 2104 (Training)

	FY2023-24 ACTUALS	FY2024-25 PROJECTIONS	FY2025-26 BUDGET	FY2026-27 PROJECTIONS
% Increase in personnel costs from prior year		16%	17%	3%
% Increase in M&S costs from prior year		-1%	2%	3%

	<b>End of Levy Deficit</b>	<b>(4,920,081)</b>
	<b>Total Administrative Overhead/Indirect Costs Imposed by the County</b>	<b>9,568,229</b>
Potential Starting Fund Balance if Administrative Overhead/Indirect Costs are returned to the Levy and not charged in the future		4,648,147
FY2025-27 Total Administrative Overhead/Indirect Costs imposed by the County		5,698,144
Potential Starting Fund Balance in the Levy if Administrative Overhead/Indirect Costs are not charged in FY26 & FY27		778,062

### Sheriff's Enhanced Law Enforcement District (ELED)

CCSO projects that the ELED will have a deficit of (\$1,654,865) at year end FY2024-25 which will require general fund support. The FY2024-25 Budget Committee committed to fund any shortfall in the ELED with general fund dollars.

#### ENHANCED LAW ENFORCEMENT DISTRICT (ELED) FUND 216

BUDGET CATEGORY	FY23-24 ACTUALS	FY24-25 PROJECTIONS	FY25-26 BUDGET
Restricted Beginning Fund Balance	453,211	103,771	-
Current Taxes	8,215,949	8,585,347	8,842,907
Other Revenue	479,152	307,807	317,042
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>9,148,313</b>	<b>8,996,925</b>	<b>9,159,949</b>
Personnel*	6,997,473	7,923,779	7,819,631
Materials & Services (M&S)	637,538	1,028,774	992,243
Cost Allocations	490,946	580,228	580,567
Administrative Overhead/Indirect Costs	627,353	829,988	1,098,379
Insurance Liability	108,101	109,881	116,314
Principal & Interest Payment	183,130	179,140	179,860
<b>TOTAL EXPENSE</b>	<b>9,044,541</b>	<b>10,651,790</b>	<b>10,786,993</b>
<b>FISCAL YEAR END TOTAL</b>	<b>103,771</b>	<b>(1,654,865)</b>	<b>(1,627,045)</b>

\*Personnel for the ELED is passed through CLCK-100-800801 and recorded as 'M&S-Contract Employees' in ELED-216

	FY23-24 ACTUALS	FY24-25 PROJECTIONS	FY25-26 BUDGET
% Increase in personnel costs from prior year		13%	-1%
% Increase in M&S costs from prior year		61%	-4%



## Footnotes

1. Email chain (March 20, 2024, March 19, 2024) Subject: *Follow Up March 5th Meeting Re: FY 23/24 Budget Information & One Page New Courthouse Staffing*
2. Email (April 10, 2024) Subject: *Budget Agreement* (from County Administrator Schmidt)
3. Email (April 20, 2023) Subject: *CCSO Proposed Budget FY 23 24 Budget*
4. Email, *Budget Preparation Guidance* (County Administrator Feb 2022 Budget Cuts)
5. Email chain (May 1, 2024; April 22, 2024; April 19, 2024) Subject: *23-24 Budget* (County Administrator's direction to submit supplemental budget to address underfunding deficit at year end May 30, 2024)
6. Email (April 10, 2024) Subject: *Budget Agreement* (from County Administrator Schmidt)
7. May 29, 2024, Sheriff Brandenburg's opening remarks before the Budget Committee, provided as written testimony
8. Email chain (November 19, 2024; November 13, 2024; October 21, 2024; October 2, 2024, September 30, 2024, September 18, 2024; September 17, 2024; September 11, 2024; September 10, 2024) Subject: *CCSO Courthouse FTE Positions*

## Footnote #1

---

**From:** Schmidt, Gary <GSchmidt@clackamas.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 20, 2024 12:30 PM  
**To:** Brandenburg, Angela <angiebran@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** RE: Follow Up March 5th Meeting Re: FY 23/24 Budget Information & One Page New Courthouse Staffing

Hi Sheriff,

Thank you for your message and budget updates. I am grateful for your willingness to work together again moving forward.

I will follow up on the POA new contract costing. The financial information you are receiving from HR is just not accurate, and if it is, then I certainly need to understand why the numbers have changed from what was shared originally with me and the Board .

I will keep you posted on what I learn.

Thank you.  
Gary

---

**From:** Brandenburg, Angela <[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 19, 2024 1:46 PM  
**To:** Schmidt, Gary <[GSchmidt@clackamas.us](mailto:GSchmidt@clackamas.us)>  
**Subject:** Follow Up March 5th Meeting Re: FY 23/24 Budget Information & One Page New Courthouse Staffing

Gary,

I want to take a moment to say that I appreciate you meeting with me on March 5<sup>th</sup> to discuss my FY23/24 budget concerns. I also appreciated that you acknowledged how tough last year's budget process was on our relationship.

Since I became Sheriff, I've worked hard to build a strong partnership with you, based on trust and open communication. I appreciate that it was never intended to become what it did, however, I was left feeling neither respected nor valued for my investment in our relationship. As we move forward, I hope you can be honest with me. I also hope that if you find yourself in a position where you are unable to keep your promises, you will reach out.

Based on our conversation, I have attached the requested one-pager with anticipated needs to staff the new courthouse. I will need 13 new positions; the details are broken down in the attachment. I hope we can discuss my plan for anticipated hiring and deployment at our in-person budget meeting in April.

## Footnote #1

Attached is a memo from my Finance Manager Nancy Artmann with the breakdown of the anticipated deficit for FY23/24. Essentially, in the FY23/24 budget, my finance staff projected a \$5m shortfall. The methodology the county finance team applied to your budget for my office to eliminate our projected deficit, both inflated revenue and deflated costs to balance the budget. As anticipated, our deficit projections were accurate and with the additional cost of the new CCPOA contract, we believe our FY23/24 deficit is conservatively \$7m.

As I understand it, during negotiations County HR projected to you and the Board a cost increase in FY23/24 estimated at \$4.8m. I've been informed however that County HR is still trying to determine the actual number which could be higher. Based on the same HR estimations, the cost increase for FY24/25 is anticipated to be a \$6.5m increase. I wanted to bring this to your attention because in our conversation you mentioned from what you could recall in the moment the contract was approximately a \$3m increase each year for the next 3 years. County HR numbers projected the total cost increase to be \$18.8m over three years.

Finally, based on our conversation and the follow-up Executive Management Team meeting, my team has entered the FY24/25 budget into OpenGov with a deficit as you instructed. Additionally, it is my understanding based on our conversation that my office will submit a supplemental budget for FY23/24 and that amount will be added to the base of our FY24/25 budget.

Please let me know if you have any questions about the attachments or the numbers.

Sheriff Brandenburg



### **Sheriff Angela Brandenburg**

Clackamas County Sheriff's Office  
9101 SE Sunnybrook Blvd, Clackamas, OR 97015  
Mail: 2223 Kaen Rd, Oregon City, OR 97045  
Phone: 503-785-5003  
[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)

## Footnote #2

---

**From:** Schmidt, Gary <GSchmidt@clackamas.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 10, 2024 2:45 PM  
**To:** Brandenburg, Angela <angiebran@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** Morrison, Jenna <jmorrison@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** Budget Agreement

Hi Sheriff,

Thank you for meeting with me today. The below reflects what I heard we discussed and agreed. Would you please reply with your agreement or any edits.

Current Fiscal Year 23/24:

- County to provide a minimum of \$2 million additional General Fund Support to CCSO by June 30, 2024, to be done during the June supplemental budget process.
- CCSO agrees to have all journal entries/journal transfers, payroll transfers between the various funds (Fund 100, Levy, ELED) totally caught up for the current fiscal year by May 30, 2024.
- County to provide additional budget staff support from other departments, if needed, to support CCSO in completing these budget entries/transfers.
- After May 30, 2024, Sheriff and County Administrator confer on any additional financial gaps and to be made whole via the June supplemental budget process if needed.

Next Fiscal Year 24/25:

- County to provide additional \$6 million of General Fund Support to CCSO now.
- CCSO will reduce proposed budget by approximately \$3.6 million now with the intent to seek that funding back during the supplemental budget process in September, December and/or early 2025.
- County to reopen Open Gov for CCSO team to enter updated proposed budget. Entry must be complete by 6 pm on Thursday, April 11, 2024.
- Additional FTE for replacement county courthouse will be submitted during supplemental budget process, not in proposed budget.

Thank you.  
Gary

### Footnote #3

**From:** Schmidt, Gary <[GSchmidt@clackamas.us](mailto:GSchmidt@clackamas.us)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 20, 2023 12:53 PM  
**To:** Brandenburg, Angela <[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)>  
**Cc:** Smith, Tootie <[TootieSmith@clackamas.us](mailto:TootieSmith@clackamas.us)>; Shull, Mark <[MarkShull@clackamas.us](mailto:MarkShull@clackamas.us)>; Schrader, Martha <[MarthaSchrader@clackamas.us](mailto:MarthaSchrader@clackamas.us)>; Savas, Paul <[PSavas@clackamas.us](mailto:PSavas@clackamas.us)>; West, Ben <[BenWest@clackamas.us](mailto:BenWest@clackamas.us)>; Madkour, Stephen <[SMadkour@clackamas.us](mailto:SMadkour@clackamas.us)>  
**Subject:** CCSO Proposed Budget FY 23-24

Dear Sheriff Brandenburg:

Thank you for allowing our budget teams to work together to attempt a solution to address the proposed General Fund reductions to the Clackamas County Sheriff's Office (CCSO). Unfortunately, our teams are at an impasse.

Under my authority as the Clackamas County Budget Officer, appointed by the Board of County Commissioners, I am making the following changes to your proposed budget. Your staff do not have to do anything further.

The attached document identifies General Fund Support (GFS) Savings available in the CCSO budget for FY 23-24. Below is a summary of savings and costs which show that the CCSO has sufficient General Fund Savings to cover all personnel costs without eliminating any employee positions, filled or vacant.

Summary	
FY22-23 GFS	\$ 74,155,000
FY23-24 GFS (post reductions)	\$ 74,615,295
<b><u>FY23-24 Total GFS Savings</u></b>	
Full distribution of CCSO admin operating costs	\$ 2,312,573
Vacancies budgeted as filled for 9 months	\$ 973,662
	<u>\$ 3,286,235</u>
<b><u>FY23-24 Budget Impacts</u></b>	
Budget Reductions	\$ (2,250,000)
Cost Allocation (net after \$1.5M subsidy)	\$ (683,179)
	<u>\$ (2,933,179)</u>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>\$ 353,056</b>

I am not approving the elimination of any classified employee positions in your office, filled or vacant. I have directed Human Resources and Finance/Payroll not to process any classified employee reductions in your office, except for the positions of Captain or Undersheriff, of which you have total authority and I have none.

It is understood that changes may be necessary for efficiencies in your office due to restructuring, merging Community Corrections into CCSO, as well as other reasons. However, it

### Footnote #3

would be best to make those changes after the FY 23-24 budget is adopted in order to not confuse those efficiency adjustments with the proposed budget.

My authority to take these actions are based on the following:

#### **County Code**

County Code 209.060 – County Administrator Authority

(F)(3)

Serve as the Budget Officer for the County and its service districts and in that role prepare and submit to the Board and Budget Committee an annual budget and a long range capital improvement and expenditure program. Administer the provisions of the budget as adopted by the Board.

County Code 209.060 – County Administrator Authority

(F)(7)

Coordinate the work and facilities of all offices, departments and agencies, both elective and appointive, and devise ways and means whereby efficiency and economy may be secured in the operation of all offices, departments, districts and agencies.

County Code 2.05.040.4 – Special Conditions – Unclassified Service

(3)

EPP 37 – Layoff Procedures applies to all employees except for unclassified employees.

County Code 205.040.3 – Application of Personnel Chapter

(1)

The Sheriff is an unclassified employee.

(12)

Other unclassified employees in the Sheriff's Office are defined as a Captain or Undersheriff.

#### **County Policy**

Employment Policy and Practice (EPP) 37 – Reduction in Force – Layoff Procedures

(III)

The decision to layoff an employee(s) is a complex and difficult one. The process requires a written layoff plan to the Human Resources Director and approval by the County Administrator.

#### **State Statutes**

ORS 294.331 – Budget Officer

### Footnote #3

The governing body of each municipal corporation shall, unless otherwise provided by county or city charter, designate one person to serve as budget officer. The budget officer, or the person or department designated by charter and acting as budget officer, shall prepare or supervise the preparation of the budget document. The budget officer shall act under the direction of the executive officer of the municipal corporation, or where no executive officer exists, under the direction of the governing body.

ORS 204.601 – Number and appointment of deputies and other employees.

(1) The county court or board of county commissioners of each county shall fix the number of deputies and employees of county officers whose compensation is to be paid from county funds.

Thank you.

**Gary Schmidt, County Administrator**

Pronouns: he/him/his

[Why pronouns matter](#)

Clackamas County

2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

503-655-8581

[www.clackamas.us](http://www.clackamas.us)

Follow Clackamas County: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Nextdoor](#)

## Footnote #4

**From:** Schmidt, Gary <GSchmidt@clackamas.us>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 10, 2022 10:56 AM  
**To:** EMT - Executive Management Team <EMTgroup@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** Becker, Cindy <CBecker@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** Budget Preparation Guidance

Dear Appointed Department Directors (copied to EMT email list):

Thank you for taking the time to meet with Elizabeth, Cindy and Nancy regarding your department budgets and possible areas where general fund reductions may occur. As I have discussed with you in previous Directors' meetings, we must reduce general fund spending over the next three fiscal years by at least \$15 million. That number will likely go higher pending final decisions on COLAs, Equal Pay and any cost escalations for the construction priorities the Board has authorized.

I have met with Elizabeth, Cindy and Nancy to discuss the findings of your meetings and the four of us will be having further discussions over the next two to three weeks.

For ALL Departments and Offices: In order for you to prepare for your budget meetings with me I am asking that you prepare your department budgets with the current information you have from Finance. General Fund allocations are increased by 2% to account for personnel increases, however I am aware this will not cover your increasing costs. During your budget meetings with me, I will be giving additional direction for general fund reductions so that we can meet these aggressive goals.

I know budget reductions are difficult and I appreciate your cooperation and collaboration working through these issues.

Thank you.

Gary



## Footnote #5

**From:** Schmidt, Gary <GSchmidt@clackamas.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 1, 2024 9:19 AM  
**To:** Brandenburg, Angela <angiebran@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** Becker, Cindy <CBecker@clackamas.us>; Comfort, Elizabeth <EComfort@clackamas.us>; Montoya, Sandra <SMontoya@clackamas.us>; Morrison, Jenna <jmorrison@clackamas.us>; Artmann, Nancy <nartmann@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** RE: 23-24 Budget

---

Hi Angie,

Thank you for talking with me yesterday, and for you and your staff's time meeting the last few weeks. My original email to you still stands as far as moving forward on the CCSO budget.

To recap:

I am approving the addition of \$2 million in General Fund Support to Fund 100 in your current year (FY 23/24) budget.

Per our prior agreement, CCSO agrees to have all transactions, including journal entries/journal transfers, and payroll transfers between the various funds (Fund 100, Levy, ELED) caught up for current fiscal year by May 30, 2024.

The remaining deficit identified by CCSO for the current fiscal year 23/24 will be analyzed by county Finance to confirm:

- Cost distributions among the Levy, ELED and General Fund were made pursuant to the Board approved budget, and
- CCSO's actuals are consistent with CCSO's projections within each fund.

If all is in order, CCSO will submit a supplemental budget request in June 2024.

-

For next fiscal year 24/25, your Open Gov is currently correct as we previously agreed: showing \$81.76 in General Fund Support.

CCSO will have all transactions for all funds posted within 30 days of activity on an ongoing basis.

During FY 24/25, as projections are developed for year-end, any additional General Fund Support needs identified beyond the adopted budget will be evaluated based on transaction history and support. If additional General Fund needs are demonstrated, CCSO will submit a supplemental budget in the new fiscal year.

Thank you.

## Footnote #5

Gary

---

**From:** Brandenburg, Angela <[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 22, 2024 2:30 PM  
**To:** Schmidt, Gary <[GSchmidt@clackamas.us](mailto:GSchmidt@clackamas.us)>  
**Cc:** Becker, Cindy <[CBecker@clackamas.us](mailto:CBecker@clackamas.us)>; Comfort, Elizabeth <[EComfort@clackamas.us](mailto:EComfort@clackamas.us)>;  
Montoya, Sandra <[SMontoya@clackamas.us](mailto:SMontoya@clackamas.us)>; Morrison, Jenna <[jmorrison@clackamas.us](mailto:jmorrison@clackamas.us)>;  
Artmann, Nancy <[nartmann@clackamas.us](mailto:nartmann@clackamas.us)>  
**Subject:** RE: 23-24 Budget

Gary,

Per our correspondence on April 10, 2024, the following was agreed upon:

1. County to provide a minimum of \$2 million additional General Fund Support to CCSO by June 30, 2024, to be done during the June supplemental budget process.
2. CCSO agrees to have all journal entries/journal transfers, payroll transfers between the various funds (Fund 100, Levy, ELED) totally caught up for the current fiscal year by May 30, 2024.

I am confused as to why I am now being asked to manipulate our projections to force the FY2023-24 budget to balance. It is my understanding that the balancing of the end of the year budget will be done through the supplemental budget process which will allow for the encumbered dollars to be realized. My Finance Team is confident that our end of year projections are correct.

As I previously discussed with you and with Cindy in our meeting with her on Thursday, CCSO's FY2023-24 personnel shortfall is projected to be \$4.3m.

Further, it should be noted that the CCSO budget for FY2023-24 cannot be balanced to zero. A fund balance for Parole and Probation in the anticipated amount of \$1.3m must be recognized and posted to FY2024-25.

Listed below is my response to the issues raised by Cindy during our phone conversation on Thursday, April 18<sup>th</sup> and documented in her email on Friday, April 19<sup>th</sup>: Cindy's email is in blue and my response is in red.

## Footnote #5

I reviewed our discussion about the Personnel costs and the \$1.3million you highlighted in the attachment with Finance. The \$1.3 million is on the balance sheet and, as such, is restricted, CCSO is not “losing” it. Please refer to the 4/3 email that Elizabeth sent:

*The expired grant you mentioned the balance of funds are in unearned revenue on the Balance Sheet. Upon spending of these dollars, the money will be moved to Revenue. This applies to all grants as well. A bit of history, the practice was to keep unspent grant funds in restricted, however it was Michael who recommended we move them to Unearned Revenue until ‘earned’ or spent. So, we have adopted this practice.*

Cindy’s statement regarding the \$1.3m is inaccurate. The \$1.3m referenced is not on the balance sheet yet as it is the projected FY2023-24 restricted fund balance for Parole and Probation. This amount must be carried forward to FY2024-25. The amount in the balance sheet is \$1.9m and accounts for the restricted fund balance from FY2022-23 carried forward to FY2023-24. The \$1.9m has already been spent and will be recognized in FY2023-24.

Per your request, I have attached a list of CCSO expense projections which Finance has re-projected to be more aligned with your actuals and history. I have attached a copy of the spreadsheet with notes made by my Finance Team. Column H is County Finance re-projections with column I being the difference. Column J is my Finance Team’s projections and notes with the supporting information. Again we are confident in our projections.

Finally, there is only one PO for vehicles. It’s my understanding that Elizabeth sent Nancy an email on Monday requesting that the costs be distributed among the General Fund, Levy and ELED as Nancy stated they would be. There will be additional vehicle and outfitting purchases made by year-end as this work is in progress. The timing of purchases is dependent upon supply chain issues. As of today, there is nearly \$926,000 remaining balance in open encumbrances for Fleet costs. My Finance Team will distribute all appropriate costs, including vehicles and furnishings.

Please use the attached Projection spreadsheet to indicate the amounts you Reproject in **Column J**. Refer to the attached spreadsheet for clarification.

We will follow through with my commitment to you to have all journal entries/journal transfers, payroll transfers between the various funds (Fund 100, Levy, ELED) up to date for the current fiscal year by May 30, 2024.

Thank you for addressing my concerns. I look forward to your response.

## Footnote #5

Angie

---

**From:** Becker, Cindy <[CBecker@clackamas.us](mailto:CBecker@clackamas.us)>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 19, 2024 9:29 AM  
**To:** Brandenburg, Angela <[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)>; Morrison, Jenna <[jmorrison@clackamas.us](mailto:jmorrison@clackamas.us)>  
**Cc:** Schmidt, Gary <[GSchmidt@clackamas.us](mailto:GSchmidt@clackamas.us)>; Comfort, Elizabeth <[EComfort@clackamas.us](mailto:EComfort@clackamas.us)>;  
Montoya, Sandra <[SMontoya@clackamas.us](mailto:SMontoya@clackamas.us)>  
**Subject:** 23-24 Budget  
**Importance:** High

Good Morning Angie and Jenna

Thanks for yesterday's conversation,

I reviewed our discussion about the Personnel costs and the \$1.3million you highlighted in the attachment with Finance. The \$1.3 million is on the balance sheet and, as such, is restricted, CCSO is not "losing" it. Please refer to the 4/3 email that Elizabeth sent:

*The expired grant you mentioned the balance of funds are in unearned revenue on the Balance Sheet. Upon spending of these dollars, the money will be moved to Revenue. This applies to all grants as well. A bit of history, the practice was to keep unspent grant funds in restricted, however it was Michael who recommended we move them to Unearned Revenue until 'earned' or spent. So, we have adopted this practice.*

Per your request, I have attached a list of CCSO expense projections which Finance has re-projected to be more aligned with your actuals and history.

Finally, there is only one PO for vehicles. It's my understanding that Elizabeth sent Nancy an email on Monday requesting that the costs be distributed among the General Fund, Levy and ELED as Nancy stated they would be.

Feel free to call if you want to discuss anything here.

Please use the attached Projection spreadsheet to indicate the amounts you Reproject in **Column J** and send back to all of us by **close of business Monday, April 22, 2024**. Finance will enter changes in OpenGov.

Cindy

---

Cindy Becker  
Project Manager  
County Administration

## Footnote #5

503-930-6894 (cell)

Follow Clackamas County: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Nextdoor](#)

## Footnote #6

---

**From:** Schmidt, Gary <GSchmidt@clackamas.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 10, 2024 2:45 PM  
**To:** Brandenburg, Angela <angiebran@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** Morrison, Jenna <jmorrison@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** Budget Agreement

Hi Sheriff,

Thank you for meeting with me today. The below reflects what I heard we discussed and agreed. Would you please reply with your agreement or any edits.

Current Fiscal Year 23/24:

- County to provide a minimum of \$2 million additional General Fund Support to CCSO by June 30, 2024, to be done during the June supplemental budget process.
- CCSO agrees to have all journal entries/journal transfers, payroll transfers between the various funds (Fund 100, Levy, ELED) totally caught up for the current fiscal year by May 30, 2024.
- County to provide additional budget staff support from other departments, if needed, to support CCSO in completing these budget entries/transfers.
- After May 30, 2024, Sheriff and County Administrator confer on any additional financial gaps and to be made whole via the June supplemental budget process if needed.

Next Fiscal Year 24/25:

- County to provide additional \$6 million of General Fund Support to CCSO now.
- CCSO will reduce proposed budget by approximately \$3.6 million now with the intent to seek that funding back during the supplemental budget process in September, December and/or early 2025.
- County to reopen Open Gov for CCSO team to enter updated proposed budget. Entry must be complete by 6 pm on Thursday, April 11, 2024.
- Additional FTE for replacement county courthouse will be submitted during supplemental budget process, not in proposed budget.

Thank you.  
Gary

Good Morning Chair Karn & Budget Committee Members,

I am Sheriff Angela Brandenburg

Joining me today is Undersheriff Jenna Morrison and my Finance Manager Nancy Artmann.

Before I address the Sheriff's Office budget, I want to highlight a few of our accomplishments over the past year.

For the second year in a row, Clackamas County is the safest county in the metro area – in fact, it is the safest of the 5 most populated counties in Oregon.

Over this past year, crime trends in our County show a drop in property crime (-16%) with a remarkable drop in car theft (-31%).

In 2023, the Sheriff's Office hired 67 employees – including 52 sworn. This far surpassed the hiring of 29 sworn in 2022.

As I stated during last year's budget hearing, paying our deputies what they are worth is necessary in order to retain our experienced and skilled deputies while also attracting highly qualified applicants into this incredibly important and challenging work.

And, I want to thank the Board of County Commissioners for negotiating a new collective bargaining agreement last year that does that.

We are already seeing the results from this contract - As of January 1<sup>st</sup>, I have sworn in 30 patrol and jail deputies – 1/3 of which are experienced officers joining us from other agencies.

As of today, the Sheriff's Office is staffed at 93% with only 3 vacant jail deputy positions and 6 vacant patrol deputy positions.

In June, we started our new Jail Substance Abuse Program which is aimed at reducing recidivism, like our Medicated Assisted Treatment Program and our GED program. This program utilizes a well-respected and widely used cognitive behavioral program focusing on changing behaviors that result in a person's involvement in the criminal justice system. And when the time comes, this program works to connect those transitioning out of the jail with community-

based sobriety programs and employment. So far, 136 individuals have completed the Jail Substance Abuse Program and I am looking forward to evaluating the measured outcomes of our efforts.

And in 2023, A Safe Place Family Justice Center reached its 10-year anniversary. Since opening in December 2013, partners have worked together to improve the lives of survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, stalking, and elder abuse through empowerment, coordinated service, and collaboration.

Over the past 10 years, A Safe Place has provided support and advocacy in over 32,000 visits for services. Over 4,000 survivors have received help in applying for protective orders through A Safe Place's Video Court Program. In 2023, 56% percent of protective orders filed in Clackamas County were from A Safe Place.

The great work happening at A Safe Place Family Justice Center is helping to create safer communities and is saving lives. There are many more accomplishments for 2023 however with the limited time I will move on to the budget.

- I want to thank the County Administrator for working with me over the past few months to reduce the \$5.2m shortfall in the County's FY2023-24 budget for my office.
- As you may recall, last year I advised the Budget Committee that the County's budget would be at least \$5m short, and I was assured if that occurred the County would cover the shortfall.
- To date the County Administrator has covered \$2m of the deficit and asked me to submit a supplemental budget in June for the remainder.
- CCSO prepared the proposed FY2024-25 budget following all County Finance requests which included accounting for General Fund vacancy savings, budgeting on a three-year average of actual costs, and implementing the approved indirect costing model.



## Footnote #7

- In order to meet operational needs in FY2024-25, an increase of General Fund support of \$9.6m was requested.
- A part of this increase resulted from costs following the new CCPOA collective bargaining agreement.
- I met with the County Administrator who agreed to provide an additional \$6m in General Fund support and requested that I not include \$3.6m in my proposed budget.
- Instead the County Administrator directed me to use the supplemental budget process to request the \$3.6m as needed throughout the fiscal year.
- I made the requested reductions in the amount of \$3.6m to balance my budget.
- However, these funds will be needed in order to meet the operational needs of the Sheriff's Office.
- Over the past several years, I have informed the County Administrator that 13 additional FTE are required to provide the personnel required to safely operate the new courthouse.
- For the past two years, the County Administrator asked me not to add those positions to my budget.
- This year he has directed me to wait until December and use the supplemental budget process to request the additional positions.
- The necessary FTE positions are: 12 Deputy positions and 1 Sergeant which will cost approximately \$3.2m.

#### Footnote #7

- During FY2023-24 budget deliberations, CCSO along with County Finance was directed to participate in a performance audit. My Office fully cooperated and complied with this request.
- While the audit showed no significant findings for CCSO, we have actively been working with County Administration, County Finance, and County Counsel to address the recommendations and set timelines for both County Finance and CCSO.
- In collaboration with County Finance, one of the recommendations has already been implemented by the creation of an indirect costing model that has been applied to this year's budget.
- A copy of the complete performance audit report can be found on the Sheriff's Office website.
- Thank you for your time and I look forward to your questions.

## Footnote #8

---

**From:** Brandenburg, Angela  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 19, 2024 2:59 PM  
**To:** Schmidt, Gary <GSchmidt@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** Morrison, Jenna <jmorrison@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** RE: CCSO Courthouse FTE positions

Good afternoon,

I have confirmed with my staff the 13 new CCSO FTE positions (12 deputy, 1 sergeant) are moving forward. I have also shared this information with Presiding Judge Wetzel and Trial Court Administrator Spradley.

Thank you,



**Sheriff Angela Brandenburg**

Clackamas County Sheriff's Office  
9101 SE Sunnybrook Blvd, Clackamas, OR 97015  
Mail: 2223 Kaen Rd, Oregon City, OR 97045  
Phone: 503-785-5003  
[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)

---

**From:** Schmidt, Gary <[GSchmidt@clackamas.us](mailto:GSchmidt@clackamas.us)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 13, 2024 1:56 PM  
**To:** Brandenburg, Angela [angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)>  
**Cc:** Morrison, Jenna [jmorrison@clackamas.us](mailto:jmorrison@clackamas.us)>  
**Subject:** CCSO Courthouse FTE positions

Hi Angie,

Thank you for your email dated October 21, 2024 and for sharing additional information to my request to explain the need for the additional CCSO FTE positions to support the replacement county courthouse. Additionally, I conducted my own research with other counties who have similar sized courthouses to Clackamas County and studied those courthouse staffing models.

I am approving 13 additional CCSO FTEs for the replacement county courthouse effective today, November 13, 2024. This is for 12 additional Deputy positions and 1 Sergeant position. This will go before the Board of County Commissioners in January for budget authority during the supplemental budget process, which I will support.

I will inform HR and Finance to go forward with the new FTEs.

Thank you.

**Gary Schmidt, County Administrator**

Pronouns: he/him

Clackamas County

2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

503-655-8581

[www.clackamas.us](http://www.clackamas.us)

**From:** Brandenburg, Angela

**Sent:** Monday, October 21, 2024 5:13 PM

**To:** Schmidt, Gary [GSchmidt@clackamas.us](mailto:GSchmidt@clackamas.us)

**Subject:** RE: Position request

Gary,

I have taken some time to respond to your below email informing me that you are now relying on the 2021 CCSO Staffing Study to determine the number of deputies to staff the new courthouse. Before I address my concerns with your position below, I first want to address my lack of trust in your word.

When our teams met last on September 9<sup>th</sup>, at your request we met privately separate from our staff at the end of the meeting. At that time, you expressed your commitment to renew our partnership and that moving forward I could depend on your candor. At that meeting you committed to approving 6 deputy positions now, and the remainder 7 positions in January. You changed your position one week later by email to our teams without the consideration of addressing your change of position personally with me. I have learned too many times, over the past four years of working together, that I cannot depend on what you tell me you will do.

Since 2022, I've informed you that given the courthouse layout, triple size expansion, and added security duties among other factors, that 13 additional deputy positions would be necessary to ensure the facility's safety and security. You have informed me every year, and recently at our September meeting, that 13 positions would be funded. In fact, for the last two budget cycles you directed me to not put the 13 positions in my FY 2023-24 and FY 2024-25 budgets but assured me they would be funded in time to meet my operational needs. Had you told me that you intended to rely solely on the 2021 Staffing Study, I would have informed you why the Staffing Study's new courthouse assumptions are wrong and the County could have averted what is now a risk management crisis, 7-months before the courthouse is set to open.

The 2021 Staffing Study has a number of incorrect operational assumptions that it relied on for staffing projections for the new courthouse. I believe this is due in part to the Study's reliance on the 2019 National Center for State Courts facility needs assessment. In 2019, the actual operational security needs of the courthouse were unknown. Below are some of the 2019 false assumptions used to project 14 deputy posts as sufficient, contrasted with actual 2025 operational security needs requiring 20 posts:

## Footnote #8

- Assumption: A total of 14 judgeships/referees will be used as a baseline for 2031 projections
  - Actual security operations: 14 judges/referee/pro-bono by 2026: 11 judges/referee with, 1 daily rotating pro-bono judge 2025; 1 additional judge and 1 referee anticipated by 2026
- Assumption: Central holding will (be) a minimum of three posts when occupied.
  - Actual security operations: 4 deputies required. Central holding will double in size; expansion of holding cells from 5 to 11; 1 deputy is required to oversee holding cell dedicated to sight and sound separation for in-custody juvenile; in-custody transports will increase with court anticipating rise in jury trials, 5-10 jury trials/ week
- Assumption: a minimum of two posts will staff the security desk, this may include a Sergeant position.
  - Actual security operations: 3 deputies required. Staffing Study did not consider addition of in-custody security desk which requires an additional deputy.
- Assumption: an average of eight courtrooms will be used daily.
  - Actual security operations: 14 courtrooms to be used daily. I have confirmed with the Trial Court Administrator's office (TCA) that the court expects all 14 courtrooms to be used daily, except for Fridays when new jury trials will not be started.
- Assumption: A rover post will be staffed to provide relief and walk through security of all posts.
  - Actual security operations: 2 float/rover posts required. Courthouse employees will expand to approximately 300+ with the inclusion of the DA's office, DHS and relocation of other offices into the courthouse. The TCA's office has informed me they expect on average 200 people associated with each jury trial and the court expects 5-10 jury trials/week. The triple size expansion of the courthouse, the layout of the courthouse and the increased public use requires 2 float/rover positions for the safety and security of employees and the public and to provide relief to deputies working other posts.

As you are aware, Oregon law requires the Sheriff to attend to the court. It's not a matter of choice, it's a legal mandate. I was the Civil Commander over courthouse security operations and I know what it takes to make a courthouse safe and operational.

Given your decision to change course, I am forced to put the County on notice that 7 additional FTE's is inadequate to meet the safety and security demands of the new courthouse and that a minimum of 13 FTE's is required.

I have informed the Presiding Judge and the Trial Court Administrator's Office of my safety and security concerns. I have advised them that the County is only committing to 7 additional deputies for expanded courthouse operations and not the 13 deputies that are needed. I have also advised them for my deputies to operate safely, they can expect the following operational impacts given the staffing levels that we will now have:

- Inability or delayed ability for deputies to staff courtrooms for non-adult in custody (AIC) events (e.g. stalking/restraining orders, family court matters, out of custody defendants)
- Delay or cancelation of AIC appearances that require deputy presence
- Reduced deputy response to facility emergencies (fires, medical, disturbances)
- Deputies unable to staff & use expanded courtroom holding areas (Oregon law requires a deputy presence for temporary hold areas)
- Reduced deputy presence for the expanded facility
- Deputy assistance in public areas delayed (medical emergencies & warrant arrests)

When it comes to courthouse operations nothing is more important than the safety and security of employees, those in the custody of my office, and the public. The County has invested in building a courthouse three times the size of the current courthouse and it has an obligation to invest in its safety and security.

**Sheriff Angela Brandenburg**

Clackamas County Sheriff's Office  
9101 SE Sunnybrook Blvd, Clackamas, OR 97015  
Mail: 2223 Kaen Rd, Oregon City, OR 97045

## Footnote #8



Phone: 503-785-5003  
[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)

**From:** Schmidt, Gary <[GSchmidt@clackamas.us](mailto:GSchmidt@clackamas.us)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 2, 2024 3:48 PM  
**To:** Brandenburg, Angela <[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)>  
**Subject:** RE: Position request

Hi Angie,

Thank you for writing directly to me about your concerns. We have agreement on some points in your email, but not all.

I did agree for you to hire seven additional positions to staff the replacement county courthouse: 1 sergeant and 6 deputy positions as follows:

- Over-hiring now to kick start the hiring.
- Going to the Board in January for a supplemental budget to approve these 7 positions as permanent positions at that time.

Where we differ is your request for six additional positions on top of the seven noted above. I have not yet agreed to support these positions due to the data from the CCSO Staffing Study – pages 86 and 86 - which also doesn't support the request for additional staffing:

<https://public.powerdms.com/CLACKAMASOR/tree/documents/1135592>

*"A total of 19.6 positions are needed for Courthouse Security in the new facility. Based on the flexible judicial schedule for courthouse security, a total of 19 deputies position and two sergeant positions are adequate to cover the proposed courthouse when it opens. This is an increase in one Sergeant and six deputy positions than what is currently assigned to the main courthouse and juvenile court. Also, one deputy position will be needed at Justice Court."*

The Staffing Study used the Court Facility Needs Assessment completed by the National Center for State Courts in 2019. That Assessment anticipated the square footage and number of courtrooms for the replacement courthouse.

At our meeting on September 9, 2024 I heard you say the Staffing Study data related to the replacement courthouse was not accurate. However, I don't see any dispute of this information on your website. Are you stepping away from the accuracy of the Staffing Study?

Please help me understand why the additional six position requests are necessary. I am happy to meet with you again to discuss. I intend to support what you need for the replacement courthouse. I am also carefully looking at every single position in every single office/department to be fiscally prudent and responsible, as expected of me from the Board and the public.

We can also go directly to the Board now, and you and I can discuss these position requests with the

## Footnote #8

Board. Please let me know what you prefer for next steps.

Thank you.  
Gary

**From:** Brandenburg, Angela <[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)>

**Sent:** Monday, September 30, 2024 5:12 PM

**To:** Schmidt, Gary <[GSchmidt@clackamas.us](mailto:GSchmidt@clackamas.us)>

**Subject:** RE: Position request

Gary,

I just returned from vacation and read your email about your approval of over-hiring 6 new deputies to meet the need of 13 new courthouse deputy positions. Your direction was different than what I took away from our Sept. 9<sup>th</sup> meeting discussing this issue with you, me, Elizabeth and Jenna. As we have agreed, I am bringing my concerns directly to you instead of involving our staff.

My understanding of our meeting and your direction at that time (as reflected in notes taken by Jenna and emailed to me shortly after our meeting) is:

- You approved 6 new deputy FTE immediately
- Elizabeth did not believe we could use the same new position request form that we previously submitted for your approval that reflected 13 new courthouse deputy positions. Elizabeth and Jenna were to work together to prepare a new position request form(s) for the 6 new positions you approved. This work is shown in your email string (below).
- In the meeting Jenna brought forth the concept of over-hiring deputies because it is likely we will fill the 6 new deputy positions you had approved before January 1<sup>st</sup>. As discussed, we are nearly fully staffed at the jail. We have an established recruitment list with candidates that may be viable for these new positions.
- You agreed to approve the remaining 6 deputy positions and 1 sergeant position in January for a total of 13 new positions.
- Elizabeth informed us in the meeting that there would not be any need for County Finance/County Admin to go to the BCC with a supplemental budget request until the overall CCSO budget was nearing being over appropriation. You stated you would support that request when it occurred.

With your new direction on only 6 positions, it is unclear to me when you intend to approve the remaining 7 positions necessary to safely operate the courthouse. Please let me know the bottom line on whether the County intends to fund 13 new courthouse positions and the timeline for that. I have been asking this question for several years now, and you have given me your word that funding would happen for those positions. I've explained to you that it takes my office on average 12-months to hire and train personnel and we are now 8-months out from the courthouse opening in May.

Thank you.

## Footnote #8



**Sheriff Angela Brandenburg**

Clackamas County Sheriff's Office  
9101 SE Sunnybrook Blvd, Clackamas, OR 97015  
Mail: 2223 Kaen Rd, Oregon City, OR 97045  
Phone: 503-785-5003  
[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)

**From:** Schmidt, Gary <[GSchmidt@clackamas.us](mailto:GSchmidt@clackamas.us)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 18, 2024 9:33 AM

**To:** Morrison, Jenna <[jmorrison@clackamas.us](mailto:jmorrison@clackamas.us)>; Comfort, Elizabeth <[EComfort@clackamas.us](mailto:EComfort@clackamas.us)>

**Cc:** Artmann, Nancy <[nartmann@clackamas.us](mailto:nartmann@clackamas.us)>; Montoya, Sandra <[SMontoya@clackamas.us](mailto:SMontoya@clackamas.us)>;  
Brandenburg, Angela <[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)>; Minor-Lawrence, Evelyn  
<[ELawrence2@clackamas.us](mailto:ELawrence2@clackamas.us)>; Pedersen, Heather <[HeatherPed@clackamas.us](mailto:HeatherPed@clackamas.us)>; Haddock, Jared  
<[JHaddock@clackamas.us](mailto:JHaddock@clackamas.us)>

**Subject:** RE: Position request

Hi all:

I have approved the overhire of 6 current Jail Deputy positions. So, two people will fill a single existing job position. I am authorizing this overhire status for up to six months. In January 2025 we will go to the Board during the supplemental budget process to make these 6 overhire positions permanent, becoming 6 new FTEs at that time.

This email is my approval. There is no further paperwork or forms to complete.

Thank you.  
Gary

**From:** Morrison, Jenna <[jmorrison@clackamas.us](mailto:jmorrison@clackamas.us)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 17, 2024 6:32 PM

**To:** Comfort, Elizabeth <[EComfort@clackamas.us](mailto:EComfort@clackamas.us)>

**Cc:** Artmann, Nancy <[nartmann@clackamas.us](mailto:nartmann@clackamas.us)>; Montoya, Sandra <[SMontoya@clackamas.us](mailto:SMontoya@clackamas.us)>;  
Schmidt, Gary <[GSchmidt@clackamas.us](mailto:GSchmidt@clackamas.us)>; Brandenburg, Angela <[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)>

**Subject:** Re: Position request

No Elizabeth these are new FTEs which Gary approved.

Undersheriff Jenna Morrison  
Clackamas County Sheriff's Office

On Sep 17, 2024, at 5:48 PM, Comfort, Elizabeth <[EComfort@clackamas.us](mailto:EComfort@clackamas.us)> wrote:

Jenna – I want to confirm these are overhires, not new FTEs for CCSO.

An overhire or overfill is when two employees sit in the same position. This is typically short-term (30



## Footnote #8

days), but can be longer. Usually this happens when someone is retiring and the department wants to hire their replacement before its vacant so the incumbent can train them for a period of time. In this case, Gary has approved CCSO to overfill 6 positions - mainly so that you can keep the recruitment open and applicants moving through the recruitment, background and training process.

I don't see this as what is being requested in the attached.

Elizabeth Comfort  
503-936-5345

**From:** Artmann, Nancy <[nartmann@clackamas.us](mailto:nartmann@clackamas.us)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 17, 2024 1:23 PM  
**To:** Comfort, Elizabeth <[EComfort@clackamas.us](mailto:EComfort@clackamas.us)>  
**Cc:** Morrison, Jenna <[jmorrison@clackamas.us](mailto:jmorrison@clackamas.us)>; Finance - Budget <[Finance-Budget@clackamas.us](mailto:Finance-Budget@clackamas.us)>  
**Subject:** RE: Position request

Hello Elizabeth,

Per your instruction, attached are the revised position request memo and 6 request forms for the 6 Jail Deputy positions to staff the new courthouse.

Don't hesitate to reach out if you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you,  
Nancy

**Nancy Artmann**  
**Finance and Business Services Manager**  
Clackamas County Sheriff's Office  
Cell: (503) 319-4435 / Desk: (503) 785-5012  
Mail: 2223 Kaen Rd., Oregon City, OR 97045

**From:** Comfort, Elizabeth <[EComfort@clackamas.us](mailto:EComfort@clackamas.us)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 11, 2024 11:38 AM  
**To:** Artmann, Nancy <[nartmann@clackamas.us](mailto:nartmann@clackamas.us)>  
**Cc:** Morrison, Jenna <[jmorrison@clackamas.us](mailto:jmorrison@clackamas.us)>  
**Subject:** FW: Position request

Hi Nancy –

A separate form needs to be submitted for each position request because the approved form is used to create new position ID numbers and these are unique to each position.

## Footnote #8

Please resubmit individual forms for each position requested.

Thank you,  
E.

Elizabeth Comfort  
503-936-5345

**From:** Morrison, Jenna <[jmorrison@clackamas.us](mailto:jmorrison@clackamas.us)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 11, 2024 11:01 AM  
**To:** Comfort, Elizabeth <[EComfort@clackamas.us](mailto:EComfort@clackamas.us)>  
**Subject:** Re: Position request

Please work with Nancy if that is the case.

Thank you,

Undersheriff Jenna Morrison  
Clackamas County Sheriff's Office

On Sep 11, 2024, at 10:59 AM, Comfort, Elizabeth <[EComfort@clackamas.us](mailto:EComfort@clackamas.us)> wrote:

Jenna – received request. Thank you.

I did hear yesterday that each FTE requires a separate form, a standard processing process for HR and Finance. I am following up on that now. Who can I work with should this be necessary on your team?

Elizabeth Comfort  
503-936-5345

**From:** Morrison, Jenna <[jmorrison@clackamas.us](mailto:jmorrison@clackamas.us)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 10, 2024 8:04 PM  
**To:** Comfort, Elizabeth <[EComfort@clackamas.us](mailto:EComfort@clackamas.us)>; Schmidt, Gary <[GSchmidt@clackamas.us](mailto:GSchmidt@clackamas.us)>;  
Brandenburg, Angela <[angiebran@clackamas.us](mailto:angiebran@clackamas.us)>  
**Subject:** Position request

Elizabeth,

Please let me know if there is anything else that I need to do for this request. Also let me know when it has been processed and there are new position numbers assigned so that I can work with HR.

Thank you,

## Footnote #8

[<image001.png>](#)

**Jenna Morrison, Undersheriff**

Pronouns: she/her/hers

Clackamas County Sheriff's Office

9101 SE Sunnybrook Blvd, Clackamas, OR 97015

Mail: 2223 Kaen Rd, Oregon City, OR 97045

Phone: 503-785-5002

[jmorrison@clackamas.us](mailto:jmorrison@clackamas.us)