

Meeting: OACCD Best Practices Workgroup  
Date: June 13, 2025  
Location: Polk County Community Corrections/Virtual

In Person Attendees:

Aaron Hartman Scott Hyde, Joe Garcia, Maureen Robb, Ryan Downing, Larry Evenson, Mike Hartford, Tanner Wark, Jeff Wood, Jessica Beach, Lee Warren, Sam Hittle, Jodi Merritt, Joel Pickard.

Virtual Attendees:

Nate Gaoiran, Dale Primmer, Jake Greer, Kristen Hanthorn, Robert Rodriguez, Chris Chandler, Kaylynn Berrios, David Denney, Jim St. Michel, Digna Moreno, Steve Works, Ahnie Seaholm, Jamie Hepner, Abe Griswold, Tira Hubbard, Tony Campa, Aaron Boyce, Dennis Holmes, Deevy Holcomb, Lodi Presley.

Welcome:

Jodi welcomed everyone in attendance. Due to the minimal amount of time for the topic, those in person provided identification so those attending virtually knew who was in the room.

Discussion:

Jodi identified that after Josephine County's presentation at the May OACCD meeting, which highlighted challenges with OAR requirements, i.e.: PO ability, time, public safety, outcomes, and funding. Our goal was to convene a workgroup to drill down on each of our requirements via OAR/ORS and provide a recommendation back to the full Association on what the workgroup believes 'best practices' should be. Focus was on 60 day assessments, measurable contact standards and the CCR. Specifically around the CCR, what's in it? What's it look like? What's the value? How's the accountability attached?

Tanner identified when going through ORS, it is very clear that the Community Corrections Act was a partnership between county's and DOC. It is believed DOC is our strongest supporter and would be amendable to discussing these requirements and the challenges we are facing, especially with the volatility of funding.

**Recommendation:** OACCD Exec develop a letter to DOC outlining the challenges we are facing in the current financial environment. Highlight some of the impacts of the current funding and discuss challenges in meeting OAR. Use as starting point for discussions, request a meeting.

Nate expressed support for this avenue and further identified the need to reference the cost study and request DOC/Legislature tell us what we should and should not be doing based on the funding levels. Dale expressed we should also keep in mind the public safety portion of our profession, getting in the homes and finding victims, contraband, weapons, etc. The need to get the PO's out in the field.

It was also identified that this letter would be a starting point and could also be used for local leaders, Boards, etc. to see what the challenges and limitations are locally, which could help with the CCR conversation locally.

Need to prioritize a balanced supervision model: Public Safety – out in the field, knocking on doors; case management for rehabilitation purposes. Further identifying that each county has different risk demographics and may be disproportionately affecting one county with increased high risk clients than that of a comparable county. Need to be sure that we are identifying those and calling those out in the CCR's.

**Recommendation:** Develop a CCR workgroup, in partnership with DOC, to assist in developing a range in responses for CCR's that truly reflect the dynamic differences and risk profiles in each region based on the data. Assure accuracy and value of the document. Provide discussion and feedback as to what is happening locally and how that is impacting OAR's. Staffing levels to contact ratios are also important to decipher and include in CCR's.

#### Measurable contact standards discussion:

Not one county has met the measurable contact standards, Washington County is meeting them at a higher rate than others. Polk County did well for a period of time until there was a staffing impact. Those counties who have dashboards tend to do better than those that only receive the spreadsheet from Denise. Lots of factors come into play here, including how staffing levels impact the ability to meet the required contacts. There was also discussion on the types of contacts that are being used to meet these standards, specifically telephone, email and virtual visits.

The OAR is a pilot and there has been a willingness to discuss and open the rule back up if there are concerns. There is hope the dashboard will be available to county's around August, hopefully. The group reviewed data around measurable contacts that were included in Tanner's document, highest county to meet contacts was 79%, and this included telephone, virtual, email contacts identified as measurable. This particular county had 39% of contacts as TV, VV, EV.

Further discussion was around the analysis portion of the measurable contacts from DOC's standpoint and the requirement that the measurable contacts be a PO. If this is a data point needed for DOC, this information is in DOC400 and there is a potential mechanism to pull it out of the system. Not necessarily needed for operational change when the data can be pulled, if that is what is needed. Back to SB 1510 – least onerous, the measurable contact requirements may be stricter in some jurisdictions than what was previously required. Additionally, individuals who are doing well are still required to report which can be negatively impactful, lacks discretion. Liability around these standards was also discussed.

**Recommendation:** Drop measurable contact for High's from 3 contacts to 2; Medium's from 2 contacts to 1; and be reflective of the additional work that is completed (non-measurable). Needs

to be reflective/correlated with number of FTE available to do the work. Total picture of contacts/work completed should be reflected in CCR's in addition to the risk profile disparities, if any.

**Best Practice Recommendation:** Measurable contacts to be in-person, face to face. Disallow TV, VV, EV from definition of measurable.

#### Funding/IGA Discussion:

Contract negotiation based on funding provided, identifying what we can and can't do based on funding. Discussion around redlining contract and letting DOC know what we can and can't do. Discussion surrounded that this was the purpose of the letter to DOC and follow-up discussion. Funding has never been provided adequately to Community Corrections, Jeremiah had stated yesterday that we are 1 for 4 with the cost study. We have always received funding in the short session or through other means, never reflected in our actual allocation. It is feeling disrespectful for our profession and the work we do. DOC's institutional budget increased 18% this year but CC was funded at baseline.

Aaron B. reminded everyone that the Governor did support a portion of the cost study and that this is the legislature. Further discussion around the additional funding (JRP, M57) these funds were to be additional to GIA funds and unfortunately they are not keeping up and some counties are having to rely on these funds. The viewpoint from legislature was that we receive these additional funding streams so we should be fine with baseline, when in reality these additional funds were to support extra programs, not for basic supervision, which is what GIA is for. This is a ripple effect and we need to call that out and separate that in the conversation.

Further discussion regarding the cost study requirement by law, why is that in there if the legislature isn't going to take it into consideration? This is a problem, how do we fix it? How do we get additional messaging in the legislature to support adequate funding for our profession? Again, additional discussion and work needed around this. Clear disconnect is the legislature, how do we motivate them?

#### Larger/broader conversation:

Seems there are a number of additional impacts within each community, our funding issues/concerns have a ripple effect throughout our LE community that impacts local public safety. AOC, Sheriff's, DA's, and Chief's all came together to support us and each county will see impacts. With the inclusion of public safety plans and the additional strings/restrictions on some of the other funding streams (grants) there may need to be a larger conversation at the executive director level with all associations to further message collaboratively. Jeff noted these conversations are being had and should continue, with the consortium letter that was just

completed, all associations discussed the impacts and provided support. We will need to continue with this work.

It was noted there was a great deal of progress around relationships this year with all other LE associations and legislature due to the **great work of our lobbyist and our Executive Director.**

Prior to the meeting, Tanner provided the workgroup with a draft data comparison for a number of key OAR's. This document will be shared with the Director's to assist in continuing conversation at the upcoming July meeting.

**Next steps/Action items:**

- Jeff and the Exec team will draft a letter to DOC outlining concerns and requesting a meeting to discuss OARs.
- Continue best practices conversation at full OACCD meeting in July.
  - Tanner to contact DOC regarding data document prior to sending out
    - Forward Tanner's data document to assist in conversation for July
- Jeff to continue conversations with other public safety associations (sheriffs, DAs, etc.) about broader public safety funding issues.