

**Board on Public Safety Standards and Training
(BPSST or the Board)
Meeting Minutes - Draft**

January 22, 2026

The Board on Public Safety Standards and Training held a regular meeting at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, January 22, 2026, in the Governor Victor G. Atiyeh Boardroom at the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training located at 4190 Aumsville Hwy SE, Salem, Oregon. Chair Casey Coddling called the meeting to order at approximately 9:10 a.m.

Board members present in-person and by Video/Teleconference:

Casey Coddling, Chair, Oregon State Police
Chris Heppel, Vice-Chair, Oregon Fire Chief's Association – (Teams)
Martha Bennett, League of Oregon Cities
Jennifer Cameron, Non-Management Parole & Probation
Jack Carriger, Oregon Volunteer Firefighters Association
Mark Daniel, Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police
Michael Fletcher, APCO-NENA
Lauren Johnson, Portland Fire & Rescue
Morry Jones, Public Member
Dan Lenzen, Private Security Industry
Kathryn Lynch, Oregon District Attorneys Association – (Teams)
Joseph Morneau, Oregon Fire District Director's Association – (Teams)
Mike Reese, Director, Department of Corrections
Mariana Ruiz-Temple, Oregon State Fire Marshal
Sam Willits, Non-Management Law Enforcement

Board Members Absent:

Robert Day, Portland Police Bureau
Nicholas Hunter, Oregon State Sheriffs' Association
Scotty Nowning, Non-Management Law Enforcement
Doug Olson, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Mo Young, Public Member

DPSST Staff:

Phil Castle, Agency Director
Kathy McAlpine, Deputy Director
Marie Atwood, Professional Standards Director
Kayla Ballrot, Fire Training Program Manager
Chris Enquist, Training Division Director
Ben Hamilton, Criminal Justice Certification Program Manager
Michael Holsapple, Compliance Specialist
Jennifer Howald, Legislative and Rules Coordinator
Sam Tenney, Communications Coordinator

Shelby Alexander, Executive Assistant to the Director
Juan Lopez, Executive Support Specialist

Guests:

Robert Wood, Police Policy Committee Member
Dianne Lyo, Statesman Journal

1. Introductions

- *Chair Coddling introduced himself and invited everyone in attendance to state their name and position for the record.*

2. *Meeting Minutes

Approve October 23, 2025, Meeting Minutes

- *Member Daniel motioned to approve the October 23, 2025, meeting minutes, as presented. Member Fletcher seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion passed unanimously by the Board.*

3. Fire Policy Committee

a. Fire Policy Committee Update – Chris Heppel, Chair

- *Chair Heppel reported that there were no updates from the FPC aside from a brief correction of the present consent agenda, since the regularly scheduled meeting was cancelled on November 19, 2025. The next FPC meeting will take place on February 25, 2026.*

b. * Consent Agenda (The following items to be ratified by one vote)

- A. *Christopher Wade, DPSST No. 30403; Christmas Valley RFPD – Revoke**
Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the FPC on November 19, 2025.
- *Member Ruiz-Temple motioned to approve the FPC Consent Agenda, item A, as presented. Member Carriger seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion passed unanimously by the Board.*

4. Criminal Justice Policy Committees

a. Police Policy Committee Update – Scotty Nowning, Chair

- *Chair Coddling noted Member Nowning's absence and briefly updated the Board on behalf of the PPC. The PPC met on November 20, 2025, whereby the committee heard four (4) cases and acted on two (2) of those cases. The next regularly scheduled meeting will take place on February 19, 2026.*

b. Telecommunications Policy Committee Update – Michael Fletcher, Chair

- *Chair Fletcher stated that the TPC last met on November 5, 2025, whereby the committee reviewed one discretionary case with no action. Additionally, Chair Fletcher was nominated as a re-appointment to the Applicant Review Committee (ARC). The next regularly scheduled meeting will take place on February 4, 2026.*

c. Corrections Policy Committee Update – Jennifer Cameron, Interim Chair

- *Vice-Chair Cameron reported that the CPC held a regularly scheduled meeting on November 12, 2025, and an emergency meeting on December 16, 2025, whereby the committee reviewed seven (7) discretionary cases altogether. The committee imposed a lifetime ineligibility period on four (4) of these case, while two (2) cases had a recommended 10-year ineligibility period, and one (1) case recommended a 3-year ineligibility period. The CPC also discussed a revision request for the Parole and Probation curriculum that was subsequently approved. The next regularly scheduled meeting will take place on February 10, 2026.*

d. *Consent Agenda (The following items to be ratified by one vote)

- A. *Shane Bond, DPSST No. 59946; DOC/Union County Sheriff’s Office – Revoke**
Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the CPC on December 16, 2025.
- B. *John Deardorff, DPSST No. 42771; DOC/Oregon State Correctional Institution – Revoke**
Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the CPC on November 12, 2025.
- C. *Mark Farmer, DPSST No. 55203; Multnomah County Sheriff’s Office – No Action**
Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the PPC on November 20, 2025.
- D. *Emily Fisk, DPSST No. 61817; DOC/Deer Ridge Correctional Institution – Revoke**
Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the CPC on November 12, 2025.
- E. *Jesus Gutierrez, Sr., DPSST No. 61908; DOC/Snake River Correctional Institution – Revoke**
Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the CPC on November 12, 2025.
- F. *Michelle Hubbard, DPSST No. 31820; DOC/Oregon State Correctional Institution – Revoke**
Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the CPC on November 12, 2025.
- G. *Erica Hurley, DPSST No. 29900; Portland Police Bureau – No Action**
Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the PPC on November 20, 2025.

H. * Bonnie Kessell, DPSST No. 46671; Umatilla County Community Corrections – Revoke

Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the CPC on November 12, 2025.

I. * August Lowthian, DPSST No. 61677; Washington County Sheriff's Office – Revoke

Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the CPC on November 12, 2025.

J. * Jonathan McNichols, DPSST No. 60995; Salem Police Department – Revoke

Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the PPC on November 20, 2025.

K. * James McQueen, DPSST No. 55471; Hillsboro Police Department – Revoke

Seven (7) to two (2) vote to recommend to the Board by the PPC on November 20, 2025.

L. * Kathleen Williams, DPSST No. 43028; Bureau of Emergency Communications – No Action

Unanimous vote to recommend to the Board by the TPC on November 5, 2025.

M. * Committee Appointments

Police Policy Committee

- Anel Ceric – Non-Management Law Enforcement. Re-appointment to the PPC, 2nd term effective January 25, 2026.
 - Michelle Duncan – Oregon State Sheriff's Association. Re-appointment to the PPC, 2nd term effective January 25, 2026.
 - Warren Hensman – Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police. Appointment to the PPC, 1st term effective January 22, 2026.
- *Member Daniel motioned to approve the Criminal Justice Consent Agenda, items A-L, as presented. Member Fletcher seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call and the motion was passed unanimously by the Board.*
 - *Member Carriger motioned to approve the Criminal Justice Consent Agenda, item M, as presented. Member Cameron seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call and the motion was passed unanimously by the Board.*

5. Private Security/Investigator Policy Committee

a. Private Security Investigator Policy Committee Update – Dan Lenzen, Chair

- *Chair Lenzen reported that the Private Security/Investigators Policy Committee (PSIPC), held a regularly scheduled meeting on November 18, 2025, where the committee reviewed and approved a proposed rule change related to emergency suspensions. The Private Investigator Sub-Committee also met on this day and reviewed one (1) case relating to a Private Investigator applicant. The committee's*

- determination will be reviewed at the next regularly scheduled PSIPC meeting scheduled for February 17, 2025.*
- *The HB2183 Workgroup, which requires DPSST to recognize prior law enforcement experience for meeting training requirements for the Private Security Professional Certification, also concluded on November 20, 2025. The program has drafted administrative rules which will be presented at the next meeting.*
 - *Finally, Chair Lenzen acknowledged Ken Berg and Alex Stone for their service as expiring members, and thanked them for their continuous input and support. Brief program updates also included compliance and training statistics, staffing changes, curriculum and website updates, and progress made on a new database project, which will likely result in a fee increase.*

b. *Consent Agenda (The following to be ratified by one vote).

A. *Proposed Rule Changes for Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 259-060-0120, 259-060-0135, 259-060-0136, 259-060-0300, 259-060-0310, 259-060-0320, and 259-060-0380

Related to Emergency Suspension

- *Chair Coddling motioned to approve the Private Security/Investigators Policy Committee Consent Agenda, item A, as presented. Member Johnson seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call and the motion was passed unanimously by the Board.*

6. BPSST Recommendations (The following items to be ratified by one vote each).

a. Advisory Discussion of Upcoming Changes to the Basic Police Program

Training Division Director, Chris Enquist, stated that this item is a housekeeping action on the Basic Police curriculum. In 2019, DPSST had phased implementation changes for Basic Police, which set several things in motion. Following this, DPSST created a 60-person class template, whereby several things happened within the curriculum during this time.

The first item on the memo is active threat, and it is a good example to focus on in order to visualize what all the changes will look like. During the phased implementation period, DPSST implemented the skills lab curriculum within Basic Police, which consisted of ten (10) hours of curriculum focused on multi-disciplinary offerings to give students the opportunity to apply skills from multiple training tracks in one venue.

The Board gave DPSST a lot of latitude with what the agency did with these offerings and one of the topics that was specifically selected was active threat. Taking the base curriculum for this topic, DPSST used a skills lab to amplify the intended outcomes because active threat training pulls from several tactical considerations.

DPSST has operated these enough times that it thinks it would do better to be more transparent with the curriculum and allot hours to active threat by title. There will still be the same amount of hours, goals, and outcomes that have been previously established, and DPSST is simply transferring the delivery from the silo of skills lab over to active threat. Members can see

that there is a 4-hour transfer of the active threat session, and at the bottom of the slate, the skills lab is reduced by the same amount of hours.

There are several other changes within the document, some related to reconceptualizing lab sessions, versus curriculum delivery in a classroom setting. This document is therefore the Training Division's offer to BPSST members to provide any comments or questions since there are a lot of impacted topics to discuss. All of the proposed changes adhere to previously approved Board goals and outcomes.

- *Training Division Director Enquist invited BPSST members to ask questions about the information presented herein, of which there were none.*

b. *Approval to Study Implementation of Fee Schedule for Registration to Regional Training Courses

Training Director Enquist noted that there are two proposed fee schedules and began by offering a general overview of both. The first fee schedule is for regional and fee schedule concepts are challenging to say the least. Staff have taken this seriously since this is not DPSST's first time brushing up against this concept, particularly on the use of campus facilities. Every time DPSST has considered this idea, however, its focus has been on what the impact to constituents is, i.e. what does this do to the people who utilize our facilities and services?

There are two very different drivers for each proposed schedule despite the similarities inherent in each of the memos being presented today. Beginning with regional, this is limited to the law-enforcement facing Criminal Justice Regional Program and as members may know, the regional team delivers training across the state, often in remote areas.

DPSST has seen an uptick in issues revolving around no-shows. For example, if a handgun instructor program is run in Enterprise or an EVOK Instructor Program at Bachelor, those are remote trainings and often have a substantial waitlist of individuals looking to register. If staff run a handgun instructor course that's rostered at 12, they will be sitting on 8 or 10 people waitlisted for that course.

Over the last two years, we've seen a gradual increase in these no-shows, resulting in a significant operational impediment for DPSST if it is running said handgun program in Enterprise with staff already committed to being there. When learners fail to present on Day 1, it's not like DPSST can pull people off the wait list and get them there, and it's also not feasible to downsize staff for the program and run it thinner. Instructors already have assignments, and leads are already in place.

Fortunately, DPSST considered alternatives for this. The first alternative that was considered is a deposit model. It seems that this would be a way to solve this discrepancy. Director Enquist stated his willingness to discuss this. The biggest barrier that was seen with this option was the administrative cost for both DPSST staff and local agencies when transferring an amount of money, holding it as a deposit, and then returning it to the agency when students attend.

The Board is considering an approval to simply study this concept for the moment. The draft fee schedule is representative of what DPSST is thinking, generally, a nominal fee. A classroom training session would be a \$50 registration fee, while a skills training session would be a \$100 registration fee. These are not the types of fees that would ever come close to recovering the cost of our services, but the ultimate hope is that they will serve as some kind of speed bump to those no-shows.

The document also lays out a conceptual waiver process for hardship. The best example for a past precedent in this regard is that approximately 3 years ago DPSST changed its practice from when it used to provide ammunition to all students who attended its programs. At the time, the process was changed to implement the expectation that local agencies must provide the training ammunition. If there were any jurisdictions experiencing financial hardship in having to procure the 1,200 rounds of required ammunition, then agencies had to submit a memo for DPSST's review in order to consider a variance to this rule.

The approval action on this item would allow DPSST to proceed with a more formal study of this fee schedule, and members were encouraged to provide feedback on the ideas presented here. Constituent feedback on the study will also be considered to determine any impacts as well.

- *Member Ruiz-Temple asked if this study implementation is exclusive to law-enforcement, to which Director Enquist answered yes. Member Ruiz-Temple expressed her gratitude, regardless of discipline, on addressing this issue in our most rural communities.*
- *Member Johnson motioned to approve a study to implement a regional fee schedule, as presented. Member Daniel seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call and the motion was passed unanimously by the Board.*

c. *Approval to Study Implementation of Fee Schedule for Use of DPSST Facilities

Training Division Director Enquist introduced the second fee schedule study implementation, this time campus-facing. The process would be the same as the one for regional but the driver on this is very different. External use of the campus remains very high among constituent agencies. Moreover, this will again be for criminal justice agencies, the law-enforcement side of training.

When an external agency uses the campus, they do so under an agreement. If they cause any immediate damage while training, there is a process in place that transfers liability and recoups costs. What DPSST is now seeing though is all the small wear and tear. The best example of this would be the use of the track. If an agency is using the track and they wreck a car, or damage it with a lane change, this is very easy for DPSST to recover. However, as we approach a point where the track must be resurfaced, DPSST is not recovering anything with that ongoing use. This extends into the Village, classrooms, the defensive tactics building, etc.

The same issues arise as with the regional fee schedule and DPSST staff understand the impacts. The draft fee usage laid out here is relatively conservative, with classroom and storage fees being \$50 per day of use, but gets more significant when utilizing the skills training venue, \$100 per day, and the EVO Track, \$250 per day, due to tactical equipment maintenance and more substantial upkeep in general.

Just like with regional, DPSST would lay out a process for a hardship waiver, but there is also a conceptual process to exempt agencies that have a standing with DPSST like an inter-government or an Interagency Agreement. The idea is that agencies would work to establish an agreement and there will be a pathway for entities to be exempted from these fees. If agencies are already in agreement, then DPSST would see a remuneration or in-kind reimbursement in terms of loaned instructors, or use of facilities through this process. We currently have this agreement in place with several other state agencies.

Additionally, this fee schedule would fall onto entities that choose to use the campus on a very sporadic basis. All law enforcement agencies are different, with some using DPSST

facilities on a monthly basis, and others only utilizing training spaces once a year. Over time, the fees would likely subset the sporadic use described above, while the entities that make routine use of facilities will hopefully see the value of entering into a formal IGA or IAA agreement with DPSST to resolve the issue. Overall, this study is a well-intended effort to try and recover some of the costs that come from wear and tear.

- *Director Phil Castle thanked Training Division Director Enquist for his presentation. Director Castle began by stating how DPSST is the largest state training facility in the country, soon to be eclipsed by Tennessee, but it is also a 20-year-old facility requiring maintenance to match its age. As a result, like any state agency, DPSST is challenged by budgetary concerns, now more than ever, and the track is of greatest concern. It must be resurfaced and this task is very expensive, with DPSST needing a rough estimate of \$12 million in funds required for upgrades and fixes. For reference, DPSST only has \$3.2 million to work with this biennium, so the agency must take measures to ensure peak operability. This would entail support from individual agencies through agency loans, etc., and this tradition is important to revive at the present moment.*
- *Member Jones asked who the aforementioned “entities” were that DPSST was referring to.*
- *Director Enquist replied that this term has a wide gamut, and typically any of the traditional law enforcement agencies such as local police and sheriff departments see wide use of DPSST facilities. The definition also extends to other less common entities, such as judicial marshals, who facilitate a one-week training every year focused on giving local correctional deputies experience and training related to courtroom security and prisoner transport. These are areas that are not covered in the Basic Academy, largely because this resource exists, but this is a specific entity that pulls a week or two of facility use on an annual basis versus municipalities that sometimes book the track ten weekends out of a three-month period, to highlight an example.*
- *Member Reese inquired about the funding mechanism for this proposed study. Is DPSST looking at a capital account, and would such an account be carried over each biennium so that money is not lost to the General Fund or going to routine expenses, instead of directly funding facility maintenance?*
- *Director Enquist referred back to the regional fee collection and how this mechanism will likely provide funding that would be utilized operationally within the fiscal cycle, whereas the DPSST facilities fee schedule is funding that would be viewed to solve the problem that Director Castle described in the future. This fee collection will not solve a \$6 million budget gap, but talking with Business Services, depending on how it is structured the money would wrap to Facilities and move into some type of accounting structure that would roll over.*
- *Chair Codding inquired about the timeline of implementation. Would entities be given time to prepare for this change within their own budgets if it is significant enough?*
- *Director Enquist replied that DPSST would look towards the study for guidance on this question. The current timeline is slated for the next biennium, but DPSST has reason to believe that most entities will want a grace period to prepare for the*

- forthcoming changes. Formally, DPSST would wait to conduct the study to connect with constituents to gather feedback and most likely realize a phased implementation.*
- *Member Cameron stated that if fees are started and the account in question is filled, sometimes the monies that were guaranteed now can be cut back with the possession of this second account and this should be considered.*
 - *Member Cameron then asked if DPSST will potentially receive less money in the future through the channels where funding is currently available because it will start charging fees for use to other agencies.*
 - *Director Enquist replied that there is certainly a risk regarding this point, but with both collection schedules presented here, the last biennium cycle had 1,900 training events hosted on campus, which is hard to break down since some of the requests are for several days. If one does the math, the fees will accumulate into a potentially sizeable pot of money, but it cannot balance the current budget discrepancy. It is likely that this amount will be expended in each fiscal cycle, likely on smaller fixes, to free the current budget for bigger fixes.*
 - *Member Ruiz-Temple addressed Member Cameron's point, and stated that since DPSST has dedicated funding, the ability to secure General Funding can fluctuate. Although this does happen to an agency that has dedicated funding, it is important to note that DPSST is attempting to recoup the budgetary gap caused by wear and tear. From a fire perspective, this could have future implications based on how DPSST looks at this. When one looks at implementing fees, being real with constituents about what the gap and need is that the schedule is attempting to resolve is important.*
 - *Member Carriger motioned to approve a study to implement a fee schedule for DPSST Facilities, as presented. Member Johnson seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call and the motion was passed unanimously by the Board.*

d. *Proposed Rule Changes for Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 259-008-0001
Recommended Repeal

Legislative and Rules Coordinator, Jennifer Howald, explained that DPSST adopted OAR 259-008-0001, titled "Board and Department Policies for the Impacts of COVID-19," in 2020. This rule was adopted to address some of the longer-term impacts that the COVID-19 Emergency was having on maintenance requirements and other minimum standards for corrections officers, emergency medical dispatchers, parole and probation officers, police officers, regulatory specialists, and telecommunicators.

The rule directed DPSST to exercise discretion where permissible through statute and rule. The key component of this was that the rule allowed DPSST to postpone punitive enforcement actions such as suspending an officer's certification when maintenance training was late because of the impacts from the state of emergency. The rule also included expiration dates for the discretionary authority.

As a result, DPSST recommends repealing OAR 259-008-0001. The action to repeal the rule will delete the rule entirely. Repealing this rule aligns with DPSST's ongoing efforts to ensure that administrative rules reflect current operational needs and statutory authority. The State of Oregon is no longer operating under a COVID-19 Emergency status and DPSST's discretionary authority under the rule has expired based on the expiration dates included in the rule.

DPSST has removed COVID-19 provisions from the other rule divisions for Fire and Private Security. Repealing the rule does not have a fiscal impact. If the Board votes to approve the repeal of the rule, DPSST will submit the proposed rule change to the Secretary of State followed by a public comment period.

If no substantive comments are received, DPSST will complete the permanent rule change of repealing the rule. If substantive comments are received, the proposed rule change may be resubmitted to the Board for further consideration.

- *Member Daniel motioned to approve the proposed rule changes for Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 259-008-0001, as presented. Member Willits seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call and the motion was passed by the Board with fourteen (14) votes in favor and one (1) abstention.*
- e. ***Proposed Rule Changes for Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 259-030-0005 Relating to the Authority of the Director of the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training**

Legislative and Rules Coordinator, Jennifer Howald, began this point by stating that DPSST is a state agency and is responsible for the operation of the Oregon Public Safety Academy. The Academy is a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week residential training facility that serves public safety professionals from across the state. Similarly, the Director is the administrative head of the agency.

Last year, DPSST identified a need to clarify and reinforce the Director's existing authorities for managing safety, security, and operational decisions, particularly in response to emergencies, adverse weather, or other urgent circumstances. To address this, DPSST initiated rulemaking to adopt a rule that would formalize and reinforce the Director's existing authorities to implement policies, procedures, and directives that support the safe and effective operation of the Academy and training activities.

OAR 259-030-0005 would be adopted as a new administrative rule. The rule text was included in the materials under review today, and it draws from statutory language that provides additional scope and meaning to the phrase "administration and management of the agency."

On August 27, 2025, DPSST requested approval from the Board's Executive Committee to adopt OAR 259-030-0005 as a Temporary Rule and to initiate permanent rulemaking by filing the rule as a Proposed Rule Change. The Executive Committee consequently approved both actions. As a result, DPSST filed the Temporary Rule right away and will expire on February 22, 2026, if the rule is not adopted as a Permanent Rule.

DPSST filed the Proposed Rule Change in September 2025 to initiate the permanent rulemaking process. The public comment period was open from September 2, 2025, through October 31, 2025, and included an opportunity for a public hearing that was held on October 22, 2025. DPSST did not receive any further written or oral comments.

It is important to note that adopting the rule does not have a fiscal impact. DPSST subsequently recommends adoption of OAR 259-030-0005 as a Permanent Rule. If the Board votes to approve the adoption of OAR 259-030-0005, DPSST will complete the last step of permanent rulemaking, filing the Permanent Rule Change to be effective on or before February 22, 2026, to replace the Temporary Rule before it expires.

- *Chair Coddling motioned to approve the proposed rule changes for Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 259-030-0005, as presented. Member Daniel seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call and the motion was passed unanimously by the Board.*

f. *Workgroup/Rules Advisory Committee Request

Related to Law Enforcement Officer Certification Maintenance Requirements Per OAR 259-008-0065

DPSST sought the Board's approval to form discipline specific workgroups to review the law enforcement officer maintenance training requirements found in OAR 259-008-0065. The Board materials provided an overview of the current maintenance training requirements for police officers, corrections officers, parole and probation officers, and OLCC regulatory specialists.

DPSST identified several factors that elevate the need for a timely review of these standards as follows:

- The standards and processes have not been reviewed in their entirety since 2015.
- The combination of annual requirements within the three-year requirement results in a significant amount of administrative work for the Department.
- OAR 259-008-0065 needs to be amended to reflect the maintenance training requirements for parole and probation officers which must include training in providing trauma-informed care, culturally specific services and de-escalation techniques per Senate Bill 1510 (2022).
- DPSST reviewed the maintenance changes that would be needed for parole and probation officers with the Corrections and Police Policy Committees in 2022. At that time the committees found value in the training topics but discussed how the addition of more designated training topics would make an already complex requirement more challenging and would also limit the hours that are currently available to use for agency specific training priorities.

Each workgroup would be asked to review the existing standards, and either affirm the current standards or recommend discipline-appropriate changes. The recommendations would then be presented to the Corrections and Police Policy Committees for consideration. Any changes to the existing standards would be completed through the rulemaking process, including opportunity for public comment and Board approval before final adoption.

- *Member Cameron asked how DPSST determines a workgroup's formation.*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that DPSST typically announces the formation of a workgroup, whereby potential applicants submit an application of interest. Members of the Corrections and Police Policy Committees are welcome to volunteer for these committees as well. DPSST also prioritizes representation from several stakeholders including large agencies, small agencies, regional, etc.*
- *Member Reese motioned to approve the DPSST Rules Advisory Workgroup Committee, as requested. Member Carriger seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call and the motion was passed unanimously by the Board.*

g. *Imposition of Civil Penalties – House Bill 2527

Professional Standards Division Director, Marie Atwood, relayed to the Board that DPSST sought to impose civil penalties on private security entities for lack of compliance under House Bill 2527 and Senate Bill 300. Director Atwood similarly clarified the Board's authority to impose the civil penalties presented in this agenda accordingly. The Board had the opportunity to review the entities in question, who have had ample opportunity to provide mitigation, along with pertinent justification from DPSST for imposing these penalties. DPSST notes that it does not take such penalties lightly.

- *Member Jones asked how many private security entities there are in Oregon.*
- *Michael Holsapple replied that there are approximately 500 active private security entities in the State of Oregon.*
- *Member Willits motioned to approve the Imposition of Civil Penalties under House Bill 2527, as presented. Chair Codding seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call and the motion was passed unanimously by the Board.*

h. *Imposition of Civil Penalties – House Bill 2527/Senate Bill 300

- *Member Daniel motioned to approve the Imposition of Civil Penalties under House Bill 2527 and House Bill 300, as presented. Member Fletcher seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call and the motion was passed unanimously by the Board.*

Agency Updates – Agency Director, Phil Castle

Director Castle began by thanking the Board members for their presence despite their individual workloads outside of Board and Committee responsibilities. Director Castle also thanked DPSST leadership and staff present for their professionalism, specifically noting Director Enquist's endeavors to steward DPSST's budget. This was primarily done by maintaining DPSST's two guiding principles, safety and quality.

The Public Safety Cabinet for the Governor met earlier in the week, and this group consists of other agencies present at the table, such as OSP, OSMF, DOC, etc. Director Castle made special mention that the group was able to meet at the Capitol building for the first time since he started his position. Additionally, all state agencies are anticipating the Economic Forecast on February 4, 2026, which will be published by the State.

The outcome will be used in the budget adjustment decisions made during the Legislative Session in its short session. As a reminder, all agencies were asked to do a 2.5% and 5% cost-cut analysis, which DPSST submitted and now awaits the Legislature. DPSST did a good job of notifying legislators of the potential impact of budgetary cuts since public safety agencies typically run lean. Similarly, DPSST is doing a lot to become as efficient as possible without compromising its guiding principles. Oregon expects quality service derived from this training institution and Professional Standards Division.

The Center for Policing Excellence conducted a study to evaluate whether DPSST is adequately staffed due to the drastic difference in personnel needs the campus requires during its daily operations. This is an inherently difficult question to answer, yet Director Castle is confident that DPSST has done so by determining the balance between how many full-time and

part-time employees are needed. As a result, DPSST is currently equipped with enough full-time employees but needs a greater number of part-time trainers and agency loans to fill in high-volume days.

Having the funding to do this is important, and DPSST is currently funded for 4.5 full-time employees' worth of part-time trainers. By comparison, DPSST utilizes anywhere between 13 to 14 trainers a month on average. As efficient as the agency can be, this number will not be reduced, and the agency has been reallocating money from different areas to afford this discrepancy. Despite this, DPSST is working hard to budget out its programs by calculating class and supplies cost. Director Castle stated that having a strong, transparent cost model to present to the Governor's Office and Legislature during the next long session is imperative to balance DPSST.

Director Castle also recognized the agency partnerships DPSST is currently engaged in, specifically noting the partnership between Chair Codding and the Oregon State Police. For example, the Department of Administrative Services was running short on cars needed for training and it is well known that the cars utilized on the DPSST EVO track suffer heavy wear when in use. DPSST would have been unable to receive the necessary number of cars needed for training in relation to the volume of students present in this situation, but thanks to the agency's partnership with OSP, DPSST was provided with loaner cars to fill this gap.

Director Castle also made special mention of DPSST's fire-prevention partnership with the Department of Corrections, specifically in collaboration with Member Reese, who is the Director of DOC. Thanks to this partnership, the DPSST campus is beautiful and free of wildfire fuel, especially after a near-miss last year when a wildfire developed across the road from the campus. This is in addition to the support received from Member Ruiz-Temple, whom DPSST is grateful for, as well as former DPSST Director, Eriks Gabliks, who continues to lend historical insight to DPSST.

Regarding DPSST staff, Director Castle recognized Fire Training Program Manager, Kayla Ballrot, who was invited to explain to the Board members of a ladder-truck training to be done on campus next week in partnership with Gresham Fire. The 4-day training will primarily take place in the Village and other areas around campus where professionals will practice aerial ladder extensions of different sizes. Director Castle added that DPSST welcomes the sight of fire service personnel on campus.

Furthermore, Director Castle notified the Board of the employee engagement survey conducted and mandated for all state agencies. DPSST was a top performer last year in terms of employee satisfaction, and although this remains true, the agency did see a reduction of overall employee satisfaction. Director Castle largely attributes this drop to budgetary stress and leadership changes felt by staff and reiterated DPSST's commitment to safety and quality.

These factors rely on proper equipment and training, and Director Castle reassured the Board that DPSST's Executive Leadership team has developed plans to address this shortfall and improve the agency's survey score next year. This outcome will also receive direct feedback from staff during the Director's weekly "Coffee Talks." Director Castle then invited Deputy Director McAlpine to address the Board, whereby she emphasized the topic of agency loans and DPSST's intention to clearly explain what its needs are during outreach.

During 2024-25, DPSST utilized approximately 25,000 hours from part-time employees working on campus, mostly in the skills venues or other subject-matter areas requiring specialized expertise. The total cost of this endeavor was \$1.5 million, and in order for DPSST to reduce its overtime use with an increased number of APT hours, the agency must reach out to its

constituents on the Criminal Justice side of the field to determine if agencies are managing to be fully staffed and able to bring in agency loans.

Deputy Director McAlpine cited her experience with agency loans at Tigard Police, where she sent a firearms expert to work at another department and subsequently implemented the firearms training received by the loaned employee in question upon their return. In all, this collaboration serves to develop a relationship between DPSST and the home agency in terms of relevant trainings. Deputy Director McAlpine then invited the Board members to remain vigilant of DPSST's requests for agency loans in the near future, and hopefully free up subject matter experts in anticipation of this request.

Professional Standards Division Director, Marie Atwood, advised Board members of the upcoming Director's Evaluation survey, which is anticipated for release in February and also took a moment to thank Board members and staff present for their time and effort.

Director Atwood mentioned a retrospective meeting done with the DPSST Criminal Justice team to evaluate a workload comparison between 2024 and 2025 where they found that the team processed approximately 2,000 certifications in 2025, while the number of cases opened for professional standards violations increased by 15-20%. This increase parallels a similar increase in the number of cases heard by today's Board, denials and revocations, as well as administrative hearings sourced out to DOJ.

Moreover, Director Atwood pointed out the 5-Year Update reports at the end of the Board materials that DPSST had to file with the Legislature at the end of 2025. This largely involved an overview of changes or implementations of new Administrative Rules within the last five years and how these changes have progressed in that time. Director Atwood also warned Board member about the substantial rule changes related to moral fitness standards that will be presented at the next round of policy committee meetings in May.

- *Member Lenzen asked Director Castle how many individuals are represented in a count of 14 full-time employees converted into part-time.*
- *Director Castle replied that this is a cumulative number since each part-time employee works very different sets of hours in a month depending on revolving needs and overlapping schedules. Deputy Director McAlpine added that when this number was calculated in the previous month, there were 79 different personnel, not including role-players.*
- *Member Reese asked whether DPSST is aware of any bills in the upcoming short session that will have an impact on the agency, whose Board members should be tracking as advocates for the agency.*
- *Director Castle replied that he is not aware of any bills that will have a significant impact on DPSST at the moment.*
- *Chair Coddling commented that the increase in moral fitness cases described by Director Atwood is not reflected in an increase in the number of full-time employees in public safety. Chair Coddling urged fellow members to analyze this data to determine why this is the case since the data should be theoretically trending in the opposite direction.*
- *Member Fletcher commented that he frequently reminds the telecommunications community that the State of Oregon holds individuals accountable despite the present political moment and any potential narratives that question the level of training of public safety professionals.*

- *Director Atwood concurred with member Fletcher's opinion, and added that the standards DPSST holds public safety professionals to in Oregon are a reflection of why the Criminal Justice compliance team is seeing a higher level of processed cases despite fewer resources. This is apart from an initial backlog of cases that has recently been cleared.*
- *Deputy Director McAlpine mentioned Director Atwood's annual report on action taken against law enforcement that will identify trends. This was a report that the Boards and Committees on Public Safety Standards and Training wished to see and it will be provided along with the results this year.*
- *Member Jones opined that he has personally witnessed constituents' surprise when informed on the work that the Boards and Policy Committees on Public Safety Standards and Training accomplish and believes that DPSST could do more to bring awareness on the work being done by these groups.*
- *Chair Coddling thanked everyone for their time and for making public safety a better entity in the State.*

8. Next Meeting Date: April 23, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.

- *With no further items or questions to discuss, Chair Coddling adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:41 a.m.*

Administrative Note:

These minutes reflect the order of the discussion/voting items as they appear on the official meeting agenda. The actual order in which they were discussed may vary.