

**Telecommunications Policy Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**April 15, 2008**

The Telecommunications Policy Committee of the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training held a special meeting on April 15, 2008 at the Oregon Public Safety Academy in Salem, Oregon. Chair Eric Swanson called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

**Attendees**

**Committee Members:**

Eric Swanson, Public Safety Telecommunicators, Chair  
Jennifer Brinlee, Public Safety Telecommunicators  
Bob Cozzie, Association of Public Safety Communications Officers  
Elizabeth Morgan, Emergency Medical Services and Trauma Systems  
James Rentz, Oregon State Police - teleconference  
LeAnne Senger, Public Safety Telecommunicators  
Tamara Atkinson, Association of Public Safety Communications Officers

**Committee Members Absent:**

Tom Clemo, Oregon Fire Chiefs Association  
Jack Jones, Oregon State Sheriffs' Association  
Chris Benson, Oregon Fire Medical Administrators' Association  
Brian Casey, Oregon Association Chiefs of Police

**Guests:**

Janis Cameron, Yamhill Communications

**DPSST Staff:**

Eriks Gabliks, Deputy Director  
Marilyn Lorance, Standards and Certification Supervisor  
Carolyn Kendrick, Administrative Assistant



1. **OAR 259-008-0060(9)(d) Proposed Changes**

Training Credit

Presented by Marilyn Lorance

*See Appendix A for details.*

*Several committee members agreed that instructors should receive credit for hours taught as if they were participating in that class. After much discussion, the committee agreed that capping the number of instructor hours that could apply towards the Telecommunications/EMD maintenance requirement should be implemented. Staff agreed to bring a discipline-specific rule back to the committee addressing what could be counted towards maintenance training. The committee agreed this was necessary prior to moving on the written language of OAR 259-008-0060(9)(d).*

- **ACTION ITEM #1** Determine whether to recommend filing the proposed language for OAR 259-008-0060(9)(d) with the Secretary of State as a proposed rule.
- **ACTION ITEM #2** Determine whether to recommend filing the proposed language for OAR 259-008-0060(9)(d) with the Secretary of State as a permanent rule if no comments are received.

*Elizabeth Morgan moved to recommend filing the proposed language for OAR 259-008-0060(9)(d) with the Secretary of State as a proposed rule and as a permanent rule if no comments are received. Bob Cozzie seconded the motion. The motion carried by all participating.*

- **ACTION ITEM #3** Determine whether there is a significant fiscal impact on small businesses.

*It is the consensus of the committee that there is no significant fiscal impact on small businesses.*

*The next regularly scheduled Telecommunications Policy Committee meeting is May 1, 2008 at 10:00 a.m.*

*With no further business before the Committee, the meeting adjourned at 10:44 a.m.*

## Appendix A

**DATE:** March 19, 2008

**TO:** Telecommunications Policy Committee

**FROM:** Marilyn Lorance  
Standards & Certification Program Supervisor

**SUBJECT:** Proposed Changes to OAR 259-008-0060(9)(d)

### **Background:**

Since approximately 2004, DPSST has been adding “Instructed” hours to officer training records when instructors are identified on F-6 Attendance Rosters. In addition, current DPSST rules provide for instructors to receive “passed” credit once each year for each course that they instruct. This provision has been included in the agency’s administrative rules since at least 1984, and has remained unchanged since that time.

### **Issue:**

DPSST has identified two concerns with continuing this traditional practice.

1. As we worked with constituents to develop the current standardized course list, and to walk through the first maintenance training period for police officers, a number of constituents expressed concern with giving “passed” credit to instructors for instructional hours. It is quite possible for some training officers to meet all maintenance training requirements simply by instructing sufficient hours, without ever participating in training themselves. Many constituents have stated that training attended and training instructed should not be considered interchangeable. Some noted that it is critical for public safety trainers/instructors to attend sufficient training to ensure that the knowledge and skills they pass on are at the level they should be.
2. We were able to implement the provisions of the current rule with our current database system using a “band-aid” approach that required significant “work-around” processes. These processes are not fool-proof; in fact, problems related to these “work-arounds” contributed to the delays in sending out the initial and final 2006 police maintenance deficiency reports to agencies.

We are currently preparing to migrate all officer records to the same Internet-based program we acquired to manage venue scheduling and training at the Academy. We can continue to track “instructed” as well as “passed” hours in our new system, as we do in our current system. However, vendors and staff are both concerned about transferring technology problems and “work-arounds,” associated with granting both “instructed” and “passed” credit for the same classes, into the new system, unless there is a substantive business need to do so.

This item was first discussed with the Telecommunications Policy Committee at its February 7, 2008 meeting. Committee members concurred with the issues raised but also identified concerns about possible effects of elimination of “passed” credit for instructional hours in some

circumstances. Liz Morgan discussed an approach being taken by EMS, i.e., allowing a defined percentage of “instructed” hours to be credited in each maintenance period.

After discussion, members requested staff to consider the feasibility of alternative approaches and to include the issues raised by the Committee when this agenda item was brought forward at the upcoming meetings of the Corrections and Police Policy Committees.

**Update:**

Following the Telecommunications Policy Committee meeting, staff reviewed the proposed EMS rules implementing a defined percentage approach to granting passed credit for instructional hours. Training records staff noted that this approach would in many cases result in a significant increase in the number of “passed” hours added to an individual’s training record, as many individuals instruct in multiple subjects many times each year. This approach would also make it difficult to assign the appropriate number of hours by training category (i.e., general training, firearms/use of force, leadership, First Aid/CPR).

On February 12, 2008, the matter was raised for discussion by the Police Policy Committee. On February 29, 2008, the matter was raised for discussion by the Corrections Policy Committee. After discussion of the topic, including the concerns and alternatives discussed by the Telecommunications Policy Committee, both committees concluded that training instructed and training received should not be considered equivalent. After ensuring that instructed hours would continue to be tracked in their own category, the Police and Corrections Policy Committees voted to recommend that the rule change be published as a proposed rule, and as a permanent rule if no comments were received.

**Request:**

DPSST staff requests discussion and recommendation by Committee members regarding whether individuals should continue to receive “passed” credit for courses that they instruct. The change proposed in the attached rule language would remove this option from our administrative rules.

**ACTION ITEM 1:** Determine whether to recommend filing the proposed language for OAR 259-008-0060(9)(d) with the Secretary of State as a proposed rule.

**ACTION ITEM 2:** Determine whether to recommend filing the proposed language for OAR 259-008-0060(9)(d) with the Secretary of State as a permanent rule if no comments are received.

**ACTION ITEM 3:** Determine whether there is a significant fiscal impact on small businesses. (see form attached)

**259-008-0060**

**Public Safety Officer Certification**

(9) Training Points. Twenty (20) classroom hours of job-related training approved by the Department shall equal one (1) training point. (Example: 200 training hours equal 10 training points.)

\* \* \*

~~(d) With proper documentation, instructors may claim course completion for law enforcement classes instructed. Training points for repeat instruction of the same class within a 12-month period shall not be awarded.~~

(e) **d** Upon receipt of documentation which shall include the source, syllabus, number of hours, dates and successful completion of the course, the Department or its designated staff may award training points for correspondence courses.

(f) **e** College credits earned may be counted for either training points or education credits, whichever is to the advantage of the applicant.

FISCAL IMPACT WORK STATEMENT  
PURSUANT TO HB 3238 (2005)

On January 1, 2006, ORS 183.333 was amended pursuant to HB 3238. This new legislation adopted a state policy requiring state agencies to seek public input, to the maximum extent possible, prior to giving notice of intent to adopt a rule.

DPSST is now required to seek advisory committee's recommendation on whether a rule will have a fiscal impact, what the extent of that impact will be and whether the rule will have a significant adverse impact on small businesses.

If the Committee determines the rule will have a significant adverse impact on small businesses, the Department will seek the Committee's recommendation on compliance with ORS 183.540:

**183.540 Reduction of economic impact on small business.** If the economic effect analysis shows that the rule has a significant adverse effect upon small business, to the extent consistent with the public health and safety purpose of the rule, the agency shall reduce the economic impact of the rule on small business by:

- (1) Establishing differing compliance or reporting requirements or time tables for small business;
- (2) Clarifying, consolidating or simplifying the compliance and reporting requirements under the rule for small business;
- (3) Utilizing objective criteria for standards;
- (4) Exempting small businesses from any or all requirements of the rule; or
- (5) Otherwise establishing less intrusive or less costly alternatives applicable to small business.

Please use the following guideline in determining whether the proposed amendments will have a fiscal impact on small businesses:
--

- 1) Are there any state agencies, unit of local governments or the public which may be economically affected by the amendment of this rule? If yes, please identify:

---

---

---

---

- 2) Is there any cost associated with compliance with the amended rule? If yes, please identify:

---

---

---

---