

Police Policy Committee Meeting Minutes May 21, 2026

The Police Policy Committee of the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training held a regular meeting on May 21, 2026, at the Oregon Public Safety Academy in Salem, Oregon. Chair Scotty Nowning called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Committee Members:

Scotty Nowning, Chair, Non-Management Law Enforcement
Casey Coddling, Vice Chair, Superintendent, Oregon State Police
Mark Daniel, Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police
Michelle Duncan, Oregon State Sheriff's Association – (Teams)
Warren Hensman, Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police
Teresa Livingston, OSP Command Staff Representative
Patricia Lofgren, Public Member
Sam Willits, Non-Management Law Enforcement
Rob Wood, Public Member

Committee Members Absent:

Anel Ceric, Non-Management Law Enforcement
Brian Hughes, Portland Police Bureau (Designee for Chief Bob Day)
Doug Olson, SAC

Guests:

DPSST Staff:

Kathy McAlpine, Deputy Director – (Teams)
Marie Atwood, Professional Standards Division Director
Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Cindy Park, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Victor Sanchez, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Jennifer Howald, Administrative Rules Coordinator
Sam Tenney, Public Information Officer
Juan Lopez-Hernandez, Executive Support Specialist



1. Introductions

Introductions of members, guests and staff.

2. Approve February 19, 2026 Meeting Minutes

A consensus was reached to approve the February 19, 2025, meeting minutes as written.

3. Administrative Closure Consent Agenda

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

The Department presented recommendations to administratively close the following professional standards cases to the Police Policy Committee.

a) Jonathon Anderson, DPSST No. 64195; Police

The Department opened a professional standards case after Jonathon Anderson reported he was criminally charged with Menacing, a misdemeanor charge, on October 21, 2024. Anderson resigned from his position with the St. Helens Police Department (SHPD) on October 28, 2024. At the time of Anderson's charge and separation, he had not completed the steps necessary to obtain certification. The Department deferred the review of Anderson's case until he was reemployed in public safety. On February 10, 2026, Anderson was rehired by the SHPD.

On July 28, 2024, the Hillsboro Police Department responded to a complaint from J.T. who is Anderson's now former wife, reporting an incident occurring in late April or early May, in which she told officers Anderson pointed his department-issued taser at her and activated it. J.T. reported that Anderson also pointed the taser at her daughter and activated it. J.T. told officers that she and her daughter were upstairs, and Anderson was in the kitchen. J.T. brought downstairs a backpack Anderson was taking with him to the Academy. As she came downstairs, she saw Anderson wearing his uniform with his police belt. Anderson drew his taser and pointed it at her, and she saw a red dot on her chest and could hear the taser zapping. After J.T. told Anderson that it was not ok, he re-holstered the taser. When J.T.'s daughter walked downstairs, Anderson unholstered his taser and pointed it at her, and she ran back upstairs to her room. The police report received by the Department does not include statements from Anderson.

On June 24, 2024, J.T., who is Anderson's now former wife, submitted an application for a Restraining Order (RO). The RO lists an incident where Anderson was said to have pointed a taser at J.T. and her daughter and indicates J.T. was admitted to the hospital during a mental health crisis. The RO was initially granted, and Anderson requested a hearing. The RO was dismissed on August 1, 2024. On December 13, 2024, J.T. applied for a Stalking Protective Order against Anderson. The application was denied.

On October 21, 2024, Anderson was criminally charged with Menacing Constituting Domestic Violence, a misdemeanor charge. Charges were updated on July 31, 2025, to include a second charge of Menacing against J.T.'s child. Anderson pled Not Guilty to both charges and was acquitted on September 4, 2025.

On July 31, 2024, the threat of harm against J.T.'s daughter was cross reported to the Department of Human Services (DHS), Child Welfare office, who conducted an assessment which included an interview of J.T.'s daughter. On December 16, 2024, the review concluded "there is some indication that abuse occurred but there is insufficient evidence to conclude there is reasonable cause to believe Anderson is responsible." The review is listed as "Unable to Determine."

The Department sought information from the St. Helens Police Department (SHPD) related to their review of Anderson's criminal charge. The SHPD provided a memo to DPSST summarizing their review during a background investigation to rehire Anderson.

The memo indicates that the SHPD reviewed police reporting of the incident and logs of the taser issued to Anderson. The taser log failed to corroborate the allegation that Anderson activated the taser and noted that the description of the taser in the police reports did not

match the taser that was issued to Anderson. The SHPD background investigation also included a summary of J.T.'s testimony from the criminal trial which indicated that J.T. changed her testimony regarding the event and contradicted her testimony under direct and cross examination.

b) Caleb Yoder, DPSST No. 54967; Police

On October 24, 2025, Caleb Yoder resigned from the Oregon State Police (OSP). At the time of separation, Yoder was under investigation for two separate incidents. One incident involved his use of a state vehicle to attend a job interview with the Oregon Department of Justice (DOJ) while on duty. The second investigation involved the record management of a case. Both investigations had sustained findings, but because of Yoder's resignation, disciplinary action was not imposed or recommended.

On June 18, 2025, an employee with the Oregon Department of Justice (DOJ) reported that Yoder had attended an interview for employment with the DOJ, wearing his OSP badge and firearm, and was believed to be driving an OSP vehicle.

The OSP conducted an investigation into the reported allegations. The sergeant who supervises Yoder was interviewed for the investigation. The sergeant indicated that Yoder did not request leave or adjust his schedule to attend an interview. The sergeant indicated that on the morning of June 18th, he saw Yoder leaving the Portland office, and Yoder told him, "I'm heading to Salem for interviews. I will be back later." Parking lot video reflects that Yoder left at 10:48 am, in a maroon Charger. The sergeant saw Yoder later that afternoon, around 3:00 pm, and asked how the interviews went. Yoder told him, "Good, I think. I guess we will see." Yoder did not provide the sergeant with any further details about what kind of interview he was attending, but the sergeant indicated that it was common for detectives to go out and conduct interviews for cases they are working on in institutions, but that it was rare for detectives to need to go to Salem. The sergeant believed Yoder was in Salem to conduct work-related interviews, likely at the Oregon State Penitentiary.

Yoder participated in an interview for the investigation. Yoder confirmed that he drove his assigned OSP vehicle from Portland to Salem to attend an interview and stated he did not request approval from his chain of command or notify anyone that he was applying for the DOJ position, stating he felt it fell within the lunch policy. Yoder indicated that he was scheduled to interview at 1:00 pm, and the interview lasted approximately 30 minutes. Yoder indicated that he also stopped for lunch before the interviews and did not conduct any other business while in Salem. He initially planned to stop at an office in Salem to collect a phone that was stored in evidence but changed his mind and decided to write a search warrant for the evidence instead.

When asked about his statement to the sergeant about going to Salem for interviews, Yoder was positive that he told the sergeant he was going to Salem for an interview. Yoder believed that it was within policy for him to attend the interview without taking time off because there is a state policy (DAS policy 60.000.10) that provides state employees with special leave time for interviews with the State of Oregon. Yoder indicated that he did not believe he needed to put in for time off because he used his breaks and lunch to cover his absence. He

also expressed concern about requesting the interview leave time because he thought it would send a message that he did not want to work with his coworkers anymore.

After his interview, Yoder logged into “CAD” and was available to be dispatched to calls for service while he drove back to Portland. And Yoder stated he did stop someone for running a red light. Yoder told the investigator that he believed his use of the state vehicle was within state policy (OAR 125-155-0500). Yoder interpreted the policy to allow the use of vehicles for things that were broad, like purchasing food and taking breaks. Yoder believed that because he was using the vehicle during his lunch break, it fell within state policy.

Two allegations were sustained in the investigation: Yoder used the state vehicle for personal use, and Yoder conducted personal business while on duty. The OSP found that Yoder’s use of the vehicle was neither necessary for official state use nor an allowable activity.

A second investigation was conducted regarding Yoder’s handling of a cold case. In 2024, a homicide cold case was assigned to Yoder, but was reassigned after one day when his workload became too high. The case was again reassigned to Yoder in 2025, and his supervisor indicated that he intended for the case to remain assigned to him until he leaves the agency. Yoder’s supervisor instructed him to familiarize himself with the case and begin sending items to the lab for testing. While working on the case, Yoder identified the “smiley face killer”, who is an AIC with the Oregon Department of Corrections (DOC), as a possible suspect and interviewed him.

On April 10, 2025, the Department of Corrections (DOC), Acting Assistant Inspector General, contacted OSP to discuss a letter Yoder had sent to the AIC. The letter was flagged because it was sent on colored paper, and the letter was described as odd. Because the letter was on colored paper, it violated the DOC’s mail policy.

The supervising sergeant discussed the issue with Yoder and told him that “any communication with the AIC should be in person and recorded.” The supervisor did not think the AIC was credible or a legitimate suspect. Yoder then submitted a report, which noted the work he had done on the case, including his interviews with the AIC, and Yoder reassigned the case back to the sergeant. No notes were documented about what Yoder sent for testing, and he did not upload notes or audio recordings of the interview with the AIC into the case evidence. The supervising sergeant approved Yoder’s report but did not realize that he had reassigned the case.

Yoder participated in an interview for the investigation and explained that he typically uploads all documents when he finishes a case, so he controls the order in which they appear. Yoder did not consider the interview with the AIC or the letter he sent to be evidence after his supervisor told him that the AIC was not a viable path to pursue. Yoder stated that, knowing now what occurred, he would enter those items into evidence.

The investigation sustained a finding that Yoder failed to follow proper investigative procedures while conducting an investigation.

After Yoder’s resignation from the Oregon State Police, he was hired by the Canby Police Department.

- *Vice-Chair Codding noted a correction of the name, “Caleb” to include a ‘B’ instead of an ‘N’, as denoted on the consent agenda.*

- *Mark Daniel moved to approve the Administrative Closure Consent Agenda recommendations made by the Department. Vice-Chair Coddling seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

4. Anderson, Tyler, DPSST No. 49648; Police

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

Reason for Discretionary Review

On April 15, 2025, Tyler Anderson was terminated from the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office (JCSO) following an investigation into allegations that he was untruthful during his background applications with the JCSO, Oregon State Police (OSP), and the Madras Police Department (MPD), and had an improper relationship with an informant. Anderson grieved his termination from the JCSO. During arbitration, Anderson and the JCSO reached a settlement agreement, which was signed on February 23, 2026. Anderson's settlement agreement did not amend the status of his termination from the JCSO.

Tyler Anderson provided verbal mitigation for committee consideration and was accompanied by his attorneys.

<i>Police Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
The Police Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors: <i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i> • Dishonesty: Anderson was intentionally dishonest by untruthfulness, omission, deception or misrepresentation when he failed to report his Idaho residence and employment with the Parma, Idaho Police Department on his JCSO background application. Anderson was intentionally dishonest when he omitted from his applications with the OSP and MPD his employment with the Parma Police Department (PPD). Anderson omitted his prior cocaine use from his application with the OSP. Anderson was intentionally dishonest about his communications with EC, stating that he sent her one message on August 1, 2024. • Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify sufficient information to make a finding of misused of authority. • Misconduct: Anderson's Brady determination created an inefficient operation at the Jefferson and Crook County District Attorney's offices and the JCSO, by impacting the ability to prosecute criminal charges. <i>Aggravating Factors:</i> • The conclusion and Brady determination by two District Attorney's offices. • Anderson's polygraph examination report did not include questions about his drug use.			

- Anderson acknowledged that he made mistakes on his application, had the opportunity to provide correct information on future applications, but continued to make the same mistakes.
- Anderson was consistent in the things he would forget or mischaracterize.
- Two witnesses provided the same testimony related to Anderson's statement about packaging drugs, with no motivation for providing the testimony except to provide the truth.
- Anderson left off relevant experience in the profession for which he was seeking employment on job applications.
- Anderson should have included the experience on the applications.
- Anderson stated in verbal mitigation that there was no record of his work experience in Idaho, but DPSST obtained records of his employment in Idaho.
- Anderson stated that he left off his experience in Idaho because the result would have been negative.
- Anderson reported on multiple forms to DPSST that he had not been discharged for cause from a public safety agency.
- The omissions or information not disclosed by Anderson was information that would have stopped the employment process or had a negative impact on the employment process.
- Anderson's contacts with the informant were inappropriate.
- Anderson's explanation about his text messages to the informant does not make sense.

Mitigating Factors:

- Anderson has 17 years of employment as a public safety professional.
- Anderson's verbal mitigation and written letters of recommendation were mitigating.
- Anderson participated in a polygraph examination with positive results.
- Anderson's demeanor in his FBI interview appeared relaxed.

A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.

Vice-Chair Coddling moved that the Police Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.	Mark Daniel	9 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Rob Wood moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board's moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case,	Sam Willits	9 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

that Board action should be taken against Anderson's certifications.			
Michelle Duncan moved, after considering the totality of the case, that Anderson be ineligible to hold public safety certification for a lifetime.	Teresa Livingston	7 ayes; 2 nays	Motion Passed

5. Lizotte, Derek, DPSST No. 61672; Police

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

Reason for Discretionary Review

he Department opened a professional standards case after Derek Lizotte submitted a criminal history reporting form (F28) indicating that he had received a misdemeanor criminal citation for Taking, Angling, Hunting, or Trapping in Violation of Wildlife Law or Rule (Wildlife Violation).

Derek Lizotte provided verbal mitigation for committee consideration along with a representative of Tribal Police.

<i>Police Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
The Police Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors: <i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i> • Dishonesty: The committee did not identify sufficient information to make a finding of dishonesty. • Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify sufficient information to make a finding of misuse of authority. • Misconduct: Lizotte violated criminal law and has a misdemeanor conviction for a Wildlife Violation. <i>Aggravating Factors:</i> • The committee did not identify any aggravating factors. <i>Mitigating Factors:</i> • The letters of support provided were compelling. • Lizotte was forthright and cooperative. • Lizotte's verbal mitigation statement was heartfelt. • Lizotte took ownership of his mistake. • Lizotte's probation was terminated early. • The case stands out amongst other Wildlife Violation cases because Lizotte took ownership and cooperated with the investigation.			

• Lizotte provided law enforcement with everything they needed during their investigation. • Lizotte's mistake was to help a child. • His agency's decision to demote him instead of dismissing him was indicative of his good standing at his agency. • The acting sheriff's letter reflects that the agency supports Lizotte's continued employment as a police officer.			
A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.			
Rob Wood moved that the Police Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.	Scotty Nowning	9 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Teresa Livingston moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board's moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case, that no Board action should be taken against Lizotte's certifications.	Scotty Nowning	9 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

6. Budworth, Corey, DPSST No. 55392; Police

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

Reason for Discretionary Review

On June 15, 2021, Corey Budworth was indicted on criminal charges for Assault in the Fourth Degree. Budworth's indictment stemmed from conduct occurring on August 18, 2020, while working as an officer with the Portland Police Bureau (PPB). Budworth used unjustified force against a photojournalist attending a protest in Portland, by pushing her to the ground and hitting her in the head with his baton while she was seated. On July 7, 2023, through a restorative justice process, the criminal charges against Budworth were dismissed.

Corey Budworth provided verbal mitigation for committee consideration and was accompanied by his attorney.

<i>Police Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			

The Police Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:

Moral Fitness Violations:

- Dishonesty: The Department did not identify sufficient information to make a finding of dishonesty.
- Misuse of Authority: The Department did not identify sufficient information to make a finding of misuse of authority.
- Misconduct: Budworth's conduct physically and emotionally harmed a photojournalist documenting a protest in Portland. Budworth's conduct harmed the City of Portland resulting in a civil lawsuit payment of \$50,000. Budworth's use of force negatively impacted the efficient operations of the PPB by threatening the relationship between the PPB and the community it serves.

Aggravating Factors:

- Budworth's push with his baton did make contact with the photojournalist's head.

Mitigating Factors:

- The contact Budworth made with the photojournalist's head was unintentional.
- There was turmoil at the time in the city; Budworth's actions were understandable.
- The explanation of the tactics used by protestors was mitigating to Budworth's conduct.
- Command staff believed an unarrest had occurred. Although that was not what happened it should be considered.
- Protestors were running at Budworth.
- Protestors were ordered to leave.
- How Budworth conducted himself was mitigating.
- Budworth provided multiple letters of support, including letters from the District Attorney, Chief of Police and peers.
- Budworth's verbal mitigation statement was mitigating.
- Budworth participated in a restorative justice process which was publicly posted.
- Budworth is on the promotion list.
- Budworth has provided a service to the community by serving as a baseball coach.

A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.

Rob Wood moved that the Police Policy Committee negate the moral fitness violation as presented, and that no Board action should be taken against Budworth's certifications after considering the	Michelle Duncan	9 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
---	-----------------	-------------------	---------------------------

Board’s moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case.			
--	--	--	--

7. ***Criminal Justice Fee Implementation**

Presented by Joe Staub, Skills South Training Manager

The agency’s Training Division (TD) requests review and approval of a study to consider the implementation of fees for external partner registration to courses offered by the Criminal Justice Regional Training Program.

Background:

DPSST operates the Oregon Public Safety Academy in Salem, built in 2006 to support mandated basic training for certified public safety professionals. External public safety partners routinely use the campus through a facility use request process that transfers liability for damage and requires adherence to DPSST training and safety policies. Approximately 200 requests are processed each year, resulting in about 1,200 external training events. While DPSST has previously explored cost-recovery models—such as charging for safety officer staffing or implementing facility use fees – these were not adopted due to workforce reductions and recession-era concerns about shifting costs to partner agencies. As campus infrastructure continues to age under heavy use, DPSST remains concerned about long-term facility sustainability since routine wear is not covered under current agreements.

DPSST also administers the Criminal Justice Regional Training Program, which delivers training statewide based on partner needs and emerging practices. In 2025, the program provided 97 training events to roughly 1,200 students. However, last-minute cancellations and no-shows have reduced operational efficiency. Because classes are capacity-limited and often require instructor travel and lodging—especially in remote areas—late withdrawals impede appropriate staffing adjustments and prevent waitlisted professionals from filling open seats. Although many cancellations stem from unavoidable local factors such as staffing shortages or court obligations, these challenges persist. DPSST’s review of comparable organizations in other states shows that most charge registration fees for non-mandated training, presenting a potential model for improving efficiency and cost management.

In December 2025, the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training approved a study of criminal justice fees. The Board directed DPSST to present the findings of this study to each policy committee for endorsement prior to returning to the Board for final review in July of 2026.

DPSST has concluded this study which is summarized in attached documents. A component of this study was the completion of a survey of constituents. This survey gathered mixed feedback from constituents on the concept, with many constituents articulating dissatisfaction with the concept of fees for existing services while many of the same respondents simultaneously concurred with DPSST’s need to consider fee imposition.

- Chair Nowning asked if it is correct that the survey demonstrated that 50 (%) percent of respondents opposed the fees and whether this was in response to all of the fees in question.
- Joe Staub replied that yes, roughly 50 (%) percent of respondents were concerned about financial hardship and indicated taking a waiver route.
- Chair Nowning stated that there are many organizations who charge for training, and many agencies use DPSST for training that is free so these fees are concerning.
- Professional Standards Division Manager, Marie Atwood, asked if Chair Nowning was referring to the on-campus usage fee or the regional fee.
- Chair Nowning answered that he is referring to both.
- Director Atwood stated that DPSST's trainings are still free, and that these fees will only apply to external agencies who have training purposes that fall outside of the Department's scope.
- Chair Nowning replied that this is correct, but commented that he is referring to local agencies primarily.
- Member Wood commented that as a non-sworn trainer working for the regional training team, it is frustrating when a class is organized and it must be limited due to safety-instructor to student ratios. There is always a waiting list, often 400-500 people, and relayed his own experience with last minute cancellations. Member Wood personally opined that the late fees are not aggressive enough and asked if a refundable deposit can be implemented into the process.
- Joe Staub replied that this idea was discussed, it did not appear in the version presented before the Policy Committees. This could certainly be reviewed further, yet there is no deposits or upfront fees, only a fee for withdrawing at the last minute.
- Chair Nowning commented that this is reasonable.
- Director Atwood added that she was involved in these conversation, and that many concerns are due to a lack of a logistical mechanism for paying fees. This is the simplest way to incentivize a commitment to attend a class.
- Member Hensman noted his support for the fees due to the wear that is generated during trainings and how this is common for many training venues.
- Member Duncan concurred her support and noted booking the emergency vehicle track is difficult to schedule and the fee would equally disburse use responsibilities among the agency that share it.
- Vice-Chair Coddling noted his support for the fees and that this is an issue many agencies experience internally, specifically the disruption caused by ongoing maintenance. These fees could also serve the added purpose of agencies considering the training use put in by their officers and lead to more conscientious behavior while conducting themselves.
- Member Daniel motioned to approve the Criminal Justice Fee Implementation, as presented. Member Hensman seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.

8. Proposed Rule Changes for Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 259-008-0085

Codifying Board Approval of the Revisions to the Basic Police Course Subject and Hour Breakdown

Presented by Jennifer Howald

- *Jennifer Howald stated that this agenda item will be moved to a later meeting due to requiring an accompanying curriculum proposal for the subject-hour breakdown that did not precede the rule change.*

9. Proposed Rule Changes for Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 259-008-0300 and 259-008-0310

Denial and Revocation Processes for Professional Standards Cases Involving Student Dismissals or Employment Arbitration Findings

Presented by Jennifer Howald

Overview:

At the February 2026 Policy Committee meetings, the Department presented a comprehensive package of proposed changes to the moral fitness standards and the processes used to deny or revoke public safety professional certifications. Following that work, staff identified two additional issues requiring clarification within the rules that guide professional standards cases. This memo presents proposed rule amendments to address those issues.

Professional Standards Cases Based on Student Dismissal

OAR 259-008-0300 (3)(b)(D) gives the Department broad discretion to open professional standards cases based on any violation of student conduct standards, even when the violation did not result in dismissal. This exceeds the intended scope of the rule and creates ambiguity about who determines that a violation occurred.

The proposed amendment limits discretionary professional standards cases to situations where a student is dismissed under OAR 259-012-0035 for a conduct violation. This clarifies that the Training Division, not Department compliance staff, makes the conduct determination and narrows the grounds for opening professional standards cases.

Professional Standards Cases That Include an Employment Arbitrator's Finding

OAR 259-008-0310 (8) ties the outcomes for professional standards cases to an arbitrator's findings, which unintentionally limits the Board's independent authority to determine moral fitness.

The proposed revisions remove prescriptive outcomes based on an arbitrator's findings and instead affirm that the Department, Board, and Committees retain authority to make independent findings related to moral fitness and certification. Arbitrator findings may still be considered while reviewing professional standards cases, but the findings are not determinative. An arbitrator's findings about employment, such as whether misconduct occurred or whether reinstatement is warranted, do not control moral fitness and certification decisions.

The amendments also clarify that when an arbitrator orders reinstatement, the Department may continue to review and process the professional standards case as a discretionary case.

- *A consensus was reached to approve the fiscal impact statement.*
- *Chair Nowning motioned to approve the proposed rule changes for OAR 259-008-0300 and 259-008-0310, as presented. Member Willits seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee*

10. Review of Public Comments for Proposed Rule Changes for Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 259-008-0005, 259-008-0290, 259-008-0300, 259-008-0310, 259-008-0320, 259-008-0330, 259-008-0340, and 259-008-0400

Amending Public Safety Professional Certification Denial and Revocation Standards and Processes

Presented by Jennifer Howald

DPSST forwarded a memo to the CPC to review the comments collected for the proposed rule changes to Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 259-008-0005, 259-008-0290, 259-008-0300, 259-008-0310, 259-008-0320, 259-008-0330, 259-008-0340, and 259-008-0400.

The comprehensive rule change package amends the moral fitness standards and denial and revocation processes for criminal justice public safety professionals. It also includes process changes for DPSST review of complaints made against a public safety professional. These rules apply to police officers, corrections officers, parole and probation officers, regulatory specialists, telecommunicators, and emergency medical dispatchers. The changes are based on discussions and recommendations from the DPSST Criminal Justice Moral Fitness Workgroup (a rules advisory committee) and the DPSST Professional Standards Division.

DPSST presented the proposed rule changes to the Policy Committees during the February 2026 meetings. Each Policy Committee provided feedback that DPSST collected as part of the comment process. Following the Policy Committee meetings, DPSST held the public comment period from February 26 – March 31, 2026.

DPSST received one submission by Anita Yandle from the Policing Project at New York University School of Law. A copy of the complete comment was sent to CPC members.

DPSST staff also provided a summary of the comment and the agency's interpretation or analysis based on current application of the rules and the intent of the proposed rule changes. DPSST did not recommend any changes to the proposed rules based on the written comments but prepared responses to the comment's suggested changes.

- *Member Willits highlighted letter C, under emergency suspension, "DPSST recommends additional review." Does this mean more review from the Committee or in general?*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that when the emergency suspension was presented, DPSST received feedback from the Policy Committees, which will be incorporated moving forward. The comment essentially stated that the proposed rule gave permission for an emergency suspension but that it is not required in certain situations. The initial proposed rule was written this way because a broader scope of conduct that could result in an emergency suspension was being examined. With the adjustments made from the Committee feedback, then this rule may become an automatic outcome if a narrower focus is reached. This rule change will be going back to the Policy Committees for further review.*
- *Member Willits asked if the Committee will review this proposed rule change once again.*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that yes, the Committee will review this item again in August.*

- *Professional Standards Division Director, Marie Atwood, commented that under the emergency suspension section, it is important to note that the comment that was received suggested broadening the scope of what an individual may be emergency suspended for along with how soon this suspension might take place. The rule proposal in the initial draft suggests emergency suspension when someone is indicted for a specific list of very significant crimes, however, the comment suggestion was for enforcement at the time of arrest. This is a bit of a lower bar for proof requirement, and this would be among the items for possible consideration if the Committee would like DPSST to engage in further discussion and review of the comment in question.*
- *Chair Nowning asked if this will be reviewed again.*
- *Director Atwood stated that this comment review will return to the Committee no matter what.*
- *Jennifer Howald stated that if members have feedback or direction on what should be included when returning in August, then this would be helpful.*
- *Member Willits stated his support for how DPSST is handling the response to the comment, and does not think that broadening the rule change, per the comment, is appropriate.*
- *Chair Nowning commented that this comment might be solving a problem that does not exist, because if someone is indicted for a serious crime it is hard to imagine an employer allowing them to keep working. Additionally, this comment attempts to solve a major crime that is committed whereby an individual still retains their certifications, even though as a practical matter, they are not utilizing it.*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that this is correct, and even if an individual is placed on a leave of absence, DPSST records show that they are still employed and certified. On page 17, it states, “(A) After receiving notification of the charge, the Department will submit any supporting documentation available at the time to the Board’s Executive Committee...(B) The Executive Committee will review the information to determine if there is a serious danger to public safety by allowing the public safety professional to retain certification and the ability to perform the duties of a public safety professional while such egregious charges are pending.” The emergency suspension immediately suspends the certification before DPSST can go through the denial and revocation process.*
- *Vice-Chair Coddling asked if this is how the rule change was originally proposed.*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that this is how the change was proposed by DPSST. The Department does not currently exercise emergency suspensions unless they are presented to the Committee for this purpose. If a discretionary case was brought forth today and an emergency suspension is recommended, it would go into effect while the denial revocation process is finalized. This is what is currently in the administrative rule. An expansion of this was presented in February to notify DPSST of a charge, as when there is an unfortunate instance of an individual who has been charged with severe crimes so that DPSST is able to take immediate action before the discretionary case is presented.*
- *Chair Nowning asked if this is a temporary suspension.*
- *Jennifer Howald replied yes, and that it is effective immediately without prior notice (once approved by a body), and remains in effect until withdrawn, or until the final order of revocation is issued.*

- *Vice-Chair Coddington noted a recent example of an instance of potential community harm since there was an individual who was not already in custody. In an incarceration example, would an emergency suspension still be issued regardless?*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that this rule gives the authority to do so. Determining what to bring forward in August will involve whether the scope should be narrowed since it currently states “charged with any crime that would be a felony” under DPSST’s mandatory standards. This is fairly broad, and the Committee feedback received noted potentially reducing discretion from one case to another or different outcomes being subjective. DPSST could evaluate narrowing this to not just any felony crime, but rather, major person crimes, Measure 11 crimes, etc. If one looks at this narrower focus, then what could be considered is whether this requires Committee approval, or if it is this narrowly focused, whether this could be something that DPSST conducts. These are the nuances that will be discussed in August.*
- *Member Livingston stated that with this further discretion, she agrees with Member Willits that this rule should not be broader and should remain stringent.*
- *Member Duncan added that even with one of the cases heard today, if the District Attorney stated that a baton was a deadly and dangerous weapon and the individual was indicated, then even without the whole story, this could be a potentially dangerous road to go down and will require elevated caution as to how it is utilized.*
- *Member Willits asked if someone is indicted and DPSST reviews the information, would the Department take action or would this go before a Committee.*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that right now, it would go before a Committee, but under the February 2026 proposal, this would be reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Board.*
- *Vice-Chair Coddington asked whether discretionary issues fall upon DPSST’s judgment regarding a community threat or elements of a case that should be presented before the Committee.*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that in part, yes, but in the proposed rule change, it currently states ‘anyone charged with a felony.’ This would probably indicate to DPSST staff to bring a case forward so that the Executive Committee may determine if there is a threat or harm to public safety. If considering the comments provided by the Committee that would more narrowly focus the rule, this would facilitate the process of bringing it forward for review.*
- *Professional Standards Division Director, Marie Atwood, stated that DPSST’s goal in the proposed rule, as drafted, is not to place undue discretion on DPSST to be this type of decision maker. If there is a very narrow set of cases where there should be a decision made regarding whether to emergency suspend, then this would give DPSST a clearer pathway of which cases should go to a committee for this decision. DPSST would not be a deciding authority on who does or does not warrant a suspension, but if an individual falls into such a narrow scope, then these will be reviewed by the Committee.*
- *Chair Nowning asked who the Executive Committee is comprised of.*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that the Executive Committee is comprised of each chair of the policy committees, i.e. Police, Corrections, Telecommunications, Fire, Private Security, along with the Chair of the Board.*

- *Vice-Chair Coddling proposed looking for language that narrows the scope, as presented. If the criteria are for any felon crime, then this is too broad, and the Police Policy Committee has seen cases before where an individual is charged with a felony crime but with there is no belief of an ongoing community threat. Articulating an ongoing threat is important in determining which cases the Committee would like to review.*
- *Vice-Chair Coddling opined that DPSST adequately addressed the public comment.*
- *Vice-Chair Coddling motioned to approve DPSST's recommended response to the public comment received, A-F, as presented. Member Daniel seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

11. Applicant Review Committee Nominations

Presented by Marie Atwood

Director Atwood noted that there are two representatives from the Police Policy Committee that serve on the Applicant Review Committee (ARC). Currently, Rob Wood is facing the end of his first term on the ARC, and assuming he will continue to a second term, then the Committee would have to renominate him in order to do so.

- *Member Wood asked if there are any other open positions available.*
- *Director Atwood answered no.*
- *Member Willits motioned for Rob Wood to serve on the Applicant Review Committee. Chair Nowning seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed with eight (8) votes in favor and one (1) abstention.*

12. Agency Updates

Presented by Marie Atwood, Professional Standards Division Director

Director Atwood began the agency updates by stating that there are a few members of this Committee whose first term will be expiring soon. This requires no action on their behalf to continue onto their second term, and Director Atwood thanked these members for the successful completion of their first two years of service, specifically Chair Nowning, Member Lofgren, and Member Daniel.

Aside from this quick note, there are many things happening at DPSST, particularly the significant amount of progress that has been made since this Committee last met regarding the procurement of a Learning Management System (LMS) for the Training Division. DPSST onboarded a program manager to begin this process and the individual in question has accomplished a load of work. As members may know, the process of procuring something at a state level is slow, to say the least, and the program manager has done an excellent job in building momentum for this item.

Furthermore, DPSST received its Stage Gate 1 endorsement and is moving into Stage Gate 2, meaning DPSST is past the initiation and information gathering phase and into the resource identification phase. This determines what collection of companies or vendors DPSST will source its LMS system from. If this determination is reached, then the actual procurement of the system will go forward.

Simultaneously, DPSST is pursuing a legislative concept for 2027 that involves adding a few staff positions onto the agency's rosters in order to get the program up and running and staffing its continued maintenance to make it a groundbreaking part of the way that training is delivered.

This system will hopefully give accessibility to many regional constituents who may not be able to come to DPSST all the time for training maintenance. This should make everything from enrollment through certification more streamlined for all new officers and public safety professionals who are at the academy.

Other agency updates include more projects occurring on campus. The B-Building is currently undergoing a large-scale roofing project, and the memorial lights have all been replaced. Additionally, the F-Building is also going through a major renovation due to internal wind shear. DPSST's Facilities and Operations team has done an enormous amount of work to ensure that the deferred maintenance and repair budgets are correctly ordered in terms of priority for an agency that is over 20 years old. DPSST will also be undertaking a parking lot resurfacing project towards the end of June and beginning of July.

Circling back to the replacement of the memorial lights, DPSST held a ceremony for the Fallen Officer memorial a couple of weeks ago but will also be hosting the Fallen Firefighter Memorial on June 16. In terms of legislative concepts, in addition to the staffing proposal for the LMS system, DPSST is also pushing forward an ask to the Legislature to adopt a new category of Board membership to include Tribal membership. This is necessary due to the important discussions that take place here and that are critical to anyone in public safety.

The other significant legislative concept that is moving forward, and is relevant to this group, is for DPSST to exercise jurisdiction over deferred cases regarding moral fitness violations available once again. When referring to 'deferred cases' this means those cases where a moral fitness violation may have occurred, but an individual is no longer employed with their agency. At this time, DPSST has no jurisdiction to take action on these cases, and they have been accumulating into a fairly large backlog, essentially sitting in limbo, until somebody new wishes to hire such an individual.

This creates a very difficult situation for DPSST since such cases cannot be processed and creates significant hurdles for the public safety professional who is in limbo since they may not be hired and would have to declare if their case is pending or deferred. This proposal would allow the Policy Committees and the Board to have discretion and jurisdiction in deciding these moral fitness cases, whether in an effort to engage in denial or revocation of that individual's licensure, or to take no action and let the individual go forth with their career in public safety.

Another big update for the agency is its efforts towards accreditation through IADLEST. This process will be a national scale stamp of approval of the work that is conducted by DPSST's Training Division.

The first round of accreditation will be specific to the Training Division, and the second round will involve the Professional Standards Division. DPSST is doing internal auditing of all its practices within the Training Division to ensure that everything that it does meets national standards and adheres to evidence-based practices. After this is completed and DPSST submits the request for accreditation, the agency will be audited onsite by IADLEST to facilitate approval. Updates on this project are forthcoming.

Finally, the Police Policy Committee will host a special meeting on June 23, 2026, at 10 a.m., to review a professional standards case that could not be reviewed today. Director Atwood also recognized Chief Day's designee, Christopher Gjovik, who was not present and is now retired, and extended DPSST's gratitude for both his individual service, as well as his service on behalf of another official. Rob Wood was also recognized for his four years of service as a representative of the public and Chair Nowning noted Member Wood's diligence when reviewing cases and providing commentary.

Member Wood noted the heavy responsibility as a committee member, not only protecting the public from bad actors, but to preserve the career of officers like the PPC did today, and mentioned how honored he is to have served with his fellow members. Director Atwood gave one final thanks to all of the members present today and thanked them for the work that they do.

- Chair Nowning then adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:02 p.m.

13. Next Police Policy Committee Meeting: August 20, 2026 at 10:00 a.m.

Administrative Notes:

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.

All documents reviewed and discussed in this meeting are subject to Oregon Public Records Law (ORS 192.410 to ORS 192.505). These documents can be requested by contacting DPSST at dpsst.records@dpsst.oregon.gov.