

Telecommunications Policy Committee

Meeting Minutes

May 20, 2026

The Telecommunications Policy Committee of the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training held a regular meeting on May 20, 2026, at the Oregon Public Safety Academy in Salem, Oregon. Chair, Michael Fletcher called the meeting to order at 11:01 a.m.

Committee Members:

Michael Fletcher, Chair, APCO-NENA
Rosa Antoine, Association of Public Safety Communications Officials – (Teams)
Kathryn Fisher, Line-Level Communicator – (Teams)
Ronda Griffin, APCO-NENA, EMS Section – (Teams)
Brandon Hamilton, Oregon Fire Chief’s Association – (Teams)
Noah Juarez, Line-Level Communicator – (Teams)
Greg Martin, Public Member – (Teams)
Dave Piercy, Oregon State Police

Committee Members Absent:

Travis Ash, Oregon State Sheriff’s Association – (Teams)

Guests:

DPSST Staff:

Kathy McAlpine, Deputy Director – (Teams)
Marie Atwood, Professional Standards Division Director
Chris Enquist, Training Division Director
Brie Murphy, Academy Operations Manager
Jennifer Howald, Administrative Rules Coordinator
Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Victor Sanchez, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Cindy Park, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Juan Lopez-Hernandez, Executive Assistant



1. Introductions

Introductions of members, guests and staff.

2. Approve February 4, 2026 Meeting Minutes

A consensus was reached to approve the February 4, 2026, Meeting Minutes

3. *Applicant Review Committee Nominations

Presented by Marie Atwood

- *Member Martin asked if there is still a one, three (3) year committee participation requirement to serve on the Applicant Review Committee (ARC).*

- *Jennifer Howald replied that the administrative rule has changed and this pre-requisite was eliminated. This means that a committee member with any amount of time and experience is eligible to serve on the ARC.*
- *Member Martin then asked if there is a public member position on the ARC.*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that there is not a specifically named public member position on the ARC, however, any member of the committee or the Board are eligible to serve as respective members of their committees.*
- *Member Hamilton motioned to approve nominating Ronda Griffin to the Applicant Review Committee. Member Antoine seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

4. *Criminal Justice Fee Implementation

Presented by Chris Enquist

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.

- *Member Martin sought clarification on page two (2) of the memo under the recommendations section, "DPSST is requesting endorsement from the Corrections Policy Committee," and asked if this was a technical error.*
- *Chris Enquist answered yes.*
- *Member Piercy asked for clarification on the waiver process.*
- *Chris Enquist replied that there are two paths to the waiver process. The regional side would be streamlined into a no-show waiver and this would be the simplest process. DPSST would also likely prepare a template memo for agencies to facilitate this, but a memo from an agency head or representative would be needed on the regional side to Jim de Sully, simply articulating a fiscal impact to said agency outside of budget constraints. Given the feedback, DPSST leans toward waiving fees when appropriate. On the regional side, if recurring no-shows are seen from a particular agency, this would likely elicit a different conversation. The campus use fee is more complicated since this is still a memo format outlining a fiscal impact, yet there is a third road carved out in the process. This also exists externally from this process. Multiple agencies who make routine use of the campus already have inter-governmental agreements (IGA) with DPSST for general use. State Police is one such agency since they have staff on campus and lease space, so there is likely a path for these entities who have these ongoing, biennial, inter-agency agreements to be exempted from facility use fees via this process. DPSST would see some in-kind reimbursement or cost recovery managed through the IGA process rather than the fee process. In an IGA, there could be a request made from the other party, simply as a condition of the IGA, to be exempted from the facility-use fees, and DPSST would reciprocate in turn stipulating a need in exchange as part of that IGA. Quid pro quo, this would likely be seen as an in-kind reimbursement since fiscal transfers are complicated. Agency loan agreements would probably be the simplest way in which DPSST would look at this. It is sometimes more beneficial for DPSST to receive an agency loan rather than receiving dollars.*
- *Member Griffin sought clarification on external partner registrations and asked if this falls outside of the telecommunications, EMD classes, and normal classes offered at DPSST.*
- *Chris Enquist replied that this contains everything but mandated courses. In the documentation, members can see that DPSST has been extending mandated courses into some places such as traffic safety programs, behavioral health, etc. This process is really looking at entities who are seeking to use the campus for their own in-service or internal training.*
- *Member Juarez commented that he understood that there was limited time for survey responses but asked if DPSST has any indicator as to how representative the survey results were of the outside agencies who are already using DPSST's facilities, or how much of this feedback derives from agencies who do not historically or typically use DPSST's facilities.*
- *Chris Enquist replied that there is no hard data on this and that the survey was anonymous, per general practice. Inferring from the comments, it did seem that a pretty good number of the entities who responded were speaking in a tone that*

- suggested they routinely use the campus. The opposite is true in that several survey comments were very clear that they did not use the campus and it was of little importance.*
- *Member Juarez asked for clarification on the attendance fee for classes or asked if this is a separate discussion.*
 - *Chris Enquist replied that this is functionally the regional no-show fee for non-attendance.*
 - *Member Juarez asked what the current process is if an agency has someone who they know will not be able to attend a class and they notify DPSST of such. How would DPSST work on having a waitlist or the seats filled before such a class occurs?*
 - *Chris Enquist answered that with few exceptions, most regional training programs have heavy waitlists. Handgun instructors, EVOC instructors, etc. routinely have a waitlist that exceeds the current registration. Even once a class is fully enrolled and another one is subsequently booked, yet another is being cited. Currently, the process for student withdrawals is rather informal, and the Training Division follows the same process as the Fire Program, i.e. repeat no-shows will prompt a conversation with an agency to advise them that they may not be given preference for registration in the future. The issue that DPSST is experiencing is no-shows the day when trainings are to take place. These are almost always driven by a true business need, but this manifests as a communication breakdown, either from officer to agency, but more often than not from agency to DPSST. This fee has the intent of hopefully offering an incentive to comply with the idea of notifying DPSST when students will not show up.*
 - *Member Juarez asked if DPSST foresees taking into consideration whether a seat is able to be filled before a class convenes*
 - *Chris Enquist noted that the 72-hour line requirement will make it difficult to fill classes, but this threshold gives DPSST enough latitude to adjust staffing since full time staff run into issues contractually when adjusting work or travel schedules on short notice. DPSST often overstaffs regional training programs with a part-time employee or agency loan, so this is the population the 72-hour line will allow to adjust. This is less about backfilling the class, and more about DPSST being able to decrease staff to appropriate numbers with enough time. This will not really serve the waitlist since agencies will realistically need two or three weeks to align back cover at the agency, travel status, etc. In the long term, this will hopefully lead to better communication to DPSST to adjust classes, but the priority lies in expended staff travel time, and work hours when a program is overstaffed by two individuals for a program that only requires six staff members, for reference.*
 - *Member Juarez asked what kind of review process DPSST has to retrospectively assess unintended impacts in future years that could potentially create a disincentive to send employees for training, if the fees are implemented.*
 - *Chris Enquist noted that the Center for Policing Excellence (CPE) had a similar concern, and they made a request for an annual or biennial review of the fees for equity, fairness, and effectiveness built into the rule of the fees. This is reasonable. However, Chris Enquist made a distinction between Member Juarez's question regarding the efficiency aspect. This would be relatively easy to work into the rule or back-processes. If fees are imposed, there will likely be a schedule to include an*

- agency update on their effectiveness each year for the Board's review and whether they will continue to be used.*
- *Member Juarez clarified that the absence fee is being implemented to avoid having to charge registration fees.*
 - *Chris Enquist replied that this is correct and in reviewing the survey, registration fees seemed like a blunt tool to solve the problem and that this is much more precise.*
 - *Member Juarez motioned to approve the Criminal Justice Fee Implementation, as presented. Member Piercy seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

5. *Review of Telecommunications Curriculum Advisory Committee Membership

Presented by Chris Enquist

The Training Division requests the review and approval of the proposed Telecommunications Curriculum Advisory Committee membership.

Background:

In April 2025, the Telecommunication Policy Committee (TPC) approved updated bylaws for the Telecommunications Curriculum Advisory Committee (TCAC). Since that date, Training Division staff have engaged with stakeholders and drafted list of members for the TCAC.

This membership list consists of partners that offer comprehensive and equitable representation in the field of telecommunications. Staff sought to ensure members offered representation of Oregon's geographic regions, different agency sizes, and a variety of roles across the strata of the telecommunications field.

- *Member Martin sought clarification on the difference between the Telecommunications Curriculum Advisory Committee (TCAC), versus the present Telecommunications Policy Committee.*
- *Chris Enquist replied that the TCAC has existed for some time, and the most recent update to its membership bylaws that was substantial occurred in 2014. The TPC still owns approval of goals, outcomes, and hours of true mandated curriculum. This is the members' role and as such has this stake in the Training Division. DPSST is looking to expand Curriculum Advisory Committees to other disciplines because this is a gap that the agency is aware of and it would like to see a unified body it can use to take questions on how to implement goals and outcomes. This standing group of SMEs that the agency can reach out to and vet out content. Some content may be raw, i.e. larger classroom topics, but some content may also be very precise, i.e. a specific call taking scenario that is not resonating with students, what can make it more tangible, contextual for students? DPSST achieved this in other disciplines through direct connection with agencies, representatives, or staff that DPSST knows are determined to become SMEs. The difference is that DPSST has several staff with corrections, parole and probation, and police backgrounds so they can carry some of that routine role. For telecommunications, there is Kathy Fink, who knows and can do a lot, but who is also a strong advocate for being able to brainstorm with individuals currently in the field. The goal of the TCAC is to keep the curriculum that the TPC approves alive, so that it may continue to be run within the parameters matching the field, rather than continuing to default back to a massive revision every*

two years. If these kinds of point corrections can be reviewed by the TCAC, it gives the TPC some ability to live within its boundaries and only bring forth items that require a fundamental change.

- *Member Piercy acknowledged a perceived conflict of interest given that one of his employees is on this roster but does not believe that this affects his ability to make an objective vote. Member Fischer also noted a peer on this roster. Member Juarez noted individuals on this roster he is familiar with, as well as Member Antoine.*
- *Member Hamilton motioned to approve the Telecommunications Curriculum Advisory Committee Membership roster, as presented. Member Antoine seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

6. *Proposed Rule Changes for Oregon Administrative Rules (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 A 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.

OAR 259-012-0010 and 259-012-0035 are included at the end of this memo as a context reference. There are no proposed changes for these rules.

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.

- *Member Martin asked if Jennifer Howald could define what, “stay the case,” means.*
- *Jennifer Howald replied that by “staying” a case, DPSST is basically pushing pause and will wait until the arbitrator’s process is completed.*
- *Member Antoine motioned to approve the proposed rule changes, as presented. Member Juarez seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

7. ***Review of Public Comments for Proposed Rule Changes for Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 259-998-0005, 259-008-0290, 259-008-0300, 259-008-0310, 259-008-0320, 259-008-0340, and 259-008-0400**

Amending Public Safety Professional Certification Denial and Revocation Standards and Processes

Presented by Jennifer Howald

Overview:

The purpose of this memo is 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 written comment.

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 Piercy highlighted the data table on page six (6) of the memo whereby DPSST provides a summary of suggestions in the left column, under B4, “Being adjudged as mentally incompetent by a court of competent jurisdiction, within or outside this State, until the public safety professional can demonstrate that they have regained mental competency.” Moreover, the accompanying statement reads,*

“DPSST interprets this an emotional standard, not a moral fitness standard.”

Member Piercy then asked what an emotional standard is.

- *Jennifer Howald stated that the statute uses the term ‘emotional’ with regards to physical, moral, and moral fitness standards. This has always been interpreted as comprising the psychological evaluation portion. Since there is no standard for maintaining a psychological or emotional standard, this is why they are viewed as being different. This falls under the employer’s jurisdiction versus DPSST’s.*
- *Member Piercy added that his previously highlighted statement also states, “If the Policy Committees and the Board wanted to explore this as grounds to deny, suspend, or revoke certification, it would need to be evaluated as a separate rule change. This would need to be treated as a separate standard and not combined with moral fitness,” Considering the context of the person being judged as mentally incompetent, and considering that federal law as it relates to possession of a firearm uses a similar phrase of adjudicated, mentally defective, and anyone found to be adjudicated or mentally defective by a court is prohibited from possessing a firearm. Does DPSST have some type of jurisdiction or influence in such a case. Must DPSST be involved in determining whether the person whom they certified now needs to have their certification revoked because that person is no longer qualified under law to possess a firearm?*
- *Professional Standards Division Director, Marie Atwood, answered that the issue as to whether a person can legally possess a firearm does come up occasionally in DPSST’s moral fitness cases across a variety of disciplines. However, in and of itself, the ability to legally possess a firearm is not moral fitness grounds for revocation and this usually complements another basis for a moral fitness revocation, such as a conviction of a felony. If this were a stand-alone fact, this would be much more likely to impact an agency’s decision to retain an employee in the first place. If the individual is neither employed nor certified, they would never reach DPSST’s radar to begin with. Notwithstanding, there are disciplines that do not require the possession of a firearm, so in theory, someone could have a legal inability to possess and use a firearm that would not impact their employment or certifications. The issue of firearms possession alone would not be something DPSST has jurisdiction over in a stand-alone way and requires some other jurisdictional basis in order to take action.*
- *Member Juarez highlighted page eight (8) of the present memo under Section D, “Aggravating and Mitigating Circumstances.” Member Juarez acknowledged DPSST’s considered review of the recommendations from the Policing Project and agreed with the assessment. On the list of whether to itemize every possible aggravating or mitigating circumstance, DPSST gave good reasons to remain neutral in its stance. From a committee member perspective, when they receive the professional standards cases along with a set of instructions quarterly, Member Juarez found that the suggested aggravating and mitigating circumstances by the Policing Project are consistently addressed in these meeting packages, i.e. the professional history of the individual in question, how long they’ve been certified, extent of the damage caused, etc. Member Juarez then asked if this is a byproduct of having hired qualified staff at DPSST who are simply doing a good job capturing the information that members would like to see in terms of considering aggravating or*

- mitigating circumstances? Otherwise, is it possible that in a future date members of the committees could receive packets that are less thorough or objective if members are not somehow incorporating mitigating or aggravating circumstances to ensure that they are being captured in the record?*
- *Jennifer Howald thanked Member Juarez for the appreciation of staff and stated that DPSST has in the past had a list similar to these items within administrative rule. This then becomes a question of whether this list is a reference, resource document, or a prescriptive list that members must go through each time to identify whether elements are aggravating, mitigating, neutral, etc. and this has become a very challenging process. DPSST transitioned by pulling the prescriptive list out of the administrative rule and gave broader definitions that guide both DPSST and the committees. These definitions appear within the present materials, under Attachment B, containing the administrative rules. These are very broad, notably, "any condition, factor, or action," identified by the Department or the Committee while reviewing the case that, "may increase," the impact a moral fitness violation has." A list of accompanying examples is attached to this as well. The committee is also not limited to what DPSST staff finds in its determinations. If members are conducting their reading of the staff report, and find something that is not included, these can be addressed during deliberations as additional factors. In essence, this is the current application and interpretation.*
 - *Member Juarez highlighted the letter from the Policing Project, specifically the aggravating and mitigating circumstances in comparison to the member instructions received during each committee meeting. In comparing these with the definitions in the proposed rule changes, they are captured consistently throughout. Member Juarez then asked if the bullet point stating, "likelihood that continued service would undermine public trust," can be added to the end of the definition of aggravating circumstances. If not, can this be incorporated within the member instructions? Member Juarez emphasized that this is a piece of information that is important to capture, at least when the TPC meets quarterly.*
 - *Jennifer Howald replied that if the TPC makes this recommendation, then an amendment can be presented to members for review in August 2026 that would incorporate this bullet point into the definition of aggravating circumstances.*
 - *Director Atwood notes that some of the factors in the discussions overlap with the moral fitness violations grounds themselves. For misconduct allegations involving misuse of authority, abuse of authority, or a threat to the efficient operations of an agency, these cases inherently involve someone whose use of power goes against public trust. Some of the suggestions in the public comments, although valuable, come up organically in cases where they are applicable, however, if not an amendment to the proposed rule change, DPSST's ability to amend instructions or onboarding materials given to Committee and Board members can be done at any time and can be a valuable discussion to keep ongoing on a regular basis for any new members.*
 - *Jennifer Howald added that as a part of the administrative rule, ORS 259-008-0290 states, "(1) The Board has established moral fitness standards that it has determined are critical to upholding the public's trust in the public safety profession, protecting the public and ensuring that the conduct of a public safety professional or an*

applicant does not reflect adversely on the public safety profession. The Board finds by adopting this rule that a violation of these standards is substantially related to the duties performed by a certified public safety professional,” so DPSST does have a tie to a violation of public trust at this particular point. This is just not in the aggravating or mitigating factors, but if this is violated then it triggers a violation of public trust based on the Board’s standards as well.

- *Chair Fletcher asked if there is a way that this could be incorporated as one of the members’ considerations for aggravating factors to abate public perception.*
- *Member Piercy wondered how one makes this value judgment without being subjective. Chair Fletcher concurred with this sentiment. Member Piercy noted that this is the same issue he has brought up previously as to whether the violation of a sworn oath is an element of misconduct. These speak to a value or perspective that is up for interpretation.*
- *Member Hamilton asked if the amendments discussed herein will be approved at this meeting or at the next meeting in August.*
- *Jennifer Howald answered that as part of the overall process, DPSST already has potential revisions built into its timeline, and this packet will return to members in August for final approval, and then for final Board approval at their meeting in October.*
- *Member Martin motioned to approve the public comments for the proposed rule changes, as presented. Member Piercy seconded the motion. A vote was taken by roll call where the motion was passed unanimously by the Committee.*

8. Agency Updates

Presented by Marie Atwood

Professional Standards Division Director, Marie Atwood, notified TPC members of the legislative work going on at DPSST, specifically Policy Option Packages and Legislative Concepts, several of which were due last month in their first iteration.

Some of the Legislative Concepts DPSST is pursuing involve an ongoing procurement of a Learning Management System (LMS) as well as a request to add additional staff to the Training Division to get this operational. This could incorporate changes to training processes and ease of access for those involved in our telecommunications classes.

DPSST is also pursuing Legislative Concepts to amend the Board and Committees membership rosters in the hopes of requesting a Tribal membership position on the Board, as well as amendments to the current positions within the Private Security/Investigators Policy Committee to facilitate recruitment of these positions. Moreover, DPSST is pursuing a Legislative Concept that assumes jurisdiction over deferred cases, meaning cases where a public safety professional has committed or potentially committed a moral fitness violation but is no longer employed.

In the current jurisdictional set-up, DPSST must defer these cases since it does not have jurisdiction to make moral fitness findings or even present them to the Board and Committees at this point. DPSST would like to take these cases out of their perpetual limbo and exert jurisdiction over them along with the rest of DPSST’s moral fitness cases. Members will receive progress updates in the following months regarding this process.

In terms of DPSST's accreditation process, the agency is pursuing national accreditation through the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training (IADLEST). This will be a two-phase, work-intensive process. DPSST is currently in the first phase, which consists of an internal audit on all training processes, record keeping processes, staffing, etc., to make sure these comply with evidence-based practices and nationwide standards.

Once DPSST has conducted its internal audit and essentially submitted its application for accreditation, IADLEST will then arrive on campus and conduct its own audit to gauge the accuracy of DPSST's findings. Members will be updated on progress as this project proceeds as well.

Finally, facilities projects are ongoing, notably the roofing project occurring in B-Building, which was direly needed. This is in conjunction with an active replacement of water heaters, AC units, and items of this nature that ensure that the funding available for such facility projects is allocated to deferred maintenance in order of priority.

The F-Building, in the Village where most of DPSST's scenario work is conducted, is also undergoing renovations to address safety issues. Toward the end of June and into the beginning of July, DPSST will be updating its parking lot during Down Week. With no further updates, Director Atwood thanked the present staff, particularly Jennifer Howald, and TPC members for their efforts and participation. Director Atwood also thanked Sheriff Travis Ash for his 4-year service as a representative of the *Oregon State Sheriffs' Association* and noted that a letter and certificate commemorating this will be sent to him as a result. The meeting was adjourned at 12:11 p.m.

9. Next Telecommunications Policy Committee Meeting: August 5, 2026 at 9:00 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.