

AGENDA

OREGON OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Oregon Office of Administrative Hearings Oversight Committee Meeting							
Date/time:		January 25, 2024 10:30 am					
Location:		Microsoft Teams Click here to join the meeting					
Attendees:							
	Rep. Nathan Sosa, Chair		Richard Lane		Sen. Janeen Sollman		Rema Bergin
	J. Kevin Shuba, Vice Ch		Rep. Osborne		Renee Stineman		
	Denise Fjordbeck		Jeffrey Rhoades		Sen. Kim Thatcher		

AGENDA

	Topic	Desired Outcome	Time	Presenter
1.	Welcome & Introduction of New Members	Informational	10:30 am	Rep. Sosa, Chair
2.	Oregon State Bar Board of Governor’s Proposals: ALJ OSB Licensure	Informational & Discussion	10:35 am	Jeffrey Rhoades, Chief ALJ
3.	Paid Leave Oregon Implementation and Update	Information & Discussion	11:05 am	Jeffrey Rhoades, Chief ALJ
4.	Strategic Plan and Hiring Update	Information & Discussion	11:15 am	Jeffrey Rhoades, Chief ALJ
5.	Legislative Update	Informational	11:25 am	Jeffrey Rhoades, Chief ALJ
6.	KPM Report	Informational	11:35 am	Jeffrey Rhoades, Chief ALJ
7.	Roundtable	Informational	11:50 am	Committee Members
8.	Public Comment Period – 3 minutes each	Informational	11:55 am	Citizens
9.	Adjourn		12:00 pm	Rep. Sosa, Chair

**Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH)
Oversight Committee Minutes
DRAFT
January 25, 2024**

Committee and Staff Present

Rep. Nathan Sosa, Chair of the Committee
Rep. Virgil Osborne
Richard Lane, Governor's Office
Sen. Janeen Sollman
Denise Fjordbeck, Oregon Department of Justice
Renee Stineman, Oregon Department of Justice
Jeffrey Rhoades, Chief Administrative Law Judge, OAH
Rema Bergin, Executive Assistant to Mr. Rhoades, OAH Staff

Absent: J. Kevin Shuba, Vice Chair, Sen. Kim Thatcher

Approval of Minutes

Minutes to be approved via email

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m. by Chair Sosa.

Introductions

Rep. Sosa introduced himself as the new Chair of the committee and all introduced themselves. He welcomed all.

Oregon State Bar Board of Governor's Proposals: ALJ OSB Licensure

Ms. Fjordbeck explained that a member of the House of Delegates, for the Oregon State bar came forward with a proposal that would require all of the administrative law judges that are employed by OAH to be members of the Oregon State Bar. It was referred back to our staff to create a work group on that question and I was asked to co-chair that work group along with Kevin Shuba, who is also a member of this committee. What we've done with the work group is try and pull in diverse members of the Oregon State Bar to talk about this issue including several private practitioners who regularly represent clients in front of OAH a representative from legal aid and a gentleman who does a lot of pro bono work for refugees and people of color in front of the OAH. Just a group of people with very different perspectives on that issue and what we've

been doing to date. Jeff's considerable assistance was gathering information regarding the number of ALJ's currently who are members of the bar and the ALJ's are essentially divided into three categories. ALJ1s hear an employment appeals cases and some of the very simplest cases. ALJ2s hear cases that are a little bit more difficult. ALJ3s who hear the most complex cases (we call them the ABC cases, agencies, boards and commissions). Regulatory boards like the Oregon Medical Board, agencies like the Water Resources Department, Division of State lands, a variety of commissions use the ALJ3s and with one exception are all members of the Oregon State bar. I think that that reflects the kind of work that they do. What we're finding is that most but not all of the ALJ's that OAH employs are members of the of the Oregon State Bar or of a bar. Some of them are members in different states or one of the Federal District Court Bars. We've been gathering information regarding talking about what training is provided to ALJs at the various levels.

On the other, on the other side there, there are competing concerns about being able to recruit. ALJ's, especially at the salary levels that are approved for OAH requiring people to be a member of the state bar might make that more difficult and diversity is a particular concern there. Then implementation issues. If this were to become a requirement, how would it be implemented? Would it be implemented over time?

When would it become effective and what would the impact of that be on the OAH, both in the in the short term and in the long term. We're in the process of scheduling another meeting for March and hopefully we will start to have the basic parameters of the report that will be making it back to the Board of Governors. They want us to report back by June and with the number of people involved, many of whom have very busy private practices, scheduling meetings could be somewhat of a challenge, but we think we're going meet that that June deadline, so that that's sort of the broad brush of what that that work group is about.

Mr. Rhoades is an ex officio member of that work group as well. He's the one that's been pulling together a lot of information about the operation of OAH, with his staff pulling that together for us as well. Jeff if you want to add anything and obviously, I'm glad to answer any questions that the committee has about that effort.

Mr. Rhoades: Thank you, Denise. I think that was an excellent summary. There was a series of questions that the work group posed to the Office of Administrative Hearings that we answered, and I've included that in the materials for you all to digest. There are a couple things I'd like to highlight in terms of impacts for us to consider. I think the budget impacts and the diversity impacts are the two top line items for me that I would like to highlight for this committee. Should this proposal go forward, it of course would require legislative change that would certainly have budget impacts.

Mr. Lane asked if there has there been any discussion about regulatory enforcement by the bar over the ALJ's? That could complicate OAH operations if somebody's unhappy with an outcome makes a complaint that goes through the regulatory process and suddenly, you're into an investigation. I just wondered if that had come up or any considerations along those lines?

Mr. Rhoades responded that we haven't had that discussion yet it's a very well taken point and something that we should probably discuss. Our ALJs are all represented by SEIU and that these are represented positions, so they are beholden to the CBA. It is the feeling that should we add this licensure requirement, as you heard from Denise, our ALJs are significantly underpaid. We don't generally bring folks in at the lowest step. Fourth step is probably the most common, so we're talking about \$80,000 a year, roughly something in that ballpark. We're anticipating that should this requirement come forward, then SEIU will come to the table and request an increase in compensation, rightfully so by virtue of the fact that we have this additional, quite onerous licensure requirement that's part of this. In particular, if you benchmark how much we pay our ALJs against entry level attorney and quite a bit higher pay at DOJ by comparison. That is a big concern because for us as you all may remember; we are an agency that recoups the cost of our services through rate settings. We are currently in this process right now working with the Legislative Fiscal Office set to be what's called budget neutral. We charge our services based on the cost of services rendered and we don't take general fund for example, we're in other funds agency that operates with what we call limitation. What that means is that if salary goes up, the cost of our services goes up and the rates go up, which means the cost of our services to all agencies across the board and over 70-80 state agencies use our services. That number is increasing all the time, because unless you're otherwise exempt, you're required to use the Office of Administrative Hearings under Chapter 183 for contested case services. The cost will go up across the entire state enterprise for all of those state agencies that use our services, and it will significantly impact the rates now that the impact of that will be dependent on the size of the agency. For larger agencies, perhaps that impact, while it's still will be significant, won't be quite as bad. We have some very small agencies like the Board of Tax practitioners for example, that's a one-person shop and when the cost of contested case services goes up for them, it is a huge impact to their very small budget. There are a number of agencies, boards and commissions that are similarly situated. That is a big concern. Any bill that does end up going through the legislature will certainly have a fiscal impact and necessitate a conversation with the Ways and Means Committee and go through that process. The implication of the proposal is that our folks are somehow deficient in some way that they need additional training and oversight, and I don't believe that is the case. We have judges that have been on our panels for 30 years and are eminently qualified to do this job. Some of the most knowledgeable folks in the state in their particular field and to say to them because they are a member of the California Bar and not a member of the Oregon State bar, they're somehow deficient in some way, that conversation

would be very difficult. I focus on this because those budget impacts are significant, and I just want to make sure everybody understands this piece.

I'd like to bring up the diversity impacts as we've looked across our current staff. When you parse out who is going to be impacted by this, who's already a member of the bar, who is a member of another bar, who's inactive, et cetera, there are disproportionate impacts to those of color. There's no question about it, where we're seeing this felt most acutely. It will have impacts to our efforts to diversify our bench. That is an incredibly important piece of this is well and I also believe that it will have impacts and on recruitment from those communities in the future. We want to have a diverse bench that represents Oregon appropriately and represents all communities in Oregon.

So that is also a huge concern to me with this additional licensure requirement and it also goes counter to some other efforts with the bar where, for example, they are allowing certified paralegals to represent individuals in certain cases due to a shortage of lawyers available. It's sort of this odd thing where on the one hand the bar is trying to figure out ways to increase representation and think more outside the box for non-lawyers to represent folks in certain instances. Then in this instance talking about adding this additional requirement, so I'll stop there and allow for comments.

Rep. Sosa asked if anyone had additional comments.

Ms. Fjordbeck: If I could to Mr. Lane's point about regulation by the bar, I think the unfortunate reality is that if you are a member of the bar and you're a public employee, you do draw bar complaints. We get them routinely and I'm sure that that ALJs would likely get them and frankly, even when they're frivolous, it takes a fair amount of my time to respond and document.

As I said, we're still in the information gathering phase and so that's not an issue that we specifically talked about. The Code of Ethics for the ALJs is pretty robust and comparable to the rules that the bar would impose on them. The issue is really whether it's necessary to do this to ensure the integrity in public trust in the process because the ALJs do make decisions that have huge impact on individual lives. The ALJ's at some of the lowest tiers arguably have the biggest impact on individuals because they're deciding cases about unemployment compensation, about entitlement to food stamp benefits, housing, etc. The work group is trying to weigh those competing, concerns so that we can get back to the bar with a coherent report on that.

Rep. Sosa: Any other comments? I will add a few things on my end as somebody who literally just renewed my bar membership yesterday. I am keenly aware of how expensive that is and also that it's not simply if ALJs are required to be members of the bar, which and looking at the

numbers that we had in the materials, it looks like approximately half the Members are OSB members already and half the ALJs are not. For those who are not, they are going to be looking at having to pay the annual cost of the bar membership pay the continuing legal education courses that they're going to have to take, which are fairly extensive then also having to pay to take the bar exam, presumably, which is also expensive. So, I think that these are all things to keep in mind if you're saying, well we want these folks to now be members of the bar that is going to come with a significant cost for those individuals. I think that to the extent that that dissuades people from becoming ALJs dissuades them from remaining ALJs or just leads to a situation where they are then demanding higher compensation, I think those are real considerations that we need to think about. Any other questions or comments from anyone on this?

Mr. Rhoades: Mr. Chair the last thing I would say is that we were asked by the work group to examine whether or not we've received complaints specific to this issue and our team was unable to find any complaints regarding lack of licensure or anything like that. The only thing that we could turn up was one complaint from somebody about it, but that person was a licensed member of the bar and was an unfounded complaint. The other piece to keep in mind is that even absent bar membership, it is a minimum qualification for even our lowest tier positions.

Everybody has to have a graduation from an accredited law school with a degree, and if not, they have to have significant contested case hearing experience of three years or more. So, there are onerous minimum qualifications and those are just the minimum qualifications. Our position descriptions require even more. Then as Denise said, we have our own separate Code of Ethics, a robust complaint process, where we handle complaints very seriously. In addition, hearings are recorded, so we're able to go back and listen to be able to figure out if something went wrong.

Rep. Sosa: Thank you. It doesn't look like anyone has any more questions or comments on this topic, so I think we can move along to the third agenda item, Paid Leave Oregon.

Paid Leave Oregon

Mr. Rhoades: Thank you Mr. Chair. We've been looking at starting up a new program at the Office of Administrative Hearings to conduct contested case hearings for the Paid Leave Oregon program. I'm pleased to report that we've made significant progress in that program, and we've already begun to conduct hearings. I have some statistics for you all and just some updates on where we are. First and foremost, we hired and trained up a new member of our executive team, a new Presiding Administrative Law Judge, Tom Mott who is going to be overseeing both the Paid Leave Oregon program as well as some other pieces of our agency that interact with the Oregon Employment Department in particular, our relief of charges cases. He is all trained up and doing a great job.

Then first order of business for Mr. Mott was to go out and hire his team which he has completed and new ALJs starting this next Monday. Of course, referrals have come over and we haven't hit the pause button on that. What we've done instead is decide to start conducting those contested case hearings by leveraging the experience and expertise of our senior panel of judges, as well as some other presiding administrative law judges. Mr. Mott has conducted them, Monica Whitaker, Presiding ALJ who oversees our agency, boards and commissions program, one of our most experienced judges, has also conducted some of these hearings.

The purpose of this is to start crafting the program and training materials because ultimately these cases will be heard by our ALJ ones. We want to make certain that we have appropriate training materials, mentorship, everything in place for them to be successful and the best way to do that is to leverage the expertise and experience of our most senior administrative law judges. I'm pleased to report that it's working quite well. These are interesting cases and we're also doing quite well with all the technical aspects. We've received approximately 30 to 35 referrals so far from the Oregon Employment Department and held approximately eight hearings on the merits. For those cases, several matters have resolved in withdrawals of hearing requests or dismissals due to non-appearance of the appellant. We are moving forward with the cases and in the process now of trying to figure out what this workload is going to look like and that's been one of the hardest things for us to determine looking into the future. We just don't know exactly how many hearings we anticipate for now.

We have hired a new group of administrative law judges on in limited duration positions and we're bringing on seven administrative law judges total in order to do this work. My plan is to circle back around in the June and July at that point we'll know a little bit more about what the workload looks like and about what the permanent resource should be there.

Rep. Osborne: Jeff, this is good information as I'm getting phone calls for paid leave. People that are upset with not getting it. Just so I understand the process here, when there's a referral, Employment Department is sending a referral over to the OAH? They are questioning me to explain how the process works and what triggers a referral. If you don't mind, please.

Mr. Rhoades: So, say you would have somebody that is going to appeal the decision from the department for example, deny benefits. If they file an appeal, everything's timely and the process is filed as followed correctly they will then send that appeal over to us in the context of UI. We call those lower appeals because there is also another appeal process, higher appeals at EAB within the Employment Department that hears those cases. We don't have that in place for paid leave Oregon yet, so we're just calling them appeals for now. They come over to us and then we

gather the information that we need, send out the notices for the hearing, schedule the hearing and then our administrative law judges preside over that hearing, where presumably you have a representative from the department that comes and presents the case and another individual coming that has been denied benefits. They come and present their side of the case and for administrative law judges it's a little bit different because their job is to develop the record. So the administrative law judge is conducting the questioning, developing the record, trying to get at the discrete issues as to whether or not benefits should be denied or benefits should be allowed. So that is the process there. As part of that process, one of the things that we're looking at, we want to make sure that we're scheduling hearings as quickly as possible from that referral date and we're not just letting folks wait in the queue. So, for those folks, Rep. Osborne that are calling you and upset about a decision, whatever the result is from the hearing, we don't want them waiting for access to justice. We want if they've appealed, gone through the process, be able to set that hearing and get them in front of an administrative law judge as quickly as practicable and make certain that they're able to have the hearing held.

Rep Osborne: That's good to hear, thank you. That's the number one complaint it's just taking way too long. By the time people are getting paid, they've already recovered from the surgeries or whatever reason they are out. This is just more information that I can tell them, so they understand the process a little better. So great, thank you.

Rep. Sosa: Any questions, comments? Well thank you, Mr. Rhodes we can move right along to the strategic plan and hiring update.

Mr. Rhoades: Governor Kotek has put forward a number of good governance requirements for state agencies across the board. Although we are technically established within the Employment Department, under Chapter 183, we are very unique at the Office of Administrative Hearings and how we are established in state government The sole responsibility vests the Chief ALJ staffing the office and appointing administrative law judges and our budget is separate and apart from the Employment Department, we contract with them for administrative services, and it's specifically delineated in statute. We are wholly separate and apart from them, in almost every other way and my position, as you all know, appointed by the governor.

I think it's very important for us to adhere to those good governance requirements on our own, even if technically we are within the Employment department to that end. Fortunately, I've been part of a number of strategic planning exercises when I served for Governor Brown, I participated in a number of strategic planning initiatives with the Oregon State Lottery and OLCC. With that experience and conducting a strategic planning exercise with my staff it's been

an excellent series of conversations. This is going to be a document that we continuously refer back to over the life of the plan to make certain that we're holding ourselves accountable for effectuating the goals that we've put in place are guiding principles and our mission statement. Mr. Rhoades shared and went over the OAH Strategic Plan attached.

Ms. Fjordbeck: An issue that that I worry about because I sometimes see it on appeal some of the disability programs, the food stamp program and whatnot don't themselves have access to technology so it's sometimes difficult for them to even access a hearing if a hearing is by is by telephone or by remote means. What's being done to try and assist those people?

Mr. Rhoades: We always offer in person hearings if there's a situation where somebody doesn't have access to the appropriate technology, we will figure out a way to make that hearing work for them. There's absolutely no question about that. We make certain our technology up is updated also providing in person hearings, or judges will travel to locations that are closer to individuals that have constraints. ADA constraints for example, they will travel to places that are closer to claimants and conduct hearings in non-traditional locations. We always err on the side of providing access to justice, and we'll do whatever is necessary for that.

Rep. Sosa Any questions or comments? I just want to say I really appreciate it. I love that the strategic plan looks sort of outward of how we help folks who are interacting with our office. How do we look inward to make sure the folks who are doing the work are taking care of? How do we keep an eye on the future and make sure that we can continue to deliver? So, I really like the balance there that you're looking at all three aspects and appreciate that. We can move right along to the legislative update.

Mr. Rhoades: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you for the comments and the Strategic Plan. For the legislative update, I'll certainly turn this over to the committee our legislators on the committee, if there's anything that you all would like to weigh in on. I'm not aware of very much that is going to impact operations at the Office of Administrative Hearings. The one thing that could have impacts on us, these would be positive impacts. There is an ask out there for the Oregon Employment Department for additional resources due to resource constraints they have there. Should that move forward, it is likely that that will cause an increase in referrals to our office, which would mean we have more UI benefits cases. The biggest impact I can see is that they potentially get additional resources so that they have more agency representatives, more folks reviewing potential appeals, et cetera. Other than that, I haven't become aware of anything.

Rep. Sosa:

I'm not aware of any I think would impact this Committee for organization. Well then, we will move on to KPMs then.

Mr. Rhoades: Shared and went over the KPM report attached.

Rema Bergin: I have a list of acronyms for the OAH that I will send out to the committee

Rep. Sosa Thank you. Everything looks like it is definitely trending in the right direction, and once we get that backlog finally cleared up, we're going to be in really good shape. Next thing on the agenda is round table. Are there any other issues that folks want to bring up for discussion before we move to the public comment period? There being none we will move right along to the public comment period if there any members of the public who want to say anything now would be the time.

Public Comments: None

Adjournment: There being no further business meeting adjourned at 11:45 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rema Bergin



Office of Administrative Hearings Strategic Plan 2023-2027

Mission

To serve the public by providing fair, accessible and efficient contested case services in a neutral forum

Guiding Principles:

Public Service: We are accountable to the public, agencies and the law, as well as each other. We take pride in the high-quality and professional services provided by the Office of Administrative Hearings.

Government Efficiency & Accountability: We ensure the best use of public resources by using efficient processes and procedures, including leveraging new technology. We are committed to providing honest, legally accurate and timely communication to all parties of the contested case hearing process.

Equity, Fairness & Access to Justice: We provide equitable access to contested case hearings by meeting the diverse needs of hearing participants and ensuring they understand both the contested case process and results. We make certain that all who use our services are treated with fairness, dignity and respect.

Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
<p>Ensure high-quality, efficient, and timely delivery of services</p>	<p>Foster a respectful workplace where all OAH employees can thrive</p>	<p>Apply forward-thinking and be adaptable in the use and application of technology</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improve customer-facing procedures by acting on customer survey data and improving phone response times and procedures, with an eye toward diversity, equity, and inclusion and compliance with statutory deadlines.</i> • <i>Update public facing web site to include fillable forms, increased use of accessibility tools, and improved information flow.</i> • <i>Work with the budget section, the legislature, customer agencies and the Oversight Committee to</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improve employee culture for everyone at the OAH with eye toward celebrating and respecting differing cultural backgrounds, including hiring DEI-specific staff and integrating those efforts into all of our processes and procedures.</i> • <i>Find ways to build team cohesiveness in a hybrid work environment, including in-person staff meetings and team building opportunities, taking into account differing employee circumstances.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Continue with ongoing updates maintenance and improvements to CMS, including instituting a public-facing portal similar to other eCourt systems, as well as updated file transfer protocols.</i> • <i>Ensure that everyone at OAH has high quality and up-to-date equipment with quick access to trouble-shooting tips and technical assistance, as well as appropriate staffing for IT at the OAH.</i> • <i>Leverage technology to provide better hybrid and remote hearings; create appropriately accessible hearings spaces provisioned with supplies to</i>



Office of Administrative Hearings Strategic Plan 2023-2027

ensure appropriate staffing levels in all programs, in order to absorb caseload surges and changing workloads.

- *Examine the provision of services in different languages, with an eye toward meeting the diverse needs of hearing participants.*

- *Communicate clear expectations, including the background, to both employees and managers. This includes holding all accountable, using free flow of information and quarterly check-ins.*
- *Improve communication from the Chief and the Executive Team, as well as among Executive Team members. Lead by example in this area.*
- *Providing appropriate training, personal development, and mentoring and advancement opportunities to all OAH employees.*

meet those needs including, but not limited to, microphones, monitors, and cameras.

- *Work more closely and proactively with our IT partners to foster better understanding of OAH's needs, and to allow for improved response time where possible.*
- *Work closely with staff, ALJs and the Executive Team to determine needs and follow up on those requests. Conduct a biannual review of new technology and what can be of use to the OAH.*

Key Performance Measures for FY 2023-2024								
KPM #7	UI appeals timeliness (number of cases disposed within 30 days of the appeal date).							60.00%
		Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23	Oct-23	Nov-23	Dec-23	Total
	UI	18.83%	38.04%	35.12%	42.58%	38.69%	43.26%	35.76%
KPM #8	Non UI Percentage of cases disposed within the standards established by the user agencies							93.00%
		Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23	Oct-23	Nov-23	Dec-23	Total
	ABC	68.75%	91.67%	90.91%	82.35%	100.00%	100.00%	87.50%
	CCB	100.00%					0.00%	50.00%
	CSP	93.24%	97.37%	100.00%	98.77%	96.88%	98.70%	97.41%
	DHS	88.07%	84.00%	90.40%	89.26%	89.52%	86.05%	87.98%
	DMV	90.85%	93.22%	93.20%	96.81%	100.00%	95.21%	94.98%
	INS	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	OHA	93.88%	89.29%	92.06%	96.51%	98.36%	96.23%	94.57%
	OLCC		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	75.00%	100.00%	92.86%
	OWRD	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%
	PL						100.00%	100.00%
	ROC			100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	80.00%	92.31%
	UI							
	UIT							
Note: Counts	Combined Percenta	90.10%	91.03%	93.07%	94.55%	96.39%	93.81%	93.18%
KPM #9	Average number of days to issue an order following the close of record.							6.60%
		Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23	Oct-23	Nov-23	Dec-23	Total
	ABC	24.81	14.92	12.27	27.76	10.43	7.85	17.47
	CCB	28.00					31.00	29.50
	CSP	10.73	8.12	8.45	9.26	8.94	11.82	9.63
	DHS	8.61	13.09	6.29	10.15	8.49	13.17	9.87
	DMV	10.18	8.33	8.97	6.92	6.20	7.78	8.00
	INS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.17	13.50	2.43
	OHA	2.18	2.21	4.25	3.65	1.57	3.21	2.93

	OLCC		22.25	0.00	1.25	21.25	1.00	12.86
	OWRD	0.00	45.00	42.00	88.00		0.00	38.75
	PL						0.00	0.00
	ROC			0.00	0.50		20.40	8.00
	UI	2.65	4.24	2.99	6.12	3.60	2.32	3.72
	UIT							
	Combined Average	3.72	5.12	3.73	6.57	4.16	3.65	4.56

Note: Only cases where there was a "record close" date were included in this statistic.

KPM #10	Number of Referrals							
		Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23	Oct-23	Nov-23	Dec-23	Total
	ABC	20	13	27	12	14	11	97
	CCB			1		1		2
	CSP	83	96	82	78	90	75	504
	DHS	117	131	108	116	119	127	718
	DMV	173	162	176	193	173	210	1,087
	INS	1	2	1	3	3	2	12
	OHA	44	98	63	50	55	51	361
	OLCC		3	2		2		7
	OWRD							
	PL					3	25	28
	ROC	54	111	110	123	21	34	453
	UI	1,248	1,307	960	1,062	1,147	1,152	6,876
	UIT							
	Combined Referrals	1,740	1,923	1,530	1,637	1,628	1,687	10,145

	Cost Per Referral								
		Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23	Oct-23	Nov-23	Dec-23	Total	
	ABC	\$6,889	\$10,801	\$3,149	\$12,903	\$10,179	\$10,212	97	
	CCB	NC	\$409	\$541	\$458	\$73	NC	2	
	CSP	\$1,441	\$1,435	\$1,415	\$2,615	\$2,255	\$2,720	504	

Target \$942

Total Cost	Cost Per Referral
\$772,870	\$7,968
\$1,480	\$740
\$954,053	\$1,893

	DHS	\$1,165	\$1,248	\$1,104	\$1,421	\$1,236	\$1,198	718	\$883,077	\$1,230
	DMV	\$741	\$1,052	\$878	\$1,105	\$1,593	\$675	1,087	\$1,083,801	\$997
	INS	NC	\$13	NC	NC	NC	NC	12	\$25	\$2
	OHA	\$1,974	\$910	\$1,358	\$2,759	\$2,316	\$2,290	361	\$644,732	\$1,786
	OLCC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	7	\$0	\$0
	OWRD	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	0	\$0	\$0
	PL	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	28	\$0	\$0
	ROC	\$46	\$12	\$15	\$52	\$26	\$31	453	\$13,397	\$30
	UI	\$550	\$528	\$649	\$828	\$650	\$534	6,876	\$4,237,932	\$616
	UIT	\$13,356	\$8,602	\$103	NC	\$2,808	\$2,543	0	\$27,592	\$0
	Unassigned Payroll	-\$49,989	\$89	\$1,110	-\$32	\$662	\$3,171		-\$44,989	
	Total Monthly Cost	\$1,260,778	\$1,401,174	\$1,187,808	\$1,730,452	\$1,645,063	\$1,348,716	10,145	\$8,573,991	\$845

KPM #10 (for OAH)

Number of Dispositions									
		Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23	Oct-23	Nov-23	Dec-23	Total	
ABC		18	26	12	16	11	13	96	
CCB		1					1	2	
CSP		77	89	58	87	76	83	470	
DHS		110	124	127	151	106	86	704	
DMV		152	174	145	187	165	144	967	
INS		2	2	1	2	6	2	15	
OHA		47	57	64	87	61	53	369	
OLCC			4	1	5	6	1	17	
OWRD		1	4	1	1		1	8	
PL							3	3	
ROC				2	4	2	5	13	
UI		2,157	2,354	1,991	2,128	1,824	1,667	12,121	
UIT									
Combined Dispositi		2,565	2,834	2,402	2,668	2,257	2,059	14,785	

	Cost per Disposition									Target \$942
		Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23	Oct-23	Nov-23	Dec-23	Total	Total Cost	Cost Per Dispositio
ABC		\$7,654	\$5,400	\$7,086	\$9,677	\$12,955	\$8,641	\$96	\$772,870	\$8,051
CCB	NC		\$409	\$541	\$458	\$73	NC	\$2	\$1,480	\$740
CSP		\$1,553	\$1,548	\$2,000	\$1,997	\$2,670	\$2,457	\$470	\$954,053	\$2,030
DHS		\$1,240	\$1,318	\$939	\$1,092	\$1,387	\$1,769	\$704	\$883,077	\$1,254
DMV		\$844	\$979	\$1,066	\$1,140	\$1,670	\$984	\$967	\$1,083,801	\$1,121
INS	NC		\$13	NC	NC	NC	NC	\$15	\$25	\$2
OHA		\$1,848	\$1,565	\$1,353	\$1,586	\$2,088	\$2,203	\$369	\$644,732	\$1,747
OLCC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	\$0	\$17	\$0	\$0
OWRD	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	\$0	\$8	\$0	\$0
PL	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	\$0	\$3	\$0	\$0
ROC		\$2,487	\$1,280	\$847	\$1,585	\$275	\$209	\$13	\$13,397	\$1,031
UI		\$318	\$293	\$313	\$413	\$409	\$369	\$12,121	\$4,237,932	\$350
UIT		\$13,356	\$8,602	\$103	NC	\$2,808	\$2,543	\$0	\$27,592	\$0
Unassigned Payroll		-\$49,989	\$89	\$1,110	-\$32	\$662	\$3,171		-\$44,989	
Total Monthly Cost		\$1,260,778	\$1,401,174	\$1,187,808	\$1,730,452	\$1,645,063	\$1,348,716	\$14,785	\$8,573,991	\$580

Staci - Costs

Rema - Report

I: Briefcase/KPMs/berginraRB Monthly Summary of All KPMS July 2023 thru June 2024

