

<b>Date:</b>	<b>April 30, 2025</b>
<b>To:</b>	Co-Chairs Kropf & Prozanski, Vice Chair Mannix, Members of the Joint Addiction and Community Safety Response Committee
<b>From:</b>	Association of Oregon Counties Legislative Affairs Manager Tim Dooley
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Support HB 3069</b>

Co-Chairs Kropf and Prozanski, Co-Vice Chair Mannix and members of the committee, for the record, I am Tim Dooley from the Association of Oregon Counties, representing Oregon's County Governments.

I am here to provide testimony in support of the concepts in the -1 and -2 amendments in HB 3069, but we believe that there is still work to be done, and we thank co-chair Kropf for convening the stakeholders.

Broadly speaking, counties are in support of the idea to reform the CJC grant process to reduce administrative burdens, align grant cycles, and free up CJC staff time from staffing committees to allow for increased technical assistance.

The public policy aims of the bill are sound and we support the idea of a holistic public safety plan that allows counties to think about how they can employ funding across multiple grant streams to improve community safety and reduce the contacts the criminal justice system has with individuals, especially those who we frequently contact due to behavioral health or substance use issues. The incentive funding in the -1 amendment is also something counties support, though we welcome discussion with CJC around the development of the plans and their evaluation of county progress towards these new goals, as there will be a lower limit to how far down counties can drive down these contacts over time.

We believe that there is room in the -1 to improve certain technical aspects around eligible staff for the wellness grant, and the grant percentages allocated towards administrative costs, and will be engaging with the chair on those items.

The -2 amendment regarding deflection is an item that counties believe needs greater work. Deflection programs have just started to get their feet under them, and converting 70% of deflection funding into a competitive grant pool is premature. Counties deliberately started these programs small, and have been iterating along the way, as they learn what works on the ground in their communities. Initially we were unsure how far funding would go, and in order to budget responsibly, were conservative in the approach to the program.

**UNITED COUNTIES. UNITED OREGON.**

1212 Court St. NE | Salem, OR 97301-4181 | 503.585.8351 | [www.oregoncounties.org](http://www.oregoncounties.org)

Over the last 8 months, counties have begun to get a better idea of their costs to run programs, and the partnerships needed in order to serve this population.

It would be significantly difficult to sustain contracts and partnerships for peer mentors and other services from a 25% baseline funding standpoint. Counties believe that we need to give space for these programs to grow and mature, as well as have the CJC's 1 year evaluation in hand, before we move towards awarding the bulk of this funding through competitive grants. As in the -1, establishing a pool of competitive funding that incentivizes successful and innovative approaches is something counties are supportive of, but not at this time, nor in this percentage. For a competitive program like this to succeed, we believe that it would need to be stepped up over a period of years.

In regards to rural area regional approaches, peer support and case management are best provided in person, and it is not feasible to have a circuit rider style program across large geographic areas.

However, we are strongly supportive of the -2's provision that transfers the funding formula development to the CJC and believe that will enable greater success for all participants.

I want to thank the chair and all of the staff for the immense amount of time and consideration that went into this process. I think we'll get good outcomes out of this bill, we just need to have a few changes.

Thank you for your time.