

Application: Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 25-27

Summary

ID: 0000000017

Last submitted: May 14 2025 09:48 PM (UTC)

Cover Sheet

Completed - Mar 13 2025

Cover Sheet

County

Multnomah

Local Public Safety Coordinating Council (LPSCC) Chair Contact

Name:	Jessica Vega Pederson
Preferred Title (e.g. Sheriff, Judge)	County Chair
Email:	jessica.vegapederson@multco.us
Phone:	503-988-6815

Primary Applicant Contact

Name:	Sara Mullen
Organization:	Multnomah County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council
Title:	Executive Director
Street Address:	501 SE Hawthorne, Suite 600
City:	Portland
Zip Code:	97214
E-mail:	Sarah.mullen@multco.us
Phone:	5039885777

March 17, 2025

Ken Sanchagrin, Executive Director
Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
885 Summer Street NE
Salem, OR 97221

Executive Director Ken Sanchagrin,

The Multnomah County Department of Community Justice is submitting this statement of commitment for Multnomah County's Justice Reinvestment Initiative funding application. We are in full support of the goals of Justice Reinvestment:

- Reduce recidivism while protecting public safety and holding individuals accountable.
- Decrease the county's utilization of imprisonment in a Department of Corrections institution while protecting public safety and holding individuals accountable.

This grant application is a result of a robust collaborative process among county stakeholders, community partners, and groups representing historically underserved individuals. We believe that this application will help us advance the goals of the state Justice Reinvestment program while protecting public safety and holding individuals accountable locally.

We believe that providing these additional resources, made possible with JRI funding, will support our county's efforts to change the behavior of justice involved individuals. Our county is committed to continuing our program that provides opportunities for justice involved individuals to avoid prison time and be successfully supervised in the community. The collaboration has been invaluable, leading to the creation of innovative programs and practices that have decreased our reliance on costly jail and prison beds. As a department, we are emphasizing supervision strategies, being intentional with increased contacts and prioritizing engagement in treatment to reduce new criminal activity.

In particular, we look forward to continuing the enhancement of programming and services to those who are participating in our JRI programs as well as for historically underserved individuals. We are committed to ensuring individuals are diverted from prison and receive the services and support needed to be successful in their home communities.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of our application.

Sincerely,



Denise Peña, Director
Multnomah County Department of Community Justice



Nathan Vasquez, Multnomah County District Attorney

1200 SW 1st Avenue, Suite 5200, Portland, OR 97204-1193
P: (503) 988-3162 | F: (503) 988-3643 | www.mcda.us

March 12, 2025

Ken Sanchagrin, Executive Director
Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
885 Summer Street NE
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Mr. Sanchagrin:

The Multnomah County District Attorney's Office (MCDA) supports Multnomah County's Justice Reinvestment application. Continued funding for the Justice Reinvestment Initiative is critical to maintain the integrity and functionality of both court processes and supervision programming in Multnomah County. MCDA is committed to partnering with members of our criminal justice system and our community to achieve the goals of this initiative.

MCDA has actively participated in the Justice Reinvestment Initiative from its creation, to implementation, to achieving and measuring outcomes. MCDA continues to be in full support of the goals of Justice Reinvestment including:

- Reduce recidivism while protecting public safety and holding offenders accountable;
- Decrease the County's utilization of imprisonment in a Department of Corrections institution while protecting public safety and holding offenders accountable.

Continued funding will enable Multnomah County to build and improve our prison diversion program. MCDA is dedicated to working with jurisdictional partners to customize services and provide a specific judicial process to 1) special populations such as women and persons up to the age of 25; and 2) offenders at risk of probation revocation and second sentence. The assigned personnel, programming, and continued collaboration supported by Justice Reinvestment will lead to further successes.

Thank you for your consideration of this proposal. We look forward to being partners in this program's continued growth.

Sincerely,

Nathan Vasquez
Multnomah County District Attorney



CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON

JUDITH H. MATARAZZO
JUDGE

FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
MULTNOMAH COUNTY COURTHOUSE
1200 S.W. FIRST AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204-3201

PHONE (971) 274-0674
Judith.H.Matarazzo@ojd.state.or.us

March 28, 2025

Mr. Ken Sanchagrin
Executive Director, Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
885 Summer Street NE
Salem, OR 97221

Dear Director Sanchagrin,

I am writing in support of Multnomah County's application for funding under the Justice Reinvestment Initiative grant program. The court continues to support the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP).

MCJRP began in Multnomah County in 2014, and since that time the program has been shown to continually reduce the number of defendants sentenced to state prison, holding offenders accountable through informed decision-making and intensive supervision without sacrificing public safety.

The Multnomah County Circuit Court remains committed to the core principles of the MCJRP program and devotes considerable in-kind resources to the administration of the program. We collaborate on an ongoing basis with our community stakeholders and justice system partners to ensure our program is structured to best meet justice system needs and continues to safely reduce reliance on prison. We are grateful for the funding received to date and appreciate your consideration of our county's current grant request.

Sincerely,

Judith Matarazzo

Application: Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 25-27

Summary

ID: 0000000017

Last submitted: May 14 2025 09:48 PM (UTC)

Proposed Grant Program One

Completed - Apr 9 2025

Proposed Grant Program One

Program Name

Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP)

Was this program a part your county's Justice Reinvestment-funded programming in 2023-2025?

[select one]

Yes

What type of program is this?

[select one]

Downward Departure

Provide a summary of the program's purpose and key activities.

Example: “The Mental Health Diversion Program diverts individuals with mental health disorders away from incarceration and into treatment. Participants receive comprehensive case management, psychiatric care, and wraparound support. The program’s goal is to reduce recidivism and address untreated mental health conditions contributing to criminal behavior.”

MCJRP is a highly collaborative downward departure, informed sentencing and enhanced supervision process aimed at meeting all goals of HB 3194 and HB 3078. The process uses validated assessment tools to inform sentencing for eligible presumptive prison cases. The process uses data and evidence-based practice to ensure consistency in sentencing and revocations, monitor disparate impacts, and improve outcomes for participants. MCJRP dedicates services at every decision point including pretrial assessment, defense-based social work teams, a custody Treatment Dorm, supervision and services. Once the assessment process is completed, individuals may be referred to treatment courts or specialty supervision to address identified risks and needs. Key JRP grant personnel ensure consistency throughout the MCJRP continuum to meet grant goals and protect procedural fairness.

Which of the goals of the Justice Reinvestment Grant Program does this program meet?

[select all that apply]

Responses Selected:

Reduce prison usage while protecting public safety and holding individuals accountable

Reduce recidivism while protecting public safety and holding individuals accountable

If it reduces prison usage, briefly describe how below.

Example: "Reduce prison usage by diverting eligible individuals into mental health treatment, the program prevents incarceration for non-violent offenses and reduces reliance on prison beds."

MCJRP reduces prison use at the sentencing, sanctioning and revocation decision points.

Initial sentencing: Assessment reports that outline a plan for community supervision and may inform prison length of stay are used in judicial settlement conferences attended by the parties, probation officers, judge, and social workers.

Certain violations must be judicially addressed for sanctioning and revocation. A dedicated PV DDA reviews all filed probation violations and attends the hearing to ensure consistent case handling. All services are evidence-based and aimed at reducing recidivism. Consistent sanctioning, judicial involvement and revocation handling also reduce intakes and lengths of stay.

If it reduces recidivism, briefly describe how below.

Example: "The program provides evidence-based mental health treatment and continuous support, reducing the likelihood of reoffending by addressing the root causes of participants' behavior."

MCJRP addresses recidivism through risk/need assessment, alignment of evidence-based services, and consistent case processing designed to protect procedural fairness. MCJRP attempts to engage participants early through the interview/assessment process, defense-based social work and treatment services, including the jail treatment readiness program. Participants take an active role in judicial settlement conferences, allowing them to take ownership of their change process.

MCJRP probationers receive dedicated evidence-based supervision and services including mentors, supportive housing, treatment, and milestone ceremonies to acknowledge successes. Violations are staffed with a dedicated Deputy District Attorney and certain violations must be judicially reviewed.

Target Population

Identify the target population(s) this program serves, including underserved groups as defined in HB 3064 (2019) (e.g., racial and ethnic minorities, women, LGBTQIA+ individuals).

Gender Identity

[select all that apply]

Responses Selected:

Men
Women
Non-binary
Not listed

Please specify below:

Eligible presumptive prison population
--

Race/Ethnicity (If it is a general eligibility program, select "all")

[select all that apply]

Responses Selected:

All

Other Historically Underserved Communities

[select all that apply]

Responses Selected:

LGBTQIA+

Risk Level

[select all that apply]

Responses Selected:

High

Medium

Low

Does your program mix risk levels (e.g. high, medium, and low)?

(No response)

Which crime types does this program serve?

[select all that apply]

Responses Selected:

Driving Offenses (generally ORS chapters 811, 813)

Property Offenses (generally ORS chapters 164, 165)

Drug Offenses (generally ORS chapters 471, 475)

Other (please indicate ORS numbers)

There are exceptions to the crime type(s) selected above

Please indicate all ORS numbers below:

The MCJRP process is intended for those arrested and/or charged with a felony offense that carries a presumptive prison sentence (12 months + 1 day or more), issued on or after July 1, 2014. Eligible offenses include those in the categories of property crime, drug crime, vehicular crime, weapon offenses, public order offenses, general welfare offenses, and certain felony person crimes.

Please indicate the exceptions below.

Exceptions include domestic violence charges, sex crimes, homicides and Tier I BM11 offenses. Beginning on or after September 30, 2019, otherwise MCJRP-eligible cases in the following categories are were deemed not eligible for the MCJRP process: • Defendants who are currently serving a DOC (12 months + 1 day or more) sentence, unless all parties agree to the MCJRP process • Defendants with more than one pending MCJRP Eligible Unlawful Use of a Vehicle (UUV) or Possession of a Stolen Vehicle (PSV) case • Stand-alone vehicular crimes (e.g. Felony DUII, Felony DWS, H&R Felony)

Which, if any, assessments do this program use?

[select all that apply]

Responses Selected:

PSC

LS/CMI

WRNA

Briefly describe how the above assessments are used in your program.

Example: "The PSC is used as an initial triaging tool to determine whether or not a candidate for our downward departure program will receive a more detailed assessment (WRNA or LS/CMI) later."

Probation officers conduct a pre-adjudication interview with MCJRP-eligible defendants. Officers next complete an assessment report including LS/CMI risk, need and criminogenic scores and a proposed case plan. The report identifies options for specialized units, such as mental health, domestic violence, gang-involved, or gender specific supervision, and informs sentencing and supervision planning at a Judicial Settlement Conference.

Post-adjudication, probation officers use the PSC to re-assess as needed along with the LS/CMI for males, and WRNA for females. Assessments further inform individualized case plans that target dynamic risk factors and responsivity for need factors, and guide referrals for treatment.

Has this program received a Corrections Program Checklist or the George Mason University Risk-Need-Responsivity Evaluation in the last 10 years?

No

How does your program meet the legal definition of culturally responsive services as defined in SB 1510 (2022)?

(“Culturally responsive service” means a service that is respectful of, and relevant to, the beliefs, practices, cultures and linguistic needs of diverse consumer or client populations and communities whose members identify as having particular cultural or linguistic affiliations by virtue of their place of birth, ancestry or ethnic origin, religion, preferred language or language spoken at home. A culturally responsive service has the capacity to respond to the issues of diverse communities and require knowledge and capacity at systemic, organizational, professional and individual levels of intervention.)

Provide specific examples of how your program addresses the cultural or linguistic needs of historically underserved communities. Include how staff are trained, services are tailored, and systemic or organizational efforts are made to ensure responsiveness.

Example: “Our program partners with culturally specific organizations to deliver trauma-informed peer mentorship for Indigenous participants. Staff receive annual training on culturally responsive practices, and program materials are translated into the primary languages of the populations we serve.”

Multnomah County requires culturally responsive procurement. County procurement guidance, created by the County Office of Diversity and Equity, is available upon request. MCJRP provides Spanish and Vietnamese-speaking officers for assessments/field supervision, as well as gang-involved, domestic violence, mental health and gender-specific services. Materials are available in several languages and the County provides on demand interpretation services. Diversity and Equity training is ongoing for County staff and providers.

VOA provides bi-lingual intakes and BIPOC mentors providing reach-in to Treatment Readiness Dorm participants, transportation to treatment, as well as weekly Habilitation Empowerment Accountability Therapy (HEAT) programs for African American men. Bridges to Change offers culturally specific housing and transportation for BIPOC individuals. Pathfinders offers culturally responsive advocacy and in-home supports for Latinx families.

MCJRP social work teams prioritize services to men of color, women, and work to maintain relationships with culturally responsive community providers.

Application: Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 25-27

Summary

ID: 0000000017

Last submitted: May 14 2025 09:48 PM (UTC)

Consultation of Data Dashboards

Completed - Mar 26 2025

Consultation of Data Dashboards

1. Prison Use Dashboard – [Prison Use Dashboard](#)

Has your county's prison usage increased over the past 12 months or exceeded your historic baseline? If yes, please identify local factors contributing to this trend.

Example: "Our county's prison usage increased by 12% in the past year. Contributing factors include:

- A 20% rise in methamphetamine-related arrests due to limited access to treatment options.
- Increased probation violations stemming from a reduction in probation officer staffing.
- A backlog in court processing has led to longer pretrial detention periods. To address these challenges, we are implementing a pretrial diversion program and exploring partnerships with local treatment providers to mitigate substance use issues."

Multnomah County's prison usage remains below its pre-pandemic level and substantially below its 2013 pre-JRP baseline. According to CJC's prison usage dashboard, Multnomah's total prison usage for JRP related offenses in December 2024 was 3,454 months while in March 2020 it was 4,415 months—an overall reduction of 22 percent from the period just before the COVID-19 pandemic. Overall, Multnomah's prison usage is down 67 percent from its peak in October 2013.

Multnomah's prison usage, however, has increased steadily over the past four years, reflecting a general return to pre-pandemic conditions for case processing and sentencing. The court closures and accompanying case backlog created by the COVID-19 pandemic created a large dip in Multnomah's prison intakes in 2020 and 2021. During the last several years, as partners worked through the case backlog, prison usage has been returning to its pre-pandemic baseline.

2. Recidivism Dashboard – [Recidivism Dashboard](#)

Has three-year incarceration recidivism increased in your county in the latest data year or since 2013? If yes, please explain local factors contributing to this trend.

Example: "Three-year incarceration recidivism increased by 8% last year. Factors include:

- Limited access to affordable housing, leading to instability for individuals post-release.
- Reductions in parole staff, resulting in decreased supervision and case management.
- A lack of funding for vocational training programs. In response, we are collaborating with local housing organizations to secure transitional housing and expanding partnerships with community colleges to offer job skills training tailored to reentry populations."

Multnomah's three-year incarceration recidivism rate has remained relatively stable over the past year and is considerably lower than it was in 2013. The incarceration recidivism rate for all offense types for the latest three-year cohort (2021/1st) is currently 8.3 percent, up slightly from the 7.9 percent of the previous 2020/1st cohort. The incarceration recidivism rate is down from the 2013 baseline as well (from 13.3 to 8.3 percent).

This slight uptick (a 5 percent increase) from last year may be due to increasing conviction rates for drug, property and driving offenses. During this time period (2023 and 2024), according to DA data, Multnomah experienced a relative increase in the number of theft and driving-related convictions. There has also been an increase in the acuity of mental health and substance abuse issues among the population, which impacts the likelihood of being able to successfully engage and treat individuals in the community.

3. Racial Disparity Tool – [Racial Disparity Tool \(Sentencing\)](#)

How does your Justice Reinvestment-funded programming address racial disparities or other disparities in historically underserved communities?

Example: "The program addresses racial disparities by partnering with culturally specific organizations that serve Black and Indigenous populations. Initiatives include:

- Peer mentorship programs led by individuals from the community.
- Legal aid clinics focusing on expungement services for populations disproportionately affected by convictions.
- Community feedback sessions to ensure programming aligns with cultural and linguistic needs."

The Justice Reinvestment Steering Committee (JRSC) and MCJRP Operations Team use data to analyze policy changes in order to avoid creating or exacerbating disparities. The program includes other offenses beyond the standard JRP crimes (e.g., some assaults and robberies), which have, historically, been a source of bias. Through these efforts, MCJRP has helped maintain a low level of racial disparity in sentencing for JRP crimes by including or excluding impactful offenses. MCJRP dedicates culturally responsive services to women, men of color, and provides supervision through representative staff.

Multnomah County applies an Equity Lens and Equity Budgeting model in program design. (Available on request) All County programs must be culturally responsive. LPSCC public engagement includes citizen advisory committees, legal clinics, monthly neighborhood committee presentations and coordination of the Justice Fellowship Program.

Application: Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 25-27

Summary

ID: 0000000017

Last submitted: May 14 2025 09:48 PM (UTC)

Eligibility Requirements

Completed - Mar 13 2025

Eligibility Requirements

Does the county consider and accept short-term transitional leave candidates as appropriate?

[select one]

Yes

Do the county or its partners assist clients with Oregon Health Plan enrollment?

[select one]

Yes

Application: Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 25-27

Summary

ID: 0000000017

Last submitted: May 14 2025 09:48 PM (UTC)

Planning and Implementation

Completed - Apr 9 2025

Planning and Implementation

Describe the partnerships that will support your county's efforts to achieve Justice Reinvestment goals.

Example: "The county collaborates with local victim service providers, housing agencies, and mental health organizations to provide comprehensive support to program participants."

MCJRP is a highly collaborative sentencing and supervision framework, designed to meet the goals of HB 3194 and HB 3078. Partners collaborate on policy, operations, procurement, budgeting, data and community engagement.

MCJRP oversight is provided by the Justice Reinvestment Steering Committee (JRSC), a subcommittee of the LPSCC. LPSCC convenes monthly public meetings. Statutory member positions are occupied and supplemented with non-system stakeholders representing Multnomah County's diverse communities.

The JRSC meets twice monthly and convenes work groups as policy, operational, and data issues emerge. The JRSC is governed by a Commitment of Collaboration, signed by the District Attorney, Department of Community Justice, Oregon Judicial Department, Sheriff, Defense Bar, Law Enforcement, and Treatment, Crime Victim, and Citizen representatives.

The MCJRP Operations and Data Teams meet regularly. Attendees include Probation Officers/Managers, DDAs, Court Coordinator, Project Manager, data analysts, social workers, defense attorneys, service providers and the Chief Criminal Judge.

How does your county incorporate input from historically underserved communities and community partners in the design, implementation, and review of Justice Reinvestment programs?

Describe specific strategies or methods for collecting input and how this feedback influences program decisions.

Example: “We hold quarterly advisory board meetings with representatives from Black, Hispanic, and LGBTQIA+ communities to review program data and discuss areas for improvement. Feedback from these meetings informed the creation of a reentry housing program tailored to the needs of formerly incarcerated LGBTQIA+ individuals.”

Several mechanisms are in place to solicit and integrate feedback from community partners and people under supervision to inform planning:

The Department of Community Justice Research and Planning (RAP) unit incorporates input from historically underserved persons and community partners that serve historically underserved communities through contracting and community partnerships. RAP completed the MCJRP Measures of Success and Perspectives evaluation in 2024, which included input from these communities and is used by the JRSC to guide policy and service delivery.

Multnomah County also uses citizen advisory boards to inform policy and budget decisions. The Sheriff’s Advisory Board composed of diverse community members and individuals with lived experience is expected to review our final application.

The LPSCC also participates in monthly community meetings and coordinates the Justice Fellowship Program. The Fellowship serves as a citizen academy for members of historically underserved/excluded communities. Finally, updates are provided at public LPSCC and Board meetings.

How will the county select which community-based victim service providers will be awarded funds? Will the county run a competitive process?

You can find a list of community-based service providers on the CJC website [here](#).

[select one]

No

If the county will not run a competitive process, please explain why below (i.e., "*there is only one provider in my county*").

Multnomah County funds three victim service providers through JRP grants. Providers report to the County quarterly and appear before the Justice Reinvestment Steering Committee (JRSC) a minimum of two times per year. This allows for robust exchange of information and collaboration on victim issues. Two vendors provide unique services while the third serves all types of crime victims. Multnomah County seeks consistent funding for existing providers and strives to avoid any disruption in service delivery by minimizing the administrative burden on providers who are already facing staff retention and resource issues.

Evaluation Plan

How will your county meet the evaluation requirement for this proposal?

Note: the application for the Evaluation Plan is scheduled for release in June.

Retain 3% of awarded funds to a locally administered research study.

What is your suggested research topic for the CJC to study?

NA

2025-2027 Competitive Grant

House Bill 3078 (2017) established a competitive grant to support downward departure prison diversion programs. Funding details for this grant will be announced once the legislature has finalized appropriations. At this stage, we only need to know if your county will apply for the grant.

Note: The application for the Competitive Grant is scheduled for release in June.

Would you like to "opt-in" for the Competitive Grant?

[select one]

Opt-in: Opting in means you intend to apply and be considered for funding.

Application: Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 25-27

Summary

ID: 0000000017

Last submitted: May 14 2025 09:48 PM (UTC)

Cover Sheet

Completed - Jul 1 2025

Cover Sheet

County

Multnomah

Primary Applicant Contact

Name:	Sarah Mullen
Organization:	Local Public Safety Coordinating Council
Title:	Executive Director
Street Address:	501 SE Hawthorne Blvd, Suite 624
City:	Portland, Or
Zip Code:	97214
E-mail:	sarah.mullen@multco.us
Phone:	(503) 988-5777

Fiscal Contact

Name:	Karen Beilstein
Legal Name of Organization for Payment:	Multnomah County Department of Community Justice
State EIN:	93-6002309
Payment Remittance Street Address:	1401 NE 68th Ave
City:	Portland
Zip Code:	97213
E-mail:	karen.beilstein@multco.us
Phone:	(503) 988-7569

Would you like ACH payment processing (direct deposit)?

Yes

Did your Local Public Safety Coordinating Council approve all components of your county's Justice Reinvestment Program application?

Yes

Application: Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 25-27

Summary

ID: 0000000017

Last submitted: May 14 2025 09:48 PM (UTC)

Final Formula Application

In Progress - Last edited: Jul 8 2025

Final Formula Application

Budget Projection Sheet: Formula Grant

Please download the Budget Projection Sheet ([click here](#)), and then upload your Formula Grant Budget Projection Sheet here.

To assist with completing your Budget Projection Sheet, you can view the 2025-27 Justice Reinvestment Funding Table by clicking [here](#).

[Blank Place holder 25-27_JRP_Budget_Projection_Sheet.xlsx](#)

Filename: Blank Place holder 25-27_JRP_Budget_Projection_Sheet.xlsx **Size:** 32.6 kB

Letters of Support + Statements of Commitment

If any of your letters of support or statements of commitment have changed since your preliminary application, upload those here.

Did the Justice Reinvestment Grant Review Committee (GRC) provide feedback to your county on your preliminary application?

Yes

Please input the feedback the GRC provided to your county here (emailed to you on May 30th). Please include the program name with the feedback statement.

Example: "Jail Release Resource Program: Clarify if the program mixes risk levels"

GRC Feedback #1	Mixed Risk Levels
GRC Feedback #2	(No response)
GRC Feedback #3	(No response)
GRC Feedback #4	(No response)
GRC Feedback #5	(No response)
GRC Feedback #6	(No response)
GRC Feedback #7	(No response)
GRC Feedback #8	(No response)
GRC Feedback #9	(No response)
GRC Feedback #10	(No response)
GRC Feedback #11	(No response)
GRC Feedback #12	(No response)
GRC Feedback #13	(No response)

Please input your county's response to the GRC-provided feedback in the corresponding number from above.
(GRC Feedback #1 is answered in Response #1.)

If your program has changed since the preliminary application and this feedback no longer applies, please state so.

Example: Program has changed/been removed, feedback no longer applies, and changes will be detailed below.

Tip: Do not reiterate what is in the preliminary application, but instead respond to the specific points of clarification.

Response #1	<p>Multnomah County does not mix risk levels in supervision or service delivery.</p> <p>It is not best practice to mix individuals of higher risk levels with those of a lower risk because it can lead to lower risk individuals being negatively influenced by antisocial attitudes and behaviors of higher risk clients. Multnomah County formal supervision follows evidence based practices that emphasize tailoring interventions to the individual based on their assessed risk level. Higher risk individuals require enhanced services and contact to address their barriers and needs and reduce their likelihood of reoffending. This also allows resources to be effectively allocated to those individuals with the greatest need.</p>
Response #2	(No response)
Response #3	(No response)
Response #4	(No response)
Response #5	(No response)
Response #6	(No response)
Response #7	(No response)

Response #8	(No response)
Response #9	(No response)
Response #10	(No response)
Response #11	(No response)
Response #12	(No response)
Response #13	(No response)

Do you need to change, add or remove a program that was submitted as part of your county's preliminary application?

Select all that apply

Responses Selected:

None

Application: Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 25-27

Summary

ID: 0000000017

Last submitted: May 14 2025 09:48 PM (UTC)

Competitive Grant Application

Completed - Jul 21 2025

Competitive Grant Application

Budget Projection Sheet: Competitive Grant

Please download the Budget Projection Sheet ([click here](#)), and then upload your Competitive Grant Budget Projection Sheet here.

[25-27_JRP_Budget_Projection_Sheet_Competitive\(1\).xlsx](#)

Filename: 25-27_JRP_Budget_Projection_Sheet_Competitive (1).xlsx Size: 88.6 kB

Downward Departure Program Target Population

What target population(s) is this downward departure program designed to serve?

As applicable, make sure to include any underserved populations as defined in HB 3064 (2019), including racial and ethnic minorities; women; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and other minority gender identity communities; and other historically underserved communities.

Gender Identity

(select all that apply)

Responses Selected:

Men
Women

Non-binary Individuals

Not listed

Please specify below:

Women and young men of color, 25 years and under

Race/Ethnicity

If it is a general eligibility program, select "all."

(select all that apply).

Responses Selected:

All

Other Historically Underserved Communities

(select all that apply).

Responses Selected:

LGBTQIA+

Risk Level

(select all that apply).

Responses Selected:

High
Medium
Low

Does your program mix these risk levels?

No

Which crime types does this downward departure program target?

(select all that apply).

Responses Selected:

Driving Offenses (generally ORS chapters 811, 813)
Property Offenses (generally ORS chapters 164, 165)
Drug Offenses (generally ORS chapters 471, 475)
Other (please indicate ORS #)
There are exceptions to the crime type(s) selected above

Please indicate other crime types below.

The MCJRP process is intended for those arrested and/or charged with a felony offense that carries a presumptive prison sentence (12 months + 1 day or more), issued on or after July 1, 2014. Eligible offenses include those in the categories of property crime, drug crime, vehicular crime, weapon offenses, public order offenses, general welfare offenses, and certain felony person crimes.

OPTIONAL: If you'd like to provide additional context surrounding other accepted crime types, please do so here:

NA

Please indicate the exceptions below.

Exceptions include domestic violence charges, sex crimes, homicides and Tier I BM11 offenses. Beginning on or after September 30, 2019, otherwise MCJRP-eligible cases in the following categories are were deemed not eligible for the MCJRP process: • Defendants who are currently serving a DOC (12 months + 1 day or more) sentence, unless all parties agree to the MCJRP process • Defendants with more than one pending MCJRP Eligible Unlawful Use of a Vehicle (UUV) or Possession of a Stolen Vehicle (PSV) case • Stand-alone vehicular crimes (e.g. Felony DUII, Felony DWS, H&R Felony)

OPTIONAL: If you'd like to provide additional context surrounding the exceptions, please do so here:

NA

Residency Requirements

(select one).

Other

Please specify below:

Eligible defendants may participate in the MCJRP adjudication. Only County residents receive supervision services.

Criminal History

Are there any criminal history factors which would result in automatic exclusion from the program?

Yes

If yes, please list the criminal history factors which would result in an automatic exclusion from the program.

Exceptions include domestic violence charges, sex crimes, homicides and Tier I BM11 offenses. Beginning on or after September 30, 2019, otherwise MCJRP-eligible cases in the following categories are were deemed not eligible for the MCJRP process: • Defendants who are currently serving a DOC (12 months + 1 day or more) sentence, unless all parties agree to the MCJRP process • Defendants with more than one pending MCJRP Eligible Unlawful Use of a Vehicle (UUV) or Possession of a Stolen Vehicle (PSV) case • Stand-alone vehicular crimes (e.g. Felony DUII, Felony DWS, H&R Felony)

OPTIONAL: Other

If any, please specify what other conditions or criteria influence sentencing decisions that are not addressed in the above sections.

Word Limit: 100

NA

Downward Departure Program Design

Program Status: Is this program new, existing, or previously funded?

(select one)

Previously funded program – Received Competitive Grant funding in (insert biennium in which it was funded):: 2017
-2025

Briefly describe your downward departure program.

Describe how the requested key personnel position(s) are important to your downward departure program and their purpose therein.

Word Limit: 200

Defense-based Social Workers and Case Managers provide pre-sentence community-based services to decrease prison use and further system involvement. They support timely case resolution and client stabilization through assessments, case planning, service referral, hearing participation, and operational meetings. Positions help clients understand the process and build relationships, including transitions to community supervision. Goals include maintaining 70% of clients out of custody and avoiding re-arrest prior to sentencing.

The dedicated Probation Violation DDA addresses MCJRP probation violations focused on probationer success, consistent case handling, avoiding "second" prison sentences and improving probation performance. The PV DDA staffs violations with DCJ weekly, attends violation hearings ensuring timely case resolution, handles global resolutions for cases with new violations, attends operations meetings, assists training system partners and collects/reports performance data.

Which assessments will be used to inform downward departure sentencing?

(select all that apply)

Responses Selected:

PSC

How is the PSC used to inform downward departure sentencing?

Example: The PSC is used as an initial triaging tool to determine whether or not a candidate for our downward departure program will receive a more detailed assessment (WRNA or LS/CMI) later.

Word Limit: 50

The Public Safety Checklist (PSC) assesses individual criminal risk factors, including risk for future criminal involvement, to inform the appropriateness of a downward departure and case supervision options. Post adjudication, DCJ utilizes the PSC and LS/CMI (males) and WRNA (females) to create individualized supervision plans.

When is the PSC assessment completed?

Example: Assessment is used after an initial assessment but before sentencing.

Word Limit: 50

DCJ probation completes a Pre-Adjudication Report (PAR) after arraignment on indictment but prior to sentencing. The Pre-Adjudication Report includes a PSC or Proxy (for Out of State convictions, juvenile records or if no PSC is available), which is completed by a DCJ probation officer.

Who receives the results of the PSC assessment?

Example: Courts, District Attorneys, defense counsel, etc.

Word Limit: 50

The Pre-Adjudication Report, including the PSC or Proxy, is forwarded to the Court Coordinator to distribute and ensure it is received by all parties including the assigned Judge, Deputy District Attorney, Defense Counsel and Defense Social Worker. It is completed on all MCJRP eligible clients once eligibility has been established.

Referral Process

If a defendant meets all eligibility requirements to participate in the downward departure program, who is the decision maker at each step in the process?

Example:

- *Candidate identification: Probation officers identify candidates based on eligibility criteria.*
- *Assessment: A licensed clinician conducts initial and follow-up assessments using the PSC and LS/CMI.*
- *Sentencing recommendation: A multidisciplinary team, including probation officers and defense counsel, submits recommendations to the judge.*
- *Final sentencing decision: The judge determines program placement based on recommendations.*

Word Limit: 100

The District Attorney determines eligibility. A sworn probation officer conducts the initial assessment using the Public Safety Checklist and an ASAM, if available. An ASAM may be coordinated by the defense attorney or may be conducted by a CADC if the defendant is in custody. The probation officer generates a pre-adjudication report which is provided to all parties. All parties may participate in a judicial settlement conference. The judge determines the final sentence, including placement on probation, specialty court or prison.

Supervision

Describe the caseload ratio for probation officers to clients in this program. If it differs from standard supervision, explain how this supports program goals.

Word Limit: 100

MCJRP caseloads are 35 or fewer with supervision that includes smaller caseloads, priority for the Treatment Readiness Dorm, peer mentors, and specialty courts/treatment placements. High-Risk probationers remain under enhanced supervision for at least 120 days. They must comply with court orders, report to PO at least twice/month, and in-person visits every 45 days. Medium supervision probationers report to PO and/or a mentor monthly, maintain regular contact, and complete home visits every 90 days. Low risk probationers must verify compliance with all court conditions. Transfer to specialized gang, mental health and domestic violence caseloads may be considered.

Describe the process for handling violations of supervision conditions. If it differs from standard supervision, explain how and why.

Word Limit: 100

DCJ's response grid imposes least restrictive sanctions to address community safety, violation behavior, and behavior change. Sanctions range least to most restrictive. MCJRP policy requires the Court and DA be notified on extended absconds, contact with victim(s), failure to pay restitution, and/or new law violation. Cases return to the sentencing judge if possible. PVs and revocations are staffed with the PV DDA for consistent case handling, sentencing, and global resolutions. Technical violations may receive warnings or administrative sanction. Warrants may receive administrative sanctions, including jail time. New law violations may become judicial detainees.

Service Capacity

Competitive Grant Funding may not be used to support wraparound services or sanctions for program participants, such as treatment, housing, or peer mentors. Applicants are strongly encouraged to use their Formula Grant Justice Reinvestment Program funding to build appropriate local service and sanction capacity.

Does your county have the capacity to provide the appropriate levels of service listed below to downward departure clients?

Substance Use Treatment

No

Housing

Yes

Peer Mentors

Yes

Mental Health Treatment

Yes

Other, please specify:

Social Work teams are key to stabilizing MCJRP downward departure clients prior to adjudication and increase the opportunity for participants to avoid a prison sentence. Presentence and Post-sentence/Supervision service capacity differ and are addressed separately below.

Presentence Mentor Capacity: Defense social work teams lack sufficient internal mentor capacity and/or access to community-based peer mentors to provide services to defendants before sentencing. Metropolitan Public Defenders does employ one full time case manager, working across all MPD cases, who can serve as a Certified Recovery Mentor (CRM/peer mentor). Currently, Multnomah Defenders, Inc houses a social worker and case manager dedicated to MCJRP clients but does not have internal access to mentors. Social workers do include mentors in case plans but report lengthy waiting lists and high turnover in community-based mentor programs.

Presentence Mental Health Capacity: Consistent with statewide trends, residents of Multnomah County lack sufficient access to mental health services to meet demand. This is particularly true pre-sentence; post-sentence, probationers can access services specifically linked to supervision.

There has been a sustained increase in mental health acuity; a larger number of defendants (both pre-and post sentence) are presenting with either symptoms, or a previous diagnosis, of Schizophrenia, Bipolar Disorder, Psychosis and other Serious and Persistent Mental Illnesses (SPMI). There is only one inpatient drug and alcohol center that accepts Medicaid and provides dual diagnosis treatment. Other than the Oregon State Hospital, which is reserved for those unable to aid and assist in their defense or have been civilly committed, there is no other hospital level of treatment of care that can be entered directly from jail. Additionally, once released from custody there is an exceptionally long wait to meet with a psychiatric provider. For example, the largest local mental health provider has a waitlist of three to six months for outpatient psychiatric care. Additionally, defendants are released from jail with only a thirty day supply of prescribed psychotropic medication, which is insufficient to bridge the time needed to reestablish a care plan. Crisis response teams are similarly difficult to access; while the Social Work teams can, and do, refer to Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) services.

If no, briefly describe why you do not presently have the capacity to adequately provide Substance Use Treatment and what steps you will be taking to increase that capacity:

Presentence Substance Use Treatment Capacity: Consistent with statewide trends, Multnomah County does not have sufficient access to substance use treatment to meet demand. This is particularly true pre-sentence, after which probationers can access services specifically linked to supervision.

Currently there are two Medicaid funded substance abuse treatment centers that regularly accept defendants directly from jail. Of those, only one offers treatment for defendants with co-occurring mental health disorders (both mental health and substance abuse disorders), a common diagnosis. There are many other individual barriers (e.g. insurance authorization) as well as systemic barriers (e.g. inadequate staffing ratios), that further restrict which defendants can enter dual diagnosis programs on a timely basis.

Currently, the average wait for a dual diagnosis inpatient treatment bed is approximately seven months for defendants pre-adjudication. Those who do not require dual diagnosis treatment have an average wait time of approximately two months. Male defendants with a history of arson or sex crimes have only one inpatient treatment center option, located in Washington County. There is currently only one inpatient treatment care center in the state, located in Madras, for those whose primary language is Spanish.

Supervision Substance Use Treatment Capacity: While treatment access for probationers post-sentencing is better than those pre-sentencing, barriers to substance abuse treatment post adjudication still exist. To improve access, DCJ contracts with various service providers in the community for stabilization housing, community based treatment readiness cognitive programs and peer mentors. DCJ also partners with a variety of Substance Use Treatment Providers in the community for both inpatient and outpatient treatment services, working closely with these partners to develop processes to quickly identify, refer and collaborate to improve the outcomes for this population.

Local Sanctions

Describe your county's capacity to provide the appropriate level of local sanctions necessary to serve the downward departure clients. Include examples, such as jail beds, community service options, or monitoring equipment.

Word Limit: 100

The Department of Community Justice (DCJ) addresses community safety violations by implementing sanctions that are the least restrictive necessary to promote effective behavioral change. Sanctions are determined using a violation response grid, progressing from least to most restrictive. These include verbal reprimands, community service, GPS and geographic restrictions, electronic home detention, and jail.

Regarding capacity, there have been limited jail sanctions matrix releases to alleviate capacity issues. However, electronic monitoring, community service, and restitution work crews have not faced restrictions.

Are structured sanctions used for every downward departure?

Yes

Revocations

Describe the process for revoking program participants.

Word Limit: 100

Revocation recommendations occur when an individual has been convicted of a new crime or presents a risk to the community, but seldom on technical violations. Typically, an individual goes through the structured sanction and court processes several times prior to a revocation recommendation.

Before revocation, probationers are sanctioned using a violation grid ranging from low-level intervention (failure to engage in supervision or case plan) to revocation (risk to public safety and/or the victim, or a demonstrated unwillingness to participate in supervision). New presumptive prison crimes are staffed with the MCJRP DDA to determine if revocation is recommended.

Downward Departure Program Impact

You are encouraged to use the following resources when projecting the number of prison intakes given program implementation:

- The [Justice Reinvestment Program Prison Usage Dashboard](#) looking specifically at the Number of Prison Intakes chart in the bottom right corner of the dashboard.
- Consult the [Justice Reinvestment Program Sentencing Dashboard](#) and look at the intakes broken down by crime type and time (first sentence v. revocation).

If you received 2023-25 Competitive (Supplemental) Grant funding, refer to last biennium's application. Did you meet your goal for anticipated decreases?

Yes

Please project the number of intakes for the following categories for the 2025-27 biennium given program implementation:

First sentence for Property Crimes:	170
Revocation for Property Crimes:	120
First sentence for Drug Crimes:	30
Revocation for Drug Crimes:	34
First sentence for Driving Crimes:	9
Revocation for Driving Crimes:	49
First sentence for Other Crimes:	440
Revocation for Other Crimes:	104

Describe how the above projections were determined for first sentences, revocations, or both.

Word Limit: 100

Projected first time prison intakes/all offense types are linear projections using local data confining base period to Q3 2023 - Q2 2025. We developed the trendline crime categories (property, drug, driving/other) by taking the slope of the trendline, projecting outward to Q2 2027.

Revocations for MCJRP supervision were projected similarly using local data, though the JRP sentencing dashboard was used to break down the revocation reason by crime type. For instance, since 42 percent of revocations are related to property crimes according to the dashboard, we multiplied .42 by the total projected number for the 25 - 27 biennium.

How will your program address factors that contributed to unmet goals in previous cycles (if applicable) or ensure the accuracy of these projections?

Word Limit: 100

The divergence between projected and empirical numbers is the result of a previous miscalculation rather than an actual unexpected and dramatic increase in prison sentences. Previous projections showed no increases in prison intakes for the current biennium, when in reality, the long-term post COVID rebound in prison sentencing should have been anticipated. Moving forward, the MCJRP analyst has devised a method to anticipate such changes using the forecast function in Excel, which will be used as part of regular reporting in the future in order to identify irregularities while using the same forecasting method is replicated throughout future analyses.

Application: Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 25-27

Summary

ID: 0000000017

Last submitted: May 14 2025 09:48 PM (UTC)

Evaluation Application

Completed - Jul 18 2025

Applicants seeking to retain funds must submit a detailed plan for the use of research funds as described below. If a county selects to retain the 3% funds and conduct evaluations in-house, funding will be released on a reimbursement basis. In choosing programs for Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) or other rigorous evaluations, CJC will consider the following factors:

- 1. The proposed program is promising and has the capability of being reproduced in other counties.***
- 2. The proposed program is capable of evaluation through RCTs or other rigorous evaluation when accounting for sample size and other practical requirements.***
- 3. The proposed RCT or other rigorous evaluation will meet the requirements of the institutional review board process.***
- 4. Studying the program will benefit the state and, more broadly, the field of criminal justice by adding to the body of knowledge available.***

Evaluation Application

Applicants seeking to retain funds must submit a detailed plan for the use of research funds as described below. If a county selects to retain the 3% funds and conduct evaluations in-house, funding will be released on a reimbursement basis. In choosing programs for Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) or other rigorous evaluations, CJC will consider the following factors:

- 1. The proposed program is promising and has the capability of being reproduced in other counties.*
- 2. The proposed program is capable of evaluation through RCTs or other rigorous evaluation when accounting for sample size and other practical requirements.*
- 3. The proposed RCT or other rigorous evaluation will meet the requirements of the institutional review board process.*
- 4. Studying the program will benefit the state and, more broadly, the field of criminal justice by adding to the body of knowledge available.*

Budget Projection Sheet: Evaluation

Please download the Budget Projection Sheet ([click here](#)), and then upload your Evaluation Budget Projection Sheet here.

[25-27_JRP_Budget_Projection_Sheet_Evaluation.xlsx](#)

Filename: 25-27_JRP_Budget_Projection_Sheet_Evaluation.xlsx **Size:** 85.1 kB

1. What is the primary research question the proposed project will seek to answer?

The MCJRP program strives to ensure that defendants that are eligible for downward departures remain in the community with the support they need to be successful. Although this is an explicit goal of the MCJRP program post-adjudication, less attention has been given to the efforts of partners to support individuals in the community before their cases are resolved. As delays in case processing have significantly expanded the duration of the pretrial period since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, there is increasing urgency to know whether MCJRP participants are successful on pretrial monitoring as well as understand how defendants' performance during pretrial impacts sentencing and recidivism down the line. Our research proposal aims to examine these effects for the MCJRP population. The evaluation will be conducted in three phases and will focus on three topical areas: (1): the impact of pretrial monitoring on pretrial success/failure for the MCJRP population, (2) the impact of the client social work program on case resolution and recidivism outcomes, and (3) how proposed changes to the assessment and case processing model impact case resolution and recidivism outcomes.

Research question one: What is the impact of pretrial monitoring on pretrial success or failure for MCJRP eligible defendants?

Defendants released from custody are referred to one of two pretrial monitoring programs: Close Street Services (CSS) and Pretrial Services Program (PSP). CSS is operated by the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office and typically involves more intensive monitoring for higher risk defendants. PSP is operated by the Department of Community Justice (DCJ) and involves less intensive monitoring for lower risk defendants. In addition, lower risk defendants may not be required to check in with pretrial staff and are released on their own recognizance (ROR). Our evaluation will look at the impact of pretrial monitoring for MCJRP participants compared to those released on their own recognizance as well as those MCJRP eligible defendants never released from custody to isolate the impact of pretrial monitoring.

Research question two: How does having a social worker/case manager affect pretrial outcomes (compliance and recidivism)?

The second phase of the evaluation will focus on the support participants receive from social work teams (SWT) at Metropolitan Public Defenders and Multnomah Defenders, Inc. Multnomah is unique among Oregon jurisdictions for having social work/case managers infused in the defense firms to provide case management to clients before their trial. Social workers provide a number of important services including initiating assessments, developing case plans, referring clients to services and treatment, as well as attending judicial settlement conferences and release hearings. Through these efforts, social workers play a significant role in client stabilization, timely case processing, and the successful resolution of cases toward downward departures. Although the social work model has been a part of MCJRP since 2017, Multnomah has not yet conducted a formal evaluation of the SWT and the impacts they

have on client success.

Research question three: How do changes to the assessment and case processing model impact sentencing and success on supervision as well as time to disposition.

The third phase of our evaluation will examine recently proposed changes to our assessment and case processing model. Starting July 1st 2025, Multnomah modified its assessment process in order to expedite case resolutions and to re-focus DCJ resources toward supervision. As part of this new model, we will also implement a two-track assessment process beginning October 1st in order to identify cases that are most likely to receive a downward departure as well as to help expedite resolutions and reduce time to disposition. Historically, the LSCMI has been conducted by DCJ writers post indictment for every eligible MCJRP case. Writers also provided an extensive MCJRP Pretrial Assessment Report (PAR) that detailed risk, need, criminal history and a summary of clients' supervision history. This process assisted defense attorneys in their mitigation, enabled DCJ staff to provide upfront case planning, and helped DDAs facilitate pretrial offers and plea negotiations. Beginning July 1st, DCJ substituted the LSCMI with the ASAM and created a more abridged PAR report for all parties. The ASAM is a comprehensive needs assessment that can be procured more easily by the defense firms without taking unnecessary resources and time away from DCJ staff. We hope to demonstrate that these changes successfully reduced average time to disposition while not increasing prison intakes or recidivism

2. What, if any, are the secondary research questions the proposed project will seek to answer?

Each of the three proposed research questions has corresponding secondary questions.

Primary Question one: What is the impact of pretrial monitoring on pretrial success or failure for MCJRP eligible defendants?

Secondary questions:

Are defendants that fail pretrial monitoring more likely to be sentenced to prison?

It's generally believed that individuals that fail during the pre-trial period— whether through absconding or picking up a new offense—are more likely to be sentenced to prison as part of a global resolution of all outstanding cases. Pretrial release violations are also generally considered aggravating in sentencing, potentially leading to harsher penalties and longer prison terms. In light of this, failing pretrial monitoring would be counterproductive to the goals of MCJRP by increasing the number of prison intakes.

Are defendants that fail pretrial monitoring more likely to recidivate or be revoked from supervision post-adjudication?

In other words, are MCJRP participants that violate and fail their pretrial conditions more likely to violate and fail their probation later? Understanding this relationship will be helpful for partners in terms of case planning and identifying barriers and unmet needs that would prevent an individual from being successful once they've been sentenced to supervision.

What impact does treatment dorm residency have on supervision outcomes?

In 2020, Multnomah County completed an evaluation of the treatment dorm. Although the results were promising, there is renewed interest in understanding whether individuals in the treatment dorm are more likely to be stabilized in the community once released from custody compared to other defendants.

Question two: How does having a social worker/case manager affect pretrial outcomes (compliance and recidivism)?

What are the impacts of defendants utilizing the social work program (social impacts, such as employment, treatment, education, etc.)?

In addition to understanding the impacts on recidivism and pretrial compliance we plan to evaluate the effects that specific services have on client outcomes. This will help future case planning as well determine if there are gaps in available services.

Who is likely to engage in the social work program, and what barriers exist for programming?

Understanding who is more likely to be referred by defense attorneys as well as who is more likely to engage in programming is important for understanding our results and for eliminating barriers to program participation and engagement.

What were the experiences of defendants who utilized the social work program?

We hope to conduct structured interviews with defendants to be able to understand their experiences with their

social work team and provide lessons for future program development.

Question three: How do changes to the assessment and case processing model impact sentencing and success on supervision as well as time to disposition.

What effect does changing assessments from the LSCMI to the ASAM have on case resolution, and sentencing outcomes?

Are comparable pre-post cases more or less likely to receive the same sentence? Does the shift from LSCMI to ASAM reduce assessment completion time?

Does the new model change the proportion of cases diverted?

Is the profile of the MCJRP participants the same pre and post new assessment (and track model) by demographics, risks, needs, charges, etc.)?

Are there risk/needs profiles of individuals the same for supervision pre and post changes? Most MCJRP cases still receive the LSCMI when they start supervision. It is worth comparing their LSCMI post-adjudication scores before and after the changes to determine if the profile of the average participant has changed in terms of needs and risk.

Stakeholder and system impact: how do judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys and probation officers perceive the new model's usefulness, efficiency and fairness?

3. Please provide a brief review of the existing social scientific research related to the proposed project.

There is a shortage of rigorous evaluations of pretrial monitoring, and virtually none related specifically to diversion populations. However, the Center for Effective Policy's (CEFP) Advancing Pretrial Policy and Research has provided a summary of the available experimental and quasi-experimental studies in their brief titled Pretrial Research Summary. Their conclusions can be summarized as : (1) pretrial monitoring is associated with somewhat higher court appearance rates but has no clear association with changes in arrest-free rates, (2) the intensity of pretrial monitoring does not appear to impact court appearance and arrest-free rates, and (3) for people assessed as least likely to succeed pretrial, pretrial monitoring shows more promise.

Overall, pretrial resources may be under-utilized or ineffective unless they are appropriately received by a population which is receptive to a structured community supervision environment. Individuals with overall moderate levels of risk and need are more prone to benefit from social services and efforts of case managers dedicated to facilitating stability, engagement & successful outcomes (Hatton & Smith, 2020). Studies also find that pretrial supervision and social support promising reductions in FTA rates.

The first documented social worker infused in a Public Defender Office was in 1969 (Santa Clara County Office of the Public Defender) and their main role was to interview clients, gather client information, understand the client's strengths and weaknesses, and identify alternatives to jail and prison (Wald, 1972). Over the next fifty years, social workers have proven their efficacy within the criminal justice system, especially for Public Defenders Offices, and have evolved into mitigation specialists with expertise in biopsychosocial assessments, familial dynamics, and overall human development (Hurd, 2023). Social workers also can uncover extenuating services that can help defendants receive favorable offers from prosecuting attorneys (Mundy, 2013). More recently, the implementation of specialty courts, which have a sentencing philosophy rooted in the incorporation of the defendant's personalized situation and history in the sentencing decision, have relied on social workers to provide investigative reports, assessment, and case management (Shafer & Ashford, 2015). Specifically, according to Hurd (2023), social workers within the pretrial phase often help with release plans and complying with the plans, assess clients for mental or cognitive impairment, and provide help understanding the nature and context of the case. Further, social workers have the ability to hold the criminal legal system accountable for racial bias, increase procedural fairness, and increase court participation and outcomes (Hurd, 2023). Ultimately, when social workers are infused within the criminal justice system and programming, social determinants for clients increase. Social workers' individualized oversight of clients has beneficial impacts on supervision outcomes, yet there is an ongoing need to further identify what specific areas of oversight are most effective (Hatton & Smith, 2020). The research available is dated and inspires a need for further analysis to quantify what areas of social work are most relevant to the current and evolving pretrial environment (Matei & Siegel, 2020).

In terms of pre-adjudication assessments, pretrial monitoring success is strongly associated with static pre-adjudication assessment factors found in one's criminal history (DeLisi et al, 2019). Limited charges, later age of first arrest, and no substance abuse issues combined, are shown to be significantly connected to higher rates of

success in supervised pretrial release (SPR). These factors are also associated with less re-arrests over time (DeLisi et al, 2019). Research also reveals that clients with lower levels of criminal history and higher levels of education are more likely to complete supervised pretrial release and benefit from resources provided (Bolger & Philips, 2023).

4. Please describe how this project will benefit the State of Oregon as well as the field of criminal justice more broadly.

Although pretrial monitoring is widely used throughout the country it is severely understudied, and is even more understudied so for diversion populations. Authors from Advancing Pretrial Research and Policy (APPR) note that “the most notable gap in the pretrial monitoring literature is the absence of empirical evaluations regarding the effectiveness of common pretrial release conditions and practices on a person’s likelihood of appearing in court or remaining arrest-free pretrial” (APPR, Pretrial Monitoring, 2025). Research has found that diversion populations generally have lower risk but higher needs than the general felony population (Cuddeback GS, Wright D, Bisig NG. (2013); Viglione, J., & Taxman, F. S. (2018)) and may be especially sensitive to interventions made at the pretrial phase.

If pretrial monitoring is determined to have a positive effect on outcomes for the MCJRP population, then it justifies current practices in terms of level of monitoring, pretrial program selection criteria, etc. If monitoring is found to harm pretrial success (e.g. increased arrests or failures to appear), this would suggest modifying pretrial approaches for the MCJRP population. For instance, there is evidence from supervision literature which suggests that more intensive forms of supervision are more likely to lead to revocations due to the increased number of check-ins increasing the opportunities for violations (Rising et. al , 2022). If this relationship holds for pretrial monitoring it may suggest reducing monitoring activities or potentially expanding more frequent supportive services rather than monitoring.

Furthermore, the research will demonstrate how success or failure during pretrial predicts outcomes for individuals eventually sentenced to supervision. Research has shown that individuals that comply with pretrial supervision conditions (e.g. check-ins, electronic monitoring tend to have better post-adjudication outcomes, and that jurisdictions with pretrial diversion programs) tend to fare better during post-release supervision (DeMatteo, D., LaDuke, C., Locklair, B. R., & Heilbrun, K. (2013). This study will examine whether this relationship holds true for JRP eligible defendants and can help to answer what type of pre-adjudication services and interventions may be helpful for ensuring long-term success on supervision.

In addition, this research will investigate if adding a social work component (practice-based evidence demonstrates promising results), increases the efficacy of the justice reinvestment programming. There is relatively limited research on the inclusion of social work services within the pre-trial phase, and even more scant when examining their work within the public defenders process. As such this project would fill a large gap in the larger criminology/criminal justice literature, as well as the social work literature.

Finally, we believe our research proposal could potentially illustrate an improved method for expediting cases toward downward departures. Our planned two-track model is meant to reduce time to disposition, particularly for

early identified probation cases (track one). We believe our research could illustrate ways in to resolve large numbers of felony cases while not jeopardizing community safety by ensuring the appropriate sentencing of cases.

Given that the MCJRP population differs from the Oregon-wide JRP population in terms of types of offenses individuals are referred for, we propose to include a subset analysis for every research question where we limit our study population to individuals referred for property, drug and driving offenses. We believe this is the best way to ensure that our findings have applicability across the different Oregon jurisdictions.

5. Please describe your dissemination plan for the results of this project.

The results from this project will be disseminated in phases corresponding to the three separate proposed phases.

Report 1: the first report on pretrial monitoring will be completed in the Spring of 2026 (April/May)

Report 2: The second report on the impact of the social work program will be completed in early 2027 (January/February)

Report 3: The third report on changes to the assessment and case processing model will be completed by the end of the biennium (July/August 2027).

All three phases will follow the same general format:

Presentations: The findings will be presented to the Justice Reinvestment Steering Committee, MCJRP operations groups, and to other community stakeholders and groups such as the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council (LPSCC). We also plan on providing presentations to CJC along with the written reports.

Progress reports: Progress will also be provided to the relevant committees once a quarter to ensure the evaluations are on track and to solicit feedback from stakeholders and MCJRP leadership. If requested by CJC, we can also submit progress, interim reports, or hold additional meetings to discuss progress.

Final Report: A final report for all three phases will be completed for archiving purposes. We may combine all phases into a single report or keep them as three separate reports depending on how our research evolves and what stakeholders will find helpful.

Misc. Products: Through the course of a large project, there are often stakeholder requests, and other products that are directly related to the data. This project will be adaptive to the needs of leadership and create products that can meet the needs of stakeholders real time.

6. How will other Oregon criminal justice stakeholders be able to replicate your program in their jurisdictions?

While it may be impractical for stakeholders to replicate our pretrial monitoring programs wholesale, we believe that by focusing on practical and actionable findings that apply to the JRP eligible population more broadly, we can identify best practices for the JRP population and influence similar examinations of other jurisdictions' pretrial practices. Some areas of focus that will have general appeal to other Oregon stakeholders include the frequency of check-ins, service referrals, violation policies, and judicial release decisions. In addition, we will collect information related to the defendant's criminal history and LSCMI/ASAM risk factors. This will help to identify individual factors related to the Oregon JRP target population and identify the types and levels of interventions that influence successful outcomes.

In terms of phase two of the evaluation, the results from this study will provide a blueprint for establishing a social work program, what a social work program might look like, and how to evaluate a social work program that is housed within a public defender's office. Specifically, the final report will include the data collection methodologies and analysis strategies, therefore serving as a recipe for replication. We hypothesize that individuals that have a social worker and are referred for services, controlling for other significant factors, are less likely to recidivate or abscond into warrant status while on pretrial. By identifying the client characteristics as well as the type of services that predict successful outcomes we hope to provide insight into what interventions and level of support make a difference for individuals during pretrial.

Finally, our evaluation of our newly-revised assessment and case processing model should speak to successful strategies for reducing time to disposition while not increasing prison sentencing or recidivism. The crux of our reforms includes the implementation of a two-track model where cases are more clearly assigned to a specific case resolution track (e.g. probation, prison, and either probation or prison). Cases that are likely to be resolved to probation, for example, will be identified and resolved more quickly. We are hoping that such efforts will reduce time to disposition while ensuring that cases are still resolved to their appropriate sentences. If successful, we believe this is a model that can be replicated across jurisdictions particularly for counties such as ours that struggle with prolonged time to disposition.

Research Design and Methodology

1. Describe the study population and expected sample size estimates.

Question one: What is the impact of pretrial monitoring on pretrial success or failure for MCJRP eligible defendants?

Study population: All MCJRP eligible cases from January 2022 (post-pandemic) period onward. Will include all cases released from custody before adjudication.

Estimated sample size: 4,000 – 5,000 total cases; 3,500 – 4,000 individuals

Question two: How does having a social worker/case manager affect pretrial outcomes (compliance and recidivism)?

Study population: This study will include the population of persons who have been sentenced under the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP) from the inception of the program through the end of the fiscal year 2026.

Estimated sample size: About 900 individuals; about 450 with assigned social worker; about 450 for comparison group.

Question three: How do changes to the assessment and case processing model impact sentencing and success on supervision as well as time to disposition.

Study population: all MCJRP eligible cases from July 1, 2024 through the time of analysis (probably June 30, 2026 or December 31, 2026). The period between July 1, 2024 through September 2025 will serve as the comparison period (pre-changes) while the period following October 1, 2025 will serve as the treatment period.

Estimated sample size: 2,000 - 2,500 cases

2. Please describe the control group; if a random control trial is not possible, please explain how the proposed research will employ a quasi-experimental design.

Due to the nature of this study, it is unethical to employ a RCT, as the interventions are required to be offered to all participants in the Justice Reinvestment Program. To overcome selection bias, this will be a quasi-experimental study that will employ propensity score matching to match defendants who received the treatment versus those that did not. Care will be taken to understand exactly how defendants are selected for each group to ensure that a workable comparison group can be created. To this end, researchers will initiate each project by interviewing stakeholders to understand selection criteria.

Question one: What is the impact of pretrial monitoring on pretrial success or failure for MCJRP eligible defendants?

Treatment group: MCJRP-eligible defendants selected to pretrial monitoring (Close Street or PSP).

Comparison group 1: MCJRP eligible defendants released on their own recognizance

Comparison group 2: MCJRP eligible defendants who were never released from custody

Question two: How does having a social worker/case manager affect pretrial outcomes (compliance and recidivism)?

Treatment group: MCJRP eligible defendants referred to a social worker by Metropolitan Public Defenders or Multnomah Defenders Inc.

Comparison group: MCJRP eligible defendants not referred to social worker.

Question three: How do changes to the assessment and case processing model impact sentencing and success on supervision as well as time to disposition.

Treatment group: MCJRP eligible defendants indicted after October 1, 2025

Comparison group: MCJRP eligible defendants indicted between July 1, 2024 and September 2025

3. What statistical methodology(ies) will be used to analyze your data?

For all three research questions we will employ a combination of descriptive, comparative and predictive statistical techniques.

Question one: What is the impact of pretrial monitoring on pretrial success or failure for MCJRP eligible defendants?

Descriptive:

Structured stakeholder/key informant interviews: We will interview recog officers, judges, defense attorneys, and prosecutors to determine how participants are selected for each pretrial program vs the criteria for release on recognizance, as well as to provide background and details regarding the monitoring process.

Descriptive analysis to illustrate the JRP pretrial out-of-custody population including bivariate analysis, hypothesis testing, and statistically appropriate measures of central tendency.

Inferential

Logistic regression using cases matched by Propensity Score Matching with Close Street and/or PSP indicated as treatment variables to identify effects net of controls. In addition, we will evaluate effects of pretrial monitoring failure on sentencing outcomes and recidivism.

Cox Survival analysis to evaluate time to disposition for pretrial failure.

Question two: How does having a social worker/case manager affect pretrial outcomes (compliance and recidivism)?

Descriptive

Structured interviews with Social Work Team (SWT) and defense attorneys to understand selection criteria as well as to provide background and details regarding social work case management.

Structured interviews with social work clients to understand the impact of the program on their behaviors and attitudes.

Paired sample t-tests/Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test for participant (pre-post) surveys.

Inferential

Logistic regression to identify average treatment effect for social work cases using cases matched by PSM.

Outcome variables will include recidivism (new warrants or convictions) and new detentions.

Cox Survival analysis to evaluate time to recidivism for treatment and control.

Question three: How do changes to the assessment and case processing model impact sentencing and success on supervision as well as time to disposition.

Descriptive:

Structured interviews with MCJRP Operations team including judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys and probation officers to understand reasons for system changes, selection criteria for the different tracks.

Evaluate cases pre and post system changes to compare the bivariate distribution of cases by sentencing type and demographics, risk scores, needs and criminal history

Inferential

Difference of difference or Regression Discontinuity weighted by PSM to compare outcomes before versus after reforms. Outcomes in this case would be sentenced to probation vs prison, and one-year recidivism post adjudication. The exact model will depend on how the eligibility tracks are determined (if using a cutoff for instance we would likely use regression discontinuity).

ASAM validation. Test if ASAM improves outcomes over the LSCI. Use inter-rater reliability tests such as Cohen's Kappa to compare how well ASAM scores correlate with successful outcomes such as probation compliance and settlement success and compare them to historical LSCMI correlations.

4. If the project involves the collection of primary data, please describe the IRB process you will use and the expected IRB timeline for this project.

The social work analysis will include qualitative interviews with twenty participants. This portion will be governed under a private IRB, Sterling IRB

List project deliverables and expected completion dates, including the following:

Research Question One

Data Collection (quantitative): August 2025 - October 2025

Key stakeholder interviews: September - November 2025

Report completion and presentations to MCJRP Ops/JRSC/LPSCC/CJC: April/May 2026

Research Question Two

Data Collection (quantitative): April 2026 - July 2026

IRB Approval Letter - April 2026

Key stakeholder interviews: April - May 2026

Participant interviews: April - May 2026

Report completion and presentations to MCJRP Ops/JRSC/LPSCC/CJC: January - February 2027

Research Question Three

Data Collection (quantitative): July 2025 - December 2026

Report Writing: April 2027 - June 2027

Presentations to MCJRP Ops/JRSC/LPSCC/CJC: July - August 2027

5. List project deliverables and expected completion dates, including the following:

IRB Approval Letter	See above
Quarterly updates on research progress and recruitment	See above
A written report of study results	See above

6. If using subcontracted research, provide a plan for the overall management of the project.

No subcontractors will be solicited for this evaluation.

7. If cooperating with another county (or counties) to increase sample size, specify how fidelity to the program between (or among) counties will be monitored and maintained.

No other counties will be solicited for this evaluation.

Application: Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 25-27

Summary

ID: 0000000017

Last submitted: May 14 2025 09:48 PM (UTC)

Victim Services Application

Completed - Jul 1 2025

Instructions

- The **county** must complete **Section 1** before distributing this form to victim services providers.
- Each **victim services provider** must complete a separate **Section 2** for their organization.
- This form collects programmatic information only. **Budget sheets will be collected after the Commission makes final award decisions in September 2025.**
 - Each victim services provider will need to complete a budget sheet.
- At least 10% of the total Justice Reinvestment Program grant award must be allocated to community-based nonprofit organizations providing victim services.
 - Funds **cannot** be used for government-based victim services (e.g., DA's Office).
 - **All** victim service providers **for both the Formula and Competitive Grants** (if applicable) should be inputted into this section of the application.
- Oregon statute requires that priority be given to culturally specific organizations and culturally responsive services.

Victim Services Application

Instructions

- The **county** must complete **Section 1** before distributing this form to victim services providers.
- Each **victim services provider** must complete a separate **Section 2** for their organization.
- This form collects programmatic information only. **Budget sheets will be collected after the Commission makes final award decisions in September 2025.**
 - Each victim services provider will need to complete a budget sheet.

- At least 10% of the total Justice Reinvestment Program grant award must be allocated to community-based nonprofit organizations providing victim services.
- Funds **cannot** be used for government-based victim services (e.g., DA's Office).
- **All** victim service providers for both the Formula and Competitive Grants (if applicable) should be inputted into this section of the application.
- Oregon statute requires that priority be given to culturally specific organizations and culturally responsive services.

SECTION 1: COUNTY-LEVEL QUESTIONS

To be completed by the county JRP grant applicant

1. County Prioritization of Victim Services Providers

Oregon statute requires that culturally specific organizations and culturally responsive services be prioritized when selecting community-based victim services providers. *If your county did not prioritize any providers under this requirement, briefly explain why (e.g., no qualifying organizations applied).*

Please describe how your county considered this requirement when selecting and allocating funds to providers.

Word Limit: 150

Multnomah County requires culturally responsive procurement. For this procurement, the County used written guidance from the internal Office of Diversity and Equity in crafting the Request for Proposals (RFP), dissemination of the RFP, and in scoring applications. The County used language directly from prior JRP Victim Services grant questions and grant reporting forms, and advertised in culturally specific media. Providers serving historically excluded communities, under-served, and marginalized populations were prioritized. Providers identifying how they reduce barriers were prioritized, including language, disability, transportation, and cultural barriers.

2. Justification for Sub-Awards Under \$10,000

CJC staff strongly encourage allocating at least \$10,000 to each community-based victim services provider to ensure impactful use of funds.

If your county plans to allocate less than \$10,000 to any provider, please briefly explain how this amount will meaningfully support victim services.

Word Limit: 100

N/A

SECTION 2: VICTIM SERVICES PROVIDER APPLICATIONS

To be completed by each community-based victim services provider

Description of Provider

Name of Victim Service Provider #1 Applying:

Oregon Crime Victim Law Center

Victim Services Provider #1 Contact

Name:	Emily La Brecque
Title:	Executive Director
Organization:	Oregon Crime Victim Law Center (OCVLC)
Email:	emily@ocvlc.org
Phone:	503-208-8160

1. What type of victim services provider are you primarily?

Other

If you selected other, please specify

Legal Services

2. Please select all of the following that apply to your organization.

Responses Selected:

Your organization is a community-based nonprofit that serves victims of crime

Your program receives Department of Human Services (DHS) or Department of Justice (DOJ) funding (including Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) or Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) funding)

Your organization is a qualified victim services provider or you employ advocates with privilege under ORS 40.264

Proposed Services

1. Describe the services your organization will provide to victims of crime using these funds. Include how you will track and measure the impact of the services.

Word limit: 200

OCVLC and Legal Aid Services of Oregon partner with Gateway Center for Domestic Violence to provide free legal services to crime victims, help them assert their legal rights, and access social-support services. Attorneys also conduct victim rights trainings to the public and other agencies. Grant funds will continue funding two full-time attorneys, one at OCVLC and one at LASO. The attorneys will mostly represent victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, and stalking on issues related to safety and protection, child custody, financial support, immigration, housing, employment, privacy, presence and participation, restitution and other issues arising in criminal and civil courts.

The OCVLC Executive Director and the Regional Director at LASO Portland are responsible for compiling data and submitting grant reports, and each attorney under the proposed grant is responsible for keeping statistics on assigned cases. LASO delivers these statistics to OCVLC for inclusion in grant reporting. Grant reports include financial information, demographic and case statistics, and narratives of case reports. The programs use case management software programs to track case demographics and information that allow the programs to run reports each quarter to compile the required statistics. The case information is housed on a secure server in OCVLC office.

Evaluation Criteria

The Community-Based Victim Services Advisory Panel will use the follow questions to evaluate whether the proposed services funds will positively impact victims, based on criteria outlined in [OAR 213-060-0060 \(6\)](#).

1. Describe your organization's history of effectively providing direct services to victims of crime. Include service types, years of experience, and relevant outcomes.

Word limit: 150

Since 2009 the Oregon Crime Victims Law Center has provided free legal representation to victims of crime across Oregon to assist them in protecting their constitutional and statutory right in criminal cases and in contested restraining order hearings. OCVLC attorneys have represented thousands of victims, primarily victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, to ensure their voices are heard in the criminal justice system and to ensure that they are protected from their abusers. In 2024 OCVLC represented more than 400 victims, victims who likely would not have had access to an attorney if not for our services. OCVLC is the only nonprofit currently providing free legal representation to victims in the criminal justice system in Multnomah County. Legal Aid Services of Oregon has represented thousands of low-income Oregonians in civil matters, including assisting domestic violence victims in family law and housing matters.

2. Briefly explain how your mission focuses on providing direct services to victims of crime.

Word limit: 150

Both OCVLC and Legal Aid provide free legal representation to victims of crime, in particular victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. We work directly with victims on legal matters including asserting rights in criminal cases, representing victims in contested restraining order hearings, representing victims in dissolution and custody cases, and ensuring victims have a voice in the criminal justice system. Last year OCVLC represented more than 400 victims, with about half having victims' rights' issues and half with protective order proceedings. Our attorneys are trained in working with victims in a trauma-informed manner and are able to assist victims in navigating a challenging system with support and empathy. OCLVC also has a victim advocate who assists victims with finding resources for other issues and with safety planning, accompaniment for reporting crimes and for court proceedings, and support.

3. Please describe your organization's capacity and specialized training to effectively deliver direct services to victims of crime.

Word limit: 150

OCVLC and LASO employ attorneys who are experienced in working with victims who have experienced trauma and in the dynamics of domestic violence and sexual assault. OCVLC attorneys (of which there are five) regularly attend trainings on issues specific to this work and are considered experts in the field of victims' rights. We work with interpreters to ensure we are able to provide representation regardless of language spoken by our clients to reduce barriers to accessing justice, and we have multiple attorneys on staff who are bilingual. LASO attorneys have extensive training in providing trauma-informed services and are experienced in providing civil legal representation in areas such as divorce and custody. OCVLC also has an advocate on staff who has significant experience working with survivors, and who is able to work with survivors on issues like safety planning and reporting violations of protective orders to law enforcement.

4. How will the proposed services address the needs of marginalized and underserved populations in your community?

Word limit: 150

OCVLC and LASO provide targeted outreach and expanded legal services to marginalized and underserved or excluded populations in the communities who have experienced domestic and sexual violence in Multnomah County. Culturally specific program partners in the domestic and sexual violence consortium repeatedly tell us that the need for legal help for marginalized communities is largely unmet with current civil legal services staffing. Attorneys will liaison with community-based organizations such as the Rosewood Initiative, IRCO, and Lutheran Community Services, who work closely with immigrants and refugees, Black, Indigenous and People of Color. The project will provide culturally and linguistically responsive legal representation to survivors who have been impacted by systemic racism and denied access to justice. The project attorneys would conduct outreach to communities to increase referrals, assess cases, give legal advice, and provide direct representation in cases involving family law, housing issues, restraining orders, and crime victim rights.

5. How will your organization address access barriers such as language, literacy, disability, cultural practices, and transportation?

Word limit: 150

Cost is a major factor in the inability of victims to find legal representation. The inequity of a crime victim having to hire an attorney in order to protect their rights is one of the fundamental reasons for the existence of programs like LASO and OCVLC. Language is another huge barrier, as any person with limited English proficiency may face hurdles when seeking assistance from government, law enforcement, and community-based resources. Through collaboration with other organizations, use of interpreter services, and outreach to the community, OCVLC and LASO have a proven track record of working with victims to overcome these barriers. Both organizations utilize bilingual attorneys and interpreter services, and work closely with agencies that specialize in culturally-specific populations. Our efforts at the Gateway Center have resulted in nearly 45% of our clients coming from traditionally marginalized communities. We have strong, established relationships with many of the providers at Gateway.

6. Will the proposed services increase capacity for geographic areas where services are difficult to access, limited, or non-existent?

Yes

7. Are the proposed services trauma-informed?

Yes

8. Does your program collect data, including demographic information about the victims served?

Note: If your organization uses Osnium, it meets this requirement.

Yes

Culturally Specific Organizations and Culturally Specific Services

Oregon statute requires that counties prioritize culturally specific organizations and culturally responsive services. These descriptions will help CJC staff understand whether a provider qualifies under SB 1510 and ensure accurate representation during the review process.

1. Culturally Specific Organization

“Culturally specific organization” is an organization, or a program within an organization, that serves a particular cultural community, that is primarily staffed and led by members of that community and that demonstrates self-advocacy, positive cultural identity and intimate knowledge of the lived experience of the community, including but not limited to: (A) The impact of structural and individual racism or discrimination on the community; (B) Specific disparities in access to services and resources experienced by the community; and (C) Community strengths, cultural practices, beliefs and traditions.

Does your organization identify as culturally specific under this definition?

Example: “We are a Latinx-led organization founded by farmworker women to serve Indigenous and Latinx survivors of domestic violence. Over 80% of our staff identify as part of the communities we serve. Our services include bilingual support groups, legal navigation in Mixtec and Spanish, and partnerships with migrant worker unions.”

No

2. Culturally Responsive Services

“Culturally responsive service” is a service that is respectful of, and relevant to, the beliefs, practices, cultures and linguistic needs of diverse consumer or client populations and communities whose members identify as having particular cultural or linguistic affiliations by virtue of their place of birth, ancestry or ethnic origin, religion, preferred language or language spoken at home. A culturally responsive service has the capacity to respond to the issues of diverse communities and require knowledge and capacity at systemic, organizational, professional and individual levels of intervention.

Does your organization provide culturally responsive services?

Example: “We serve African immigrant survivors by offering counseling in Amharic and Somali, hosting faith-based support groups, and conducting outreach in collaboration with community elders and local mosques. Staff receive ongoing training in culturally grounded trauma recovery.”

Yes

If yes, describe how your services are culturally responsive.

Word limit: 100

OCVLC and LASO attorneys are trained to provide legal services and advocacy to victims of crime in a trauma-informed and culturally-aware manner. We emphasize a sophisticated understanding of the neurobiology of trauma, the cycle of domestic violence, trauma informed legal practice, enhanced trainings on working with interpreters and awareness of cultural differences as well as de-escalation practices and suicide prevention training. Our attorneys are experienced in working with survivors, and approach every case in a trauma-informed manner to try to lessen stress for the clients and make the experience with the legal system as positive as it can be.

Would you like to add another victim services provider?

Yes

SECTION 2: VICTIM SERVICES PROVIDER APPLICATIONS

To be completed by each community-based victim services provider

Description of Provider

Name of Victim Service Provider #2 Applying:

IRCO

Victim Services Provider #2 Contact

Name:	Angela Dimmick
Title:	Grants Manager
Organization:	The Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization (IRCO)
Email:	angelad@irco.org
Phone:	971-517-6360

1. What type of victim services provider are you primarily?

Human Trafficking Services

2. Please select all of the following that apply to your organization.

Responses Selected:

Your organization is a community-based nonprofit that serves victims of crime

Your program receives Department of Human Services (DHS) or Department of Justice (DOJ) funding (including Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) or Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) funding)

Your organization is a qualified victim services provider or you employ advocates with privilege under ORS 40.264

Proposed Services

1. Describe the services your organization will provide to victims of crime using these funds. Include how you will track and measure the impact of the services.

Word limit: 200

Funding helps IRCO Survivor Services provide potentially lifesaving emergency and stabilization services for survivors of human trafficking, including case management, emergency shelter/hoteling, rental application and relocation assistance, connection to public benefits, and referrals to long-term housing programs.

The Survivor Services Manager and Program Coordinator, will supervise an Advocate providing language and culturally specific, trauma-informed services to immigrant and refugee survivors of sex and labor trafficking in Oregon. Funding will fill gaps in case management for trafficking survivors, particularly in high-risk industries such as agricultural services, construction, and service industries.

Advocates center client agency and person-centered best practices. Advocates connect survivors with vital resources to help them gain stability and thrive despite little to no support from family and/or community. IRCO is the only multiethnic immigrant- and refugee-specific organization providing survivors with culturally specific, long-term, relationship-based advocacy and case management. Funding helps crime victims, improves public safety, decreases recidivism, and ensures offenders are held accountable.

IRCO measures and tracks the impact of services provided with the data system Apricot 360. Apricot 360 tracks contact information, demographics, public benefits, victimization issues, housing, financial resources, client assistance/service provision, referrals, and program enrollments. System reports help analyze program outcomes, effectiveness for continuous improvement.

Evaluation Criteria

The Community-Based Victim Services Advisory Panel will use the follow questions to evaluate whether the proposed services funds will positively impact victims, based on criteria outlined in [OAR 213-060-0060 \(6\)](#).

1. Describe your organization's history of effectively providing direct services to victims of crime. Include service types, years of experience, and relevant outcomes.

Word limit: 150

For 27 years, IRCO has served Oregon survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault via our Refugee and Immigrant Family Strengthening (RIFS) program. Since 2018, we've also provided direct services to survivors of sex and/or labor trafficking via our Services Against Exploitation (SAE) program.

SAE's culturally specific, trauma-informed, survivor-centered services include case management, interpretation, housing assistance, crisis intervention, safety planning, participant assistance, education support, legal assistance, connections to resources, outreach, and prevention education. We coordinate response efforts with hospitals, legal providers, law enforcement, etc.

We've gotten solid results: we supported 80 survivors through crisis response and long-term case management in 2024. We helped 60% access medical care directly related to trafficking, helped 55% with legal referrals, accompanied 100% of caseloads to in-person appointments, and provided 55% of households with emergency housing assistance. We also helped survivors navigate transit, the school system, childcare, parenting classes, and translation of key documents.

2. Briefly explain how your mission focuses on providing direct services to victims of crime.

Word limit: 150

IRCO SAE's mission is to ensure immigrant and refugee inclusion in and access to human trafficking prevention and services in Oregon, and to increase the awareness and discourse about sex and labor trafficking in rural and immigrant communities. This mission is the basis for all SAE services. It guides our staff in helping survivors achieve safety and navigate resources while approaching stabilization. SAE focuses exclusively on services for survivors of sex and/or labor trafficking. All SAE staff receive training about how to serve and advocate for survivors. Feedback from our clients shapes and informs future service delivery: we request client feedback every quarter, and the SAE Program Coordinator thoroughly reviews client feedback to see both what's effective and areas that need improvement. The Coordinator also serves on several committees informed by community advisory boards of survivors, so our team stays in touch with survivor communities and actively incorporates their feedback.

3. Please describe your organization's capacity and specialized training to effectively deliver direct services to victims of crime.

Word limit: 150

Capacity: IRCO has effectively served immigrants and refugees for nearly 50 years and is the largest community-based immigrant and refugee organization in Oregon. Our robust infrastructure supports managing an annual budget of \$60+ million spanning 300+ contracts/projects up to \$7.1 million. Our Survivor Services infrastructure includes our secure client database Apricot 360 (capable of managing and tracking survivor services outcomes), a 24-hour hotline staffed by IRCO and Call to Safety, emergency housing, and strong connections with other IRCO programs for wraparound support.

Training: IRCO's four SAE Advocates (3.75 FTE) and SAE Program Coordinator have completed 40 hours of OCADSV Certified DV Advocate training and meet all Oregon training requirements. They receive ongoing training about best practices for serving survivors and trauma-informed approaches. Thanks to IRCO's International Language Bank, staff can easily access interpretation and translation for clients who speak languages other than Spanish or English (237 languages available).

4. How will the proposed services address the needs of marginalized and underserved populations in your community?

Word limit: 150

Our services meet the needs of underserved, marginalized survivors of sex and labor trafficking by addressing foundational needs like safety, housing, and medical care, as well as connecting survivors with workforce resources. IRCO is the only statewide human trafficking service provider for these populations and the only statewide organization that specializes in supporting immigrant and refugee communities with wraparound programming for every stage of life.

Outreach efforts include targeted community outreach into non-English speaking communities and Designated Economic Opportunity Areas. We continue to build relationships with non-English language media and businesses to help educate immigrant and refugee communities about how to identify warning signs of human trafficking, services available to survivors, and protections against exploitation. This outreach is culturally specific and culturally responsive to have the most impact on vulnerable immigrant and refugee populations.

5. How will your organization address access barriers such as language, literacy, disability, cultural practices, and transportation?

Word limit: 150

Our program is accessible, low-barrier, and survivor-led, with trauma-informed, certified Advocates. All four SAE Advocates are bilingual, from families of color, and part of immigrant communities. If an Advocate doesn't speak the same language as a survivor, they can use translation and interpretation services in 237 languages from IRCO's International Language Bank, including ASL; we provide materials in accessible formats for clients with disabilities. Additionally, we have translated community outreach and education materials into 16 languages. Our Advocates understand the cultural barriers that survivors may face, including pressure from tight-knit traditional communities that threaten to ostracize survivors if they involve outsiders or legal authorities. We work hard to overcome these barriers through a culturally sensitive and empathetic approach. To address transportation barriers, we provide survivors with transportation assistance when necessary, e.g., distributing free TriMet bus tickets, helping survivors sign up for reduced fares if they qualify, and coordinating safe rideshares.

6. Will the proposed services increase capacity for geographic areas where services are difficult to access, limited, or non-existent?

Yes

7. Are the proposed services trauma-informed?

Yes

8. Does your program collect data, including demographic information about the victims served?

Note: If your organization uses Osnium, it meets this requirement.

Yes

Culturally Specific Organizations and Culturally Specific Services

Oregon statute requires that counties prioritize culturally specific organizations and culturally responsive services. These descriptions will help CJC staff understand whether a provider qualifies under SB 1510 and ensure accurate representation during the review process.

1. Culturally Specific Organization

“Culturally specific organization” is an organization, or a program within an organization, that serves a particular cultural community, that is primarily staffed and led by members of that community and that demonstrates self-advocacy, positive cultural identity and intimate knowledge of the lived experience of the community, including but not limited to: (A) The impact of structural and individual racism or discrimination on the community; (B) Specific disparities in access to services and resources experienced by the community; and (C) Community strengths, cultural practices, beliefs and traditions.

Does your organization identify as culturally specific under this definition?

Example: “We are a Latinx-led organization founded by farmworker women to serve Indigenous and Latinx survivors of domestic violence. Over 80% of our staff identify as part of the communities we serve. Our services include bilingual support groups, legal navigation in Mixtec and Spanish, and partnerships with migrant worker unions.”

Yes

If yes, describe your organization's culturally specific identity, leadership, and services

Word limit: 100

Founded by refugees, IRCO has served immigrants and refugees for nearly 50 years, and IRCO's Executive Director is a former refugee. IRCO is Oregon's largest culturally specific community-based organization serving immigrants and refugees. Our mission is to welcome, serve, and empower refugees, immigrants, and people across cultures and generations to reach their full potential. In FY 2024, we served 29,126 individuals; of those who provided racial/ethnic data, 78% were part of immigrant or refugee communities or communities of color. 89% of our board and 62% of IRCO staff are part of immigrant or refugee communities or communities of color.

2. Culturally Responsive Services

“Culturally responsive service” is a service that is respectful of, and relevant to, the beliefs, practices, cultures and linguistic needs of diverse consumer or client populations and communities whose members identify as having particular cultural or linguistic affiliations by virtue of their place of birth, ancestry or ethnic origin, religion, preferred language or language spoken at home. A culturally responsive service has the capacity to respond to the issues of diverse communities and require knowledge and capacity at systemic, organizational, professional and individual levels of intervention.

Does your organization provide culturally responsive services?

Example: “We serve African immigrant survivors by offering counseling in Amharic and Somali, hosting faith-based support groups, and conducting outreach in collaboration with community elders and local mosques. Staff receive ongoing training in culturally grounded trauma recovery.”

Yes

If yes, describe how your services are culturally responsive.

Word limit: 100

RCO's multilingual, multicultural staff and cultural hubs enable SAE to provide culturally responsive services. We solicit immigrant and refugee survivors' perspectives via quarterly SAE client surveys as well as agency-wide Community Needs Assessments, in which 500+ community members from 23 language groups representing 50+ cultural and national backgrounds shared issues from their diverse communities. Their needs shape our goals and services, both on a program and organizational level. IRCO can uniquely see and address unmet needs, and in many cases, IRCO is the only forum where immigrant and refugee survivors feel safe talking about their experiences and connecting with services.

Would you like to add another victim services provider?

Yes

SECTION 2: VICTIM SERVICES PROVIDER APPLICATIONS

To be completed by each community-based victim services provider

Description of Provider

Name of Victim Service Provider #3 Applying:

Lutheran Community Services, NW

Victim Services Provider #3 Contact

Name:	Mindy Johnston
Title:	Program Director, Transformative Justice and Healing
Organization:	Lutheran Community Services NW
Email:	mjohnston@lcsnw.org
Phone:	971-888-7832

1. What type of victim services provider are you primarily?

Other

If you selected other, please specify

Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (DVSA), Human Trafficking Services Bias Incident Services Other o Please specify: Hate & Bias, homicide, robbery, gun violence, theft, fraud, DUI, property crimes, elder/child abuse, arson, assault, etc. – we serve all crime types.

2. Please select all of the following that apply to your organization.

Responses Selected:

Your organization is a community-based nonprofit that serves victims of crime

Your program receives Department of Human Services (DHS) or Department of Justice (DOJ) funding (including Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) or Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) funding)

Your organization is a qualified victim services provider or you employ advocates with privilege under ORS 40.264

Proposed Services

1. Describe the services your organization will provide to victims of crime using these funds. Include how you will track and measure the impact of the services.

Word limit: 200

LCSNW provides a comprehensive range of trauma-informed services to all crime victims, with a focus on Refugee, Immigrant, and Migrant (RIM) populations. LCSNW provides case management/planning, crisis management, advocacy, and referral services. This includes system navigation, safety planning, and culturally responsive advocacy to promote recovery and reduce risk of re-victimization.

Victims are supported with information sharing and in accessing:

- Legal Advocacy: assistance understanding and navigating legal processes, evaluating participation, and ensuring rights are protected.
 - Medical Advocacy: help making informed decisions about care and ensuring providers respond in ways that respect rights and autonomy.
 - Support Groups: reducing isolation, offering shared learning, and validation of trauma-related experiences in a safe setting.
 - Outreach and Awareness: community collaborations to enhance organizational capacity, increase knowledge of available services, and raise awareness of behaviors/conditions that may elevate risk, prevent future victimization.
- Measuring Impact: We track victimization by type, whether reported, primary and secondary victims served, and hours/types of service delivered in a secure database called EmpowerDB. Client feedback is gathered throughout service delivery, starting at intake. Long-term clients (6+ months), receive structured follow-ups to assess satisfaction, identify gaps, and adapt services as needed. This ensures our advocacy remains responsive, effective, and aligned with client goals.

Evaluation Criteria

The Community-Based Victim Services Advisory Panel will use the follow questions to evaluate whether the proposed services funds will positively impact victims, based on criteria outlined in [OAR 213-060-0060 \(6\)](#).

1. Describe your organization's history of effectively providing direct services to victims of crime. Include service types, years of experience, and relevant outcomes.

Word limit: 150

LCSNW launched Multicultural Community Services (MCS) in Portland in 1975 to support immigrants and refugees with culturally and linguistically appropriate services. For over 50 years, MCS has been a trusted provider of culturally specific support, serving over 46,000 individuals and families in 2024 alone.

The Transformative Justice & Healing Department provides direct services to victims of crime, including trauma-informed advocacy, person-centered case management, legal and medical advocacy, crisis intervention, and support groups. Services are free, individualized, and available regardless of involvement with the criminal justice system.

Our bi-cultural, bi-lingual Crime Victim Advocates and Restorative Justice Facilitators reflect the communities we serve and are uniquely equipped to address cultural and language barriers. Our services center survivors' voices, promote healing and accountability, and reduce re-traumatization. We are deeply committed to an equity-driven, community-rooted approach and actively engage with national partners to ensure our services remain innovative and responsive.

2. Briefly explain how your mission focuses on providing direct services to victims of crime.

Word limit: 150

LCSNW's mission is to partner with individuals, families, and communities for health, justice, and hope. The Transformative Justice & Healing Department advances this mission by providing direct support that meets the emotional, safety, and resource needs of crime survivors and their loved ones, especially those from communities disproportionately impacted by crime and systemic inequities.

Survivors often face isolation, fear, and barriers to justice within systems shaped by racism, power imbalances, and historical harm. Our trauma-informed, culturally responsive advocacy centers each survivor's voice, choices, and healing process. We offer individualized support—ranging from safety planning and legal advocacy to emotional care and resource navigation—free of charge and for as long as needed.

We believe that access to care, dignity, and healing is a human right. Our work restores agency to those harmed and builds pathways toward safety, justice, and long-term well-being, reflecting our commitment to compassionate, survivor-centered care

3. Please describe your organization's capacity and specialized training to effectively deliver direct services to victims of crime.

Word limit: 150

Our organization employs three full-time advocates in the Portland-Metro region, each certified through Oregon's State Victim Assistance Academy (SVAA) and the Victim Assistance Training Online (VAT Online). Staff receive in-depth training in trauma-informed care, confidentiality, culturally specific practices, safety planning, and restorative justice, with annual refreshers on VAWA, VOCA, and PREA compliance to maintain current knowledge of laws and standards.

We maintain strong partnerships with mental health providers, criminal justice agencies, community organizations, and local businesses. When language or accessibility barriers arise, we work with qualified interpreters and accessible communication providers to support survivors with limited English proficiency or disabilities.

Our infrastructure includes a secure client database and emergency housing resources to meet immediate survivor needs. We consistently meet state and federal compliance requirements and have the administrative and operational capacity to effectively manage, monitor, and report on outcomes. This ensures we deliver high-quality, culturally responsive services to crime survivors.

4. How will the proposed services address the needs of marginalized and underserved populations in your community?

Word limit: 150

While we serve all survivors, our focus is on refugee and immigrant communities—populations that are historically underserved and face systemic barriers to safety and justice. In the past 24 months, over 40% of crimes disclosed to our Advocates were never reported to law enforcement. Many of our participants - 45–55% annually—identify as BIPOC and/or immigrant/refugee, groups often underrepresented in and distrustful of traditional systems due to fear of retaliation, deportation, or unfamiliarity with U.S. laws.

Language barriers, cultural stigma, and systemic inequities further deter access to support. Clients we serve come from diverse countries including Ukraine, Burma, Rwanda, Mexico, Iraq, and Somalia. CVAP has seen a rise in assaults, financial crimes, family violence, and hate crimes—underscoring the urgent need for culturally and linguistically responsive services. Our program fills a critical gap, offering trauma-informed support that would not otherwise exist for many survivors in our community.

5. How will your organization address access barriers such as language, literacy, disability, cultural practices, and transportation?

Word limit: 150

LCSNW in Portland has historically been Oregon's largest refugee resettlement agency, serving immigrant and refugee survivors who face barriers such as language, literacy, cultural differences, disability, and limited access to transportation. Many experience financial and housing instability and are disproportionately targeted for scams and exploitation. Victimization can have profound and lasting impacts on individuals and families in diverse communities.

Our low-barrier, community-based advocacy services are accessible without requiring law enforcement involvement. We prioritize hiring bilingual/bicultural staff from the communities we serve. We recognize that no single approach can meet all survivors' needs; instead, we offer tailored, culturally responsive support that reflects each person's unique background, values, and circumstances. Staff work collaboratively with survivors to identify strengths, needs, and barriers, building trust and promoting safety. This individualized, respectful approach allows us to effectively support healing and empowerment—offering survivors a critical pathway to recovery and justice that may not otherwise exist.

6. Will the proposed services increase capacity for geographic areas where services are difficult to access, limited, or non-existent?

Yes

7. Are the proposed services trauma-informed?

Yes

8. Does your program collect data, including demographic information about the victims served?

Note: If your organization uses Osnium, it meets this requirement.

Yes

Culturally Specific Organizations and Culturally Specific Services

Oregon statute requires that counties prioritize culturally specific organizations and culturally responsive services. These descriptions will help CJC staff understand whether a provider qualifies under SB 1510 and ensure accurate representation during the review process.

1. Culturally Specific Organization

“Culturally specific organization” is an organization, or a program within an organization, that serves a particular cultural community, that is primarily staffed and led by members of that community and that demonstrates self-advocacy, positive cultural identity and intimate knowledge of the lived experience of the community, including but not limited to: (A) The impact of structural and individual racism or discrimination on the community; (B) Specific disparities in access to services and resources experienced by the community; and (C) Community strengths, cultural practices, beliefs and traditions.

Does your organization identify as culturally specific under this definition?

Example: “We are a Latinx-led organization founded by farmworker women to serve Indigenous and Latinx survivors of domestic violence. Over 80% of our staff identify as part of the communities we serve. Our services include bilingual support groups, legal navigation in Mixtec and Spanish, and partnerships with migrant worker unions.”

Yes

If yes, describe your organization's culturally specific identity, leadership, and services

Word limit: 100

The Multicultural Community Services (MCS) District at LCSNW meets the legal definition of a culturally specific program per SB 1510 (2022). MCS is led and staffed by individuals with lived immigrant and refugee experience who intimately understand the cultural communities they serve. The MCS CVAP includes multilingual Burmese, Hispanic, and Ukrainian advocates who co-create culturally responsive services rooted in trust and cultural understanding.

LCSNW recognizes these communities face disproportionate victimization, stigma, and systemic barriers. We partner with communities to promote protective factors such as peer support, family engagement, and healthy coping strategies grounded in positive cultural identity and self-advocacy

2. Culturally Responsive Services

“Culturally responsive service” is a service that is respectful of, and relevant to, the beliefs, practices, cultures and linguistic needs of diverse consumer or client populations and communities whose members identify as having particular cultural or linguistic affiliations by virtue of their place of birth, ancestry or ethnic origin, religion, preferred language or language spoken at home. A culturally responsive service has the capacity to respond to the issues of diverse communities and require knowledge and capacity at systemic, organizational, professional and individual levels of intervention.

Does your organization provide culturally responsive services?

Example: “We serve African immigrant survivors by offering counseling in Amharic and Somali, hosting faith-based support groups, and conducting outreach in collaboration with community elders and local mosques. Staff receive ongoing training in culturally grounded trauma recovery.”

Yes

If yes, describe how your services are culturally responsive.

Word limit: 100

The proposed project is led by multilingual professionals with lived refugee and immigrant experience and provides linguistically and culturally specific services to RIM communities. Advocates speak Karen, Ukrainian, Russian, Spanish and English. Survivors are matched with advocates who speak their language when possible; interpreters are used as needed. For example, a Karen-speaking assault survivor, retraumatized by her employer and the workers' compensation process, was supported by CVAP advocates who built trust, assisted with reporting, and connected her to culturally responsive counseling—honoring her identity, values, and language while supporting healing.

Would you like to add another victim services provider?

No

BUDGET PROJECTION SHEET		Justice
CJC Grant Program:	JRP Competitive	
Applicant Name:	Multnomah County JRP	

Instructions: Please fill out all three requests at 100%, 90%, 80%, and 75%. After you complete the 100% request, the positions requested will autopopulate into the subsequent requests, and you will just adjust the FTE and/or months employed to reduce it by the required percentages. For each request scenario, you will also indicate the method by which you would prefer the GRC to reduce your request further, should it be necessary.

100% request

REDUCTION METHOD: Should the total amount of requested funds among all applicants exceed the total funds available, the JRP Grant Review Committee may reduce your 100% budget request and take into consideration your indicated reduction method preference. Reduction methods outlined below.

Method A: Reduce all line items proportionately (meaning, apply the required percentage reduction uniformly across all line items)

Method B: Reduce by line item, in a bottom-up approach (meaning, the line item that appears furthest down on your sheet would be reduced first; e.g., if you have line items #1-5, a reduction may remove line item #5 entirely and reduce line item #4 by 25%)

Please select from the dropdown which option you prefer the GRC to adopt to make any necessary reductions to your 100% budget request:

Method A

Personnel: Salaries, wages and fringe benefits costs for all grant-funded personnel (in whole or in part) employed by the grant recipient

Directions:
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the position supports.
In the "% Time per Month" field, use percentages to show the position's time dedicated to grant-related work. Example: a half-time case manager = 50%
In the "Monthly Rate" field, combine salary/wages and fringe benefits for a single month at full time, regardless of the value included in the "% Time per Month" field.
In the "Months Employed" field, indicate the number of months the position is expected to be funded during the grant period.

Position Title	Program Supported	Employing Agency	Is this a new or existing position to your agency, and is it currently funded by the CJC grant for which you're applying?	% Time per Month	Monthly Rate (wages+fringe)	# Months Employed	Total Amount Requested	If a reduction is required to your budget request, indicate how you prefer the GRC to reduce this line item: either by FTE (% Time per Month) or Number of Months employed	Personnel Narrative: For each requested item to the left, provide a brief (1-3 sentences) justification as to how it meets or fulfills the purpose/intent of the program.
1 Deputy District Attorney 2 (PV -	JRP	MCDA	Existing Position -			24	288,382.25		1.) This DDA works daily with MCJRP probation officers, defense counsel, and judges to address MCJRP probation violations, crafting resolutions focused on the participants' success in the
2 Case Manager	JRP	Metropolitan Public Defender	Existing Position -			24	147,655.00		2.) Defense-based Social Work Teams (SWTs) include both Social Workers and Case Managers to provide key pre-sentence community-based services while striving to decrease the
3 Social Worker	JRP	Multnomah Defenders Inc.	Existing Position -			24	275,852.00		3.) Dedicated MCJRP case Social Worker(s) assess, refer, and help defendants navigate community-based services prior to sentencing. Social Workers develop service case plans, attend
4 Case Manager	JRP	Multnomah Defenders Inc.	Existing Position -			24	187,046.00		4.) As part of the Defense -based Social Work Team, provide services to individuals pre-sentence, including: facilitate assessments, attend judicial settlement conferences and release
5			Select Option				0.00		5.)
6			Select Option				0.00		6.)
7			Select Option				0.00		7.)
8			Select Option				0.00		8.)
9			Select Option				0.00		9.)
10			Select Option				0.00		10.)
11			Select Option				0.00		11.)
12			Select Option				0.00		12.)
13			Select Option				0.00		13.)
14			Select Option				0.00		14.)
15			Select Option				0.00		15.)
Personnel Total:							\$ 901,945.25		

90% request

REDUCTION METHOD: Should the total amount of requested funds among all applicants exceed the total funds available, the JRP Grant Review Committee may reduce your 90% budget request and take into consideration your indicated reduction method preference. Reduction methods outlined below.

Method A: Reduce all line items proportionately (meaning, apply the required percentage reduction uniformly across all line items)

Method B: Reduce by line item, in a bottom-up approach (meaning, the line item that appears furthest down on your sheet would be reduced first; e.g., if you have line items #1-5, a reduction may remove line item #5 entirely and reduce line item #4 by 25%)

Please select from the dropdown which option you prefer the GRC to adopt to make any necessary reductions to your 90% budget request:

Method A

Personnel: Salaries, wages and fringe benefits costs for all grant-funded personnel (in whole or in part) employed by the grant recipient

Directions:
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the position supports.
In the "% Time per Month" field, use percentages to show the position's time dedicated to grant-related work. Example: a half-time case manager = 50%
In the "Monthly Rate" field, combine salary/wages and fringe benefits for a single month at full time, regardless of the value included in the "% Time per Month" field.
In the "Months Employed" field, indicate the number of months the position is expected to be funded during the grant period.

Position Title	Program Supported	Employing Agency	Is this a new or existing position - Currently CJC Grant	% Time per Month	Monthly Rate	# Months	Total Amount	If a reduction is required to your budget	Personnel Narrative:
1 Deputy District Attorney 2 (PV -	JRP	MCDA	Existing Position - Currently CJC Grant	0.0			259,544.01		1.) This DDA works daily with MCJRP probation officers, defense counsel, and judges to address MCJRP probation violations, crafting resolutions focused on the participants' success in the
2 Case Manager	JRP	Metropolitan Public Defender	Existing Position - Currently CJC Grant	0.0			132,889.50		2.) Defense-based Social Work Teams (SWTs) include both Social Workers and Case Managers to provide key pre-sentence community-based services while striving to decrease the
3 Social Worker	JRP	Multnomah Defenders Inc.	Existing Position - Currently CJC Grant	0.0			290,975.80		3.) Dedicated MCJRP case Social Worker(s) assess, refer, and help defendants navigate community-based services prior to sentencing. Social Workers develop service case plans, attend
4 Case Manager	JRP	Multnomah Defenders Inc.	Existing Position - Currently CJC Grant	0.0			166,341.40		4.) As part of the Defense -based Social Work Team, provide services to individuals pre-sentence, including: facilitate assessments, attend judicial settlement conferences and release
5	0	0	Select Option				0.00		5.)
6	0	0	Select Option				0.00		6.)
7	0	0	Select Option				0.00		7.)
8	0	0	Select Option				0.00		8.)
9	0	0	Select Option				0.00		9.)
10	0	0	Select Option				0.00		10.)
11	0	0	Select Option				0.00		11.)
12	0	0	Select Option				0.00		12.)
13	0	0	Select Option				0.00		13.)
14	0	0	Select Option				0.00		14.)
15	0	0	Select Option				0.00		15.)
Personnel Total:							\$ 811,750.71		

80% request

REDUCTION METHOD: Should the total amount of requested funds among all applicants exceed the total funds available, the JRP Grant Review Committee may reduce your 80% budget request and take into consideration your indicated reduction method preference. Reduction methods outlined below.

Method A: Reduce all line items proportionately (meaning, apply the required percentage reduction uniformly across all line items)

Method B: Reduce by line item, in a bottom-up approach (meaning, the line item that appears furthest down on your sheet would be reduced first; e.g., if you have line items #1-5, a reduction may remove line item #5 entirely and reduce line item #4 by 25%)

Please select from the dropdown which option you prefer the GRC to adopt to make any necessary reductions to your 80% budget request:

Method A

Personnel: Salaries, wages and fringe benefits costs for all grant-funded personnel (in whole or in part) employed by the grant recipient

Directions:
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the position supports.
In the "% Time per Month" field, use percentages to show the position's time dedicated to grant-related work. Example: a half-time case manager = 50%
In the "Monthly Rate" field, combine salary/wages and fringe benefits for a single month at full time, regardless of the value included in the "% Time per Month" field.
In the "Months Employed" field, indicate the number of months the position is expected to be funded during the grant period.

Position Title	Program Supported	Employing Agency	Is this a new or existing position -	% Time per Month	Monthly Rate	# Months	Total Amount	If a reduction is required to your budget	Personnel Narrative:
1 Deputy District Attorney 2 (PV -	JRP	MCDA	Existing Position -	0.0			230,705.80		1.) This DDA works daily with MCJRP probation officers, defense counsel, and judges to address MCJRP probation violations, crafting resolutions focused on the participants' success in the
2 Case Manager	JRP	Metropolitan Public Defender	Existing Position -	0.0			118,124.00		2.) Defense-based Social Work Teams (SWTs) include both Social Workers and Case Managers to provide key pre-sentence community-based services while striving to decrease the
3 Social Worker	JRP	Multnomah Defenders Inc.	Existing Position -	0.0			223,089.60		3.) Dedicated MCJRP case Social Worker(s) assess, refer, and help defendants navigate community-based services prior to sentencing. Social Workers develop service case plans, attend
4 Case Manager	JRP	Multnomah Defenders Inc.	Existing Position -	0.0			149,636.80		4.) As part of the Defense -based Social Work Team, provide services to individuals pre-sentence, including: facilitate assessments, attend judicial settlement conferences and release
5	0	0	Select Option				0.00		5.)
6	0	0	Select Option				0.00		6.)
7	0	0	Select Option				0.00		7.)
8	0	0	Select Option				0.00		8.)
9	0	0	Select Option				0.00		9.)
10	0	0	Select Option				0.00		10.)
11	0	0	Select Option				0.00		11.)
12	0	0	Select Option				0.00		12.)
13	0	0	Select Option				0.00		13.)
14	0	0	Select Option				0.00		14.)
15	0	0	Select Option				0.00		15.)

75% Request

REDUCTION METHOD: Should the total amount of requested funds among all applicants exceed the total funds available, the JRP Grant Review Committee may reduce your 70% budget request and take into consideration your indicated reduction method preference. Reduction methods outlined below.

Method A: Reduce all line items proportionately (meaning, apply the required percentage reduction uniformly across all line items)

Method B: Reduce by line item, in a bottom-up approach (meaning, the line item that appears furthest down on your sheet would be reduced first; e.g., if you have line items #1-5, a reduction may remove line item #5 entirely and reduce line item #4 by 25%).

Please select from the dropdown which option you prefer the GRC to adopt to make any necessary reductions to your 75% budget request: **Method A**

Personnel: Salaries, wages and fringe benefits costs for all grant-funded personnel (in whole or in part) employed by the grant recipient

Directions:

In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the position supports.

In the "% Time per Month" field, use percentages to show the position's time dedicated to grant-related work. Example: a half-time case manager = 50%

In the "Monthly Rate" field, combine salary/wages and fringe benefits for a single month at full time, regardless of the value included in the "% Time per Month" field.

In the "If Months Employed" field, indicate the number of months the position is expected to be funded during the grant period.

Position Title	Program Supported	Employing Agency	Is this a new or existing position?	% Time per Month	Monthly Rate	# Months	Total Amount	If a reduction is required to your budget	Personnel Narrative:
1 Deputy District Attorney 2 (PV -	JRP	MCDA	Existing Position -		0.0		216,286.69		1.) This DOA works daily with MCIRP probation officers, defense counsel, and judges to address MCIRP probation violations, crafting resolutions focused on the participants' success in the
2 Case Manager	JRP	Metropolitan Public Defender	Existing Position -		0.0		110,741.25		2.) Defense-based Social Work Teams (SWTs) include both Social Workers and Case Managers to provide key pre-sentence community-based services while striving to decrease the
3 Social Worker	JRP	Multnomah Defenders Inc.	Existing Position -		0.0		209,146.50		3.) Dedicated MCIRP case Social Worker(s) assess, refer, and help defendants navigate community-based services prior to sentencing. Social Workers develop service case plans, attend
4 Case Manager	JRP	Multnomah Defenders Inc.	Existing Position -		0.0		140,284.50		4.) As part of the Defense-based Social Work Team, provide services to individuals pre-sentence, including: facilitate assessments; attend judicial settlement conferences and release
5	0		0 Select Option		0.0		0.00		5.)
6	0		0 Select Option		0.0		0.00		6.)
7	0		0 Select Option		0.0		0.00		7.)
8	0		0 Select Option		0.0		0.00		8.)
9	0		0 Select Option		0.0		0.00		9.)
10	0		0 Select Option		0.0		0.00		10.)
11	0		0 Select Option		0.0		0.00		11.)
12	0		0 Select Option		0.0		0.00		12.)
13	0		0 Select Option		0.0		0.00		13.)
14	0		0 Select Option		0.0		0.00		14.)
15	0		0 Select Option		0.0		0.00		15.)
Personnel Total:							\$ 676,458.94		

BUDGET PROJECTION SHEET									
CJC Grant Program:		JRP Evaluation	Justice						
Name of Applicant		Multnomah County JRP	Instructions: please follow the naming convention outlined for the grant program for which you are applying.						
Is the applicant a Tribal Government?		No	Examples: BHD = County/Tribe Name BHD Program; IMMEGP = IMMEGP: Name of Entity Applying; IMPACTS = County/Tribe Name IMPACTS Program; JMOUD = County/City Name + Name of Jail; JRP = County Name/Victim Service Provider Name; OKT = Name of Agency/Task Force; RJ = Legal Name of Entity Applying TC = County Name + Court Type						
Date:		7/21/2025							
Personnel: Salaries, wages and fringe benefits costs for all grant-funded personnel (in whole or in part) employed by the grant recipient or contracted provider									
Directions:									
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the position supports.									
In the "Employing Organization / Contracted Organization" field, identify the entity that will employ the position or the contractual service provider funding the position.									
In the "% Time per Month" field, input the whole percentage of the position's time dedicated to grant-related work. Example: a half-time case manager = 50									
In the "Monthly Rate" field, combine salary/wages and fringe benefits for a single month at full time, regardless of the value included in the "% Time per Month" field.									
In the "# Months Employed" field, indicate the number of months the position is expected to be funded during the grant period.									
Position Title	Program Supported	Employing Organization /	Is this a new or	% Time per	Monthly Rate	# Months	Total Amount	Personnel Narrative:	
1 Research Evaluation Analyst Sr	JRP	MCA	Existing Position -			24	159,577.00	1.) This analyst will lead Multnomah County Evaluation project examining pretrial, defense-based social work teams, and changes to MCJRP case processing	
2 Data Analyst	JRP	OJD	Existing Position -			24	45,913.00	2.) This analyst will assist lead analyst in conducting the 25.27 Evaluation project.	
3			Select Option				0.00	3.)	
4			Select Option				0.00	4.)	
5			Select Option				0.00	5.)	
6			Select Option				0.00	6.)	
7			Select Option				0.00	7.)	
8			Select Option				0.00	8.)	
9			Select Option				0.00	9.)	
10			Select Option				0.00	10.)	
Personnel Total:							\$ 205,490.00		
Housing & Facilities: Eligible expenses for space/utilities necessary to complete program work, short-/long-term housing support for participants, or programs within correctional facilities									
Directions:									
In the "Item Description" field, identify what the expense covers (generally).									
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the expense supports.									
In the "Organization / Contracted Organization," identify the entity that will provide the housing & facilities or the contractual service provider that will provide the housing & facilities service.									
Item Description	Program Supported	Organization / Contracted	Unit Type		Price per Unit	# Units Required	Total Amount	Housing & Facilities Narrative:	
1			Select Option				0.00	1.)	
2			Select Option				0.00	2.)	
3			Select Option				0.00	3.)	
4			Select Option				0.00	4.)	
5			Select Option				0.00	5.)	
6			Select Option				0.00	6.)	
7			Select Option				0.00	7.)	
8			Select Option				0.00	8.)	
9			Select Option				0.00	9.)	
10			Select Option				0.00	10.)	
Housing &					\$				
Equipment: Permanent or non-expendable equipment with a purchase price of \$5,000 or more, or a useable life of two or more years, for a single item									
Directions:									
In the "Item Description" field, identify the name/type of equipment to be purchased.									
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the equipment supports.									
In the "Organization Served / Contracted Organization" field, identify the entity that will own and operate the equipment as well as the contractual service provider, if applicable.									
In the "# of Units Required" field, indicate the number of individual items to be purchased.									
Item Description	Program Supported	Organization Served / Contracted			Price per Unit	# Units Required	Total Amount	Equipment Narrative:	
1							0.00	1.)	
2							0.00	2.)	
3							0.00	3.)	
4							0.00	4.)	
5							0.00	5.)	
6							0.00	6.)	
7							0.00	7.)	
8							0.00	8.)	
9							0.00	9.)	
10							0.00	10.)	
Equipment Total:							\$ -		
Supplies: Consumable materials or supplies, including the cost of small items of equipment that do not meet the threshold for the "Equipment" category									
Directions:									
In the "Item Description" field, identify the name/type of supplies to be purchased.									
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the supplies supports.									
In the "Organization Served / Contracted Organization" field, identify the entity that will use the supplies as well as the contractual service provider, if applicable.									
In the "# of Units Required" field, indicate the number of individual items to be purchased.									
Item Description	Program Supported	Organization Served / Contracted			Price per Unit	# Units Required	Total Amount	Supplies Narrative:	
1							0.00	1.)	
2							0.00	2.)	
3							0.00	3.)	
4							0.00	4.)	
5							0.00	5.)	
6							0.00	6.)	
7							0.00	7.)	
8							0.00	8.)	
9							0.00	9.)	
10							0.00	10.)	
Supplies Total:							\$ -		
Direct Services: Any service that is provided directly to participants or program operations whose main purpose does not fit within personnel, housing & facilities, or supplies (for example: SUD treatment, detox services, hauling services)									
Directions:									
Items should be limited to non-billable services.									
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the direct participant service supports.									
In the "Organization / Contracted Organization," identify the entity that will deliver the direct participant service or the contractual service provider that will provide the services.									
Item Description	Program Supported	Organization / Contracted	Unit Type		Price per Unit	# Units Required	Total Amount	Direct Services Narrative:	
1			Select Option				0.00	1.)	
2			Select Option				0.00	2.)	
3			Select Option				0.00	3.)	
4			Select Option				0.00	4.)	
5			Select Option				0.00	5.)	
6			Select Option				0.00	6.)	
7			Select Option				0.00	7.)	
8			Select Option				0.00	8.)	
9			Select Option				0.00	9.)	
10			Select Option				0.00	10.)	

Direct Services									
Total: \$ -									
Training/Associated Travel: Eligible expenses for transportation, lodging, per diem, and registrations for trainings that support grant purposes									
Directions: Each line item should be dedicated to a single training cost or travel cost. All travel expenses must follow state DAS and federal GSA regulations; luxury expenses are not allowed (e.g. first-class seating). In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the training supports. In the "Organization Served / Contracted Organization" field, identify the entity that will have personnel attending training as well as the contractual service provider, if applicable. In the "Is this a Training or Travel Cost?" field, select to which this line item relates from the dropdown menu. In the "Training or Travel Costs (Per Individual)" field, input the estimated individual travel cost or registration cost for gsa attendee.									
Training Title	Program Supported	Organization Served / Contracted	Location of Training	Is this a	Training or Travel	# of Individuals	Total Amount	Training/Associated Travel Narrative:	
1				Select Option			0.00	1.)	
2				Select Option			0.00	2.)	
3				Select Option			0.00	3.)	
4				Select Option			0.00	4.)	
5				Select Option			0.00	5.)	
6				Select Option			0.00	6.)	
7				Select Option			0.00	7.)	
8				Select Option			0.00	8.)	
9				Select Option			0.00	9.)	
10				Select Option			0.00	10.)	
Training/Travel							\$ -		
Administrative Costs: Activities associated with administering the grant such as purchasing, budgeting, payroll, reporting, accounting and staff services									
Directions: Total Administrative Costs may not exceed 10% of total funds requested, unless an exception is granted by the Commission. In the "Item Description" field, identify the specific activities to be conducted. In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the expense supports. In the "Organization Served / Contracted Organization" field, identify the entity that will be conducting the administrative activities (this might be a contractual service provider if activities associated with administering the grant is contracted out).									
Item Description	Program Supported	Organization Served / Contracted					Total Amount	Administrative Costs Narrative:	
1 Administrative Costs	JRP	MCD					\$ 15,958.00	1.)	
2								2.)	
3								3.)	
4								4.)	
5								5.)	
6								6.)	
7								7.)	
8								8.)	
9								9.)	
10								10.)	
Administrative							\$ 15,958.00		
Budget Projection Totals: This section will be automatically calculated based on the information provided above									
Budget Categories	Category Totals								
Personnel	\$	205,490.00							
Housing & Facilities	\$	-							
Equipment	\$	-							
Supplies	\$	-							
Direct Services	\$	-							
Training/Travel	\$	-							
Subtotal	\$	205,490.00							
Administrative Costs	Total	% of Total Request							
All Items	\$	15,958.00	7%	*No more than 10%, without exception request					
Budget Projection Grand Total:		\$	221,448.00						

CJC Grant Program:

Name of Applicant

Is the applicant a Tribal Government?

Date:

JRP Formula

Multnomah County JRP

No

7/21/2025

BUDGET PROJECTION SHEET

Reinvestment-

Instructions: please follow the naming convention outlined for the grant program for which you are applying.
Examples: BHD = County/Tribe Name BHD Program; IMMEGP = IMMEGP: Name of Entity Applying; IMPACTS = County/Tribe Name IMPACTS Program; JMOUD = County/City Name + Name of Jail; JRP = County Name/Victim Service Provider Name; ORT = Name of Agency/Task Force; RJ = Legal Name of Entity Applying TC = County Name + Court Type

Personnel: Salaries, wages and fringe benefits costs for all grant-funded personnel (in whole or in part) employed by the grant recipient or contracted provider

Directions:
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the position supports.
In the "Employing Organization / Contracted Organization" field, identify the entity that will employ the position or the contractual service provider funding the position.
In the "% Time per Month" field, input the whole percentage of the position's time dedicated to grant-related work. Example: a half-time case manager = 50
In the "Monthly Rate" field, combine salary/wages and fringe benefits for a single month at full time, regardless of the value included in the "% Time per Month" field.
In the "# Months Employed" field, indicate the number of months the position is expected to be funded during the grant period.

Position Title	Program Supported	Contracted Organization	existing position to	Month	(wages+fringe)	Employed	Requested	For each requested item to the left, provide a brief (1-3 sentences) description and justification as to how it meets or fulfills the purpose/intent of the program.
1 Parole Probation Officer	JRP	DCI	Currently CJC Grant	100%			345,163.00	1.) Dedicated MCJRP Probation Officers provide enhanced supervision for presumptive prison justice involved individual sentenced to probation
2 Parole Probation Officer	JRP	DCI	Currently CJC Grant	100%			370,031.00	2.) Dedicated MCJRP Probation Officers provide enhanced supervision for presumptive prison justice involved individual sentenced to probation
3 Parole Probation Officer	JRP	DCI	Currently CJC Grant	100%			381,591.00	3.) Dedicated MCJRP Probation Officers provide enhanced supervision for presumptive prison justice involved individual sentenced to probation
4 Sworn Community Justice Manager	JRP	DCI	Currently CJC Grant	15%			74,095.00	4.) Manager/Supervisor for the MCJRP Probation Unit
5 Program Administrator	JRP	MCSO	Currently CJC Grant	100%			467,048.00	5.) Treatment Readiness Dorm Program Administrator supervises provider staff and collaborates with DCI, VOA and MCSO to deliver behavioral curriculum
6 Counselors (2)	JRP	MCSO	New	100%			567,477.00	6.) Treatment Dorm Counselors deliver on-dorm Readiness Curriculum
7 Adjudication)	JRP	MCDA	Currently CJC Grant	100%			458,307.00	decisions points throughout the public safety continuum.
8 Probation Violation)	JRP	MCDA	Currently CJC Grant	37%			171,578.75	8.) This DDA works daily with MCJRP probation officers, defense counsel, and judges to address MCJRP probation violations, crafting resolutions focused on the participants' success in the MCJRP program.
9 Legal Assistant 1	JRP	MCDA	Currently CJC Grant	50%			123,597.00	LA completes criminal history reports for all MCJRP cases by Day 15 from date of arraignment on indictment, and sends electronic copies of finalized reports to the appropriate parties. This position also
10 Research Evaluation Analyst Sr	JRP	MCDA	Currently CJC Grant	54%			189,782.00	sustain a data-driven approach.
11 Staff Assistant (Project Manager)	JRP	LPSCC	Currently CJC Grant	80%			400,725.00	11.) Dedicated Project Manager to coordinate operational, policy and data needs of MCJRP
12 Program Coordinator	JRP	OJD	Currently CJC Grant	100%			396,841.00	12.) Dedicated MCJRP Court Coordinator is the primary court liaison to practitioners, operations and OJD. The position tracks dockets, distributes assessments to parties, collects and reconciles court data.
13 Data Analyst	JRP	OJD	Currently CJC Grant	14%			54,604.00	attends all policy and operational meetings.
14 Social Worker	JRP	Defender	Currently CJC Grant	100%			317,986.00	sentenced to prison and help their clients avoid further system involvement. These positions play a significant role in timely case processing, case resolution, and client stabilization. SWTs can initiate
15 Case Manager	JRP	Defender	Currently CJC Grant	100%			259,280.00	sentenced to prison and help their clients avoid further system involvement. These positions play a significant role in timely case processing, case resolution, and client stabilization. SWTs can initiate
16 Case Manager	JRP	Defender	Currently CJC Grant	36%			83,469.00	sentenced to prison and help their clients avoid further system involvement. These positions play a significant role in timely case processing, case resolution, and client stabilization. SWTs can initiate
17 Social Worker	JRP	Multnomah Defenders, Inc.	Currently CJC Grant	5%			13,860.00	Conferences and release hearings. Social Work positions also help to supervise case managers, collect and report data, and attend operations meetings.
18 Case Manager	JRP	Multnomah Defenders, Inc.	Currently CJC Grant	5%			9,297.00	planning, refer to services and treatment, and, facilitate successful transition to community supervision post-adjudication.
19		Select Option					0.00	19.)
Personnel Total: \$							4,684,731.75	

Housing & Facilities: Eligible expenses for space/utilities necessary to complete program work, short-/long-term housing support for participants, or programs within correctional facilities

Directions:
In the "Item Description" field, identify what the expense covers (generally).
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the expense supports.
In the "Organization / Contracted Organization," identify the entity that will provide the housing & facilities or the contractual service provider that will provide the housing & facilities service.

Item Description	Program Supported	Organization	Unit Type	Price per Unit	# Units Required	Requested	For each requested item to the left, provide a brief (1-3 sentences) description and justification as to how it meets or fulfills the purpose/intent of the program.
1 Stabilization Beds	JRP		Select Option			156,054.00	1.) Dedicated lower barrier housing for MCJRP probationers in need of stabilization and preparation for treatment placements
2 Stabilization Housing Case Managers (2)	JRP		Select Option			216,209.00	2.) Dedicated case manager/peer mentors to assist MCJRP probationers with transportation, basic needs, system navigation and sobriety support
3 Clean and Sober Housing	JRP		Select Option			264,992.00	3.) Highly structured, dedicated long term housing for MCJRP probationers completing treatment and transitioning from supervision.
4			Select Option			0.00	4.)
5			Select Option			0.00	5.)
6			Select Option			0.00	6.)
7			Select Option			0.00	7.)
8			Select Option			0.00	8.)
9			Select Option			0.00	9.)
10			Select Option			0.00	10.)
Facilities Total: \$						637,255.00	

Equipment: Permanent or non-expendable equipment with a purchase price of \$5,000 or more, or a useable life of two or more years, for a single item

Directions:
In the "Item Description" field, identify the name/type of equipment to be purchased.
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the equipment supports.
In the "Organization Served / Contracted Organization" field, identify the entity that will own and operate the equipment as well as the contractual service provider, if applicable.
In the "# of Units Required" field, indicate the number of individual items to be purchased.

Item Description	Program Supported	Contracted Organization	Price per Unit	# Units Required	Requested	For each requested item to the left, provide a brief (1-3 sentences) description and justification as to how it meets or fulfills the purpose/intent of the program.
1					0.00	1.)
2					0.00	2.)
3					0.00	3.)
4					0.00	4.)
5					0.00	5.)
6					0.00	6.)
7					0.00	7.)
8					0.00	8.)
9					0.00	9.)
10					0.00	10.)
Equipment Total: \$						

Supplies: Consumable materials or supplies, including the cost of small items of equipment that do not meet the threshold for the "Equipment" category

Directions:
In the "Item Description" field, identify the name/type of supplies to be purchased.
In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the supplies supports.
In the "Organization Served / Contracted Organization" field, identify the entity that will use the supplies as well as the contractual service provider, if applicable.
In the "# of Units Required" field, indicate the number of individual items to be purchased.

Item Description	Program Supported	Contracted Organization	Price per Unit	# Units Required	Requested	For each requested item to the left, provide a brief (1-3 sentences) description and justification as to how it meets or fulfills the purpose/intent of the program.
1					0.00	1.)
2					0.00	2.)
3					0.00	3.)
4					0.00	4.)
5					0.00	5.)
6					0.00	6.)
7					0.00	7.)
8					0.00	8.)
9					0.00	9.)
10					0.00	10.)
Supplies Total: \$						

Direct Services: Any service that is provided directly to participants or program operations whose main purpose does not fit within personnel, housing & facilities, or supplies (for example: SUD treatment, detox services, hauling services)

Directions:

Items should be limited to non-billable services.

In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the direct participant service supports.

In the "Organization / Contracted Organization," identify the entity that will deliver the direct participant service or the contractual service provider that will provide the services.

Item Description	Program Supported	Organization	Unit Type	Price per Unit	# Units Required	Requested	For each requested item to the left, provide a brief (1-3 sentences) description and justification as to how it meets or fulfills the purpose/intent of the program.
1 Readiness	JRP	TBD	Select Option			789,722.25	1.) Contracted services to provide CBT to MCJRP participants
2			Select Option			0.00	2.)
3			Select Option			0.00	3.)
4			Select Option			0.00	4.)
5			Select Option			0.00	5.)
6			Select Option			0.00	6.)
7			Select Option			0.00	7.)
8			Select Option			0.00	8.)
9			Select Option			0.00	9.)
10			Select Option			0.00	10.)
				Direct Services			
				Total:		\$ 789,722.25	

Training/Associated Travel: Eligible expenses for transportation, lodging, per diem, and registrations for trainings that support grant purposes

Directions:

Each line item should be dedicated to a single training cost or travel cost.

All travel expenses must follow state DAS and federal GSA regulations; luxury expenses are not allowed (e.g. first-class seating).

In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the training supports.

In the "Organization Served / Contracted Organization" field, identify the entity that will have personnel attending training as well as the contractual service provider, if applicable.

In the "Is this a Training or Travel Cost?" field, select to which this line item relates from the dropdown menu.

In the "Training or Travel Costs (Per Individual)" field, input the estimated individual travel cost or registration cost for one attendee.

Training Title	Program Supported	Contracted Organization	Location of Training	Training or	Costs (Per	Attending	Requested	For each requested item to the left, provide a brief (1-3 sentences) description and justification as to how it meets or fulfills the purpose/intent of the program.
1				Select Option			0.00	1.)
2				Select Option			0.00	2.)
3				Select Option			0.00	3.)
4				Select Option			0.00	4.)
5				Select Option			0.00	5.)
6				Select Option			0.00	6.)
7				Select Option			0.00	7.)
8				Select Option			0.00	8.)
9				Select Option			0.00	9.)
10				Select Option			0.00	10.)
				Total:		\$ -		

Administrative Costs: Activities associated with administering the grant such as purchasing, budgeting, payroll, reporting, accounting and staff services

Directions:

Total Administrative Costs may not exceed 10% of total funds requested, unless an exception is granted by the Commission.

In the "Item Description" field, identify the specific activities to be conducted.

In the "Program Supported" field, identify the specific program/project the expense supports.

In the "Organization Served / Contracted Organization" field, identify the entity that will be conducting the administrative activities (this might be a contractual service provider if activities associated with administering the grant is contracted out).

Item Description	Program Supported	Contracted Organization	Requested	For each requested item to the left, provide a brief (1-3 sentences) description and justification as to how it meets or fulfills the purpose/intent of the program.
1 Administrative Costs	JRP	DCJ	\$ 117,086.00	the funder, which for this award is 10%.
2 Administrative Costs	JRP	MCSC	\$ 94,003.50	the funder, which for this award is 10%.
3 Administrative Costs	JRP	DA	\$ 82,438.50	the funder, which for this award is 10%.
4 Administrative Costs	JRP	LPSCC	\$ 16,750.00	the funder, which for this award is 10%, but the LPSCC's department rate is lower at 4.18% so that is the rate used here.
5				5.)
6				6.)
7				7.)
8				8.)
9				9.)
10				10.)
			Total:	\$ 310,278.00

Budget Projection Totals: This section will be automatically calculated based on the information provided above

Budget Categories	Category Totals
Personnel	\$ 4,684,731.75
Housing & Facilities	\$ 637,255.00
Equipment	\$ -
Supplies	\$ -
Direct Services	\$ 789,722.25
Training/Travel	\$ -
Subtotal	\$ 6,111,709.00
Administrative Costs	Total
All Items	\$ 310,278.00 5% % of Total Request
*No more than 10%, without exception request	
Budget Projection Grand Total:	\$ 6,421,987.00

Application: Multnomah

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 23-25

Summary

ID: 0000000027

Last submitted: May 20 2025 09:55 PM (UTC)

Q8 JRP Semi-Annual Formula Grant Progress Report (January 1, 2025 - June 30, 2025)

Completed - Jul 16 2025

Q8 Semi-Annual Formula Grant Progress Report

Responses to this report should reflect your Justice Reinvestment Program as a whole, as well as each individual program. This includes all grant-funded activities, as well as local policy changes or collaborative efforts that support the county's progress toward meeting the goals of Justice Reinvestment.

Report responses should reflect the previous six-month period and must be reviewed and approved by the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council prior to submission.

Grantees are required to respond to questions using the CJC dashboards where noted. In addition, it is recommended that grantees provide local quantitative and qualitative data related to their program to describe program progress toward meeting the goals of the Justice Reinvestment Program.

PART I: Program Implementation

1. Is program implementation progressing as expected?

Identify implementation challenges. Note if there have been any changes from what was proposed in your original application or approved adjustments. Please speak to each individual program.

If changes are needed that will significantly impact program design, please submit an adjustment request.

The Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP) progressed as proposed in the application. Between January 1, 2025 and June 30, 2025, 386 cases were MCJRP eligible, 386 MCJRP cases were sentenced, 30 percent received prison sentences, 70 percent received probation sentences, and 60 cases were revoked, primarily on new law violations. Forty percent of probation cases (109) were sentenced to MCJRP Supervision, 18 percent received Specialty Court sentences (50), and the remaining 41 percent were sentenced to specialty unit or general supervision (112 cases). Most MCJRP cases involving female defendants receive gender specific supervision services.

The Justice Reinvestment Steering Committee (JRSC) continued to focus on evaluating the informed sentencing model initiated through the Measures and Perspectives on Success (MAPS) research project (2023). A JRSC workgroup met regularly to assess case processing delays and develop a new case sorting mechanism. Case processing changes are expected to be fully implemented Fall 2025.

The reporting period included county budget, JRP and Specialty Court grant writing processes, and presented the primary challenge to program improvement and policy development. Significant 1145 and local reductions, combined with increased costs, impacted services at the start of the fiscal year. Operational changes are expected to be fully realized in the next reporting period. The assessment tool and defendant report changed effective July 1, 2025. MCJRP now uses the PSC and an ASAM (when appropriate) generating a shorter Pre-Adjudication Report (PAR) to inform sentencing decisions. In response to funding cuts and increased prison use, MCJRP is now focusing on supervision, disparities, and pre-trial services and outcomes in the next grant cycle.

Operational challenges remain driven by changes in population needs, backlogs and capacity issues. As of June 2025, approximately 1200 cases in Multnomah County lacked representation. Of those, approximately 200 are MCJRP eligible. These cases continue to be set over, have longer resolution times and/or result in warrants. Probation and social work teams continue to report increased acuity, dual diagnosis individuals, houselessness, limited treatment options and long waiting lists.

The JRSC and Operations team continued to focus on resolution times in order to reduce re-arrests, increase early treatment engagement, and disrupt further progression into the system. Ongoing strategies include increased communication between the jail and District Attorney's Office, increased reach-in from social work teams and mentors to encourage Treatment Readiness Dorm participation. The Court also continued increased status reports at scheduling hearings.

All funded positions were filled in the reporting period.

MCJRP Deputy District Attorney (DDA): Continued to focus on internal training, and developing program materials. The DDA sits on the workgroup and is responsible for developing the new case sorting criteria and internal case flow. In addition to policy projects, the DDA reviewed 157 cases for initial eligibility and staffed 25 cases for ongoing eligibility issues, and reviewed weekly jail reports to expedite MCJRP Adults in Custody (AIC) eligibility for Treatment Dorm services and case longevity issues. The DDA spends a significant amount of time each week working with analysts reconciling data, preparing quarterly performance reports and special projects requested by the JRSC.

Department of Community Justice (DCJ): DCJ planned for several million in funding cuts during the reporting period. Starting July 1, 2025, funded report writing positions will transition to MCJRP Supervision and will eliminate non OHP service contracts. MCJRP caseloads averaged 35 while Probation Officers maintained contact standards: a minimum of three measurable client contacts monthly, as well as collateral contacts through mentors and service providers. DCJ's writers completed an average of 20 weekly interviews and assessments including assessments STEP Court

Metropolitan Public Defenders (MPD): The MPD Social Work Team (SWT) was fully staffed during the reporting period. JRP funds support three MPD social work team positions with average caseloads of 25. The team closed 50 cases in the reporting period; 65% of MPD's clients remained out of custody pretrial, 25% of clients received prison sentences. Each member of MPD's team attended an average of 2 hearings a week and spends an average of 3 hours a week in court. The team attended at least one hearing per client 72% prior to sentencing. Per MPD Social Work Team:

- A majority of our clients are assigned to us while they are currently in custody
- Have increased planning/case coordination with Forensic Diversion for cases going through the A&A process. Specifically we have been able to work together to find permanent placements for clients who are found never able —it is now rare that a client is released directly to the streets after being found never able
- Have been heavily utilizing flex funds (JRP Formula Grant Funding)
- Have been able to assist clients with the following items/ costs: storage units, utility bills, limited rent assistance, clothing, transportation to treatment, basic need items (back packs/ tents), medical bills, medical items

- Continue to heavily utilize level 2.5 treatment or IOP with sober housing
 - Found that the transition from being in services to independence is easier with this model because the client can look for jobs/ ways to fund housing while in treatment
 - Housing for folks with MH continues to be the hardest part of the transition—services for MH for out of custody are more available. The struggle for housing for people with MH occurs both pre trial and when transition to probation (we previously thought that the long case lengths impacted this but now we believe it's just a lack of services available)
 - Clients report it is easier to work with probation- an increased trusting relationship when they work with a social worker because they are used to checking in with someone/using their social work as a practice so to speak for how it may look working with probation on services
 - Continue to have community partners meet with us at a bi weekly meeting to build/ strengthen relationships
 - Fentanyl continues to be a big issue/ used by most clients
 - High mental health acuity
 - Continue to have lack of appropriate level of services especially for clients who need dual diagnosis treatment (no current inpatient dual diagnosis treatment centers we can refer in custody clients to)
-

2. Highlight program successes or promising practices.

Include any lessons learned, accomplishments, or individual program outcome measures. Please speak to each individual program.

MCJRP remains collaborative and all standing committees and teams continue to meet regularly despite ongoing system and funding challenges. All partners continue to express their commitment to data-driven policy-making and system improvement.

The Operations Team continues to meet weekly including all MCJRP partners, analysts, the Chief Criminal Judge. Team priorities include reducing resolution times, pre-sentence arrests, initial prison sentences and revocations.

The MCJRP Data Team increased to bi-weekly meetings while developing a data management plan for a tiered MCJRP case processing model. Data sharing barriers created by a case management migration in the DA's Office was largely resolved in the reporting period.

Over the reporting period, MCJRP AICs grew to constitute 20% of the total jail population. The Treatment Dorm remained at capacity in the reporting period with an average population of 72. The unit delivered readiness curriculum to just under 6000 AICS in the reporting period.

The Jail Program Unit Supervisor continued attendance at weekly operations meetings. Per MCSO/Trends on TRD:

- There has been significant increase in AIC participation/engagement in TRD on-dorm programming. AICs participating in on-dorm groups average between 50-60 participants.

- Higher percentage of participants on TRD report poly-substance use, with upward spikes in numbers of AICs reporting use of fentanyl (in small doses).

- Higher percentage of AICs housed on TRD are being enrolled in Medication Supported Recovery (MSR) Program and induced/receiving suboxone. Current model (receiving meds in 'med-line' on-dorm) is contributing to some challenges/disruption with on-dorm programming

MCJRP Trends for MCSO facilities:

- On average, 20% of the MCSO jail population (both facilities) are MCJRP eligible (excluding 'outcounts' such as State Hospital).

- MCJRP flagged female AICs account for roughly 10-11% of all MCJRP flagged AICs at both locations and remain

underserved in terms of programming offered to them.

-On average, 23% of 'MCJRP flagged' AICs housed at Inverness are in MH Dorm housing

3. [Optional] Do you have any stories relating to your JRP program (as a whole or individual programs) that you wish to share with us?

Examples include programmatic successes, individual client outcomes, notable achievements, etc.

(No response)

PART II: Goals of Justice Reinvestment

Goal: Reduce recidivism through evidence-based practices while increasing public safety and holding individuals accountable.

1. Describe your county's Justice Reinvestment program's progress, as a whole, toward reducing recidivism through evidence-based practices while increasing public safety and holding individuals accountable during the reporting period. Please respond utilizing the most up-to-date data available on the CJC dashboards, in addition to local quantitative and qualitative data.

Please use the [CJC recidivism dashboards](#), which are updated every six months.

CJC's statewide statistics provide recidivism data from three sources, namely arrests from LEDS, convictions in state courts, and incarcerations in the Oregon Department of Corrections (ODOC) for both 1-year and 3-year intervals. Using either interval, Multnomah County has lower percentages across all three recidivism metrics, with the exception of 1-year incarceration rates. However, the small sample size might explain this outlier as there are only 3 individuals in the 2023/2nd cohort that were re-incarcerated within a one year period.

Arrests:

1-Year interval: Multnomah County – 22.8 percent – Statewide – 29.7 percent

3-Year interval: Multnomah County – 33.9 percent – Statewide – 44.0 percent

Convictions:

1-Year interval: Multnomah County – 18.1 percent – Statewide – 18.7 percent

3-Year interval: Multnomah County – 27.5 percent – Statewide – 34.9 percent

Incarcerations:

1-Year interval: Multnomah County – 5.8 percent – Statewide – 3.8 percent

3-Year interval: Multnomah County – 10.9 percent – Statewide – 11.6 percent

Recidivism rates differ slightly by race/ethnicity. For instance, using the cohort with the most recently updated data—2023 first cohort—28.7 percent of White participants were arrested within 28 months from release from incarceration, while 32.7 percent of African Americans were arrested within the same time period. Similar small differences (about two to five percent) are apparent in conviction and incarceration rates between White and African American participants as well.

The difference between genders appears to be small for all types of recidivism. Men have a slightly higher three-year re-arrest rate than women (34.1 percent compared to 33.0 percent), but women have a slightly higher one-year re-arrest rate (25.2 percent compared to 22.3 percent). Women have a slightly higher re-conviction rate than men for both three-year and one-year periods while men in general have a higher re-incarceration rate.

Looking at Multnomah County, the latest recidivism data appears to show an overall decline in arrests and

convictions beginning around 2017. For instance, the three-year conviction recidivism rate was down from 42.7 percent for the first 2016 cohort to 33.9 percent for the second 2021 cohort. Furthermore, the three year recidivism rate for felony convictions has declined from 2017 (from about 28 to 20 percent) while the same rate for misdemeanors has declined from 24.4 percent to 14.4 percent for the 2021 second cohort. The rate of new incarcerations in ODOC has also declined since 2017 although it's stayed relatively flat since the second 2019 cohort hovering between 8 and 10 percent. When cohorts are broken out by year, Multnomah County remains below the state average for arrests, convictions, and new incarcerations for all three years.

The Oregon Judicial Department maintains information regarding cases revoked from the MCJRP program. During the period from January 1 through June 30, 2025, 56 individuals were revoked from any sentencing outcome that resolved a MCJRP-eligible case. Of these, 34 were revoked directly from MCJRP Intensive Supervision and 22 from other Treatment Courts or traditional probation. This total reflects a decrease from the previous six-month period where 79 total MCJRP eligible cases were revoked.

The Multnomah County Sheriff's Office maintains booking statistics for individuals booked into Multnomah County jails. In the first six months of 2025, there were 505 bookings for 348 MCJRP participants subsequent to their first sentence to MCJRP intensive supervision. 37 percent of those participants were booked more than once during the time period. About 24% (165) of these bookings had a new charge as one of the reasons listed in the jail record for the booking. Although the number of total bookings increased from the last previous six month period (from 449 in the second half of 2024 to 505 in the first half of 2025), the total number of individuals booked decreased slightly from 348 to 332 during the same time period.

Goal: Reduce prison utilization for property, drug, and driving offenses while increasing public safety and holding individuals accountable.

2. Describe your county's Justice Reinvestment program's progress, as a whole, toward decreasing county prison usage for property, drug, and driving offenses while increasing public safety and holding individuals accountable during the reporting period. Please respond using the most up-to-date data on the CJC dashboards to analyze trends in usage. Responses should incorporate data specific to prison intakes, revocations, length of stay, and relationship to the statewide rates as appropriate.

Please use the [CJC JRP prison usage dashboard](#), which is updated regularly.

Although total prison use, as measured by length of stay, has been increasing steadily in Multnomah County since its low of 1,128 months in May 2021, it remains significantly below baseline. The most recent available data from May 2025 shows a total length of stay of 3,443 months, down 67% from a high of 10,675 months in October 2013. Statewide, the decrease in total length of stay during the same period was only 43%. Person offenses carry the longest sentence lengths in Multnomah County and in the state as a whole.

Multnomah County prison intakes show a similar trend to length of stay, hitting a low of 80 in June 2021 and steadily increasing to 188 in May 2025. The number of intakes has been continuing to increase both in the county and statewide. However, Multnomah's prison intakes are still significantly below baseline, down 68% from its peak of 593 in October 2013 while the statewide decrease in prison intakes during that period was only 41%. Both statewide and in Multnomah County, the increase in prison intakes has been driven by property offenses.

The median sentence length in Multnomah County increased from 14.8 months in 2024 to 15.5 months through May 2025. During the same period, the statewide sentence length declined from 17.2 to 16.3 months. However, median sentence lengths in Multnomah remain consistently lower than for the state. The number of prison sentences specifically for the Multnomah County MCJRP-eligible population—a broader population than reflected on the JRI Prison Use dashboard—has increased relative to the COVID-related lows in late 2020 and early 2021, but remains below pre-pandemic levels. Prison sentences appear to be increasing, in part due to an overall increase in case resolutions after a pandemic-related period of backlog, and in part because the longer the backlogged cases had been pending, the more opportunity defendants had to pick up new cases, which in turn increased the likelihood of a prison sentence.

Between June 2024 and May 2025, 74 percent of total prison usage in Multnomah County was a result of a first sentence and 26 percent was a result of a probation revocation. This is generally consistent with most reporting periods where the ratio between initial sentences and revocations stays around 75/25 percent, respectively. Statewide, a greater proportion of prison use is the result of a first sentence (79 percent, vs. 21 percent resulting from a probation revocation). Local data provides revocation trends specific to the MCJRP-eligible population. The

total number of revocations went down considerably in this current six month period: from 95 in the July - December 2024 period to 65 in the January to June period. However, the total number of revocations for MCJRP intensive supervision only remained the same at 40. For both the MCJRP-eligible population and those sentenced to intensive supervision, the number of revocations remains below pre-pandemic levels.

Application: Multnomah

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 23-25

Summary

ID: 0000000027

Last submitted: May 20 2025 09:55 PM (UTC)

Q8 JRP Semi-Annual Competitive Grant Progress Report (January 1, 2025 - June 30, 2025)

Completed - Jul 17 2025

Q8 Semi-Annual Competitive Grant Progress Report

Please only complete this task if you received Competitive Grant funding.

Report responses should reflect the previous six-month period and must be reviewed and approved by the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council prior to submission.

Part 1: Competitive Grant - Program Implementation

1. Is program implementation progressing as expected?

Identify implementation challenges. Note if there have been any changes from what was proposed in your original application.

If changes are needed that will significantly impact program design, please submit an adjustment request.

Multnomah County's JRP Competitive Grant funds key downward departure personnel, including defense-based social work positions and a Probation Violation Deputy District Attorney (PV DDA). Program implementation progressed as expected in the reporting period and did not encounter significant implementation challenges.

PV DDA: This position was fully staffed in the reporting period. The MCJRP PV DDA attended 237 hearings and spent approximately 125 hours in court in the reporting period. The DDA reviewed 350 cases with an emphasis on global resolutions in cases with new charges and resolved one contested case.

Multnomah Defenders, Inc: Both the Social Worker and Case Manager positions were filled during the reporting period. The more complex social worker caseload averaged 14, while the case manager caseload ranged from 20-25 cases. MDI closed 27 cases and 70% of clients were released prior to sentencing. Seventy-four percent of clients assessed as High/Very High Risk. Both SW & CM attend a minimum of 1-2 court hearings per case, mostly Judicial Settlement Conferences and release hearings in addition to pleas, and specialty court hearings.

The majority of SWT work is client engagement done in the jails, office, and field locations. On average, 15-20/hours week were spent on direct client contact. The loss of MCJRP Escort Deputies in this grant cycle continues to be a barrier in communicating with clients in custody. SWTs often make jail calls in the evening and can face long wait times when waiting for clients to be brought to visit rooms.

Per MDI:

Successes:

-Access to client flex funds has been tremendous help. Having the ability to support clients with basic needs when exiting jail is very helpful in keeping them engaged in treatment programs and reduces desperation.

-We continue to build relationships with more accessible programs, primarily level 2.1/2.5 – outpatient treatment with sober housing

-We have been trying to build stronger relationships and strategies for working with DCJ and having smoother transitions to probation / supervision

-There is an increase in willingness from new programs to accept our clients and work with them

-We have also increased our communication with corrections counselors to help facilitate smooth transitions from jail to treatment

-Easier access to suboxone in custody has been a positive shift

Primary Challenges:

-Residential treatment options still quite limited

-Continued lack of access to mental health specific programs which most importantly create barriers for clients with primary mental health concerns

-Can be challenging to find placement for clients who have been in A&A process for a long time and are then found able, because even if mental health is stable, programs may be reluctant to accept them

-Continue to see serious addiction to both meth and fentanyl

-More push-back on probation offers and seem less inclined to staff cases

2. Has your program's target population changed from what was in your application?

No

3. Please describe any implementation delays or changes to services, sanctions, or supervision capacity.

No delays or changes to Competitive personnel positions in the reporting period.

4. [Optional] Is there any additional information and/or insight into your program implementation you would like to share?

NA

Part II: Competitive Grant - Prison Intake Reductions

Responses in this section should reflect only the program's target population.

1. How many program participants were granted downward departures who otherwise would have gone to prison during the past six months?

129

2. How many program participants were revoked during the past six months?

34

3. Of the above revocations, how many were for a new crime and how many for other violations? Please choose only one reason for revocation per applicable program participant.

New Crime	18
Other Violations	19

4. [Optiona] Is there any additional information and/or insight into your prison intake reductions that you would like to share?

We're currently conducting an analysis of revocations to better understand the factors that predict why someone is revoked from probation. There's been an increase in revocations over the past year and we seek to identify whether there are policy or service-level changes that can be implemented to reduce this trend. The analysis looks at a variety of factors including race, gender, age, risk scores/LSCMI scores, technical violations, and new law violations to try to isolate the significant and predictive factors. We will also look at time to revocation to identify which cases are more likely to revoke sooner during their supervision tenure.

Part III: Competitive Grant - Program Information

1. During the past six months, how many program participants were engaged in some form of treatment (substance use disorder, cognitive, mental health, and/or pre-treatment)?

28

2. During the past six months, how many program participants received housing assistance?

Examples include transitional housing, vouchers, rental assistance, etc.

3

3. During the past six months, how many program participants were assessed by a validated risk assessment tool?

87

3.a. Which validated risk assessment tool(s) did you use?

LS/CMI, WRNA, PSC

4. During the past six months, how many program participants received education or employment assistance?

3

5. [Optiona] Is there any additional information and/or insight into your program information that you would like to share?

NA

Application: Multnomah

Lily Yamamoto - lily.yamamoto@multco.us
Justice Reinvestment Program 23-25

Summary

ID: 0000000027

Last submitted: May 20 2025 09:55 PM (UTC)

2024-2025 JRP Victims Services Annual Report

Completed - Jul 15 2025

2024-2025 JRP Victims Services Annual Report

Page 1 - Cover Page

2024-2025 JRP Grant Victims Services Annual Report

July 01, 2024 - June 30, 2025

Each community-based victim services provider funded through the Justice Reinvestment Program must complete a SEPARATE progress report. Victim services provider progress reports are due annually, and each report covers the previous year of the grant.

Please note, there is a tab in the "expense tracker" that will need to be completed for each victim services provider.

County

Multnomah

Community Based Non-Profit Service Provider #1

Oregon Crime Victim Law Center

Program Contact Person

Emily La Brecque

Contact Person Title

Executive Director

Contact Email

emily@ocvlc.org

Number of LPSCC Meetings Attended by Victims Service Provider During Reporting Period

2

Part I: Program Implementation

How is program implementation progressing? Highlight relevant challenges or successes.

Include program quantitative or qualitative data as available.

The Oregon Crime Victims Law Center's program at the Gateway Center for Domestic Violence Services has been consistently providing much-needed legal services to survivors of domestic and sexual violence since 2016. Most recently, from July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025, attorneys from OCVLC and Legal Aid Services of Oregon have opened 228 new cases for legal representation in Multnomah County. The majority of these victims seeking legal representation would likely have had to proceed without an attorney if not for this program. Nearly all of those seeking legal representation were victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking. Most of the cases handled involved representation of victims at contested restraining order hearings, assistance with dissolution and custody issues where there was violence in the home, and obtaining permanent stalking orders. This year, 95% of the clients of OCVLC and LASO were women.

The most notable success of this program remains the high number of survivors who have sought and received critically needed legal help as a result of the grant. There is no other option in Multnomah County for victims seeking free legal assistance for issues arising from domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking. Additionally, both LASO and OCVLC have bilingual attorneys to assist victims who are non-English speakers, ensuring that language is not a barrier to their participation in the justice system.

Another success of the project has been an increased collaboration between community partners and agencies located at the Gateway with LASO and OCVLC, which has led to greater representation of traditionally underserved populations and those who face multiple barriers, such as language, immigration status, and geographic or transportation challenges. The referral process has been almost seamless between Gateway navigators and both OCVLC and LASO.

In three individual cases, LASO was able to provide extended legal services to clients who were monolingual Spanish speakers by assisting them with filing family law forms. One involved drafting legal pleadings that do not exist as fill-in-the-blank forms for self-represented litigants. LASO also represented a survivor in two separate but related matters. The client had a FAPA restraining order, as well as a simultaneous dissolution of marriage and custody case. When the client came to LASO, she had a contested hearing scheduled in the FAPA and an immediate danger hearing in the dissolution that had been consolidated and would occur at the same time and place. The attorney successfully filed a notice of representation in the case and represented the client at the hearing. The attorney successfully negotiated with the opposing party, agreeing to uphold the restraining order and award legal custody to our client with a protective parenting time plan for the child. Because custody and parenting time were resolved, the court dismissed the immediate danger order. The dissolution proceedings continue, and LASO is providing direct representation to the survivor in this case. However, the survivor now has a protective order in place for a period of two years.

OCVLC's MCJRP cases included representation in contested Family Abuse Protective Order cases, Stalking Protective Order cases, Sexual Abuse Protective Order proceedings, Elder Abuse Protective Order cases, criminal cases, and parole board cases. OCVLC received very positive feedback from the clients we assisted. Some of the comments from MCJRP cases in the last quarter included:

- “[My attorney] made this stressful event so much easier for me. Her communication was great, and she made sure I knew what to expect on the day of the hearing. I am so thankful that she was able to represent me.”
- “OCVLC placed me with someone who was professional, knowledgeable and caring to my situation.”
- “I was fortunate enough to get the representation and counsel of [my attorney]. I have had a civil attorney and a district attorney in the past, and [my attorney] far exceeded the guidance and support I received in the past. I felt so well informed and educated by (My attorney), and before I had even met her in person, I felt an overwhelming sense of calm and fierce support at my back. I had extreme anxiety and fear at the prospect of having to be in a courtroom with my abuser, and fear over not being able to defend myself or be regulated enough to advocate for myself. Even before [My attorney] had officially taken my case, she informed me of the rights, the process of the hearing, the legality of the SAPO restraining order, and I could tell she had done immense research about the SAPO order before reaching out to me. This made me feel secure and well prepared to face my abuser and the judge on a matter that is so new, most attorneys and judges have not had experience with SAPO orders yet

Part II: Victim Services Funding Criteria

Describe how grant funds have been used to provide services specifically targeting marginalized and underserved populations.

Define which marginalized and/or underserved populations the funds are serving, and give specific examples of how these funds are being used (ex: salary for bilingual advocate to run support group for Spanish speaking survivors).

The Justice Reinvestment funding has allowed OCVLC and Legal Aid to place attorneys at the Gateway Center, a resource center for victims of domestic violence in Multnomah County. By locating attorneys at both the Gateway Center for Domestic Violence and at Legal Aid's Eastside location, which are easily accessible via multiple modes of public transit, we are providing greater access for survivors to reach us without having to travel downtown or to our main offices. In total, fourteen social service organizations operate within the Gateway Center to ensure that comprehensive and holistic services are available for survivors who seek help at the center. The partnership with Gateway, facilitated through this grant, enhances the attorneys' ability to reach populations that may not be aware of the services available to them and reduces barriers that potential clients may encounter when accessing services. Many culturally specific victim service providers are located at Gateway, and this structure promotes increased access and referrals of traditionally underserved populations to the project attorneys.

Both Gateway and the Eastside LASO location are situated in areas with a higher population of survivors who come from communities that have often been underserved or marginalized, and by being available to meet them closer to where they live, they are more likely to access services and have better outcomes with the legal system. We have used the grant funds to represent non-English speaking clients in cases ranging from a minor in a Sexual Abuse Prevention Act restraining order, to representing domestic violence survivors in immigration cases to further ensure safety of the family. We have used the funds to create pathways for access to justice for clients and those with limited access to resources. Both organizations employ bilingual attorneys and prioritize training around the successful and trauma-informed use of interpretation services. In the course of representing individual clients, we foster closer relationships and build trust with other social service organizations serving marginalized non-English speakers and share information about how we can serve their client population. We are also able to provide wraparound services for crime victims. We regularly provide legal representation to victims in restraining order hearings as well as criminal cases that have arisen from the same facts that led to the restraining order. We have also worked with victims who have multiple civil legal needs, including divorce, custody, immigration issues, and restraining orders.

Describe how grant funds have addressed access barriers including, but not limited to, language, literacy, disability, transportation and cultural practices?

As stated above, the funding from the Justice Reinvestment has enabled us to place attorneys at Gateway, which allows us to reach survivors who may otherwise be unable to access services. With the numerous social service agencies available, survivors can address multiple issues by working with a navigator at Gateway, and organizations can refer survivors to other organizations to ensure their needs are being met. Several social service agencies at Gateway specifically target underserved populations. By working closely with these agencies, OCVLC and LASO are able to reach these populations as well and ensure that such common barriers, such as language and disability, do not prevent a survivor from accessing services.

What barriers to grant-funded services, if any, are you encountering that you have not yet been able to overcome using grant funding?

The barriers that we are seeing are the same as we've always encountered when working with traumatized victims and the criminal justice system. There is a lack of trust in the criminal justice system in many communities, so victims are often reluctant to attempt to access justice through traditional means. Unfortunately, this means that when victims do reach out, it is likely because their situation has become significantly more dangerous for themselves and their children. By providing attorneys to victims accessing the justice system, we aim to improve outcomes for victims, thereby increasing trust in the system. If victims feel they will be supported and protected by the justice system, they are more likely to seek assistance. Meeting clients where they are, whether by increasing physical access to our services, enhancing access to bilingual attorneys and attorneys trained to utilize interpretation services effectively, and focusing on providing culturally competent and trauma-informed services, goes a long way toward overcoming these barriers.

Have grant funds increased capacity in areas where services are difficult to access, limited, or non-existent?

If so, please describe how capacity has increased. Please include data and numbers when possible (e.g., able to connect with 35 low-income families).

By placing attorneys at the Gateway Center, we have made it easier for survivors to access our services. As low-income communities continue to be displaced, increasingly, our clients live in East County. With Justice Reinvestment funds, there is the capacity to take cases for full representation. We have attorneys able to meet with clients where they are, and to make victims aware of the kinds of services available to them. Both Legal Aid and OCVLC have bilingual attorneys, allowing them to connect more easily with non-English speakers. LASO and OCVLC also utilize translation services to ensure that all non-English-speaking victims can access our services and make informed choices. Our attorneys have developed a coordinated outreach plan that includes multiple community organizations, aiming to further reach isolated communities that may not typically seek legal help.

Have grant funds have been used to support trauma-informed interventions and services?

If yes, please describe what interventions and services are being supported.

The Justice Reinvestment Grant attorneys have gained new opportunities through collaboration with other Gateway partners, including working with DHS, IRCO, Slavic Community Services, El Programa Hispano UNICA, Bradley Angle, NAYA, and other programs available at the Gateway Center. Combining a trauma-informed approach to client services fits in perfectly with the Gateway Center's overall emphasis on receiving and assisting trauma victims in a way that best fits their needs. Placing an attorney at the Gateway Center has given OCVLC new opportunities to assist a population of victims that would have otherwise not been aware of our services. Additionally, our attorneys have continued to pursue further training in providing services in a trauma-informed manner, and in turn, have provided numerous trainings to all on-site and many off-site partners. OCVLC and LASO continue to collaborate with the Gateway navigators to ensure that they can accurately identify the legal needs of victims contacting Gateway, directing them to the appropriate resource. This alleviates the need for victims to seek services in a variety of locations and is a more trauma-informed approach, and productive, informed cross-referrals help us to maximize the limited resources for advocacy and legal services.

Access to attorneys at no cost is an essential component of ensuring that the services at locations such as the Gateway Center are trauma-informed. Providing a survivor with access to legal advice enables them to make informed decisions and regain autonomy. Involvement in the legal process is traumatic in and of itself, and this trauma grows exponentially when a survivor does not understand the process that they are involved in, is misadvised, or is pressured into making a legal decision without fully understanding the consequences. OCVLC and LASO serve this community in a way that no other partner with the Gateway Center can.

Would you like to report on another victim services provider?

Yes

2024-2025 JRP Grant Victims Services Annual Report

July 01, 2024 - June 30, 2025

Each community-based victim services provider funded through the Justice Reinvestment Program must complete a SEPARATE progress report. Victim services provider progress reports are due annually, and each report covers the previous year of the grant.

Please note, there is a tab in the "expense tracker" that will need to be completed for each victim services provider.

County

Multnomah

Community Based Non-Profit Service Provider #2

IRCO

Program Contact Person	Kaitlyn Brennan
Contact Person Title	SAE Coordinator

Contact Email

kaitlynb@irco.org

Number of LPSCC Meetings Attended by Victims Service Provider During Reporting Period

2

Part I: Program Implementation

How is program implementation progressing? Highlight relevant challenges or successes.

Include program quantitative or qualitative data as available.

The Services Against Exploitation (SAE) program has 4 four multicultural staff members who are experienced and dedicated to the wellbeing of Human Trafficking survivors.

Over the past year, IRCO SAE continued to serve survivors of labor and/or sex trafficking as they sought healing and life stabilization services after their victimization. From July 1, 2024, to June 30, 2025, SAE served 71 total clients and their households. Services provided included safety planning, clothing procurement, transportation, utility and rental assistance, connection to legal services and public benefits, education and job training supplies, and referrals and support for mental health services. Of those 71 clients, 8 were US born and 69 were multi-cultural. 42 were women, and 29 were men. 15 self-identified as having a disability. All 71 lived below the 30% AMI when entering our program.

IRCO SAE partnered with local DVSA organization, Call to Safety, to expand our phone line into a 24-hour crisis line and have developed relationships with several local law firms in order to expand our client reach.

IRCO SAE was invited to participate in Multnomah County's Proclamation for Trafficking Awareness Month in January. The team trained ODHS staff, IRCO staff within other departments, community based organizations, culturally specific partners, and attendees of the Multnomah County Sexual Assault Awareness Month Conference on topics related to human trafficking among immigrants and refugees. SAE expanded its presence and survivor response in rural Oregon and within culturally specific communities within the Portland Metro region. The team joined a state wide labor trafficking committee to connect with other providers, collaborate on trainings, and support survivors with the most up to date information and best practices as well as a rural trafficking committee in Malheur County to meet the needs of survivors seeking support in the Eastern Ontario office.

IRCO SAE participated in Multnomah County's Sex Trafficking Executive Committee and Sex Trafficking Expansion Project with input from survivors with lived experience sitting on the Community Advisory Board for Sex Trafficking and helped in the formation of an ongoing Sex Trafficking Awareness Campaign.

Some of the challenges that we are working on are as follows: Community partners are facing substantial financial strain and anticipate that this will continue into the foreseeable future, limiting resources such as housing, food,

and legal help for the survivors on our caseload; the price of living has impacted the number of survivors who are able to flee their trafficking situation

Part II: Victim Services Funding Criteria

Describe how grant funds have been used to provide services specifically targeting marginalized and underserved populations.

Define which marginalized and/or underserved populations the funds are serving, and give specific examples of how these funds are being used (ex: salary for bilingual advocate to run support group for Spanish speaking survivors).

All survivors of human trafficking within Oregon are eligible for IRCO SAE's services. The majority of our participants are members of immigrant and refugee communities, and 63 of our 71 participants are learning English as a second language.

Describe how grant funds have addressed access barriers including, but not limited to, language, literacy, disability, transportation and cultural practices?

We have three bilingual staff who are able to speak with the majority of our participants in their native languages, practicing trauma informed and culturally specific care and services for those survivors. All four advocates were either foreign born or have foreign born family, adding lived experience to their knowledge of the unique barriers faced by survivors on our caseload. We have also expanded our services into rural immigrant communities, reaching those survivors with fewer resources and organizations at their disposal and providing vital necessities, rental support, and safety planning in an attempt to break the added isolation of rural survivors.

What barriers to grant-funded services, if any, are you encountering that you have not yet been able to overcome using grant funding?

We have not encountered barriers to using the grant funds awarded to us by LPSCC for grant-funded services.

Have grant funds increased capacity in areas where services are difficult to access, limited, or non-existent?

If so, please describe how capacity has increased. Please include data and numbers when possible (e.g., able to connect with 35 low-income families).

IRCO SAE is the only team of anti-trafficking advocates within the Portland Metro Area to serve survivors of both sex and labor trafficking. With the majority of anti-trafficking services in the county focused on building services for survivors of sex trafficking, IRCO SAE has been able to fill in a crucial service gap and help 69 survivors from non-English speaking communities, 48 who have experienced labor trafficking, and 16 who have experienced both labor and sex trafficking. We have expanded our services into rural immigrant communities, reaching those survivors with fewer resources and organizations at their disposal and providing vital necessities, rental support, and safety planning in an attempt to break the added isolation of rural survivors.

Have grant funds have been used to support trauma-informed interventions and services?

If yes, please describe what interventions and services are being supported.

IRCO SAE's coordinator has attended several trainings within the past year on trauma informed supervision by Futures Without Violence. SAE's advocates have each received the 40 hour OCADSV DVSA Confidential Advocate Privilege training that emphasizes the need for trauma-informed response to survivors of interpersonal violence. Staff continue to receive up-to-date trainings on trauma informed response. This includes, ensuring that an interpreter is present if no staff member who speaks the participant's language can be found, adopting a survivor-led model that emphasizes each survivor's knowledge of their own safety needs, ensuring staff have one-on-one supervision to support their work each week, interrupting harmful myths surrounding trafficking, and supporting the autonomy of each participant in their healing journey towards stabilization.

Would you like to report on another victim services provider?

Yes

2024-2025 JRP Grant Victims Services Annual Report

July 01, 2024 - June 30, 2025

Each community-based victim services provider funded through the Justice Reinvestment Program must complete a SEPARATE progress report. Victim services provider progress reports are due annually, and each report covers the previous year of the grant.

Please note, there is a tab in the "expense tracker" that will need to be completed for each victim services provider.

County

Multnomah

Community Based Non-Profit Service Provider #3

Lutheran Community Services, NW

Program Contact Person	Mindy Johnston
Contact Person Title	Program Director

Contact Email

mjohnston@lcsnw.org

Number of LPSCC Meetings Attended by Victims Service Provider During Reporting Period

4

Part I: Program Implementation

How is program implementation progressing? Highlight relevant challenges or successes.

Include program quantitative or qualitative data as available.

The Crime Victim Advocacy Program at Lutheran Community Services Northwest (LCSNW) continues to provide critical, trauma-informed support to victims and survivors of crime across Multnomah County. While our program is open to all, we maintain a strong focus on serving those most impacted by systemic inequities—particularly BIPOC, immigrant, refugee, LGBTQIA+, and disabled communities. Through our "no wrong door" approach, we are honored to serve any individual who reaches out for assistance, regardless of background or crime type.

Over the past year, the program provided more than 790 hours of direct advocacy services, despite a staffing challenge—one of our 1.5 FTE staff was out on family medical leave for three months. Despite this, our advocates continued to go above and beyond, offering individualized, participant-led support to survivors working to stabilize and rebuild after trauma.

Specific Service Achievements

Victim Support and Ongoing Engagement: Over the past year, we served 113 victims of crime through a robust network of community partners and referral sources. Approximately 20% of participants have received support for over a year, often due to the complexity of their cases, ongoing trauma, or secondary victimization. This sustained engagement highlights the trust-based, long-term relationships our advocates build—even amid staff transitions.

Broad Scope of Crime Types Addressed: We addressed 19 different primary crime types at intake. Notably, 42% of participants experienced multiple victimizations—including secondary or subsequent incidents. In many cases, these additional needs surfaced after intake and required equally attentive, individualized support.

Direct service hours included:

62.5 hours for Information & Referral

299.75 hours for Personal Advocacy & Accompaniment

56.5 hours for Emotional Support & Safety Services

77.5 hours for Criminal & Civil Justice System Assistance

Demographic Reach and Representation:

Among new intakes:

65% were immigrants, refugees, or people of color

Participants originated from diverse countries including: Bhutan, Burundi, Cameroon, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Jordan, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Thailand, and Ukraine

Continuity of Care: We continue to serve individuals who first engaged with the program as far back as 2016. Some return for support related to the original harm; others return following new victimizations. This long-term engagement underscores the ongoing and evolving needs of survivors and the importance of flexible,

individualized services.

Gender and Age Representation:

Of the participants served:

66% identified as female

33% identified as male

18 participants did not report gender, primarily due to hotline calls where demographic data is not collected

These gender trends have remained consistent since the program's inception.

Age breakdown:

2% were under age 24

80% were between ages 25–59

18% were over age 60

Outreach and Collaboration/Strengthened Community Partnerships

We have continued to build and maintain strong partnerships with both systems-based and community-based providers. The program provided 115 hours of outreach, including formal presentations and participation in community events. Through this, we reached hundreds of community members and strengthened ties with key collaborators, including the Portland Police Bureau, City of Portland Office of Violence Prevention, Latino Network, and multiple culturally specific counselors and victim service organizations. These partnerships have improved referral pathways and contributed to more comprehensive, wraparound support for survivors.

Key Successes for FY 2024–25

Advocate Pay Plan Implementation: In July 2024, the agency implemented a long-overdue pay plan review and salary increase for our victim advocates. While this was a meaningful and positive step forward, we remain unable to offer compensation that is competitive with systems-based advocate roles, which are most comparable in scope and responsibility. As a result, our program continues to serve as a de facto training ground, and we anticipate ongoing staff turnover.

Leadership and Staffing Stability: As of July 2024, Jen Romig joined as our new Program Supervisor, bringing years of experience and deep expertise in victim services. Since June 2024, the program has maintained staffing stability, and in February we welcomed a third advocate to the team. All current advocates are bilingual, offering services in Russian, Ukrainian, Spanish, Karen, and English—a major asset to our linguistically diverse participant base.

Community Outreach and Education: Outreach remains an important aspect of the program. We participated in numerous community events, delivered targeted presentations, and conducted direct outreach to individuals impacted by crime. We remain active partners in Restorative Justice services with the Department of Community Justice/Juvenile Division and have expanded collaborations with the Portland Police Bureau, Portland Public Schools, and other key stakeholders. Recognizing the intersection of trauma with mental health and substance use, we have also prioritized outreach to behavioral health and addiction service providers.

Expanded Language Access: Our program delivered advocacy in eight languages, increasing accessibility for immigrant and refugee survivors who may otherwise be unable or unwilling to engage with services due to language barriers.

Specific Case Success Examples:

CVAP's Spanish-speaking advocate successfully supported a client in filing a police report after he had spent over a year trying to do so on his own. The client had been experiencing financial abuse, theft, forgery, harassment, and domestic violence at the hands of his ex-husband. With the advocate's assistance, the client was finally able to report the abuse—an action that led to the recovery of some of his financial losses, a renewed sense of safety, and the ability to live free from daily harassment.

CVAP's Karen-speaking advocate has returned from FMLA and has been instrumental in re-engaging and supporting the Burmese community. Recognizing the need for long-term financial assistance beyond our own Emergency Financial Assistance (EFA) program, the advocate identified an external housing program to better serve participants. Since her return, she has consistently gone above and beyond expectations, significantly uplifting the CVAP team and its impact.

Together, these achievements reflect the program's ongoing commitment to culturally responsive, trauma-informed advocacy that adapts to the complex and evolving needs of the community we serve. As one of the few community-based programs in the Portland metro area that provides advocacy for all crime types, we continue to be a vital resource for underserved and system-impacted communities. Our advocates often serve individuals who may not meet the eligibility criteria for other services or who have never previously sought help. The relationships we build are long-term and trust-based, often continuing over months or even years, as survivors navigate complex systems and begin to heal.

While staffing capacity remains a concern, the resilience of our team and the strength of our partnerships have allowed us to maintain high-impact services. We are actively exploring additional funding opportunities to sustain and grow this critical work in the years ahead.

Challenges:

Persistent Need in Domestic and Sexual Violence Cases: We continue to see high needs related to family violence and sexual assault across all communities, despite the presence of several organizations that specialize in these crimes. While our program typically focuses on other crime types to avoid duplicating services, many participants express frustration with DV/SA providers and feel they are not receiving adequate support. We work hard to collaborate with both participants and partner organizations, but these concerns remain ongoing.

Lack of Life-Stabilizing Resources: There is a significant and ongoing need for housing, employment, legal

support, and other life-stabilizing resources. For participants impacted by crimes that are not reported—or who lack access to financial assistance—there is often no clear path forward. This resource scarcity contributes to deep frustration, hopelessness, depression, and isolation.

Limited Staff Capacity: Our team's capacity is limited given the wide range of crime types the program serves. Balancing diverse and complex needs with a small staff continues to be a significant challenge. Furthermore, as of June 2024, CVAP has undergone a complete team turnover. This transition has led to a temporary decrease in new client intake and service hours, as time and training are required to bring new advocates up to full performance.

Unrealistic Expectations and High-Need Cases: At times, participant expectations of what our program can provide are unrealistic—particularly in cases where victims have numerous, compounding needs. Advocates often find that one case can require the majority of their time and resources, leaving less availability for others.

Insufficient Client Assistance Funding: A lack of flexible financial assistance—especially for needs that fall outside the scope of Crime Victim Compensation or other aid programs—is a significant barrier. Victims frequently need legal support, help with moving costs, or other critical services that are not covered, and they often lack the means to pay for them.

Complex Needs in Underserved Communities: We continue to serve victims facing complex and intersecting barriers: severe mental health issues, houselessness, lack of medical insurance, and limited knowledge of their rights or available services. Many of these individuals are foreign-born, with limited English proficiency and deep mistrust of formal systems. We've seen a particularly strong need for culturally responsive advocacy and support in Portland's immigrant, refugee, and multicultural communities—needs that are currently underserved.

Despite the challenges, our team works diligently to creatively problem-solve and provide meaningful solutions within our limited resources. I'm continually inspired by the consistency and perseverance of our advocates—it speaks volumes about their dedication and passion for this work. They show up every day to support participants in healing and making empowering choices, even while earning lower wages than many system-based advocates in the area. Their commitment is the heart of CVAP.

Victims Served by Type of Victimization

The program continues to serve a wide array of victims. The six most frequently reported categories for the primary crime represent 76% of all cases and include some of the most serious forms of harm. These crime categories have been fairly consistent over the past 5 years:

Adult Physical Assault / Homicide / Attempted Homicide / Gang & Gun Violence – 23% (These are grouped due to overlapping nature of harm; individual categorization reflects how victims describe their experience.)

Mass Violence related to fleeing from war/persecution in home country – 22%

Stalking/Harassment – 13%

Domestic/Family Violence – 12%

Hate Crimes – 6%

Child Abuse/Neglect, Sex Abuse, Pornography (again combined due to overlapping nature of victimization and how

victims describe their experience) – 6%

Breakdown by Crime Type (Including Secondary/Subsequent Victimitizations)

The following reflects the distribution of 190 unique victimizations reported by participants. These include both primary and secondary/subsequent incidents, each with varying levels of complexity and community impact:

Adult Physical Assault – 19

Adult Sexual Assault – 7

Adults Sexually Abused as Children – 2

Arson – 1

Bullying – 9

Burglary – 3

Child Physical Abuse/Neglect – 2

Child Pornography – 1

Child Sexual Abuse/Assault – 3

Domestic/Family Violence – 21

DUI/DWI Incidents – 1

Elder Abuse/Neglect – 2

Hate Crimes – 13

Labor Trafficking – 2

Sex Trafficking – 3

Identity Theft/Fraud/Financial Crime – 4

Custodial Kidnapping – 2

Non-Custodial Kidnapping – 2

Mass Violence – 22

Other Vehicular Victimization – 6

Robbery – 3

Stalking/Harassment – 24

Teen Dating Victimization – 1

Attempted Homicide – 2

Homicide – 5

Gun Violence – 14

Gang Violence – 3

Property Crimes – 6

Theft – 7

These 190 incidents reflect a broad and complex spectrum of victimization, highlighting the diverse, often overlapping, and compounding experiences of the individuals and communities we serve. Many participants have endured multiple forms of harm—sometimes across different stages of life—which can intensify trauma and

complicate the path to healing. The range of cases we encounter requires our small but skilled team of advocates to possess not only deep knowledge of trauma-informed care and victims' rights, but also cultural humility, linguistic sensitivity, and the flexibility to navigate systems that are often difficult and retraumatizing for survivors. This work demands more than technical expertise—it calls for sustained emotional presence, creativity in problem-solving, and a deep commitment to building trust. Each case represents not only an act of harm, but an opportunity for meaningful, survivor-centered support that can restore a sense of safety, agency, and connection..

Part II: Victim Services Funding Criteria

Describe how grant funds have been used to provide services specifically targeting marginalized and underserved populations.

Define which marginalized and/or underserved populations the funds are serving, and give specific examples of how these funds are being used (ex: salary for bilingual advocate to run support group for Spanish speaking survivors).

While the CVAP program is open to all and follows a “no wrong door” approach, it is specifically designed to serve those most impacted by crime and systemic barriers—particularly BIPOC communities, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and LGBTQIA+ individuals. These funds are critical in reducing longstanding disparities in access to culturally responsive, trauma-informed victim services.

In the past year:

44% of our participants were foreign-born, and of those who reported, 78% identified as BIPOC, reflecting a highly diverse client base with unique linguistic, cultural, and systemic challenges.

We hired bilingual/bicultural advocates whose lived experience reflects the communities we serve, strengthening trust and increasing accessibility. These advocates provided services in English, Spanish, Karen, Ukrainian, and Russian.

Funds supported advocate salaries, training in culturally responsive and trauma-informed care, and the ability to offer individualized safety planning, resource navigation, legal advocacy, and emotional support tailored to each survivor’s needs.

Outreach efforts funded through this program targeted communities most impacted by gun and gang violence, as well as neighborhoods where residents face multiple barriers to accessing traditional victim services, such as limited English proficiency, fear of law enforcement, or lack of awareness about their rights.

Our services extend beyond immediate crisis intervention. Many participants experience multiple and overlapping forms of harm, including domestic violence, hate crimes, labor or sex trafficking, and gun violence. We often support survivors over long periods—sometimes years—reflecting both the complexity of their experiences and the depth of relationship our team builds through consistent, culturally grounded engagement.

In this way, the funds not only support direct services, but also build community trust, expand access to healing for historically underserved populations, and support long-term recovery and resilience in communities deeply affected by violence.

Describe how grant funds have addressed access barriers including, but not limited to, language, literacy, disability, transportation and cultural practices?

Grant funds have been essential in reducing access barriers that often prevent survivors from receiving timely, meaningful support. These funds enabled us to hire bicultural, bilingual, and culturally responsive advocates, whose lived experiences and language skills reflect the communities most impacted by crime in Multnomah County. This has strengthened trust and connection, especially in communities historically marginalized or distrustful of systems such as law enforcement or the courts.

Advocates provide trauma-informed support and education in languages other than English, including Spanish, Karen, Ukrainian, and Russian, or in other languages via interpreters as needed. They assist participants with understanding victims' rights, safety planning, the criminal and civil justice systems, crime reporting, and prevention strategies, while also helping clients access critical services such as housing, legal support, transportation, rental and utility assistance, and interpretation services.

Because we do not impose case closure timelines, our advocates are able to spend the time required to support individuals with limited literacy, disabilities, or complex trauma histories. This flexibility is particularly important for survivors navigating multiple barriers, including those who may not trust service systems or need long-term support to regain stability.

In addition, grant funds have supported the development and distribution of written materials in multiple languages, and we intentionally meet people where they are—whether that means providing services in a physically accessible location, adjusting for cultural practices, or adapting our methods of engagement to each participant's needs and preferences.

Overall, these services not only reduce systemic barriers, but also promote self-determination, empowerment, and long-term resilience by centering the voices, goals, and choices of survivors throughout their healing journey.

What barriers to grant-funded services, if any, are you encountering that you have not yet been able to overcome using grant funding?

While grant funding has allowed us to expand access in many important ways, several barriers persist that we have not yet been able to fully overcome:

Language and Cultural Gaps in Less-Common Languages: Although our team includes bilingual/bicultural advocates who provide services in several key languages, there are only so many language needs we can meet with a small team of just three staff members representing 1.5 FTE under this grant. We continue to encounter language barriers with emerging or less commonly spoken languages in our community (e.g., Tigrinya, Rohingya, or Amharic). While we utilize interpretation services as needed, they are not always trauma-informed or culturally attuned to the specific needs of survivors, particularly in cases involving sensitive or stigmatized crimes.

Housing and Economic Stability: Many participants—especially immigrants, refugees, and those impacted by domestic or gang violence—experience housing insecurity and financial instability. While we offer referrals, the demand far exceeds available resources, and current funding does not allow us to directly cover emergency housing or provide financial relief, both of which are often essential for long-term safety and stabilization.

Transportation Access: Survivors often face transportation challenges, particularly those in East County, with disabilities, or without safe access to public transit. While we make every effort to meet participants in their communities or provide remote options, funding limitations prevent us from consistently offering assistance with rideshare costs, fuel, or transit passes.

Technology Access and Digital Literacy: Some clients, especially elders and low-income participants, lack access to devices or internet, or struggle with digital tools. This can limit their ability to access virtual services, complete online forms, or stay connected with advocates.

We continue to adapt and problem-solve where we can, and we are actively exploring partnerships and additional funding opportunities to address these ongoing gaps.

Have grant funds increased capacity in areas where services are difficult to access, limited, or non-existent?

If so, please describe how capacity has increased. Please include data and numbers when possible (e.g., able to connect with 35 low-income families).

For nearly every victim we serve, these funds have increased capacity to access services, seek justice and often start the process of healing that would otherwise be non-existent. The victims that we work with often have complex mental health diagnoses, have multiple victimizations and often high needs, with little knowledge, skill or ability to navigate systems on their own. We are able to provide person-centered advocacy and spend the time needed to offer support after victimization – both to primary and secondary victims. We hire staff who we believe will help reach deeper into the pockets of our community to help those who have been victimized, are at risk of victimization and/or are disproportionately impacted by the criminal justice system, particularly because of race and ethnicity. We have expanded our victim services to include restorative justice related processes because we understand there needs to be a range of choices and options for people if we truly want to be victim-centered. In our work specifically with immigrant and refugee groups, we have learned that even “basic” information about the criminal justice system, victim rights, accessing legal services, etc. are not well understood, so some communities often do not engage in processes that would ultimately make our whole community safer and healthier.

Have grant funds have been used to support trauma-informed interventions and services?

If yes, please describe what interventions and services are being supported.

Yes. These grant funds have significantly increased our capacity to serve individuals and communities who have historically had little to no access to meaningful, trauma-informed victim services. In the past year, we provided direct support to 113 victims of crime, many of whom faced complex barriers such as language access, mental health challenges, housing instability, or fear of system involvement. For many of these participants, engagement with our program marked the first time they were able to receive advocacy, understand their rights, or access justice-oriented services in a way that felt safe and culturally relevant.

The individuals we serve often experience multiple and ongoing forms of victimization, as well as high levels of trauma. Many are navigating systems alone—with limited information, resources, or trust. Trauma can make it incredibly difficult for individuals to identify and prioritize their own needs, let alone take steps toward stability and healing. Our advocates are trained to slow that process down—helping participants clarify what safety, recovery, and stability look like for them. This approach empowers survivors to make informed, values-aligned choices, and rebuild a sense of control, agency, and accomplishment in managing their lives after harm.

Some key ways capacity has increased include:

Hiring culturally specific, bilingual/bicultural advocates who serve hard-to-reach immigrant and refugee communities. In the past year, our team provided services in nine languages, improving access for dozens of non-English-speaking survivors.

Expanding access to restorative justice-related services, offering participants additional pathways to healing, accountability, and safety—especially important in communities where traditional legal systems are seen as inaccessible or harmful.

Deepening engagement in communities with limited victim service infrastructure, including those heavily impacted by gun and gang violence, intergenerational trauma, or systemic marginalization. Our outreach and education efforts have reached hundreds of individuals, many of whom had never accessed victim services before.

Through our work, we've also identified key gaps in understanding of basic victim rights, justice system processes, and available legal protections—particularly among immigrant and refugee groups. With grant support, we are actively filling those gaps by offering one-on-one education, multilingual materials, and community-based outreach that demystifies systems and empowers survivors to engage on their own terms.

Ultimately, this funding allows us to meet people where they are—not just geographically, but emotionally, culturally, and practically. It enables survivors to not only access services, but to reconnect with their sense of self, begin to manage their lives with confidence, and experience meaningful progress in their recovery journey. Without this

support, many of the individuals we serve would remain isolated from the resources, choices, and healing they deserve.

Would you like to report on another victim services provider?

No