

---

Multnomah County District 2

**Background**

For the last two years LPSCC and its Pretrial Subcommittee have been discussing a restructure of the County’s pretrial monitoring programs. In September 2025, as part of the state and federal rebalance, Sheriff Morrissey O’Donnell proposed to eliminate the Close Street program in order to close a budget gap. As part of that process, the Board passed a budget note that directed LPSCC, informed by DCJ and MCSO, to provide a report to the Board by March 1, 2026, with a range of options for the Board to consider on the County’s pretrial programs. The recommendation should be drafted by the LPSCC Pretrial Subcommittee with review by the LPSCC Council at regularly scheduled meetings. LPSCC will provide those updates to the Board on January 8, 2026 with a final report due by March 1, 2026. This board discussion, my review of the JSP reports, a series of meetings with Director Mullen, Director Pena, Judges Greenlick and Howes, Sheriff Morrissey O’Donnell, and Commissioner Jones Dixon, and reports from District 2 Policy Director, Salomé Chimuku who regularly attended the LPSCC and LPSCC pretrial subcommittee meetings. On April 7th, Director Mullen presented one option for pretrial services to the Board– “Option 1” from the subcommittee. The Courts presented “Option 2” which was designed by the Courts. DA Vasquez provided additional information about “Option 2”. As I stated in the series of meetings mentioned above and the Board briefing, the subcommittee was at a stand still and many didn’t know where to go from there. I believed there was an opportunity to find a compromise and provide the Board with an option that was made from a hybrid version of option 1 and option 2.

Below is a summary of the notes from all of the above activities. The last column provides the subcommittee with a roadmap to reconvene and put together costs to the compromise option, “Option A”.

Multnomah County District 2

**Summary of Notes**

	<b>Current State</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Agreement</b>
DCJ Recog Role (related to pretrial)	<p>24/7</p> <p>Runs the PSA (mostly automated) on every booking with a new Multnomah County charge.</p> <p>Applies the Pretrial Release Order</p> <p>Completes no contact orders for cases with named victims</p>	<p>Continues recog role as is.</p> <p>Eliminates PSA when OPAT is available.</p>	<p>Eliminates recog role, has OJD RAOs taking on this role in addition to monitoring.</p>	<p>To move to the OPAT when available</p> <p>RAOs take over pretrial monitoring roles and responsibilities</p>
What determines the level of monitoring?	<p>The PSA provides two scores indicating risk of New Criminal Activity and Failure to Appear. These scores are plotted on a locally developed matrix to recommend a pretrial monitoring</p>	<p>Judges will determine if someone should be referred to “Pretrial Support Services” (PSS) but cases will be sent to PSS without a designated monitoring level.</p>	<p>The Court will continue using the PSA recommendation until the OPAT is implemented. The Judge will make the final determination for any level of monitoring, including</p>	<p>Preliminary agreement of the specific charges for enhanced monitoring to include, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● DV assault misdemeanors</li> <li>● Person</li> </ul>

Multnomah County District 2

	<p>level and agency. This recommendation is provided to the Judge, who makes the final determination.</p>	<p>Intake specialists at PSS will make the appropriate level determination based on a validated risk assessment tool and assessed need. (the PSA will be replaced with the OPAT)</p> <p>For “Enhanced Monitoring”, only specific charges are eligible. PSS staff will be in the courtroom and DA, Defense and PSS will make the recommendation together, with Judges making final determination.</p> <p>Judges’ discretion with using PSA and OPAT (new), along with the primary and secondary release criteria</p>	<p>referrals to enhanced monitoring</p> <p>Specific charges for enhanced monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● DV assault misdemeanors</li> <li>● Person felonies</li> <li>● Restraining order violations</li> <li>● DUII (2nd+)</li> <li>● Misdemeanor sex offense</li> </ul>	<p>felonies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Restraining order violations</li> <li>● DUII (2nd+)</li> <li>● Misdemeanor sex offense</li> </ul> <p>Agreement on the need to carefully manage capacity at “enhanced monitoring”</p>
--	---	---	---	---

Multnomah County District 2

<p>Levels 1-2</p>	<p>Cases referred to Pretrial Monitoring Level 1 go to DCJ PSP.</p> <p>Cases referred to PML 2-3+ go to Close Street.</p> <p>Both agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Require phone check-ins (automated system, leaving messages)</li> <li>● Could have GPS or SCRAM (if ordered by Court)</li> <li>● Monitor compliance and request warrants</li> </ul> <p>Close Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Has 2</li> </ul>	<p>Levels at PSS are based on need (barriers to court appearance).</p> <p><b>No automatic requirement of phone check-ins.</b></p> <p>Level 3 are those assessed at highest risk of Failure To Appear, may have most significant barriers to court appearance.</p> <p>Awareness that failure to appear and risk to community safety are not always one in the same</p> <p>All levels: monitoring compliance with conditions of release (example: checking LE databases for</p>	<p>Levels 1-2 will be managed by OJD RAOs, using an automated phone check-in system that can receive calls.</p>	<p>Agreement that more intensive resources should be directed towards those at higher risk of non-appearance.</p> <p>Agreement that supportive services could increase successful appearance.</p>
-------------------	---	---	---	---



Multnomah County District 2

	<p>Corrections Counselors that can assist with referrals, as requested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staffed with Corrections Deputies (not LE, cannot arrest)</li> <li>• Some in-person services (limited)</li> </ul> <p>DCJ PSP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No in-person services</li> <li>• Staffed by Corrections Techs (CTs)</li> </ul>	<p>arrests)</p> <p>No warrants for “failure to comply”, focus is on appearance in court not if someone met a phone call requirement.</p>		
<p>Enhanced monitoring</p>	<p>Close street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not add or remove conditions from court order</li> <li>• Level 2-3+3+</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specialized training for PSS Specialists in DV, gang dynamics,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly the same as Option 1 - - the Court would have the County taking</li> </ul>	<p>Agreement on specialized training.</p> <p>Agreement that this group of individuals may otherwise be</p>



Multnomah County District 2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both PSP/CS: Some cases have GPS or SCRAM (from court order); an alert goes to deputy who calls law enforcement and, if available, LE responds; not 100% reliable for 24/7 coverage as most deputies work regular business hours</li> <li>Higher levels of monitoring mean more phone calls</li> </ul>	<p>trafficking, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Required phone check-ins; proactive phone calls to clients</li> <li>50:1 ratio for monitoring</li> <li>Better partnership with Law Enforcement (this is really across the board, but likely more relevant for enhanced monitoring)</li> </ul>	<p>on this responsibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In this option, the higher level of risk to FTA and the higher level charges are both looped into "enhanced monitoring"</li> </ul>	<p>held in custody without a pretrial option.</p> <p>*NOTE: Enhanced Monitoring sounds like "supervision", but really it is just more phone calls - still not LE, no arrest authority.</p>
<p>Staffing</p>	<p>PSP: Office Assistances Corrections Tech</p>	<p>4 FTE Peer navigators 2 FTE victim advocates</p>	<p>2 FTE peer navigator  27 FTE RAOs 9 FTE TBD for</p>	<p>Agreement on Peer Navigators as part of support services for pretrial system</p>



Multnomah County District 2

	<p>CS: Deputies Supervisor</p> <p>Court: 8 RAOs</p>	<p>12 FTE case manager 2 FTE intake specialist 1 FTE program manager 1 FTE program supervisor 1 FTE data analyst</p>	<p>enhanced monitoring (County) 1 FTE program supervisor (Court) 1 FTE program manager (County) 3FTE data analysts (2 court, 1 county)</p>	<p>Agreement on courts hosting the monitoring staffing</p> <p>Agreement on staffing ratios - with lower ratios of staff to client for higher risk/need levels</p>
Automated court reminder	7 days and 1 days			<p>Both options could use e-supervision application, which would add one more court notification at 2 days prior to scheduled court event.</p> <p>Add to state agenda for Court, DA, and County– ask for addition of behavioral language for automated reminders</p>
Data sharing and	3 different databases:		esup and ecourt work	Agreement that better

Multnomah County District 2

<p>case management system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSP and Close Street use Automon Case Management System. This has been modified so much that you can't pull data. Most data shared is hand counted.</li> <li>• Recog uses the PSA database to automate the scoring.</li> <li>• OJD uses Odyssey.</li> </ul>		<p>together</p>	<p>data sharing is needed (from monitoring programs, participation and data sharing from the Court, and from peer navigators.</p> <p>Agreement that any future option should use e-supervision.</p> <p>Confirmation from OJD that non-OJD staff can use the application.</p>
<p>Electronic Monitoring</p>	<p>Both programs currently have clients who are on: GPS monitoring, SCRAM (alcohol monitoring), handheld breathalyzer.</p>	<p>Includes \$200K for Electronic Monitoring.</p>	<p>Includes Electronic Monitoring.</p>	<p>Agreement that EM should be part of a new system, but could be used more efficiently to reduce costs.</p> <p>Reductions could be</p>



Multnomah County District 2

	<p>Judges determine when to add these more restrictive conditions.</p> <p>PSP and CS have contracts with Vigilnet. Apx cost is \$320K per year.</p> <p>PSP clients are not asked to pay for EM.</p> <p>CS are assessed for ability to pay by Vigilnet and asked to pay.</p>			in: amt used, length of time used.
Ability to refer to sobering program	Was not discussed	Was not discussed	Was not discussed	yes
Housing supports	Close Street Corrections Counselors can refer.	If County staff can develop direct connection to existing resources.	Referrals as requested.	Agreement to leverage existing resources and closely partner with peer navigators for access to other County services.



Multnomah County District 2

<p>Barriers to successful court appearance assessed assessed include</p>	<p>CS Corrections Counselors do some of this, informally</p>	<p>Needs assessment would be developed to be used at intake to then place individuals on different levels of support</p>	<p>Basic needs assessed at booking touchpoint</p> <p>RAOs will do basic assessments for things like transportation and phones</p>	<p>Agreement that assessing needs is important</p> <p>Peer navigators will do assessment for County and other supportive services; should also be able to refer to other County services such as the sobering center, deflection or housing supports.</p>
<p>Location</p>	<p>PSP and CS are currently at the Justice Center.</p>	<p>TBD &amp; PSS staff would be present in courtrooms to facilitate warm handoffs from arraignment</p>	<p>In the Courts offices at the Justice Center</p>	<p>RAOs in the court spaces within Justice Center.</p> <p>County in charge of placement of County staff</p> <p>County department to administer peer navigator services</p>

## Multnomah County District 2

### Scenarios

A few key things to remember:

- The Pretrial Monitoring Levels and referrals to monitoring are set at arraignment, which happens 1-3 days after booking (shorter sometimes, longer if weekend). Many people are released prior to arraignment and would not yet have seen a Judge or been referred to pretrial monitoring.
- If someone is booked and released prior to arraignment, it often happens within 2-4 hours.
  - This is an important timeline, as we think about interaction with everyone who is booked and providing a needs assessment.

### Current State

Pre-Arrest Release: Regardless of the hour, individuals are provided a Release Agreement and their court date information.

Post-Arrest Release: For individuals who have been held prior to arraignment but then are released at arraignment and ordered to pretrial monitoring, in the current state (regardless of level) they are all required to complete the pretrial intake within a certain amount of time (24h, I think). Pretrial staff at either agency will then explain the requirements (frequency of phone calls, any GPS/SCRAM that needs to be put on, etc) at the intake. Intake with CS is done in person. Intake with PSP is done via a phone in the courthouse.

### Option 1

Pre-Arrest Release: Regardless of the hour, individuals are provided a Release Agreement and their court date information.

## Multnomah County District 2

**Post-Arrest Release:** For individuals who have been held prior to arraignment but then are released at arraignment and ordered to pretrial monitoring, in the current state (regardless of level) they are all required to complete the pretrial intake within 24h. During business hours (or other determined schedule, e.g. swing shift), MCSO Corrections Counselors will facilitate a warm handoff to PSS staff or peers who will explain PSS and the requirements and provide any requested material support/immediate connections.

**Out of Custody Arraignment Referral:** Individuals who appear in court out of custody (released prior to appearance) and are referred to PSS will be required to complete an intake within 24h that will determine their support level (if 1-3) or for enhanced monitoring just explain conditions. When possible, PSS staff or Peers will be present in the courtroom for a warm handoff and to ensure clients understand the process and requirements.

### Option 2

\*Some TBDs in here - the Court indicated that RAOs at booking can manage a lot of the warm-handoff/explanation of monitoring. However, at that booking point individuals won't know if they are ordered to monitoring or not because they will have not seen a Judge. Little detail about the intake process to date.

**Pre-Arrest Release:** Regardless of the hour, individuals are provided a Release Agreement and their court date information. RAOs will complete a needs assessment (TBD) and provide a warm-handoff (TBD to where) along with material supports, as requested.

**Post-Arrest Release:** TBD

**Out of Custody Arraignment Referral:** TBD

Multnomah County District 2

**Suggested Next Steps**

1. The pretrial subcommittee should:
  - a. reconvene to discuss the following:
    - i. Cost of each element of the staffing, support services/resources needed, and esup IT costs
    - ii. Implementation details of the agreed upon staffing model above and any associated costs
    - iii. Discuss places where there is not yet agreement (in red above)
  - b. Present fleshed out Option 3 to LPSCC for approval.
2. Work with Commissioner Singleton to finalize a budget amendment to replace the placeholder amendment being introduced on April 28, 2026.