

Submitter: Tiffani Olsen
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB1505

Chair Jama, Vice-Chair Starr, and Members of the Committee.
My name is Tiffani Olsen, and I am the Director of IDD Residential Services at Shangri-La, where we support adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities. I oversee a workforce of approximately 165 Direct Support Professionals, and I strongly oppose SB 1505.

Every day, my role requires balancing the needs, rights, and choices of the adults we support with the realities of staffing and operations. That balance is already fragile. SB 1505 would disrupt it by shifting authority away from people with disabilities and placing it instead into rigid structures that do not reflect individual needs or preferences, and honestly, there is already a strong accountability to Oregon Administrative Rules.

If this bill is intended to support DSPs, I want to be clear: providers like Shangri-La are already deeply committed to our workforce. Our DSPs are skilled, compassionate professionals who show up consistently for people on their best and hardest days. We already meet or exceed many of the standards outlined in this bill, and we continuously prioritize directing available resources toward wages and benefits. What limits our ability to do more is not lack of commitment—it is chronic underfunding. This is not the answer.

SB 1505 also adds another layer of regulation to an already heavily regulated system. Our programs are already overseen by CMS, OHA, ODDS, BOLI, and multiple auditing entities. Additional oversight will increase administrative burden without improving outcomes for people with disabilities or the DSPs who support them.

Most concerning, this bill does nothing to meaningfully increase DSP wages. Providers have been clear for years about what is needed. The wage study shows services are underfunded by roughly 30 percent. If the legislature wants to strengthen the DSP workforce and protect people with disabilities, the solution is predictable funding, annual cost-of-living adjustments, and direct investment in wages—not additional regulation.

For these reasons, I urge you to oppose SB 1505.

Tiffani Olsen