

1) Representative Lewis asked about the revenue generated to the state from adjudicating violation cases.

- a. Answer: Parking violations adjudicated in the Multnomah County Circuit Court generated more than \$25 million for the state in 2016-18. Other violation cases adjudicated statewide generated about \$68 million during those years.
- b. Detail: The table below lists the number of parking cases processed in the Multnomah County Circuit Court in 2016, 2017, and 2018, as well as the amount and destination of revenue from those cases (which is directed by statute). Revenue will increase as collections on these cases continue. Revenue from non-parking violations goes to the Criminal Fine Account (ORS 137.300), which funds a variety of public safety services. The General Fund receives all revenue from Multnomah parking cases, as well as collection costs from defendants who don't pay the full amount at time of conviction.

Year/Case Type	Cases Filed	CFA	General Fund
2016			
Municipal Parking	236,154		\$ 9,431,709
Offense Violation	199,465	\$ 20,945,573	\$ 5,097,921
2017			
Municipal Parking	234,761		\$ 9,170,078
Offense Violation	222,341	\$ 20,886,311	\$ 4,167,482
2018			
Municipal Parking	271,796		\$ 6,809,226
Offense Violation	218,271	\$ 16,288,894	\$ 1,262,489

2) Representative Sprenger asked why new judges requested in HB 2239 were primarily in larger counties, and not in eastern or southern Oregon.

- a. Answer: OJD is requesting judges to focus on dependency cases in counties where a 2015 workload study showed the county needed at least 0.9 FTE of a judicial officer to meet statutory timelines in dependency cases. That criteria dictated where new judicial positions would be requested.
- b. Detail: Smaller counties generally have smaller caseloads and fewer judges, and therefore are less likely to need a 'full' judicial position to meet timelines in dependency cases. OJD's request does include judges in Coos/Curry, Deschutes, Douglas, Jackson, Klamath and Malheur counties. Josephine County would have been on the request list, but the 2017 legislature authorized a new judicial position there. Changing the criteria to a half-time judicial position for dependency cases would add requests in judicial districts covering Crook/Jefferson, Lincoln, Polk, Umatilla/Morrow, Hood River/Wasco/Sherman/Gilliam/Wheeler, and Yamhill counties.

3) Representative Greenlick asked whether the Oregon eCourt system had generated efficiencies that would mitigate the loss of OJD staff since 2007-09.

- a. Answer: Yes, many internal and external functions have been automated, which has eliminated or reduced portions of the court staff workload. However, electronic

processing of filings and payments does not eliminate all staff work, and we believe that the level of staff reductions has exceeded the level of efficiencies achieved.

- b. Detail: Staff reductions started in the 2007-09 biennium and continued through the early implementation period (statewide implementation finished in 2016). Therefore, many assumed efficiency savings were 'taken' before they were planned. To explain in greater detail, attorneys are required to file pleadings electronically, which eliminates opening mail, creating hard-copy case files, and locating files for review or hearings. However, court staff still must review and process all pleadings to ensure that comply with statute and then electronically route them for processing. Similarly, although many payments are made online, staff still must receipt payments and apply them to cases. Staff reductions also reduced training and the ability to document many business processes, which still need to be improved to facilitate consistency, provide accurate data reports and analysis, and promote effective management. Shifting from paper to electronic information also have record retention and data sharing benefits, but do not always reduce the staffing requirements.

4) Representative Greenlick asked for information about the county and state roles in supporting the circuit courts.

- a. Answer: The State generally is responsible for providing judges, staff, and furnishings and equipment. Counties are statutorily responsible for providing suitable and sufficient courthouse facilities and court security.
- b. Detail: When the legislature created the unified court system, the State assumed costs for court staff and equipment, while counties retained responsibility for court facilities and security. ORS 1.182, 1.185, 1.187. Although the elected district attorney is a State official, deputy district attorneys are county employees, and counties are directed by statute to provide office space, supplies, and assistants. ORS 8.760, 8.850. Statutes require county sheriffs to execute court process and orders and attend upon the court. ORS 206.010.