

ANALYSIS

Judicial Department Pretrial Release Report

Analyst: John Borden

Request: Acknowledge receipt of a report on the development of a pretrial release program and request the allocation of \$2.5 million from a special purpose appropriation and the appropriation of an additional \$1.4 million General Fund and the authorization for 40 positions (20.00 FTE).

Analysis: The budget report for SB 48 (2021), the Judicial Department's primary budget measure, included the following budget note:

The Judicial Department is requested to submit a report on the Chief Justice release guidelines established for pretrial release orders under SB 48 (2021). The report is to be submitted to the Legislature in 2022, by no later than February 1, 2022, and to the House and Senate Committees on Judiciary and the Joint Committee on Ways and Means. The report is to address how the guidelines accomplish the intended objectives in SB 48, which are as follows: (a) provide consistent release decision-making structure across the state; (b) reduce reliance on the use of security; (c) include provisions for victim notification and input; and (d) balance the rights of the defendant and presumption of pretrial release against community and victim safety and the risk of failure to appear. In addition, the report is to provide a fiscal estimate related to the Chief Justice release guidelines and for a continued Legislative investment in the state's pretrial release programs and activities.

HB 5006 (2021), an omnibus budget measure, included a special purpose appropriation (SPA) for \$2.5 million General Fund for allocation to the Oregon Judicial Department (OJD) for the implementation of pretrial release modifications authorized under SB 48 (2021). If the special purpose appropriations is not allocated by the Emergency Board before December 1, 2022, any remaining funds become available to the Emergency Board for general purposes.

The genesis of the budget note and SPA was centered around the Legislature's desire for more detailed information surrounding the implementation of SB 48 and the associated costs.

Background

SB 48 modified the criminal pretrial release process, including removal of minimum bail amounts, and requires Oregon's Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to establish pretrial release guidelines with input from a criminal justice advisory committee, appointed by the Chief Justice. The guidelines established by OJD will be applied across the state through release orders issued by the presiding judge. The guidelines are intended to:

- Provide a consistent release decision-making structure across the state;
- Reduce reliance on the use of security for bail;
- Include provisions for victim notification and input; and
- Balance defendant rights and presumption of pretrial release against any risk to public safety and of failure to appear.

The Chief Justice is expected to adopt guidelines in the spring of this year (2022). Judicial release decisions under SB 48 would begin on July 1, 2022.

SB 48 also places new victim notification requirements on District Attorney's and OJD release assistance officers (RAOs). The District Attorney shall make reasonable efforts to inform the victim of the location, time, and place of the arraignment, and inquire during the arraignment whether the victim is present and wishes to be heard. (ORS 135.245(2)(b)) The RAO shall make reasonable efforts to contact the victim prior to arraignment to gather information regarding the victim's position on release, including whether special release conditions should be imposed, and if the information is available, the RAO shall inform the victim of the location, date and time of the defendant's arraignment or other first appearance. (ORS 135.235(2)).

In addition, SB 48 appropriated \$2.2 million General Fund to begin to standing-up OJD's Pretrial Release Program and included one permanent full-time Senior Staff Counsel (0.88 FTE) located in the Office of the State Court Administrator, starting in October 2021, two permanent full-time Analyst 4 positions (1.75 FTE) located in the Office of the State Court Administrator, starting in October 2021; and 10 additional permanent full-time Analyst 2 positions (7.08 FTE) located in circuit courts statewide, starting in February 2022.

Report Findings and Recommendations

The report recommends the following framework for pretrial release decisions: (1) release on personal recognizance; (2) conditional release; and (3) hold until arraignment or overriding circumstance hold. Each of the three categories is defined by specific references to statutory crimes.

Under the Chief Justice's Order, a presiding circuit court judge may appoint a RAO and may delegate release decisions to the RAO. Upon arrest, a defendant being held in custody would either be subject to a judicial pretrial release order and released under either their own recognizance or conditional release or have their release considered at the defendant's first court appearance/arrangement or at a scheduled release hearing. On average, over the calendar years 2019-2021, the OJD reported statewide caseloads would have been 42,449 released on their own recognizance, 18,400 conditional releases, and 8,831 hold until arrangement/overriding circumstance holds.

The RAO will "...interview in-custody defendants, research individual defendant circumstances, complete a risk assessment, contact crime victims, and make a recommendation as to whether a defendant should be released pending case resolution," according to the report. An RAO "...directs the entity supervising the local correctional facility regarding the release." The RAO will make reasonable attempts to contact victims before notifying the court of a release decision (ORS 135.235).

The risk assessment tool(s) used by RAOs, once developed, will be re-validated "...at least every five years or following significant changes to the population or laws and policies related to arrest/citation, detention, and sentencing..." per the report.

Lane County's pretrial release program, one the most fully developed and long-standing programs in the state, is considered a model program. The program is supported by eight OJD employees and three Lane County Sheriff's deputies. Lane County has a staffing model for seven day a week coverage and 16 hours per day. One full-time equivalent (FTE) employee has a caseload of approximately 62 bookings/supervisions per month. Overall, Lane County, one of the higher volume counties, has an average of 679 bookings per month and 800 persons on pretrial release.

Fiscal Impact

OJD provided two options for the preliminary fiscal impact of the expanded Pretrial Release program, which includes state-employed RAOs for OJD. The number of positions was determined using the Lane County staffing model of 62 bookings/supervisions per one FTE.

- Provide RAOs in 17 counties that currently do not have any pretrial release staffing. The budget impact is estimated to be \$2.5 million General Fund and 27 positions (13.50 FTE) for the 2021-23 biennium and \$5 million and 27 positions (27.00 FTE) for the 2023-25 biennium. This estimate was made to reconcile with the \$2.5 million General Fund special purpose appropriation.
- Provide RAOs in 17 counties that currently do not have any pretrial release staffing and augment staffing in two other counties (Josephine and Washington) with an established program, but limited RAO staffing. The budget impact is estimated to be \$3.9 million General Fund and 40 positions (20.00 FTE) for the 2021-23 biennium and \$7.4 million and 40 positions (40.00 FTE) for the 2023-25 biennium.

These two options do not include RAO staffing in the 13 remaining counties that have existing pretrial programs, which may be a budget request by OJD for the 2023-25 biennium. This request could be for an additional 20 RAO. An estimate of the costs of these positions was not provided in the report.

Analysis

SB 48 represents a significant paradigm shift for not only the move from minimum bail amounts and the reduced use of bail to a more consistent statewide risk-based criminal pretrial release process, but also a shift from primarily a decentralized, local government function to more of a coordinated state Judicial Branch program responsibility. This will require a period of normalization to both begin the implementation of the program on a statewide basis as well as normalize existing county programs as well as various state funding streams. The benefits include statewide program consistency, training, administration, data gathering and analysis, to name a few. This transition will not be without challenge given the current county/state hybrid schema and the various local and state funding streams used to operate the programs.

The report could have been strengthened by providing more specific information around how RAOs will interface with district attorney offices for crime victim notification and input, how courts in smaller jurisdictions will be serviced effectively, and how the risk assessment tool will be constructed and utilized.

Recommendation: The Legislative Fiscal Office recommends acknowledging receipt of the report and deferring consideration of the budget request until later in the 2022 legislative session.



OREGON JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT
Office of the State Court Administrator

January 14, 2022
(SENT BY EMAIL)

Senator Elizabeth Steiner Hayward, Co-Chair
Representative Dan Rayfield, Co-Chair
Joint Committee on Ways and Means
900 Court Street NE
H-178 State Capitol
Salem, OR 97301-4048

Re: SB 48 Budget Note Report on Pretrial Release and Special Purpose Appropriation Request

Dear Co-Chairpersons:

Nature of the Emergency/Request

The Oregon Judicial Department (OJD) requests that the committee acknowledge receipt of this report on the development of the Chief Justice's release guidelines for presiding judge pretrial release orders under Senate Bill (SB) 48 (2021) and that OJD's budget be increased by \$3.9 million with 40 positions (20.0 FTE) to implement those guidelines. If the legislature is not inclined to provide an appropriation above the \$2.5 million special purpose appropriation, our request is for the distribution of the \$2.5 million to fund 27 positions (13.5 FTE) that will be used to begin implementation of the SB 48 (2021) guidelines.

This report provides an update of the ongoing work by the Chief Justice to develop release guidelines, which are intended to inform individual presiding judge orders, and the additional resources needed by OJD to effectuate the intent of SB 48. We understand the intent of SB 48 is to improve pretrial practices across the state, particularly for those judicial districts that do not have a developed pretrial program. The input and guidance from counties and our public safety partners was invaluable in the development of the recommendations for the Chief Justice's guidelines, and we look forward to continuing work with counties and our public safety partners to craft pretrial programs and activities for Oregon that balance the rights and needs of defendants with crime victim and community safety.

Agency Action

In 2021, the Oregon legislature passed SB 48 (Oregon Laws 2021, chapter 643), which was introduced by the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission to reduce reliance on security release

and provide statewide guidance for local pretrial release orders. SB 48 provides that the Chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court shall establish release guidelines for presiding judge pretrial release orders that:

- Provide a consistent release decision-making structure across the state;
- Reduce reliance on the use of security;
- Include provisions for victim notification and input; and
- Balance the rights of the defendant and presumption of pretrial release against community and victim safety and the risk of failure to appear.

Presiding judges must create pretrial release orders in each circuit court that comply with the Chief Justice's guidelines. The presiding judge orders must "specify to the sheriff of the county, or to the entity supervising the local correctional facility responsible for pretrial incarceration within the judicial district, those persons and offenses:

- (a) Subject to release on recognizance;
- (b) Subject to release with special conditions as specified in the order; and
- (c) That are not eligible for release until arraignment."

SB 48 (2021) provides that the Chief Justice's release guidelines should be informed by input from a criminal justice advisory committee. Chief Justice Martha L. Walters established the CJAC in 2020 to advise the Chief Justice on changes to court roles, policies, processes, services, and other areas in response to current and future issues in the state criminal justice system for the purpose of improving the administration of justice and ensuring access to justice for all.

The CJAC's Pretrial Subcommittee, which included representatives from courts, district attorneys, defense attorneys, community-based service providers and legal service providers for crime victims, appellate attorneys, law enforcement, community corrections, state and local government, and the State Bar, developed recommended pretrial release guidelines. The Pretrial Subcommittee met nine times from May through December 2021 to discuss the requirements of SB 48 and develop the recommendations for the Chief Justice's guidelines. The recommended guidelines were approved by the full CJAC and submitted to the Chief Justice in December 2021. The Chief Justice is anticipated to adopt guidelines for the presiding judge pretrial release orders in the Spring of 2022. As part of the process of adopting guidelines, the Chief Justice may solicit additional input from judges and circuit courts and, in response to that feedback, may modify the recommendations for the guidelines developed by the CJAC. The CJAC's Pretrial Subcommittee will continue its work in 2022 and may provide additional input and recommendations to the Chief Justice in the future.

The CJAC recommendations, which are included in the next section of this report, are based on Oregon law governing pretrial release effective July 1, 2022, when circuit courts will no longer utilize security schedules that are applicable immediately upon a defendant's arrest. Instead, either a judicial district's pretrial release program or the local correctional facility (i.e., sheriff or

the entity supervising the local correctional facility) in accordance with a presiding judge order will determine immediate release. In either instance, the presiding judge of the judicial district will issue pretrial release orders that will govern pre-arraignment release decisions. The new pretrial release orders are intended to work with – as opposed to replace – existing pretrial programs and clarify judicial release decision-making authority.

CJAC December 2021 Recommendations for the Chief Justice’s Pretrial Release Guidelines

A presiding judge should create a pretrial release order (PRO) that directs the entity supervising the local correctional facility to determine whether a defendant will be released on recognizance, released on conditions, or held for arraignment in accordance with Recommendations 1-3, below. A presiding judge’s PRO may also direct the entity supervising the local correctional facility to hold a defendant for arraignment based on objective, nondiscretionary, person- specific criteria (“overriding circumstances”) as provided in the PRO and consistent with Recommendation 4, below. This creates a two-step decision-making process: identifying the offenses in accordance with Recommendations 1-3 and then identifying any “overriding circumstances.”

Presiding judges should work closely with the members of their local public safety coordinating council to create their PRO and structure the PRO to utilize already established local pretrial release resources.

A presiding judge’s PRO does not delegate judicial release decision-making authority, instead it directs the entity supervising the local correctional facility regarding release.

Recommendation 1: A presiding judge's pretrial release order (PRO) should direct the entity supervising the local correctional facility to release on personal recognizance on a release agreement with the general conditions in ORS 135.250 all defendants charged with the following offenses:

- Any non-person misdemeanors
- Any non-person Class C felonies
- Any driving while suspended offense defined in ORS 811.182, except for aggravated driving while suspended as defined in ORS 163.196.
- Any other offenses that are not included in Recommendations 2 or 3.¹

Recommendation 2: A presiding judge's PRO should direct the entity supervising the local correctional facility to release on conditions imposed by the court all defendants charged with the following offenses:

- Any non-domestic violence person misdemeanor, as defined in OAR 213-003-0001(15);
- Any driving under the influence of intoxicants (DUI) offense; and
- Any non-domestic violence Class B felony and any non-domestic violence person Class C felony as defined in OAR 213-003-001(14), except for those offenses included in Recommendation 3 to be held for arraignment.²

A presiding judge's PRO should include specific conditions of release consistent with ORS

¹ Table 1 lists the number of cases filed in each year since 2019 by the most serious offense category under Recommendation 1 – Release on Recognizance. This Table is included for information purposes for this report and was not part of the consideration or recommendations of the CJAC.

Table 1 - Release Group	2019	2020	2021
Release on Recognizance			
DWS	3,135	2,459	2,816
Other Offenses Not Included in Rec. 2 or Rec. 3	5,226	4,783	5,744
Non-Person Class C Felonies	13,580	11,981	11,073
Non-Person Misdemeanors	27,814	20,827	17,908
Grand Total	49,755	40,050	37,541

² Table 2 lists the number of cases filed in each year since 2019 by the most serious offense category under Recommendation 2 – Conditional Release. This Table is included for information purposes for this report and was not part of the consideration or recommendations of the CJAC.

Table 2 - Release Group	2019	2020	2021
Conditional Release			
DUII	11,959	9,407	9,641
Non-DV Class B Felony	3,725	3,272	2,460
Non-DV Person Class C Felony	1,312	1,176	1,271
Person Misdemeanor	4,163	3,358	3,456
Grand Total	21,159	17,213	16,828

135.260. Release conditions should be available in the county and be the least onerous conditions necessary to ensure public and victim safety and that the defendant returns to court as required.

The PRO should specify if the release conditions provided in the order will apply to every person charged with a specific offense or to individual defendants based on criteria provided in the PRO or the result of a risk assessment that is conducted consistent with the law and these recommendations.

If a PRO directs or permits the sheriff or the entity supervising the local correctional facility to use a risk assessment tool to determine which conditions of release are appropriate for a specific defendant, the PRO should direct the sheriff or entity supervising the local correctional facility how and when certain release conditions must be imposed.

Courts should strive to ensure that release conditions are available to all defendants and not contingent upon a defendant's ability to pay.

Recommendation 3: A presiding judge's PRO should direct the sheriff or entity supervising the local correctional facility to hold for arraignment, first appearance, or other judicial department release decision all defendants charged with the following offenses:

- Any violent felony, as defined in ORS 135.240, and any offense in ORS 137.700.
- Any Class A felony.
- Any sex crime, as defined in ORS 163A.005.
- Any domestic violence felony or misdemeanor, as defined in ORS 135.230.
- Any felony stalking as described in ORS 163.732, felony violation of a stalking protective order as described in ORS 163.750, and felony strangulation as described in ORS 163.187.³

Recommendation 4: In addition to the offense-specific categories described in Recommendations 1-3, a presiding judge may also provide person-specific overriding circumstances that, if present, will require a sheriff or entity supervising the local correctional

³ Table 3 lists the number of cases filed in each year since 2019 by the most serious offense category under Recommendation 3 – Hold Until Arraignment, First Appearance, or Other Judicial Release Decision. This Table is included for information purposes for this report and was not part of the consideration or recommendations of the CJAC.

Table 3 - Release Group	2019	2020	2021
Hold Until Arraignment			
DV Felony or Misdemeanor	3,373	3,558	3,351
Measure 11	1,889	1,971	2,221
Non-M11 Class A Felony	1,914	1,692	1,525
Non-M11 Felony Stalking and Strangulation	899	955	1,008
Non-M11 Sexual Offense	712	689	737
Grand Total	8,787	8,865	8,842

facility to hold a defendant for arraignment or a judicial department release decision. If a presiding judge's PRO provides overriding circumstances, the PRO must specify objective, non-discretionary, person-specific criteria that constitute overriding circumstances. The criteria must be specified in the PRO and could include a score from a risk assessment tool that is adopted in a manner consistent with these recommendations. If a defendant has been held due to overriding circumstances, a representative of the entity determining the hold shall either be at arraignments to report to the judge the overriding circumstances for the hold or provide the information in writing to the judge at or before the arraignment hearing.

Each judicial district with a PRO directing a sheriff or entity supervising the local correctional facility should identify and consider using a risk assessment tool to assist with release decision making as provided in a PRO. The PRO may direct the entity supervising the local correctional facility on the appropriate use of the risk assessment score.

The tool should be used to inform decisions on which type of release is appropriate for a defendant or in setting the conditions of release. The tool chosen should be reviewed to ensure that it is reliable and unbiased, and regularly validated. Validation of the tools should occur at least every five years or following significant changes to the population or laws and policies related to arrest/citation, detention, and sentencing.

Senate Bill (SB) 48 Fiscal Estimate for OJD Release Assistance Officers

Oregon's pretrial operations vary widely across the state in program staffing and are funded and operated by both judicial and executive branch agencies. Less than half of Oregon jurisdictions have any kind of pretrial program which employs a risk assessment tool (see Table 4, Group 3) and most pretrial programs have been operating for less than five years, except for Lane, Multnomah, and Yamhill Counties. The Lane County program is the oldest and most extensive program in the state in terms of pretrial operations, risk assessment/screening, and monitoring.

The Lane County pretrial program employs eight OJD funded release assistance officers (RAOs) and three Lane County Sheriff's deputies to staff the program 16 hours a day, seven days a week for 679 average monthly bookings (or one FTE for approximately 62 bookings per month), as well as supervising an average of 800 persons per month on pretrial release.⁴ A presiding judge may appoint RAOs under a personnel plan established by the Chief Justice and may delegate release decision making authority to the OJD RAO.⁵ Based on the needs and structure of a county's pretrial program, OJD's RAOs work closely with sheriff deputies and other executive branch pretrial staff.

⁴ Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting delays in resolving cases, the average monthly number of persons supervised on pretrial release has more than doubled since March 2020 when it was an average of 350 persons supervised per month on pretrial release. Also, during that time period the number of monthly bookings has decreased.

⁵ ORS 135.235.

The primary duties of an RAO are to interview in-custody defendants, research individual defendant circumstances, complete a risk assessment, contact crime victims,⁶ and make a recommendation as to whether a defendant should be released pending case resolution. The RAO may also develop and implement release agreements, may monitor defendants while on release and investigate release violations and recommend an appropriate response to the court. This work, consistent with SB 48, directly supports victim input and involvement at an early stage of a criminal proceeding and ensures victim and community safety are at the forefront of a release decision.

Using the Lane County pretrial program as a staffing model, Table 4 provides an overview of Oregon's pretrial operations and program staffing, the average number of monthly bookings in 2021, and the recommended RAO staffing levels for counties in Group 1 (No Pretrial Program or Release Assistance Officers) and Group 2 (Release Assistance Officers Only). Counties in Group 3 (Existing Pretrial Programs) and some in Group 2 (Release Assistance Officers) operate their programs as a partnership between counties and courts. This partnership between counties and courts has been a critical component of building effective pretrial programs that serve the needs of communities. We appreciate that counties have partnered with courts on this effort and look forward to continuing to work with them on improving pretrial practices in Oregon.

To continue implementation of SB 48 (2021), OJD is requesting 40 RAOs. Twenty-seven RAOs are requested to staff counties with no existing pretrial operations of any kind, and the remaining 13 RAOs are requested to adequately staff Josephine and Washington counties. (The recommended staffing level for Josephine and Washington Counties is 17.5; however, those counties currently have 4 staff. Therefore, the request for those two counties is 13.) The costs for the current and subsequent biennium are detailed in the Table below.

Biennium	Request	General Fund
2021-23 Biennium	40 Release Assistance Officers (20.0 FTE)	\$3.9 million
2023-25 Biennium	40 Release Assistance Officers (40.0 FTE)	\$7.4 million

If the legislature is not inclined to go beyond the \$2.5 million special purpose appropriation, then our request is 27 positions (13.5 FTE) to begin implementation of the SB 48 (2021) guidelines.

Biennium	Request	General Fund
2021-23 Biennium	27 Release Assistance Officers (13.5 FTE)	\$2.5 million
2023-25 Biennium	27 Release Assistance Officers (27.0 FTE)	\$5.0 million

⁶ ORS 135.235, as amended by section 3 of SB 48, provides that the RAO shall make reasonable efforts to contact the victim prior to submitting a report or making a release decision. If contact is made, the RAO must include in their report information regarding the victim's position on release, including whether special conditions should be imposed, and consider this information if the RAO makes the release decision. Additionally, if the information is available, the RAO shall inform the victim of the location, date, and time of the defendant's arraignment or other first appearance.

Looking ahead, the legislature will need to invest in additional resources to fully fund pretrial release programs and activities across the state as each county develops their program under SB 48 (2021). According to a December 2020 report from the Public Safety Task Force, counties in Group 3 with existing pretrial programs have approximately 51 staff. Their estimated staffing need based on the Lane County model is 72 staff, or a gap of approximately 20 staff. We are not able to determine the recommended staffing levels for these counties at this time without more information about their programs. We will continue to work with counties to determine their needs for additional resources for pretrial release programs and activities and anticipate that we will have this information prior to the 2023 session.

Table 4 - Oregon Pretrial Operations Overview	Avg. Monthly Bookings	Recommended Staffing
Group 1 - No Pretrial Program or Release Assistance Officers⁷	1,655	26.8
Baker County	35	0.6
Coos County	185	3.0
Crook County	97	1.6
Curry County	36	0.6
Douglas County	324	5.3
Grant County	31	0.5
Harney County	21	0.3
Jefferson County	112	1.8
Lake County	40	0.7
Linn County	239	3.9
Malheur County	74	1.2
Hood River, Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Wheeler (NORCOR Jail)	167	2.7
Umatilla County	296	4.8
Group 2 - Release Assistance Officers Only	1,196	19.4
Josephine County – 1 OJD RAO	337	5.5
Tillamook County - .5 OJD RAO	46	0.7
Union County -1 OJD RAO	71	1.2
Washington County – 2 OJD RAO, one funded by county	742	12.0

⁷ In these counties, pre-arraignment release is determined by a defendant posting security based on a security (“bail”) schedule.

Group 3 – Existing Pretrial Programs⁸	4,432	To Be Determined Prior to 2023 Legislative Session
Multnomah County – Split Recog DCJ/Close Street MSCO	1,072	
Benton County - BCSO	72	
Clackamas County - CCSO/P&P, in jail division	651	
Clatsop County - CCSO/jail division	75	
Columbia County – Community Justice	106	
Deschutes County - DCSO/1 OJD RAO funded by MOU w/Sheriff	260	
Jackson County – Community Justice	476	
Klamath County - KCSO/jail division	176	
Lane County - 8 OJD RAOs/3 LCSO deputies	679	
Lincoln County - LCSO/jail division	110	
Marion County - MCSO	493	
Polk County – Community Corrections	112	
Yamhill County – Community Justice	151	
Total	7,283	

Action Requested

OJD requests that the committee acknowledge receipt of this report on the development of the Chief Justice’s release guidelines for presiding judge pretrial release orders under SB 48 (2021), and for the committee to recommend a corresponding increase in General Funds appropriation of \$3.9 million and permanent positional authority for 40 Release Assistance Officer positions for the 2021-23 biennium (20.0 FTE). If the legislature is not inclined to provide an appropriation above the \$2.5 million special purpose appropriation, then our request is for the committee to recommend a corresponding increase in General Funds appropriation of \$2.5 million and permanent positional authority for 27 Release Assistance Officer positions for the 2021-23 biennium (13.5 FTE)

⁸ We anticipate that counties in Group 3 will need additional resources and are working to identify what is needed. That information should be available prior to the 2023 session.

Legislation Affected

\$2.5 million Special Purpose Appropriation established under HB 5006 (Oregon Laws 2021, chapter 669, section 35(1)) during the 2021 Regular Legislative Session.

\$3,912,320 General Fund appropriation for OJD operations established under HB 5012 (Oregon Laws 2021, chapter 557, section 1(2)) during the 2021 Regular Legislative Session.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nancy J. Cozine". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Nancy" being the most prominent part.

Nancy Cozine
State Court Administrator

NC:jm/22eNC001jm

Attachments

cc: Chief Justice Martha L. Walters
John Borden, Principal Legislative Analyst, LFO
April McDonald, Policy and Budget, DAS-CFO
David Moon, Director of BFSD, OJD