

Oregon Judicial Department					
	2019-21 Actual	2021-23 Legislatively Adopted	2021-23 Legislatively Approved*	2023-2025 Current Service Level	2023-25 Governor's Budget
General Fund	515,362,621	585,357,211	627,356,646	659,782,944	656,474,179
Other Funds	111,158,222	174,808,269	281,646,988	43,668,340	228,326,136
Federal Funds	1,009,969	1,476,446	1,782,035	1,584,283	1,584,283
Total Funds	627,530,812	761,641,926	910,785,669	705,035,567	886,384,598
Positions	1,934	1,932	1,999	1,956	2,178
FTE	1,817.99	1,888.09	1,921.42	1,925.01	2,214.34
* Includes Emergency Board and administrative actions through December 2022.					

Program Description

The Judicial Department (OJD) includes the judges and administrative staff who operate general-jurisdiction circuit courts, the Tax Court, the intermediate Court of Appeals, and the Oregon Supreme Court. Oregon's 36 counties are consolidated into 27 judicial districts for purposes of circuit courts. Oregon's justice, county, and municipal courts fall outside the jurisdiction of the department. The Chief Justice is the administrative head of the Department.

The budget is organized into the following program areas: trial courts; judicial compensation, administrative and central support, appellate and tax courts, mandated payments for jurors and interpreters, State Court Facilities Security Account, third party debt collection, pass-through payments, eCourt, capital construction, Oregon Courthouse Capital Construction and Improvement Fund, and Debt Service.

OJD is funded predominately with General Fund, Other Funds, and a nominal amount of Federal Funds. Major sources of Other Funds revenue are court filing fees, fees-for-service, assessments on state agencies, donations, and allocations from the Criminal Fines Account. Direct Federal Funds come from a grant for a Juvenile Court Improvement Project. Indirect Federal as Other Funds comes from the Department of Human Services (DHS) for the Citizen Review Board and the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) for the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA). By statute, OJD retains any unspent General Fund carryforward (i.e., reversions). The 2021-23 carryforward amount has is-to-be determined.

OJD is responsible for the collection of past-due crime victim restitution payments, compensatory fines, and other fines, costs, and assessments with most court-generated revenues are distributed to the General Fund (\$139.6 million), the Criminal Fine Account (\$87.8 million) cities and counties (\$36.4 million), and the Public Defense Services Commission(PDSC)(\$4.4 million). OJD is estimated to send \$23.5 million in restitution to victims of crime. The department will retain approximately \$7 million primarily for the State Court Technology Fund,

which by statute retains 8.85% of most major court filing fee collections and generate another \$6.1 million in subscription fee revenue from electronic access to court records.

As a constitutionally separate branch of government, OJD operates independent of the Governor and the Executive Branch. The Executive Branch makes no recommendation and exercises no budgetary control over OJD's budget. That responsibility falls solely to the Legislature. In addition, OJD is statutorily exempt from many statutes that apply to executive branch agencies, such as allotment authority, human resources, compensation, procurement, and information technology; however, OJD does try to maintain parity with Executive Branch statutory requirements. The Chief Justice also has the administrative authority to increase select fees.

CSL Summary

The 2023-25 current service level budget totals \$705 million total funds, which includes \$659.8 million General Fund, \$43.7 million Other Funds, and \$1.6 million Federal Funds. The budget includes 1,956 positions and 1,925.01 FTE. The CSL is \$205.8 million, or 22.6%, less than the 2021-23 legislatively approved budget of \$910.8 million. The budget is comprised of \$519.9 million (or 74%) for personal services, \$100.4 million (or 14%) for services and supplies, \$3.5 million (or 0.5%) for capital outlay, \$34.1 million (or 4.8%) for special payments, and \$47.3 million (or 6.7%) for debt service.

Modified Current Service Level (\$2.2 million Total Funds shortfall) - The 2023-25 modified current service level budget for OJD totals \$702.9 million total funds, including \$659.8 million General Fund, \$41.5 million Other Funds, and \$1.6 million Federal Funds. The budget includes 1,956 positions and 1,925.01 FTE. The modified CSL is a reduction to CSL of \$2.2 million Other Funds with no change to either positions or FTE. Revenue shortfall is reported in: eCourt Program operation and maintenance costs exceed a portion of court filing fee and subscription fee revenues (see Policy Packages #070 and #123, discussed below).

Adjustment to Current Service Level - DAS recently transferred \$9 million in Article XI-Q bond proceeds and associated General Fund debt service from DHS to OJD to support the Supreme Court Building renovation project. This transfer will result in an associated reduction in the legislatively authorized sale amount needed for the project from \$22 million to \$13 million in the spring of 2023. In addition, OJD notes that final project costs for the Supreme Court Building renovation project will soon be determined and may be less than the amount authorized by the legislature, in which case will reduce further the spring of 2023 bond sale amount. Furthermore, yet-to-be determined Article XI-Q bond sales and associated debt service for legislatively authorized sales related to circuit courthouse replacements may need to be adjusted due to project delays. All the above adjustments were made in the 2023-25 Governor's current service level debt service budget.

Base Budget Adjustment (\$11 million Total Funds; 37 positions/5.09 FTE) - offsetting adjustments to the base budget include standard personal service and debt service adjustments, the phase-in of permanent full-time positions, and the phase-out of one-time capital construction costs for the Supreme Court Building renovation project.

Phase-Outs (\$229.3 million Total Funds) - Major phase-outs of the budget include: (1) Oregon Courthouse Capital Construction and Improvement Fund - various projects (\$201 million Other Funds/Article XI-Q bond proceeds); (2) SB 1543 (2022) Legal Aid Services (\$4.5 million General Fund); (3) Supreme Court Building renovation (\$5 million Other Funds/ARPA); (4) Supreme Court Building renovation cost of bond issuance (\$250,000 Other Funds); (5) 2019-21 General Fund carryforward or retain reversion(s)(\$4.3 million General Fund); (6) Curry Courthouse planning funds (\$3.5 million Other Funds/ARPA); (7) Columbia County Courthouse improvements (\$2 million General Fund); (8) Benton County Courthouse planning funds (\$2 million General Fund); (9) Oregon State Bar Association’s OregonLaw+Connect information technology project (\$2.3 million General Fund); (10) Deschutes Courthouse (\$1.5 million General Fund); (11) marijuana expungement (\$1.2 million General Fund); and (12) records project expungement (\$1 million Other Funds/ARPA).

Phase-In (\$0 million) - none.

Inflation Adjustment (\$12.5 million) - Both standard (\$9.2 million) and above standard inflationary adjustments were made (\$3.3 million).

Policy Issues

The Legislature in 2023 may be considering public safety system legislation including the codification of Ballot Measure 114 (2022). Circuit and appellate courts will be impacted by the recent Oregon Supreme Court ruling in *Watkins v. Ackley* that held that the requirement of unanimous jury verdicts in serious criminal cases applies to older criminal cases as well as those still on appeal. The ruling applies to cases where a criminal conviction was final and the appeals, if any, were over before the U.S. Supreme Court ruling decision that was issued in April 2020. At least hundreds of convictions are involved and may end up going back to circuit courts for new trials.

OJD has had introduced legislation that have associated policy packages to account for their budgetary impact: (a) juror compensation (HB 2224, POP#112); (b) increase in the number of statutory judgeships (SB 235, #108); and (c) increase the compensation of statutory judgeships (SB 233, #111). OJD has also had introduced an omnibus bill to: (a) increase transcriber rates; (b) simplify procedure for appointment of senior judges; (c) protect court users’ privacy; and (d) non-substantive technical changes to statute (HB 2225). An additional OJD-introduced measure, SB 234, relates to court data and demographic information-gathering but has no associated policy package.

Governor’s Budget Summary

The Governor’s budget totals \$886.4 million total funds, which includes \$656.5 million General Fund, \$228.3 million Other Funds, and \$1.6 million Federal Funds. The budget includes 2,178 positions and 2,214.34 FTE. The Governor’s budget is \$181.4 million (or 25.7%), more than the 2023-25 current service budget of \$705 million and includes 222 additional positions (289.33 FTE).

The Governor’s budget, however, needs to be qualified, according to the Department of Administrative Services: “The Governor makes no recommendation for this budget, as it is a separate branch of government. For statutory purposes, the Governor included \$656,474,179 General Fund, \$228,326,136 Other Funds and \$1,584,283 Federal Funds for total funds of \$886,384,598 in her budget as a placeholder.” In

other words, the Governor's budget funded the Chief Justice's Recommended budget (CJRB) at only the 2023-25 current service level for *General Fund only*, less standard adjustments (e.g., debt service). The Governor's budget left unchanged in the CJRB all Other and Federal Funded requests above the current service level as well as position/FTE counts. The combination of these actions, while consistent with the actions of prior governor's, distort the budgetary view of Judicial Department's budget.

The CJRB includes the following 23 policy package requests categorized into major budgetary policy areas:

Judicial Compensation/Statutory Judgeships

- Package #108 New Judges and Support Staff (\$6.6 million General Fund; 28 positions/24.64 FTE)(required substantive law change)(Agency Priority #9) - new judges and support staff in the following counties: Clackamas, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine, Lane, and Washington.
- Package #111 Judicial Compensation (\$17.3 million General Fund)(required substantive law change) (Agency Priority #1) - two ten-percent salary increases for judges; one in July 2023 and another in January 2024.

Mandated Payments for jury trials and grand jurors

- Package #112 Juror Compensation (\$21 million General Fund)(required substantive law change) (Agency Priority #7) - increased daily compensation and mileage rates for jury service.

Circuit Court Facilities and Security - Pass-Through Entity Funding (Pass-Through Entity Funding)

- Package #116 Court Security Entrance Screening (\$12.5 million General Fund)(Agency Priority #15) - equipment and contract personnel services for entrance screening in 22 jurisdictions.
- Package #121 Circuit Court Capital Improvement Projects (\$8.7 million Other Funds)(CFA Allocation)(Agency Priority #21) - courthouse improvement projects in Benton, Clatsop (security improvements), Columbia, Coos, Douglas, Josephine, Lake, Tillamook, Umatilla (security improvements), and Wasco counties.

Statewide Pretrial Program (SB 48, 2021)

- Package #101 Statewide Pretrial Program (\$9.6 million General Fund; 45 positions/39.60 FTE)(Agency Priority #3) - expansion of pretrial programs with release assistance officers in Clackamas, Clatsop, Columbia, Deschutes, Klamath, Jackson, Lane, Lincoln, Marion, Multnomah, and Polk counties as well as the development of a statewide case management system and risk assessment tool, and additional Office of the State Court Administrator (OSCA) program staff.

Self-Represented Litigants

- Package #104 Self-Represented Litigants (\$2.6 million General Fund; 13 positions/11.44 FTE)(Agency Priority #5) - expansion of resources for self-represented litigant facilitation and customer service in Clackamas, Klamath, Multnomah, and Umatilla circuit courts

as well as OSCA program staff to support expanded translation services for documents, forms, and online resources, and a one-time investment to translate online content.

Expungement Program (SB 397, 2021)

- Package #103 Fresh Start Expungement Program (\$1.2 million General Fund; eight positions/4.89 FTE)(Agency Priority #10) - Permanent resources for processing of expungements for qualified individuals. The package would continue and expand efforts launched last session and were funded previously with one-time ARPA funds which would be exhausted in January 2024.

Protective Proceedings

- Package #102 Protective Proceedings Oversight Program (\$790,017 General Fund; four positions/3.10 FTE)(Agency Priority #11) - Provides for permanent Office of the State Court Administrator (OSCA) staff to improve, standardize, and monitor circuit court protective proceedings. The package would continue and expand efforts began under a federal grant that expires in September 2023.

Family Treatment/Specialty Court Enhancements

- Package #113 Family Treatment Courts (\$2.4 million General Fund; eight positions/7.76 FTE)(Agency Priority #12) - expansion of resources for Family Treatment Courts in Benton, Polk, Clackamas, and Josephine counties, provide staff to stabilize FTCs in Wasco and Klamath counties, and continue the OSCA positions began under a federal grant that expires in September 2023.
- Package #114 Specialty Court Enhancements (\$2.5 million General Fund; 14 positions/10.13 FTE)(Agency Priority #14) - Additional staff to support new, understaffed, or unstaffed specialty courts in Baker, Clackamas, Clatsop, Columbia, Coos, Crook, Douglas, Hood River, Josephine, Lane, Lincoln, Malheur, Tillamook, and Yamhill counties.
- Package #115 Direct Funding for Existing Specialty Courts (\$6.3 million General Fund; 30 positions/22.45 FTE)(Agency Priority #22) - Shifts funding for existing Criminal Justice Commission funded grant for specialty courts from CJC to OJD.

Operational Investments

- Package #105 Promoting Justice for Communities (\$2.3 million General Fund; 12 positions/9.00 FTE)(Agency Priority #6) - OSCA staff to develop core curriculum for court staff related to changes in technology, legislation, and new program development.
- Package #107 Appellate Court Improvements (\$1.9 million General Fund; nine positions/6.88 FTE)(Agency Priority #8) - Additional Court of Appeals staff resources to expedite decision-making and one Senior Staff Counsel to support the Supreme Court.
- Package #110 Classification and Compensation Plan changes (\$TBD)(Agency Priority #2) - Classification and compensation changes based on comprehensive organization-wide study with the costs depend on completion of labor market research and implementation approach.
- Package #120 Continue Other Funds Grant Positions (\$11 million Other Funds)(Agency Priority #21) - Expenditure limitation to accept specialty court and other grant funds.

Information Technology

- Package #070 Revenue Shortfall (<\$2.2 million Other Funds>)(see POP #123 Technology Fund Replacement)(Agency Priority #N/A) Program operation and maintenance costs exceed a portion of court filing fee and subscription fee revenues.
- Package #106 Remote Proceedings and Data Interfaces (\$3 million General Fund; 12 positions/9.00 FTE)(Agency Priority #4) - Adds audio/video and information technology staff in - Office of the State Court Administrator as well as Josephine, Multnomah, and Washington counties for expanded use of remote proceedings and new data interfaces with public safety entities.
- Package #109 Equipment Lifecycle Replacement (\$2.5 million General Fund)(Agency Priority #13) - Supplemental funding for increasing costs for software licensing and equipment lifecycle replacement.
- Package #123 Technology Fund Replacement (\$2.2 million General Fund)(see Package 070 Revenue Reduction)(Agency Priority #17) - Backfill of a revenues revenue shortfall with General Fund in order to fully fund eCourt operation and maintenance costs.

Oregon State Bar Association/Legal Aid Services (Pass-Through Entity Funding)

- Package #118 Legal Aid for Vulnerable Oregonians (\$14 million General Fund)(Agency Priority #16) - Increase passthrough funds to Legal Aid for: (a) administrative capacity, facilities, and technology enhancements (\$9.6 million); and (b) immigration legal service providers (\$4.4 million).

Oregon County Courthouse Replacement - Planning Phase (Pass-Through Entity Funding)

- Package #119 Circuit Court Replacement Planning (\$1.6 million General Fund)(Agency Priority #18) - (Hood River, Lincoln, Polk, Washington, and Umatilla counties) Pass-through funding for planning projects in Hood River (\$42,549), Lincoln (\$56,250), Polk (\$225,000), Umatilla (\$100,000) and Washington (\$1.25 million) counties.

Oregon County Courthouse Replacement - Article XI-Q Bonding Financing/Capital Construction Phase(s)(Pass-Through Entity Funding)

- Package #122 Circuit Court Capital Replacement Bonds (\$167.2 million Other Funds)(Bonding/Capital Construction Measures)(Agency Priority #22) - The request has two components: (a) state match funded with Article XI bonds - Benton (\$5.1 million), Clackamas (\$61.7 million), Curry (\$10.7 million), and Morrow (\$6.5 million) counties; and (b) Other Funds expenditure limitation associated with local county matching funds totaling an additional \$83.2 million.

Debt Service (\$0 General Fund)

- There is no policy package request for General Fund debt service for the 2023-25 biennium because the requested Article XI-Q bond sale is structured to be issued late in the biennium (March 2023). The 2025-27 biennium General Fund debt service cost is estimated to be \$11.8 million General Fund for Policy Package #122. Of note is that debt service for the Oregon eCourt investment will be retired during the 2021-23 biennium leaving only debt service for the Supreme Court Building renovation and state matching funds for county courthouse replacement(s).

Other Significant Issues and Background

OJD can be viewed as one of the few agencies that meets the criteria of a 21st century agency. The department operates under a sound strategic planning process with a modern information technology platform that provides for a data-driven organization. The department has been well-resourced by the legislature to accomplish these objectives.

Caseloads - Circuit and appellate courts are returning to pre-pandemic case filings. The complexity of criminal cases continues to grow due to electronic discovery and body camera footage, among others. The criminal adjudicatory process for those individuals with mental health and substance abuse disorders continues to represent a major challenge to circuit courts and consuming more and more court time and court resources.

Unrepresented Defendant/Persons Crisis

The cause of the unprecedented unrepresented defendant/persons crisis facing the state is driven by a deficit in attorney capacity and is likely to continue into the 2023-25 biennium. This will continue to challenge the docketing of circuit courts and most especially a circuit court judge's decision about whether to release defendants with conditions or on their own recognizance, or dismiss the charges to avoid a violation of a criminal defendant/person's right to speedy trial under the Sixth and Fourteen Amendments to the United States Constitution. Circuit courts, however, are expected to continue collaborating with public safety partners to alleviate the crisis, including through early resolution/settlement conferences and docketing practice changes.

Pretrial Release Implementation Challenges (SB 48, 2021)

The primary challenge of SB 48's implementation continues to be determining the appropriate state and local funding mix for the pre-trial release program. SB 48 affirmed pretrial release decisions are a judicial function; however, court staff may at times determine an individual's custody status immediately after arrest by following nondiscretionary, objective release criteria established in a circuit court presiding judge's release order. The first challenge, however, comes with extent of the state's funding commitment and the "maintenance of effort" required of counties with existing pretrial programs, especially given the current county/state hybrid funding schema that exists across many counties. The secondary challenge is that state's total funding of pretrial release programs, both the General Fund appropriations and Criminal Justice Commission's Justice Reinvestment Act grants to counties, needs to be re-evaluated and coordinated with county funding for maximum affect and where possible, to economize on the commitment of the state's General Fund resources.

Family Treatment Courts

The 2021 Legislature adopted a budget note (HB 5006) seeking to have agencies normalize or coordinate their investments in Family Treatment Courts (FTC) to maximize their effect on dependency cases. The 2021 Legislature expressed a desire to expand FTC; however, such an expansion was forestalled by what the legislature found as uncoordinated investments between OJD FTCs, PDSC's Parent Child Representation Program (PCRP), DOJ's Child Advocacy Section (CHAS) for juvenile dependency representation, and ODHS - Child Welfare Programs. The Legislature deferred further investments until a more considered plan was developed that focused primarily on: investing first

in existing PCRPs; making investments within the confine of existing statutory judgeships for circuit courts; and shoring up investments in pre-existing FTCs. A multiagency FTC Steering Committee established by the Legislature presumably continues to evaluate FTC expansion opportunities, while acknowledging FTC expansion to the PCRPs of Multnomah, Douglas, and Yamhill counties unfeasible at this time due to either insufficient judicial and court staff capacities to devoted FTCs or the lack of judicial resources.

Normalization of Uncoordinated Funding Streams - State and Local

Disparate state and local funding streams of key legislative initiatives, including those related to family treatment/specialty courts, pretrial release, self-represented litigants, and circuit court capital improvements would benefit from a re-assessment to understand current service level funding and to better evaluate and coordinate funding requests across multiple agencies, governments, and entities.

Oregon County Courthouse Replacements

Counties are responsible to provide suitable and sufficient court facilities for the statewide operation of the circuit courts (ORS 1.185). In 2013, the legislature established the Oregon Courthouse Capital Construction and Improvement Fund (OCCCIF) to assist counties in replacing unsafe county-owned courthouse facilities housing the state's circuit courts. State matching funds support is primarily from the authorization of Article XI-Q general obligation bonds and whose repayment, or debt service, is funded by state General Fund. While the OCCCIF can be viewed as being successful, some county governments have been challenged in their ability to generate matching funds with at least one county resorting to an alternative long-term financing agreement through a public-private partnership in lieu of local bonding (Clackamas County). County government challenges in raising local matching funds have resulted, in some instances, in significant delays in the issuance of Article XI-Q general obligation bonds, which adversely impacts the legislature's ability to fund other, more immediately viable projects. Poor county cost estimating, and more recently cost escalations, have contributed to highly variable project costs and an underestimation of the state's matching funds requirement. There may also be an effort to expand the statutory eligibility of the OCCCIF to include renovation and/or expansion project rather than just new courthouse construction. There also does not appear to be standardized/scalable designs for new courthouses instead each being of unique design and cost. Nearly 15 years have passed since the Oregon Court Facilities Assessment was completed in 2008 and a re-assessment may be necessary, as well as a review, update, and possible permanent codification of the temporary statutory provisions governing this process that were first adopted in 2013. There exists the need for codification in Oregon Revised Statute the Oregon Courthouse Capital Construction and Improvement Fund

Circuit Court Facilities - Security and Capital Improvements

The enhancing circuit courthouse security continues to be of concern and a priority of OJD. Capital improvements continue to be needed across circuit courts that are currently not under consideration for replacement.

Application Contribution Program

The Application Contribution Program (ACP) was created with the intent to avoid some taxpayer costs related to providing court appointed counsel at public expense by an assessment of advance payment from people who could afford to make a monetary contribution toward the cost of representation and the administrative costs of determining their eligibility. The Commission enters into an intergovernmental

agreement with OJD for the use of these fees for public defense verification staffing. OJD verification specialists assist the courts in determining whether a person must pay these costs. Due to the pandemic, as well as actions taken by the Chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court as well as circuit court judges, there is an ACP revenue shortfall; however, ongoing review of ACP revenues is necessary to determine if a revenue shortfall issue exists or if the ACP revenue stream is in recovery. In addition, some judges have misunderstood the distinction between the ACP contribution amount and attorney fees and have only ordered attorney fees at the conclusion of the case. This is having an adverse effect on the financial viability of the ACP given the statutory difference in how the funds are distributed and utilized. Legislative concern continues to exist around the determination of eligibility.

Criminal Fines Account

Criminal Fines Account (CFA) revenue is derived from court imposed on monetary obligations in criminal proceedings such as criminal fines, attorney fees, diversion fees, and other financial penalties imposed on violations other than parking infractions, misdemeanors, and felonies. CFA revenue is collected state circuit courts, Justice or county-based courts, and local municipal or city courts. Circuit courts account for approximately 73.5% of the account's revenues, Justice Courts 12.7%, and local municipal courts approximately 13.8%. CFA revenues are beginning to see some level of post-pandemic recovery; however, revenues remain below historic averages (in part explained by legislative actions), allocations from the account are increasing, and therefore distributions to the General Fund are declining. CFA revenues have declined by 19.8%, combined total allocations have increased 26.8%, and deposits into the General Fund have decreased by 56.3%. These trends warrant further investigation as to the intermediate-term financial viability of CFA.

Report on Liquidated and Delinquent Accounts Receivable (June 30, 2022)

Collection activity has resumed after the suspension of collection referrals from March 2020 to November 2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. According to the most recent Report on Liquidated and Delinquent Accounts Receivable (June 30, 2022), OJD reported that \$1.6 billion is owed the state on 1.4 million accounts with an average balance of \$1,114. Of this total, \$948 million, or 60.5%, is in collections with the Department of Revenue or private collection firms, \$318 million or 20.3%, is being actively worked OJD, and \$301.1 million, or 19.2%, is inactive status pending assignment to collections after being returned from collections.

Budgetary Restructuring

OJD, as part of a reorganization plan approved by the 2022 Legislature, was instructed to work with the Legislative Fiscal Office to align the Department's 2023-25 budget structure with the reorganization. This work continues to be underway. An OJD restructuring of the administrative function of the Appellate Court Services Division is also underway.

Budget Note and Other Anticipated Reports

There are no statutory or budget note reporting requirements for OJD for the 2023 Legislative session. The Oregon State Bar, however, may be asked to report on the Universal Representation Fund/Legal Aid Services of Oregon (SB 1543, 2022) and the OregonLaw+Connect information technology project, which is a single, coordinated portal to connect Oregonians with civil legal assistance.

Compensation Plan Change

By statute, the Chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court, as the administrative head of the Oregon Judicial Department, is to establish and maintain a department-wide personnel plan (ORS 1.008). The personnel plan includes a classification and compensation structure as well as other benefits. Statute directs that the plan be in reasonable conformity with the general salary structure of the state (ORS 240.245) and that prior to implementing any changes to the plan, a report must be submitted to the Legislature (ORS 8.105(1)). The Department has recently completed a major classification and compensation plan study across all salary range(s), step structure, and job classifications. The Department will be reporting this change to the 2023 Legislature. The estimated cost of the proposed changes total \$1.8 million Total Funds for the 2021-23 biennium and \$13.9 million Total Funds for the 2023-25 biennium. The costs would be predominately funded with General Fund.

Internal Audits

court technology assessment, and grant administration. The Secretary of State Audits Division also completed a standard Audit of Selected Financial Accounts (December 2022).

2021-23 Biennium Adjustment

At the present time, OJD may require a 2021-23 Federal Funds expenditure limitation adjustment to reconcile expenditure limitation with expected federal grants previously approved by the legislature or the Emergency Board (estimated at \$950,000).

Key Performance Measures

A copy of the OJD Annual Performance Progress Report can be found on the LFO website:

https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/lfo/APPR/APPRProposed_OJD_2022-09-27.pdf

OJD may be requesting a title and description update to the department's Drug Court Recidivism Key Performance Measure (#7).