

Public Comment Submitted  
Via Task Force on Removing  
Barriers to Jury Service  
Online Contact Form

Public Comment Submitted August 13, 2026, by Ivar Anderson:

“Published orientation policy does not match actual requirement — Wasco County Summary This comment does not address juror compensation rates, which the task force has considered at length. It raises a narrower and, I believe, less-examined problem that falls within the task force's charge to identify other obstacles to jury service: In at least one circuit, the orientation requirement stated on the Oregon Judicial Department's own juror information page does not match the requirement the court actually imposes. A juror who relies on the state's published information will be wrong about what is required of them — and the requirement actually imposed is a potentially uncompensated appearance scheduled before the term of service begins. I ask the task force to determine how widespread this is, and to recommend that published juror information be accurate and that compelled appearances fall inside the compensated, protected term. 1. The divergence Wasco County Circuit Court's Juror Resources page, hosted on the Oregon Judicial Department website, states that the Juror Orientation and Implicit Bias videos are to be watched before reporting for jury duty. The videos are embedded on the page for remote viewing. The page describes no in-person orientation session. It states that on the first day of the jury term, a juror will either be selected for a panel or excused. I nonetheless received written notice from Wasco County Circuit Court requiring in-person attendance at orientation on a date well before my first reporting day. I quote from the email received 13 August: "Thank you for responding to your jury summons for the October, November, and December 2026 term. We will be holding Petit Jury Orientation on Friday, August 28, 2026 in Courtroom 301, which is located on the third floor. Jurors must check-in by 8:30 AM. Orientation should take no more than an hour and upon completion jurors will be released for the day." 2. Why the divergence matters independently of the underlying policy Whatever the merits of in-person orientation, a juror cannot comply with a requirement the state conceals and cannot plan around one the state misstates. The OJD juror pages are not incidental. They are where the summons process directs people, where deferral and excusal instructions live, and where a summoned juror goes to work out what jury service will cost them — whether they need childcare, whether they must arrange coverage at work, how many days to warn an employer about. A page that describes orientation as two videos watched at home, when the actual requirement is a weekday morning at the courthouse, causes a juror to plan for the wrong obligation and to discover the error late. That is a barrier to service in the most direct sense: some proportion of jurors who would have complied will fail to appear, appear unprepared, or seek excusal, because the information the state gave them was wrong. I do not know whether this is a Wasco-specific lapse, a stale page, or a pattern across circuits. Determining which is a task well suited to the task force, and not one an individual juror can perform. 3. The appearance falls outside the compensated and protected term The orientation date precedes the first reporting day. Two consequences follow, both of which the task force is positioned to address. Compensation. Per diem and mileage under ORS 10.061 and ORS 10.065 attach to required attendance during service. An appearance scheduled before the term begins appears to fall outside that. Because most summoned jurors are never seated, this places a fixed uncompensated cost — a weekday morning plus round-trip travel — on a population whose expected service is frequently zero. This is

where the rate question intersects, and I raise it only to that extent: at \$10 per day and 20 cents per mile — the mileage figure fixed by statute and unamended since 2002 — even reclassifying orientation as compensated service would not make a juror whole for the morning. The classification and the rate are separate defects, and fixing only the first accomplishes little. Employment protection. ORS 10.090 and ORS 10.092 are framed around jury service. Where a court itself treats orientation as preceding the term of service, it is not obvious those protections reach an absence taken to attend it. That would leave a juror compelled to miss work without the protection that ordinarily accompanies jury duty, and employers without clear guidance on whether they must accommodate the absence. I ask the task force to establish whether this gap exists in fact; if it does, it is a barrier operating precisely on jurors who cannot afford an unprotected absence.

4. In-person delivery does not appear to be necessary. Practice already varies. Wasco's published materials contemplate remote viewing. Benton County Circuit Court (and many others) holds orientation on the first day of the jury term, so that the appearance coincides with reporting rather than adding a separate one. Neither model requires a distinct pre-term trip to the courthouse. Where identity verification, hardship screening, or badge issuance are the reason for an in-person session, those functions do not obviously require a separate day rather than the opening of the first reporting day.
- Requests
1. Audit each circuit's published juror information against its actual orientation requirement, and report the results. Where they diverge, correct the published page.
2. Recommend that no juror be required to appear on a date not stated on the summons, and that any required appearance fall within the stated term of service.
3. Determine whether ORS 10.090 and ORS 10.092 protections attach to a court-compelled appearance scheduled outside the term of service, and recommend statutory clarification if they do not.
4. Recommend a default of remote or asynchronous orientation, consistent with the practice OJD already publishes for several circuits; where in-person orientation is retained, schedule it on the first day of the term.
5. Survey how many circuits require a separate pre-term in-person appearance, whether it is compensated, and how many summoned jurors it affects annually.

Respectfully submitted, Ivar Anderson  
Summoned juror, Wasco County Circuit Court"