

Ratified - Meeting Minutes (voted on at the 7/14/26 meeting)
Task Force on Removing Barriers to Jury Service

Date: June 8, 2026

Time: 11:30am-1:00pm

Location: Virtual via WebEx Webinar

Members in Attendance: Derek Sangston, Chair Kimberly McCullough, Tim Dooley, Honorable Matthew Shirtcliff, Senator James Manning, Jr., Andrew Smith on Behalf of Representative Tom Andersen, Honorable Chanpone Sinlapasai, Royce Williams, Kia Tolbert, Bryan Brock, Nansi López, Keren Farkas

Members Not in Attendance: Honorable Tucker Rossetto, Senator Kim Thatcher, Representative Wallan

Quorum: Yes (9)

Ratify Prior Meeting Minutes

- Chair McCullough asked if anyone had changes to the prior meeting minutes
 - There were none
- Chair McCullough asked if there were objections to ratifying the prior meeting minutes
 - There were none
- Chair McCullough noted the prior meeting minutes were ratified

High-Level Overview to Understand the Universe of Potential Barriers and Brainstorm Policy Ideas for Overcoming Barriers

- Chair McCullough referenced the prior Citizens on Call and Preserving the Future of Jury Trials reports that were previously sent as materials
- Brock noted there are many people who cannot do multi-day jury trials, but in most counties you don't know how long the jury service will be when you receive a summons
 - The majority of cases generally end up being one day
 - Brock noted many people summoned seem to think it will be for multiple days and therefore don't respond or ask to be excused, but when they find out it will likely be for one day they say they can do that
 - If there was a way to ask people who would be available for a one-day jury service, we may get more people responding and less saying they can't serve
 - Seems more possible in the criminal rather than civil sphere
 - People may be able to afford the financial burden of attending for one day more than they could attending for one week

- Chair McCullough noted ORS 10.107 (i.e., the goal of having jurors serve for one day or one trial)
 - Some courts have implemented that, but some have not
 - Agreed that where it's possible to say service will be for one day, it would be helpful to let potential jurors know that
 - There's a public education component here in letting people know how often it tends to only be one day
- Tolbert noted a concern that the court/parties don't necessarily know when the summonses are sent whether it will be one-day, and some trials end up getting cancelled, continued, or resolved at the last minute
 - Example: Douglas County assigns jurors to trials randomly on the day of trial
 - Unclear how to implement advance notice in practice
 - Could implementing new trial court rules make it possible to know further in advance which cases will need jurors?
 - We could have public education about how long a trial usually lasts
- Andrew Smith for Representative Andersen
 - There's no guarantee how long a trial would last, but we could educate the public by saying something on the summons about how many trials resolve in one day and that, while not guaranteed, it's likely you would only serve one day
 - Is there any risk with putting something informational in the summons?
- Dooley tried to comment but had audio issues
- Judge Shirtcliff noted that Baker County has a jury orientation day where the court explains that if a juror has a scheduling conflict they can let the court know so they won't need to come for a trial, but that they will still need to check the phone and website for messages from the court
 - Would it be possible/legal to have people request to only serve on one-day trials?
 - Agreed that noting on summonses that most, but not all, trials, are one-day could potentially help with turnout
 - López noted that potentially having an FAQ on the summons about jury service could help give folks a general sense of what to be prepared for and then further detail could be given as people come to the court
 - Tolbert cautioned that allowing potential jurors to choose to only be assigned to one-day trials could be problematic

- Could result in only those with the financial means to serve longer than one day being assigned to certain cases, particularly in criminal cases where they may not be the peers of the defendant
 - Harvis noted that setting trial expectations can be helpful and that there are some things that could help with that
 - Judicial considerations of jury trial certainty and more strict call hearings
 - Providing clarity on lengthier trials and reevaluation of length of service in counties with longer terms
 - Increasing public knowledge on jury trial expectations
 - The Oregon Judicial Department has some information on its jury website on length of service, but not on the summonses
 - Chair McCullough noted we can do a deeper dive into the one day/one trial issue and setting expectations around length of service at a future meeting
 - Dooley attempted to speak again, but audio issues continued
- Brock suggested educating the public, before they get a summons, as to what jury service entails, its importance, and dissuading common concerns could prepare people for when they do get a summons
 - May cost less than increasing juror compensation
 - Chair McCullough suggested doing a deeper dive into the public education piece and what a state investment in that could look like
- López noted it's important to continue discussing the financial burden issue
 - Even if people want to participate, it can be a decision between paying for food/gas/etc. and attending jury service
 - Having a jury of peers is hard when your peers cannot afford to go
 - Interested in looking at innovative ways to improve the financial issue
 - We could discuss pilot programs from other states and see if we can learn from those
 - Example: Of \$1.8 million Oregon provides for juror compensation, \$580K was not requested, so if we could build a system that assesses people's needs so they can participate would make a big difference on what our juries look like across the state
 - Would also help identify the daily struggles Oregonians face
- Tolbert agreed that we need public education/outreach about the jury system and post-jury duty feedback and also suggested the task force address:

- Having mock jury trial programs, especially for those who are younger and just receiving their license, which could potentially engage parents too
- Lack of control and long waiting times
 - Once someone receives a summons, they could let the court know the best times in that month that they could attend jury duty
 - Potentially having an online scheduling platform
 - Making it clearer to the public that you can request a deferral/excusal online prior to the day before service
 - Online juror qualification questionnaires to let jurors know if it's a type of case that would be traumatic or triggering for them so they can inform the court in advance
 - Staggering jury panel sign-ins to avoid long security/check-in lines
- Uniform Trial Court Rules establishing and addressing unnecessary pretrial concerns beforehand
 - Deadlines to resolve cases would be helpful in helping jurors know in advance if they would be serving
- Providing proposed agendas for trial to help jurors know what to expect
- Discuss juror compensation by examining/comparing multiple state frameworks (CA, AZ, FL, OR, MA/CT - Employer Pay-State Pay, NY - Wage Replacement, Expense Focus Model)
- Making the extraordinary expenses fund more accessible
- Childcare at courthouses
- Lodging for jurors in instances where traveling to/from court is difficult or it would be very dark in an area where driving at night is unsafe
- Court shuttle in counties without good public transport
- Potentially, remote processes for civil cases
- Privacy and safety concerns for jurors
 - Unclear if there's more to address beyond juror anonymity
- Having access to post-jury duty counseling to address post-trial anxiety/guilt and vicarious trauma
- Andrew Smith for Representative Andersen suggested we could diversify support for these issues and that the task force should look into shared funding models
 - We could maybe explore a partnership with the state bar (they have a role in education and outreach we could tap into)
 - Potentially having dedicated funding in bar dues that lawyers pay
 - Would that be appropriate?

Juror Compensation

- Review Juror Compensation in Oregon
 - Chair McCullough presented on Oregon's juror compensation history
 - Reviewed changes in juror pay (per diem and mileage) from 1955 to 2002, both what they were then and adjusted per the Consumer Price Index to see how much that would be in 2026
 - Noted differences in pay between circuit courts, justice courts, and municipal courts, as well as distinctions for courts of record
 - Discussed how the implementation of the Grand Bargain impacted the shift from counties paying versus the state paying
 - Noted that the extraordinary expenses payment was created in 1999
 - Discussed the implementation of requiring jurors for circuit courts to waive fees, but not mileage, if their employer paid
 - Juror compensation amounts in circuit courts were last adjusted in 2002
- What It Would Cost to Increase Compensation
 - Ran out of time, we will discuss this at the next meeting
- National Landscape
 - Jawwaad Johnson, Director for Center of Jury Studies, NCSC, and Miriam Hamilton, Senior Research Analyst, NCSC, introduced themselves
 - Hamilton shared slides showing the minimum flat per diem juror fee across multiple states
 - States tend to have either a flat rate or a locally based rate where they pay a minimum amount of pay
 - Most have daily rates, but some pay per hour based on minimum wage
 - Hamilton reviewed the payment models of several different states
 - Not many states have increased juror compensation itself, rather they have tried to alleviate barriers by doing things such as providing free childcare, increasing mileage and parking reimbursements, etc.
 - Jawwaad noted that many states are looking into the issue of juror compensation and holistic approaches to removing barriers to jury service
 - Failure to appear/respond rates for jurors are high across the country

- Example: New Jersey started adding a QR code on the summons to provide information about jury service to jurors before they get to court
- Improving juror education by educating people on their rights as jurors and, if selected, their duties, length of term, etc. and the direct contact information for their local jury management office
 - Example: In New Jersey, juror orientation is now recorded and made remote and accessible to all jurors when they receive their summons
- Brock asked if NCSC has statistics on how the discussed changes other states have made has impacted juror attendance/response rates (the legislature would want to know this if the task force will be asking for funds)
 - Jawwaad noted that North Dakota is collecting appearance statistics, but they haven't shared their findings with NCSC
 - Jawwaad noted they may be more likely to share that with another state system instead
- Chair McCullough noted HB 4844 (Illinois) had passed both chambers and was awaiting the Governor's signature, but Jawwaad was not sure if it will be signed
 - Illinois also has a law that you can't be required to work the night shift if you have jury duty the next day
 - Chair McCullough noted Oregon does not have this, but it may be a suggestion this task force could make
 - Dooley noted that that clause has been in some union contracts he has worked on, and that, while hard for the employer, it is a benefit to employees
- Tolbert asked if NCSC has been able to compare attendance rates to the different compensation formats that currently exist across different states
 - NCSC does not currently have good data on that
 - Anecdotally, NCSC has heard that courts implementing newer technology to pay jurors faster seems to affect jurors positively (e.g., getting paid instantly rather than waiting)
- López asked NCSC, based on what they've seen across the country, what they think the perfect system would entail
 - Hamilton cited:
 - North Dakota increasing juror pay to \$100/day
 - New York, but their juror pay model is tied to employers paying a portion, which makes it harder to implement

- Arizona's lengthy jury trial fund
- Williams asked if any states have looked into putting the cost of juror pay in civil jury trials on the parties?
 - Hamilton noted she has heard that idea in brainstorming sessions, but was not sure it had been implemented anywhere
 - Smith seconded Williams' cost splitting idea
 - Senator Manning asked if a court filing fee could be used to address that? (e.g., adding \$1 to that fee to go towards jurors)
 - Chair McCullough agreed the idea is worth discussing further and noted it would be added to the task force's list of various ideas
- Tolbert noted it's important that we broaden the pool of potential jurors, particularly to try to include the unhoused population
 - It's supposed to be a jury of the defendant's peers, and, especially in criminal cases, many of the clients represented are unhoused individuals
 - Unclear how this would be done, but it's something to think about
 - Chair McCullough asked Hamilton if other states have done this?
 - Hamilton has not seen this done
 - Harvis noted that improving source lists (such as including those receiving public benefits) may help
 - OJD has not historically done an evaluation of its source lists
- If anyone has more questions or data requests for NCSC, send them to Chair McCullough and she can pass them along

Where Are We Going From Here

- Further discuss juror compensation
- Impacts of trauma and stress from jury service
- Longer lengths of service
- Public education
- Accessibility
- Peremptory challenges

Public Comment

- None

Next Meeting

- Date: July 14, 2026
- Time: 11:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

- Via: Webex Webinar