

# Multnomah County FY 2026 Budget Work Session Follow Up

## District Attorney's Office

May 13, 2025



---

Note: Follow up can be presented to the Board on May 15, 2025 during the afternoon Budget Worksession

### Chair's Office

#### 1. Role of PPB in staffing investigators.

- a. Funding from the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) for investigative work fits into two categories:
  - i. Personal service subpoenas and core investigative work  
Prior to 2015, PPB assigned officers to be embedded within the District Attorney's Office to perform these functions. Since then, rather than assigning officers, PPB has funded 3.00 FTE DA Investigators through an intergovernmental agreement. For FY 2026, the anticipated funding amount from PPB for these positions is \$531,335.
  - ii. Organized Retail & Auto Theft Task Forces  
In FY 2024 and FY 2025, the City of Portland and the County partnered to fund these task forces, which included 2.00 FTE Deputy District Attorneys (DDAs), 2.00 FTE DA Investigators, and 1.00 FTE Legal Assistant 2. The City contributed \$350,000 each year towards this partnership and has committed to continuing the investment in FY 2026.

#### 2. Impact of legislative changes on auto theft prosecutions.

- a. Oregon's auto theft law changed on January 1, 2020, to address the epidemic of stolen cars that were not prosecutable due to adverse appellate rulings. Unlawful Use of a Vehicle (UUV) cases are now again chargeable with circumstantial evidence that supports that the suspect was aware of and consciously disregarded a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the owner of the vehicle did not consent to having their car taken without permission. MCDA has had a higher conviction rate for the past five years since this change.

### 3. Bodies of work/Positions initiated with ARPA funding.

MCDA Investments Initiated with American Rescue Plan Act Funds FY 2022 - FY 2026					
Description	FY 2022 Revised	FY 2023 Revised	FY 2024 Revised	FY 2025 Revised	FY 2026 Proposed
Domestic Violence Backlog - 1.00 FTE DDA 2	242,360	191,354	195,805	200,565*	224,676
Gun Violence Case Backlog - 1.00 FTE DDA 3	200,000	225,000	233,827	250,993	273,850
Gun Violence Case Backlog - 1.00 FTE DDA 3	200,000	225,000	0	0	0
Gun Violence Case Backlog - 1.00 FTE DDA 3	200,000	249,856	233,827	289,331	264,517
Gun Violence Case Backlog - 1.00 FTE DDA 3	200,000	249,856	0	0	0
Gun Violence Case Backlog - 1.00 FTE DA Investigator	125,000	136,189	139,307	167,196	179,377
Gun Violence Case Backlog - 1.00 FTE DA Investigator	125,000	136,189	139,307	164,340*	179,377
ARPA					
General Fund (one-time-only)					
General Fund (ongoing)					

*\*Converted to ongoing with internal reallocation*

### 4. Impact of delayed defense on cases and ability to prosecute cases.

- a. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.

#### District 1 - Commissioner Moyer

##### 1. What is the Failure to Appear (FTA) or no-show rates by case type?

- a. MCDA does not have good data that would allow for analyzing FTAs due to the complexity of court data entry in this particular area. The key policy considerations here would involve more than just numbers by case type, and MCDA welcomes an in-depth conversation about it. The best practice in pre-trial release is to analyze release decisions and FTAs from a risk-based model, not a charge-based model. That is, two defendants arrested for the same charge are treated differently based on their risk of FTA, which in turn is based on their history of FTA, conformance on supervision, and other factors.

## District 3 - Commissioner Brim-Edwards

### 1. Provide a list of your priority add backs (program, \$, FTE)

FY 2026 Add Package Requests (Proposed Budget)					
Priority	Brief Description	General Fund Amount	Other Fund Amount	FTE	Request Type
1	Body Worn Cameras Unit	810,500		3.00	Continue Prior OTO
2	Organized Retail & Auto Theft Task Forces	510,400	350,000	5.00	Continue Prior OTO
3	Senior Legal Assistants Expansion	966,000		7.00	New
4	Strategic Prosecution & Services Unit Expansion	1,274,110		7.00	New
5	Treatment Court Unit Deputy District Attorney	205,064		1.00	Restore GF Reduction
6	Domestic Violence Unit Deputy District Attorney	222,000		1.00	Restore GF Reduction
7	Juvenile Unit Deputy District Attorney	198,000		1.00	Restore GF Reduction
8	Homicide Unit Senior Deputy District Attorney	380,000		1.00	Continue Unbudgeted
9	Civil Commitment Deputy District Attorney	211,985		1.00	New
10	Research & Planning Manager	175,000		1.00	New
11	Gun Dispossession DA Investigator	175,000		1.00	New
Total		5,128,059	350,000	29.00	

### 2. Expanded discussion about the investments in legal assistants, impacts or work, efficiencies and cost.

- a. The budget request to fund 7.00 FTE Senior Legal Assistants is intended to solve for a key inefficiency identified in a workload analysis MCDA completed by the Coraggio Group in 2023. The analysis followed a similar report completed in 2018. Each analysis used time tracking entries, focus group discussions, calculations by total number of cases, and interviews with individual employees to assess staffing levels. The 2023 report found that the adequate DDA staffing level for the MCDA's workload would be 109.12 FTE, 26.92 FTE short (24.7%) of where the office was at that time (82.20 FTE). The report recommended a series of improvements, including:
  - i. Updating technology (including the case management system), improving standardization and data collection, and tracking projects/time.
  - ii. Dedicating resources to onboarding, mentoring, and training to support a new workforce.
  - iii. **Investing in opportunities to delegate tasks not requiring legal expertise to legal assistants, paralegals, and interns.**
  - iv. Hiring additional DDAs into felony units.
  - v. Empowering DDAs to have increased agency in determining process changes within their units.

MCDA has implemented and/or is currently implementing many of the recommendations that are within our control.

Regarding the recommendation to invest in delegating tasks not requiring legal expertise, the report reads, "Delegating non-technical or administrative tasks to legal assistants would allow DDAs to focus their limited time on their actual cases, but it will also reduce the cost of the office's operations to taxpayers given that these staff typically command a much lower salary than lawyers." Currently, lawyers are responsible for many administrative tasks such as obtaining, managing, and organizing discovery, scheduling court appearances, managing their calendars, coordinating witness appearances and meetings, trial preparation, including building trial binders, creating exhibit and witness lists, and creating and marking trial exhibits, generating basic legal documents, and filing paperwork. Adding 7.00 FTE Senior Legal Assistants would allow MCDA to add one in each felony unit to take on and oversee the delegation of administrative tasks from DDAs to legal staff.

## **District 2 - Commissioner Singleton**

**1. How was your equity manager involved in the budgeting process and decision-making for any proposed reductions?**

- a. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.

**2. How have current and historical disparate negative impacts of the criminal justice system informed/impacted your proposed reductions based on the County general fund revenue realities?**

- a. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.

**3. What percentage of resources allocated are directed toward alternatives to prosecution or restorative justice?**

- a. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.

**4. How did you analyze and decide on priority investments in relation to your stated commitment to reduce all racial and all forms of discrimination?**

- a. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.

**5. What is the demographic makeup of your CBAC? How do communities disproportionately impacted by the criminal justice system have influence and voice in your budget and policy making processes?**

- a. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.

**6. How many expungements have you worked on since Jan 2025? How much is that in terms of the backlog?**

- a. Motions to set aside conviction are reviewed by MCDA for statutory eligibility and conditions or circumstances that would lead MCDA to object to the motion (discretionary objection). Discretionary objections are very rare due to 2022 changes in the law that narrowed the criteria for such an objection.

During the period of January 1 - April 30, 2025:

- i. 3,155 motions to set aside conviction (expungements) were received
- ii. 2,380 responses to motions to set aside conviction were submitted to the court. Of these:
  - 1. No objection to the motion: 2,183 (92%)
  - 2. Objection to the motion: 197 (8%)
    - a. Statutory objection (i.e., the applicant does not meet legal criteria for a set aside): 196
    - b. Discretionary objection: 1

As of May 14, 2025, MCDA has 545 motions that are ready to be reviewed by a DDA and 54 that are waiting for the Oregon State Police to complete their records checks before it is ready for review. None of these are a true "backlog," as MCDA has worked down overdue reviews over the last six months and is now within the 120-day timeline on all pending motions.

**7. In what community-based organizations are MAAPS DDA's currently located?**

- a. MAAPS DDAs work throughout the community, including with many community-based organizations. Recent engagement includes: Compass Center (monthly hours at the Central Library), Rosewood Initiative (weekly hours), Lents Neighborhood Livability Association, Cultivate PDX, Dads helping Dads, Stadiumhood Neighborhood Association, Hazelwood Neighborhood Association, Eliot Neighbor Hood Association, Community Peace Collaborative, Lloyd Business Association, Downtown Security Network, Portland Clean and Safe, Organized Retail Crime Association Oregon (ORCAOR), and Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center (POIC).

The Rockwood DDA serves as an example of the kind of community engagement carried out by MAAPS DDAs. The Rockwood DDA is not located inside any community-based organizations, but they work very closely with many of them. Most of their contacts are through the East

Metro Outreach Prevention Intervention (EMOPI) out of the City of Gresham. They have had community outreach events with Dads Helping Dads, Liongevity, Going Home II and POIC. An example is an event at Rockwood Market, hosted by Liongevity, in which different community partners including the Rockwood DDA presented on different issues affecting the community and how to work together to solve those problems. There was tabling, multiple speakers, games and food for the community.

The Rockwood DDA also:

- Works with the City of Gresham's Ceasefire program. The goal of the program is to reduce gun violence in Gresham. They work hand in hand with EMOPI, the Gresham Police Department, Multnomah County Parole and Probation, Oregon Youth Authority, Multnomah County Juvenile Department and other community partners to meet that goal.
- Attends meeting at Portland Community College's East Campus bi-monthly to discuss different community safety issues with other community partners. In attendance are members from APANO, SE 82nd Community Safety Collective, City of Portland, Oregon Department of Transportation and other smaller organizations.
- Attends different neighborhood association events, including the Madison South Neighborhood association meetings and the Rockwood Neighborhood association meetings.

**b. Have they ever been located in a community-based organization?**

- i. Yes, we currently co-locate within the Rosewood Initiative, and have previously had space at Transition Projects. We've also considered co-locating opportunities with City Team, though no firm plans have been developed.

**c. Regarding the community contact statistics, how many of those are police officers or victims that are involved in cases?**

- i. None are police contacts and very few are victims of already open cases. We don't count police contacts as community contacts. Many community contacts are for victims of crime where we don't currently have an open case or people seeking general information about the criminal justice system. There is a lot of confusion as to what the District Attorney's Office actually does, so we see people from all walks of life seeking some type of legal help. Although we may not be able to help with all legal issues due to our ethical obligations, we still provide direct referrals to other community-based organizations that can help. For example, we see a lot of people asking for help with family law issues (divorce/custody) or eviction. We occasionally refer small business owners to legal

resources and clinics that can help with contract disputes, establishing nonprofit status, etc.

**d. How many cases have been referred to the restorative justice program from the MAAPS unit?**

- i. None, this is not how cases flow through these programs. Restorative justice cases come in via conventional prosecution processes (i.e., custody case intake). A case created via a MAAPS contact may be eligible for restorative justice consideration, but it's not a referral process.

**e. How many expungements has MAAPS performed? How many warrant lifts?**

- i. MAAPS DDAs do not perform expungements, but they do provide information on them at all community events and offer a detailed packet on how to complete them.
- ii. MAAPS DDAs do conducted warrant lifts on non-BM 11 cases. If they can't do a warrant lift, they work with the person to get them a future court date to lift the warrant. When we encounter an old warrant on a low-level case, it is often reviewed for dismissal. MAAPS DDAs have reviewed over 100 cases for warrant lifts in the last year, and have dismissed 26 cases where prosecution was no longer necessary or viable. We have several direct examples of this helping individuals attain housing, employment, and/or treatment.

**f. Regarding the referrals to services, were those for victims, or other community members? Were those made by MAAPS DDA's or victim's advocates? How do those referrals differ from normal referrals made outside of that unit?**

- i. MAAPS DDAs do not have Victim Advocates with them in the community. Any referrals made out in the community, to victims or general members of the community, are made by MAAPS DDAs. The referrals are different due to the nature of being out in the community meeting individuals with varied needs. Because of grant program restrictions and program design, our Victim Advocates focus on victims of initiated criminal cases. If someone has not yet officially been designated as a "victim," they are ineligible for certain services. We often support people impacted by crime who do not wish to be "victims" in a criminal case, and offer them information and service referrals outside of the criminal justice system.

**8. Strategic Prosecution and Services Unit (SPSU) – Program #15206**

**a. Where do you get the data for this program?**

- i. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.

**b. What efforts do MCDA DDA's make (specifically) to ensure individuals go to culturally specific treatment, or make community/family support connections?**

- i. While we do not directly supervise defendants, MCDA does propose sentencing orders that include culturally responsive services, behavioral health assessments, substance use disorder evaluation and treatment, and a host of other types of support, which is then implemented and managed by the Department of Community Justice. We use scientifically validated assessment tools to help us understand the specific needs of each defendant. We also depend greatly on mitigation provided by defense attorneys to paint a more complete picture of each defendant's strengths and challenges.

Relatedly, MAAPs Old Town DDA attends a monthly meeting with the Behavioral Health Unit of the Portland Police Bureau that is attended by social workers, members of various community organizations, and officers with the Portland Police Bureau. The meeting focuses on individuals in the Portland community who are experiencing mental health crisis due to mental illness, alcohol, and/or substances, with a focus on providing those individuals with access to mental health and/or addiction treatment services that, in many cases, are culturally specific.

**c. How often are individuals prosecuted by SPSU DDA's going to prison vs. individuals prosecuted by other units that handle comparable cases?**

- i. SPSU cases tend to resolve in prison where a Ballot Measure 11 charge is the lead charge as often as the rest of the units in the office. We also recommend treatment courts like START or Mental Health Court at a slightly higher rate when compared to our minor felony units when dealing with the same lead charges. This question is necessarily complicated by the fact that SPSU defendants have more complex and numerous charges and prior convictions, so it's very hard to give an 'apples to apples' comparison.

**d. What number of contacts is necessary before an individual is "flagged" to be prosecuted by this unit?**

- i. There is no set number.

**1. Are all of those "contacts" criminal?**

- a. No. This was discussed and answered on 5/15.  
Depending on the data we are accessing, we can see

a variety of unplanned system contacts, including 911 calls. While our office ultimately focuses on the criminal activity, information gleaned from those unplanned system contacts, such as overdoses or welfare checks, can point to an individual's level of need, the necessity of intervention, and resources they might need to improve their welfare.

**2. Do they include when someone is a witness or victim?**

- a. Not generally, but those things could be factors we consider at different points in the processing of the information. We have, at different points, done data runs for these types of contacts, but it confuses the data in a way that makes it difficult to organize.

**3. What counts as law enforcement contact for one to be labeled as a "chronic offender"?**

- a. When there is probable cause to make an arrest.

**e. Does SPSU keep a list of these "high system utilizers"? If so, can you release the racial demographics of the members of that list?**

- i. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.

**f. Where do you get the data for this program and what data are you looking for?**

- i. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.

**9. Justice Integrity Unit**

**a. There is no narrative re: expungements in this Program Offer, please share what you expect this unit to do regarding expungements**

- i. Our review of [PO 15021 – Justice Integrity Unit](#) shows information about the role of the unit in expungements.

**b. Demographics: Can they produce the demographic data that they track in arraignments? Why is that not on a public facing dashboard? How is that data used to inform DDA's release arguments?**

- i. We do not track demographic data during arraignments. It is not on the public facing dashboard because that data is not collected. Making different release arguments for defendants similar except for their demographics would be unconstitutional.

**C. How will JIU deputies be able to process expungement and SB 819 petitions if they have all of the same responsibilities of the pretrial unit, with no additional FTE?**

- i. See the snip below of the technical detail from PO 15021 – Justice Integrity Unit. As can be seen in Significant Program Changes (highlighted in yellow), 9.60 FTE were moved from the Pre-Trial Unit to JIU. That variance is not shown in the year-over-year Revenue/Expense Detail (highlighted in green) due to how the positions were “cross walked” in the technical budget detail.

There are currently DDAs in JIU assigned to process set aside petitions. That is a core JIU function and a statutory mandate for the District Attorney. See ORS 137.225(2). The assumption of positions and duties from the Pre-Trial Unit does not prevent us from doing this work. In fact, having the ability to spread the workload over more DDAs provides a more robust buffer to avoid a backlog from occurring when DDAs transfers to another unit or are on leave. JIU has worked hard this year since the reorganization and currently has no overdue reviews (i.e., we are currently meeting our 120-day deadline to review all expungement matters).

Processing 819 petitions is not a statutory mandate, and if funding is cut from core prosecutorial functions, we will need to take a hard look at whether we are able to continue devoting resources to that work.

### Revenue/Expense Detail

	Adopted General Fund	Adopted Other Funds	Proposed General Fund	Proposed Other Funds
<b>Program Expenses</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>2026</b>	<b>2026</b>
Personnel	\$2,816,758	\$380,843	\$2,818,488	\$391,704
Materials & Supplies	\$16,378	\$0	\$4,498	\$0
Internal Services	\$64,257	\$46,646	\$40,295	\$47,742
<b>Total GF/non-GF</b>	<b>\$2,897,393</b>	<b>\$427,489</b>	<b>\$2,863,281</b>	<b>\$439,446</b>
<b>Program Total:</b>	<b>\$3,324,882</b>		<b>\$3,302,727</b>	
<b>Program FTE</b>	<b>14.14</b>	2.46	<b>14.13</b>	2.47

<b>Program Revenues</b>				
Intergovernmental	\$0	\$427,489	\$0	\$439,446
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$427,489</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$439,446</b>

### Explanation of Revenues

This program generates \$47,742 in indirect revenues.

Fed/State Funding:

\$225,553 - Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG-PPB). Continuous grant that partially funds 0.46 FTE of a DDA4 plus indirect expense.

\$213,893 - Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG-CJC). Funds 2.00 FTE administrative staff, indirect not allowed.

Award of \$469,128 that began 2/01/24 and expected to extend through 9/30/26.

### Significant Program Changes

Last Year this program was: FY 2025: 15021 Justice Integrity Unit

During Mid-Fiscal Year FY 2025, the Justice Integrity Unit (JIU) reorganized by taking on 9.60 FTE and duties from the now-dissolved Pretrial Unit. The work absorbed advances the mission of JIU and is more efficiently supervised under its umbrella. New duties include arraignments, public records provision, probation violation hearings, and matters relating to inter-state coordination with other prosecuting authorities.

Also, to more align with operations, 1.00 FTE DDA was moved from the Body Worn Cameras (BWC) program offer to this program offer.

### d. How many expungements and SB 819 have been done since January 2025?

- i. Please see the response to #6 above regarding expungements. Between Jan 1, 2025 and May 13, 2025, JIU completed 77 SB 819 petition reviews.

### 1. How will they prevent another backlog of expungement petitions without FTE dedicated to processing those petitions?

- a. Please see the response to #6 above.

**10. Please share salaries of your executive team and level 4 deputies from FY24, FY25, and FY26 proposed budget?**

MCDA Leadership Base Wages (60000) FY 2024 - FY 2026					
Position	Job Profile	Working Title	FY 2024 Adopted	FY 2025 Adopted	FY 2026 Proposed
<b>Non-Represented/Elected Official Staff</b>					
704354	District Attorney	District Attorney	98,372	111,779	114,797
702416	Deputy District Attorney First Assistant	First Assistant to the District Attorney	262,715	280,609	302,308
700562	Deputy District Attorney Chief	Chief Deputy District Attorney	259,037	273,994	281,190
703118	Deputy District Attorney Chief	Chief Deputy District Attorney	259,037	273,994	275,031
704617	Deputy District Attorney Chief	Chief Deputy District Attorney	259,037	273,994	281,190
749038	Staff Assistant	General Counsel			240,000
742379	Staff Assistant	Chief of Staff to the District Attorney <sup>1</sup>	220,321	235,327	201,571
746254 <sup>2</sup>	Staff Assistant	Communications Director	150,000	154,763	174,539
748901 <sup>3</sup>	Staff Assistant	Executive Coordinator	97,921	104,590	111,070
702993	District Attorney Investigator Chief	Chief Investigator	140,595	150,171	158,240
700696	District Attorney Administrative Manager	Finance Manager	150,395	155,960	159,553
712607	Division Director 2 <sup>4</sup>	Operations Director	137,687	160,217	168,825
<b>Multnomah County Prosecuting Attorney's Association (wages established by collective bargaining agreement)</b>					
701798	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	230,162	238,678	214,211
702062	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	200,312	231,726	199,957
702150	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	226,810	235,202	240,628
702564	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	206,935	225,295	237,072
702640	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	198,705	215,461	232,365
703098	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	230,162	238,678	244,184
703872	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	230,162	238,678	244,184
703906	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	226,810	235,202	191,210
704501	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	223,458	235,202	237,072
706152	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	223,458	235,202	237,072
707146 <sup>5</sup>	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	141,434	140,209	237,072
710283	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	207,777	218,081	234,248
710285	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	230,162	238,678	237,072
744114	Deputy District Attorney 4	Senior Deputy District Attorney	219,030	231,726	237,071

<sup>1</sup> Prior working title was Policy Advisor

<sup>2</sup> Was position number 719321 in FY 2024

<sup>3</sup> Was position number 702627 in FY 2024 and FY 2025

<sup>4</sup> Reclassified from District Attorney Administrative Manager in FY 2025

<sup>5</sup> Reclassified from Deputy District Attorney 2 in FY 2025

**11. What are the expected funding amounts from the City of Portland, state, and federal government?**

FY 2026 MCDA Other Funds (Local, State, & Federal)				
PO Number	PO Name	Funder	Grant Program	Amount
15013	Research & Planning Unit	State of Oregon	HB 3194 (Justice Reinvestment)	169,839
15015	Victim Assistance Program	Federal	Victims of Crime Act	776,881
		State of Oregon	County Assessment Function Funding (CAFF) & Unitary Assessment	563,830
		Federal	Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Office for Victims of Crime (OVC)	32,118
		Federal	Byrne Discretionary Community Project	24,690
15021	Justice Integrity Unit	Federal thru Portland Police Bureau	Justice Assistance Grant	225,553
		Federal thru State of Oregon	Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant	213,893
15102	Domestic Violence Unit	Federal thru State of Oregon	Violence Against Women Act	133,317
15103	Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) - Child Abuse Unit	State of Oregon	Child Abuse Multidisciplinary Intervention	949,577
15203	Unit A/B - Property/Drugs	State of Oregon	Child Abuse Multidisciplinary Intervention	78,733
15206	Strategic Prosecution & Services Unit	Federal	Shepard and Byrd Hate Crimes Program	105,834
15207	MCDA Access Attorney Program (MAAP)	Gresham Police Department	N/A	144,033
		Portland Police Bureau	N/A	144,033
		Port of Portland	N/A	237,713
		TriMet	N/A	498,570
15208	Child Support Enforcement	Federal	Child Support Enforcement	3,452,513
		State of Oregon	Child Support Enforcement	238,857
15209	Treatment Court Unit	State of Oregon	HB 3194 (Justice Reinvestment)	537,323
		State of Oregon	Specialty Courts Grant Program (START)	74,976
		State of Oregon	Specialty Courts Grant Program (STEP)	125,325
15302	Unit C	Federal	Byrne Discretionary Community Project	93,062
15402	Investigations Unit	Gresham Police Department	N/A	159,536
		Portland Police Bureau	N/A	531,335
		TriMet	N/A	334,006
		Federal	Shepard and Byrd Hate Crimes Program	86,126
				9,931,673

**12. In multiple POs (example PO 15001) you have significant increases in internal services, why is this?**

- a. This is due to the reorganization. Overall, internal services costs have decreased year-over-year for MCDA.

MCDA Internal Service Costs FY 2025 - FY 2026			
Ledger Account	FY 2025 Revised	FY 2026 Proposed	Difference
Internal Service Data Processing	1,188,144	1,192,530	4,386
Internal Service Distribution	112,590	117,614	5,024
Internal Service Enhanced Building Services	131,020	340,816	209,796
Internal Service Facilities & Property Management	2,694,666	2,379,885	(314,781)
Internal Service Fleet Services	206,950	237,768	30,818
Internal Service Motor Pool	9,530	519	(9,011)
Internal Service Telecommunications	206,922	53,835	(153,087)
Internal Service Records	347,915	351,862	3,947
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,897,737</b>	<b>4,674,829</b>	<b>(222,908)</b>

**13. During your budget presentation, there was discussion about failure to appear rates. What is the failure to appear rate of law enforcement?**

- a. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.

**14. Public defenders see an ~30% dismissal rate at court, often due to evidence found from cameras, how can this be improved to dismiss earlier and save time for both DAs and public defenders?**

- a. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.

**15. Division I Administration (PO 15100) - what are the outcomes for the misdemeanor cases offered specialty court diversion so much lower when there is an increase in this budget?**

- a. Response provided during follow-up session on 5/15. Please let us know if additional information is needed.