

CCJMC - Carson City Justice/Municipal Courts
LVMC - Las Vegas Municipal Court
RMC - Reno Municipal Court
HMC - Henderson Municipal Court

DTJC - Dayton Township Justice Court
HTJC - Henderson Township Justice Court
LVTJC - Las Vegas Township Justice Court
NLVTJC - North Las Vegas Township Justice Court
STJC - Sparks Township Justice Court
TTJC - Tonopah Township Justice Court

1. For each of the last two 2 fiscal years (FY2016 and FY2017), please indicate the total amount of money assessed and collected by your court for traffic fines, including, without limitation, fines relating to violations of laws relating to vehicle registration, driver's licenses and motor vehicle insurance. [Please do not include any administrative assessment fees imposed and collected or bail forfeiture in these numbers]

(a) Of that total amount, how much was remitted to the State Treasury pursuant to NRS 176.265 requiring all fines imposed and collected for a violation of a penal provision of NRS to be paid into the State Treasury?

CCJMC:

FY 2016

Assessed:	\$212,725.00
Collected:	\$215,908.25

FY 2017

Assessed:	\$261,969.00
Collected:	\$230,113.50

- Assessed amounts do not include fines dismissed and/or waived.
- Collected amounts include installment payments by defendants that were established in previous fiscal years. Additionally, collected amounts will include receipts related to warrants for failing to appear to pay fines which were issued in previous fiscal years.
- Fines include all misdemeanor traffic cases related to traffic laws under NRS 484.

Amounts remitted to State Treasury pursuant to NRS 176.265:

FY 2016:	\$19,321
FY 2017:	\$11,271

LVMC:

FY 2016

Collected: \$12,273,978.37

FY 2017

Collected: \$12,264,158.40

- The Las Vegas Municipal Court (LVMC) does not have the capability to record assessed fines with our current case management software. In addition, we do not separate criminal and traffic when recording fine revenue, therefore we can only provide net fine revenue posted in fiscal years 16 and 17.

Amount remitted to State Treasury pursuant to NRS 176.265: \$0

- Pursuant to NRS 5.050, municipal courts do not have jurisdiction over cases involving violations of state law. Thus, any fine collected by a municipal court would be characterized as a fine imposed for an ordinance violation and would not be required to be remitted to the State Treasury. The amount of such fines would be remitted to the city.

RMC:

FY 2016

Assessed: \$1,732,541.50

Collected: \$1,080,809.41

FY 2017

Assessed: \$1,419,469.00

Collected: \$823,104.17

- These amounts do not include Driving Under the Influence (DUI) charges, which are processed as criminal offenses in Reno Municipal Court.

Amount remitted to State Treasury pursuant to NRS 176.265: \$0

- Pursuant to NRS 5.050, municipal courts do not have jurisdiction over cases involving violations of state law. Thus, any fine collected by a municipal court would be characterized as a fine imposed for an ordinance violation and would not be required to be remitted to the State Treasury. The amount of such fines would be remitted to the city.

HMC:

FY 2016: \$5,491,416.28

FY 2017: \$5,518,079.86

FY 2018: \$5,132,176.12

Amount remitted to State Treasury pursuant to NRS 176.265: \$0

- Pursuant to NRS 5.050, municipal courts do not have jurisdiction over cases involving violations of state law. Thus, any fine collected by a municipal court would be characterized as a fine imposed for an ordinance violation and would not be required to be remitted to the State Treasury. The amount of such fines would be remitted to the city.

DTJC:

FY 2017:

Assessed: \$71,447

Collected:

Lyon County Fines collected: \$28,970

State Fines collected: \$18,837

Fines Dismissed: \$19,400

FY 2018

Assessed: \$85,150

Collected:

Lyon County Fines collected: \$32,971

State Fines collected: \$17,586

Fines Dismissed: \$14,550

- Dismissed fines are from Jail time/Community Service Work or Waiver of fines in the Interest of Justice.

Amount remitted to State Treasury pursuant to NRS 176.265: \$26,459

HTJC:

FY 2016 Collected: \$68,057.00

FY 2017 Collected: \$49,214.00

Amount remitted to State Treasury pursuant to NRS 176.265: 100%

LVTJC:

Assessed: Based on the limitations of our case management system, I cannot provide the total money assessed.

Collected: We are still working on this amount

NLVTJC:

FY 2016 Collected: \$187,482

FY 2017 Collected: \$209,964

Amount remitted to State Treasury pursuant to NRS 176.265: 100%

STJC:

FY 2016

Washoe County Fines Assessed: \$347,410

Washoe County Fines Collected: \$186,283

State Fines Assessed: \$211,513

State Fines Collected: \$133,049

FY 2017

Washoe County Fines Assessed: \$341,420

Washoe County Fines Collected: \$176,342

State Fines Assessed: \$225,613

State Fines Collected: \$159,272

Amount remitted to State Treasury pursuant to NRS 176.265:

FY 2016

State Fines: \$133,049

FY 2017

State Fines: \$159,272

TTJC:

FY 2016

Assessed: \$20,575

Collected: \$11,795

Amount remitted to State Treasury pursuant to NRS 176.265: \$325

FY 2017

Assessed: \$72,190

Collected: \$54,206

Amount remitted to State Treasury pursuant to NRS 176.265: \$9,416

2. Please identify any fees that your court may charge in relation to a traffic offense, other than the administrative assessment fees. Please include a statement of:

- (a) What the fee is called;**
- (b) The purpose for which the fee is imposed;**
- (c) The amount of the fee (provide a range, if appropriate);**
- (d) The legal authority for imposing the fee;**
- (e) A breakdown of the amount of revenue collected for each type of fee for each of the last two fiscal years (FY2016 and FY2017); and**
- (f) For any fees assessed and collected that are not expressly authorized by NRS 176.059, 176.0611, 176.0613 or 176.0623, the order in which a partial payment is applied to the additional fees if an offender makes a partial payment (i.e. a statement of whether partial payments are applied to the additional fees before or after the statutory fines and administrative assessments are satisfied).**

CCJMC:

Applicable only to DUI offenses:

Chemical Analysis Fee - \$60 - NRS 484C.510

DUI Specialty Court Fee - \$100 - NRS 484C.515

Amount collected:

FY 2016 Chemical Analysis Fee: \$16,080

FY 2016 DUI Specialty Court Fee: \$19,420

FY 2017 Chemical Analysis Fee: \$19,323

FY 2017 DUI Specialty Court Fee: \$26,065

Order of Applying Partial Payments: The automated distribution hierarchy in the court's case management system is set up to have all fees under NRS 176.059 (Administrative Assessment) paid in full before distributing to the chemical analysis fee and DUI Specialty Court Fee.

LVMC:

Name of Fee: Transaction Fee for payments with credit card

Purpose of Fee: A combined fee representing the cost of credit card banking fees and the technology (hardware, software and programming) necessary to provide the service.

Amount of Fee: \$2.50 prior to July 1, 2018; \$4.00 after June 30, 2018

Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 354.770 (Fee for payments by credit card, debit card or electronic transfer of money); 354.790 (Fee for expedited or convenient service); and the inherent power of the court under *Blackjack Bonding v. City of Las Vegas Mun. Court*. 116 Nev. 1213, 14 P.3d 1275 (2000)

Amount Collected:

FY16, NRS 354.770 (Payment by credit or debit or electronic transfer): \$159,091.73

FY16, NRS 354.790 (Fee for expedited or convenient service): \$106,873.00

FY17, NRS 354.770 (Payment by credit or debit or electronic transfer): \$167,731.50

FY17, NRS 354.790 (Fee for expedited or convenient service): \$111,821.00

RMC: (Order in Which Payments Applied Provided in Attachment)

Name of Fee: Surety Bond Fee
Purpose of Fee: Compensation of Crime Victims
Amount of Fee: \$50
Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 178.518
Amount Collected:
 FY16, \$1,000
 FY17, \$550

Name of Fee: Cash Bail Processing Fee
Purpose of Fee: Offset cost of processing bail
Amount of Fee: \$50
Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent Power of Court
Amount Collected:
 FY 16: \$3,100
 FY 17: \$3,600

Name of Fee: Chemical Analysis Fee
Purpose of Fee: Defray cost of forensic lab
Amount of Fee: \$60
Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 484C.510
Amount Collected:
 FY16: \$60
 FY17: \$60

•Information reported for this fee does not include chemical analysis fee imposed for DUI's

Name of Fee: Collection Fee
Purpose of Fee: Covers cost of contracting with collection agency to collect unpaid monies
Amount of Fee: \$100
Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 176.064
Amount Collected:
 FY16: \$21,372.50
 FY17: \$13,067.42

Name of Fee: Court Construction Fee (Administrative Assessment)
Purpose of Fee: Covers cost of maintaining court facilities
Amount of Fee: \$10
Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 176.0611
Amount Collected:
 FY16: \$93,258.34
 FY17: \$74,175.00

Name of Fee: Credit Card Transaction Fee
Purpose of Fee: Covers external fee of processing credit cards
Amount of Fee: \$3
Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 1.113
Amount Collected:
 FY16: \$6
 FY17: \$0

Name of Fee: Payment Plan Fee
Purpose of Fee: Defrays administrative cost of establishing payment plans
Amount of Fee: \$25-\$100
Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$56,500.69

FY17: \$32,418.06

Name of Fee: Late Payment Fee

Purpose of Fee: Defrays administrative cost of modifying payment plans and due dates

Amount of Fee: \$25

Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 5.073; Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$21,863.73

FY17: \$19,738.49

Name of Fee: Legal Defender Fee

Purpose of Fee: Cover cost of public defender when defendant becomes able to pay cost

Amount of Fee: Varies based on financial resources of defendant and nature of burden

Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 178.3975

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$453

FY17: \$300

Name of Fee: NSF Fee (Insufficient Funds)

Purpose of Fee: Covers cost of processing returned checks

Amount of Fee: \$30

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$125

FY17: \$90

Name of Fee: Miscellaneous (Copy Fee, Certified Copy Fee, Notice of Appeal Fee)

Purpose of Fee: Covers administrative cost of processing paperwork and making copies

Amount of Fee: Varies

Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 4.060, 5.073; Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$175.50

FY17: \$90

Name of Fee: Extension Fee (Discontinued in FY16)

Purpose of Fee: Cover administrative costs

Amount of Fee: \$10

Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 5.073; Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$8.94

FY17: \$0 (Discontinued)

Name of Fee: Security Fee (Discontinued in FY16)

Purpose of Fee: Purchase of needed security equipment

Amount of Fee: \$3

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$3

FY17: \$0

Name of Fee: Supervision Fee

Purpose of Fee: Defrays cost of court-ordered probation

Amount of Fee: \$20

Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 211A.130

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$20

FY17: \$65

Name of Fee: Warrant Fee

Purpose of Fee: Defray cost of processing a warrant

Amount of Fee \$250

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$250

FY17: \$0

HMC:

Name of Fee: Time Payment Setup Fee (TPSF)

Purpose of Fee: Offset administrative costs associated with managing/monitoring payment files

Amount of Fee \$50

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court to impose reasonable fees

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$264,491.50

FY17: \$263,642.45

FY18: \$250,156.00

Name of Fee: Non-sufficient Funds Fee (NSF)

Purpose of Fee: Recoup bank fees imposed as a result of NSF check and offset administrative costs of processing the NSF in the case

Amount of Fee \$25

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court to impose reasonable fees

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$3,712

FY17: \$3,625

FY18: \$3,975

Name of Fee: Fine Enforcement Fee (ENF)

Purpose of Fee: Offset collections costs used by the court for internal efforts via public records database companies, to pay for collections staff salaries and to pay for collection fees for external collection agencies

Amount of Fee \$100

Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 176.064

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$379,085.94

FY17: \$389,751.90

FY18: \$375,144.25

Order In Which Payments are Applied to Fees:

Time Payment Setup Fee collected first, then Administrative Assessments then Fines

NSF Fee is collected first upon next payment

Enforcement Fee is collected first then Administrative Assessments then Fines

• Court stated: "Upon review of various NRS related to fines, administrative assessments, and collections, [court was] unable to locate language governing the collection order of fees imposed outside those expressly authorized

DTJC:

Name of Fee: Late Fee

Purpose of Fee: Imposed when payment past due 30 days or when person fails to appear

Amount of Fee \$10

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court to impose reasonable fees

Amount Collected:

FY17: \$3,715

FY18: \$5,525

Order in Which Partial Payment Applied to Fee: Last

Name of Fee: Payment Plan Fee

Purpose of Fee: Imposed when person requests a payment plan

Amount of Fee \$25; if fines paid in full within 10 days court clerk will waive fee

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court to impose reasonable fees

Amount Collected:

FY17: \$4,664

FY18: \$3,975

Order in Which Partial Payment Applied to Fee: Last

HTJC:

Name of Fee: Payment Plan Fee

Purpose of Fee: Imposed when defendant placed on payment plan

Amount of Fee \$25

Legal Authority for Fee:

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$10,355

FY17: \$13,422

Name of Fee: Collection Fee

Purpose of Fee: Recover cost of collection efforts

Amount of Fee \$100

Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 176.064

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$81,125

FY17: \$74,128.47

Name of Fee: Warrant Fee

Purpose of Fee: Imposed for failure to appear or pay

Amount of Fee \$178

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$145,638

FY17: \$131,967

Name of Fee: Convenience Fee

Purpose of Fee: Imposed for online payments made by debit or credit card to recover the costs imposed by the bank and payment processor

Amount of Fee 2.2% of Payment Amount

Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 1.113 and 354.770

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$12,747.34

FY17: \$19,186.04

Order In Which Payments are Applied to Fees:

Payment Plan fees

Collection Fees are paid first under NRS 176.064(4)(d) to satisfy the fees charged by the collection agency.

Warrant Fees are not expressly authorized by NRS; the Court's case management system has been coded to satisfy this fee last if partial payments are applied.

Convenience Fees are collected by the payment processor at the time of the transaction

LVTJC:

Name of Fee: Warrant Administration Fee

Purpose of Fee: Recoup some of the administrative costs associated with traffic warrants

Amount of Fee \$150

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$2,201,670.97

FY17: \$2,760,719.75

Name of Fee: Compliance Fee (Collection Fee)

Purpose of Fee: Recoup some of the administrative costs associated with sending case to collections

Amount of Fee \$100

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$1,128,632.64

FY17: \$1,455,761.10

Name of Fee: Traffic Court Fee Level 1

Purpose of Fee: Allow defendants to pay a fee to the court in lieu of paying for and completing five-hour traffic school class via a third-party to obtain the benefit of demerit point reduction

Amount of Fee \$100

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$1,972,620.01

FY17: \$2,202,830.99

Name of Fee: Traffic Court Fee Level 2

Purpose of Fee: Allow defendants to pay a fee to the court in lieu of paying for and completing eight-hour traffic school class via a third-party to obtain the benefit of demerit point reduction

Amount of Fee \$200

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$236,058

FY17: \$274,692

Name of Fee: Payment Plan Transaction Fee

Purpose of Fee: Allow defendants to pay total amount due in installments

Amount of Fee \$50

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$493,564.85

FY17: \$503,994.08

Order In Which Payments are Applied to Fees: See Fee Code Priority Provided by Court

NLVTJC:

Name of Fee: Warrant Fee
Purpose of Fee: **Imposed for failure to appear or pay**
Amount of Fee \$100
Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court
Amount Collected:
FY16: \$26,582.36
FY17: \$20,626

Name of Fee: Collection Fee
Purpose of Fee: **Recover cost of collection efforts**
Amount of Fee \$100
Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 176.064
Amount Collected:
FY16: \$23,810
FY17: \$18,075

Name of Fee: Convenience Fee
Purpose of Fee: **Recover costs imposed by bank or payment processor for payments made by debit or credit card**
Amount of Fee 2.2% of payment amount
Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 1.113 and 354.770
Amount Collected:
FY16: \$4,401.07
FY17: \$4.351

Order In Which Payments are Applied to Fees:

Warrant Fees are not expressly authorized by NRS; the Court's case management system has been coded to satisfy this fee last if partial payments are applied.

Collection Fees are paid first under NRS 176.064(4)(d) to satisfy the fees charged by the collection agency.

Convenience Fees are collected by the payment processor at the time of the transaction.

STJC:

Name of Fee: Payment Plan
Amount of Fee \$25-\$100 Based on Amount Owed
Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court
Amount Collected:
FY16: \$13,505
FY17: \$12,503

Name of Fee: Partial PMT Plan
Amount of Fee \$55-\$100 Based on Number of Defaults
Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court
Amount Collected:
FY16: \$3,151
FY17: \$55

Name of Fee: Community Service-SMC; Community Service
Amount of Fee \$10-\$25

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$506

FY17: \$0

Name of Fee: Late Payment Fee

Amount of Fee \$25

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$33,132

FY17: \$36,355

Name of Fee: Failure to Appear (FTA) Fee

Amount of Fee \$35

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$33,131

FY17: \$0

Name of Fee: Miscellaneous Fees Ordered by Judge

Amount of Fee \$10-\$250

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$15,912

FY17: \$17,470

Name of Fee: Correction Tickets/Proof Documents

Amount of Fee \$30

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$1,310

FY17: \$1,430

Name of Fee: Extension Fee Programs/PMTS

Amount of Fee \$10

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$2,118

FY17: \$2,221

Name of Fee: Extension Fee - Second Programs/ PMTS

Purpose of Fee: Allow defendants to pay a fee to the court in lieu of paying for and completing five-hour traffic school class via a third-party to obtain the benefit of demerit point reduction

Amount of Fee \$25

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$1,961

FY17: \$1,581

Name of Fee: Bench Warrant Fee

Amount of Fee \$100

Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court

Amount Collected:

FY16: \$25,221

FY17: \$45,941

Order In Which Payments are Applied to Fees: Payments applied to these fees after administrative assessments imposed pursuant to NRS 176.059-176.0623 and special court fee imposed for DUI.

TTJC:

Name of Fee: Payment Agreement Fee
Purpose of Fee: Imposed when defendant enters into payment agreement
Amount of Fee \$25 by mail; \$10 in person
Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court
Amount Collected:
FY16: \$1,985
FY17: \$3,020

Name of Fee: Convenience Fee
Purpose of Fee: Convenience of using credit or debit card to make payments
Amount of Fee 3% of payment amount
Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 1.113
Amount Collected:
FY16: \$10,711
FY17: \$5,980

Name of Fee: Failure to Appear, Failure to Pay, Failure to Comply Late Fee
Purpose of Fee: Collection fee to offset cost for preparing, mailing, tracking and maintaining a failure to appear notice for a scheduled hearing, failure to comply with terms of judgment, failure to pay fine or fees as ordered by the court
Amount of Fee \$25
Legal Authority for Fee: NRS 176.064
Amount Collected:
FY16: \$14,360
FY17: \$15,840

Name of Fee: Bench Warrant Fee
Purpose of Fee: Collection fee to offset cost to court of preparing, issuing, tracking and clearing bench warrants
Amount of Fee \$200 for Failure to Appear; \$100 for Failure to Pay; \$100 for Failure to Comply
Legal Authority for Fee: Inherent power of the court; NRS 176.064
Amount Collected:
FY16: \$44,396.50
FY17: \$51,616.50

Order In Which Payments are Applied to Fees: Payments applied to these fees after administrative assessments imposed pursuant to NRS 176.059-176.0623 and fines have been paid in full.

3. For each of the last two fiscal years (FY2016 and FY2017), please indicate how much revenue your court has collected from bail forfeitures for traffic offenses.

(a) To what governmental entity or entities have the bail forfeitures been remitted and to which governmental fund have the bail forfeitures been deposited?

CCJMC:

FY 2016: \$299,977.00

FY 2017: \$305,109.00

Governmental Fund in which Deposited: Carson City General Fund

LVMC:

FY 2016: \$689,718.50

FY 2017: \$540,481

Governmental Fund in which Deposited: City of Las Vegas General Fund

Note: LVMC does not separate criminal and traffic when recording bail forfeiture, therefore we can only provide net fine bail forfeiture posted in fiscal years 16 and 17.

RMC:

RMC does not have an electronic report that accurately captures bail forfeitures for traffic offenses, but our estimates are as follows: FY2016 - \$580,000, FY2017 - \$594,000

All bail forfeitures for traffic offenses are submitted to the City of Reno.

HMC:

HMC's case management system is set up such that money posted as "bail" are converted to "fines" and are reported in the figures set forth in question #1.

Amounts converted to "fines" are remitted to City of Henderson General Fund

DTJC:

FY 2016: \$88,748

FY 2017: \$129,228

Governmental Fund in which Deposited: Lyon County

Note: Amounts above reflect both traffic and other criminal cases. Reports do not breakdown between traffic and other criminal cases.

HTJC:

FY 2016: \$1,141,146.60

FY 2017: \$1,148,655.53

Governmental Fund in which Deposited: Clark County General Fund

Note: Amounts above reflect both traffic and other criminal cases. Reports do not breakdown between traffic and other criminal cases.

LVTJC:

FY 2016 Cash: \$12,366,050.16

FY 2016 Bond: \$3,488

FY 2017 Cash: \$14,063,613.78

FY 2017 Bond \$9,900

Governmental Fund in which Deposited: Unknown

NLVTJC:

FY 2016: \$112,108.60

FY 2017: \$96,413.68

Governmental Fund in which Deposited: Clark County General Fund.

STJC:

FY 2016 County: \$223,758

FY 2016 State: \$133,050

FY 2017 County: \$176,342

FY 2017 State: \$159,272

Governmental Fund in which Deposited: State amounts go to State Court Forfeiture GL; County amounts go to County Court Forfeiture GL

TTJC:

FY 2016: \$101,033

FY 2017: \$345,077.11

Governmental Fund in which Deposited: Nye County General Fund

4. Do you have a fine and/or bail schedule, which has either been created internally or provided by a district or city attorney's office or otherwise, for traffic offenses that provides guidance as to the amount of the fine, whether a set amount or a range? If so, please provide a copy of that fine and/or bail schedule.

CCJMC:

See attached Bail Schedule

LVMC:

Located online at

<https://www.lasvegasnevada.gov/cs/groups/public/documents/document/chjk/mda5/~edisp/prd009307.pdf>

RMC:

See attached Traffic Fine Schedule

HMC:

Court sets the bail schedule for all offenses unless statutorily required. Bail for traffic offenses is generally set at the possible fine amount; however, the judge always has the right to impose any amount allowed for a misdemeanor offense.

DTJC:

Does not use a fine schedule.

HTJC:

See attached schedule

LVTJC:

See attachment

NLVTJC:

See attached Traffic Citation Matrix for Non-Moving Violations

STJC:

See attached Court Bail Schedule-Traffic with Administrative Order 2015-1, Washoe County Sheriff Bail Schedule Brazo's and NHP Bail Schedule Brazo's,

TTJC:

See attached schedule.

5. Does your court or your county or city, as applicable, utilize an outside collection agency to collect fines and fees? If so, please identify the name of the collection agency or agencies utilized over the last two fiscal years (FY2016 and FY2017).

CCJMC: AliianceOne

LVMC: Harris & Harris

RMC: Valley Collections

HMC: TSI

DTJC: Valley Collections

HTJC: NO – at present time Henderson Justice Court does not utilized an outside collection agency. However, County Courts have a contract with Valley Collection Services.

LVTJC: Harris & Harris, Ltd.

NLVTJC: Yes. Valley Collection Services.

STJC: See item 16

TTJC: Valley Collection Services

6. Does the court and/or collection agency distinguish between first party and third party collections?

CCJMC: No

LVMC: Yes

RMC: Yes

HMC: Yes, court is the first party collector and any contracted collection agency would be the third party collector

DTJC: Unknown

HTJC: Yes, the Court is the first party and only collector at this time.

LVTJC: Yes, the Las Vegas Justice Court and Harris & Harris, Ltd. distinguish between first party collections and third party collections. At 49 days delinquent, cases are sent to first party collections. At 121 days delinquent, cases are sent to 3rd party collections.

NLVTJC: Yes.

STJC: See item 16

TTJC: Yes

7. Over the last 5 fiscal years (FY13, FY14, FY15, FY16 and FY17), what is the internal collection rate for fines/fees assessed?

(a) What is the collection rate for fines/fees in first party collections?

(b) What is the collection rate for fines/fees in third party collections?

CCJMC:

Court does not distinguish between first and third party collections. Overall collections:

FY 13: Information not available

FY 14: Information not available

FY 15: Information not available

FY 16: 88.64% (Approximate)

FY 17: 86.97% (Approximate)

LVMC:

Due to system limitations in our current Case Management System we do not calculate collection rates.

RMC:

RMC can only provide a comprehensive collection rate, which includes both traffic and non-traffic offenses.

The rates below are first party collection percentages.

FY13 - Not available (legacy case management system).

FY14-71%

FY15-73%

FY16-68%

FYI7-66%

The rates below are third party collection percentages:

FY13 - 15 are not available.

FYI6-31%

FYI7-22%

HMC: No information provided

DTJC:

Calendar year 2016: \$34,976 (Includes all fees)

Calendar year 2017: \$36,965 (includes all fees)

HTJC: No response provided

LVTJC:

Overall collection rate:

2013, 2014 and 2015 10.9%

2016, 2017 and 2018 – Still working on this information

NLVTJC:

First Party Collections: 1.6%

Third Party Collections: 7.0%

STJC:

State First Party (Court):

FY13: 47%

FY14: 44%

FY15: 55%

FY16: 45%

FY17: 53%

State Third Party: NA

COUNTY First Party (Court):

FY13: 40%

FY14: 38%

FY15: 51%

FY16: 60%

FY17: 56%

County Third Party: NA

NOTE: SJC has a collection project progress and has a contract with Valley Collections for all County courts. The court estimated time of deployment is scheduled for October 2018.

TTJC: Unkown

8. Does your court conduct an assessment at any point to determine whether a fine is uncollectible such that the fine may be cancelled pursuant to NRS 176.059(3)?

(a) If yes, what criteria is used to make this determination?

(b) What amount of unpaid fines/fees have been deemed by the court to be uncollectible over the past two fiscal years (FY16 and FY17)?

CCJMC: No

LVMC:

Yes. Every July 1, all cases that have had no activity of any sort for a full 7 year period are purged as uncollectible under Judicial order, after review by the City Attorney. This data is inseparable from other fines and fees which have been waived or vacated under judicial discretion.

RMC:

Yes.

If a traffic fine has not been collected within the case retention timeframe, then the Court deems it as uncollectible and closes the case. Additionally, some cases may be deemed uncollectible by the bench and closed earlier.

The Uncollectible amounts are for both traffic and non-traffic offenses.

Uncollectible

FY16	FY17
\$5,442.15	\$4,030.00

HMC:

Fines may be declared uncollectible once the active warrant for failure to pay exceeds 7-years of inactivity. If so, the Court has a warrant purge process where the judges vacate the remaining outstanding fine/fee balance and the case is closed.

In FY16 and FY17, no amount of unpaid fines/fees have been deemed uncollectible

DTJC:

The court looks at failure to pay fines/ failure to appear warrants on a yearly basic. Based on age and interest of justice some warrant are purged at the discretion of the judge.

HTJC:

Criteria determining whether uncollectible:

- The citations must be in bench warrant / collection status;
- Have no activity for more than 7 years;
- The citation must be over 7 years old; and
- We have a warrant purged process that will vacate outstanding fine / fee balance and close the case yearly.

In FY16 and FY17, no amount of unpaid fines/fees have been deemed uncollectible

LVTJC:

No, the Las Vegas Justice Court does not presently conduct such an assessment. The last such assessment was conducted in 2011. Several citations were dismissed pursuant to Administrative Order

11-02. The criteria used to make this determination were: 1) Every reasonable effort had been made to locate the defendant; and 2) No contact had been made with the defendant in over five years.

NLVTJC:

No, however, the collection agency may make that determination and notify the court.

If the collection agency notifies us that a defendant is deceased or otherwise unable to pay, then it would be deemed uncollectible.

In FY16 and FY17, no amount of unpaid fines/fees have been deemed uncollectible

STJC:

Yes, Standard is 7 years on FTA/FTC/FTP warrants with no further violations in this court.

No amount has not met the standard of 7 years for uncollectable for FY16 or FY17

TTJC:

Yes, unpaid traffic warrants are purged after 10 years.

Amount deemed uncollectible in FY16 and FY is unknown.

9. NRS 176.085 authorizes the court to direct payment of fines/administrative assessment fees in installments if the amount due is not “within the defendant’s present ability to pay.” Does your court allow defendants to pay in installments?

(a) What criteria does your court use to determine whether the amount due is “within the defendant’s present ability to pay”?

CCJMC:

Yes, Defendants are required to complete a Financial Application/Affidavit. The Court has set guidelines of criteria for monthly installment amounts. Defendants usually state when they are on public assistance, social security, unemployment, disability, unemployed, etc. When this occurs, the staff advises defendants that the standard amount is \$100 per month however, because of the financial circumstances; the staff asks defendants how much they can pay. The staff has the authority to reduce the payments for three months, if defendants advise that they are in the process of being employed or for other reasons that depicts hardship. Community service is encouraged when these circumstances arise.

LVMC: Yes. We require the defendant to self-report.

RMC: Yes. The court relies on the defendant's claim of financial hardship. If a defendant states they are unable or unwilling to pay the fine amount, the amount owed is converted to community service.

HMC: Yes. A determination is made after a colloquy between the Judge and the defendant in court and/or a review of a written application submitted by the defendant.

DTJC: Yes. Everyone is allowed a payment plan. If they are unable to pay community service work is set up with the individual at the counter.

HTJC: YES. Court has a payment plan schedule based on total amount owed.

LVTJC: Yes, the Las Vegas Justice Court allows defendants to pay in installments. Presently, there are no pre-set criteria to determine a defendant's present ability to pay. Defendants requesting to pay in installments are permitted to do so, however, a \$50.00 payment plan transaction fee is added to the total balance. The payment plan fee may be waived at the discretion of the Traffic Referee or Judicial Officer. At their first appearance, defendants are asked about their ability to pay. Defendants are subsequently provided options such as a payment plan, additional time to pay and/or community service options as deemed appropriate by the judicial officer.

NLVTJC: Yes. Defendants are initially asked to make a minimum monthly payment of \$50 per month. If the defendant states that they cannot afford to pay it, then the judges will use discretion to allow for a lower payment. We have no tools available to determine financial ability to pay.

STJC: Review defendants' employment status with the total fines imposed. Minimum standard for Fines over \$100 a payment plan is generated to pay \$100 a month unless review of employment status requires lower installments. Case by Case review.

TTJC: Yes. Court does not have strict criterion to qualify for a payment plan. Court requires a minimum payment of \$50/month, but is also on a case by case basis and we may allow a lower monthly payment if needed.

10. If payment in installments is directed or authorized, does your court charge a fee to enter into a payment plan? If so:

(a) What is the amount of the fee?

(b) Is the fee imposed per case?

(c) Is the fee imposed per offense?

CCJMC:

Amount of Fee: 10% of total amount due. There is a minimum fee. Maximum Fee is \$100.

Fee Imposed Per Case: Yes

Fee Imposed Per Offense: No

LVMC:

Amount of Fee: \$50

Fee Imposed Per Case: Defendant will only be imposed fee upon request, therefore if a defendant has three (3) cases, he or she can pay \$50 to enter into an installment plan for all three (3) cases.

Fee Imposed Per Offense: No

RMC:

Amount of Fee: \$25.00

Fee Imposed Per Case: Yes

Fee Imposed Per Offense: No

HMC:

Amount of Fee: \$50

Fee Imposed Per Case: Yes. The fee is added to one case per defendant when the payment plan is imposed. If a defendant has multiple active cases, the payment plan is imposed for each. The court collects all fees/fines on the oldest case first and then moves to the next oldest case.

Fee Imposed Per Offense: No

DTJC:

Amount of Fee: \$25.00

Fee Imposed Per Case: No. One time only if there are multiple cases.

Fee Imposed Per Offense: No

HTJC:

Amount of Fee: \$25.00

Fee Imposed Per Case: Yes

Fee Imposed Per Offense: No

LVTJC:

Amount of Fee: \$50

Fee Imposed Per Case: No. Fee is imposed per payment plan.

Fee Imposed Per Offense: No. Fee is imposed per payment plan.

Note: The fee may be waived at the discretions of the Traffic Referee or Judicial Officer. If a defendant acquires new charges and wishes to have those charges added to an existing payment plan, an additional \$50.00 payment plan transaction fee is charged. This is because the existing payment plan is dissolved and a new plan is established. Similarly, if a defendant defaults while on a payment plan, the payment plan is dissolved. If the defendant then wishes to reestablish a payment plan, there is an additional \$50.00 payment plan transaction fee for the new plan.

NLVTJC: No fee to enter into payment plan.

STJC:

Amount of Fee: Fine \$1-\$500 = \$25 Partial PMT Fee

Fine \$501-\$1,000 = \$50 Partial PMT Fee

Fine \$1,000+ = \$100 Partial PMT Fee

Fee Imposed Per Case: Yes

Fee Imposed Per Offense: No

TTJC:

Amount of Fee: \$25 if by mail; \$10 if in person

Fee Imposed Per Case: Yes.

Fee Imposed Per Offense: No.

11. If offenders choose to perform community service to satisfy traffic fines/fees, how much money is credited for each hour of community service performed? Please indicate a range if the amount differs among the judges of your court.

(a) Does your court require court authorization before a defendant may perform community service to satisfy traffic fines/fees?

CCJMC:

\$10.00 per hour of community service completed.

Prior Court Authorization Required to Perform Community Service to Satisfy Fines/Fees: Not initially. Only applicable if defendant is attempting to switch back and forth between an installment plan and community service.

LVMC:

Regular rate is 8.25 per hour, special events are double time, and the downtown work site is 12.50 per hour. Does not differ among judges.

Prior Court Authorization Required to Perform Community Service to Satisfy Fines/Fees: Yes, although any defendant who requests the option of working off their financial obligations is given the opportunity. The defendant signs up at the RJC.

RMC:

\$10 per hour of credit.

Prior Court Authorization Required to Perform Community Service to Satisfy Fines/Fees:

HMC:

\$10 per hour worked credited toward fines/fees

Prior Court Authorization Required to Perform Community Service to Satisfy Fines/Fees: Yes, a judge must approve community service for an offender via a Gilbert hearing.

DTJC:

\$10.00 per hour

Court sets up and monitors community service work

HTJC:

1 hour of Community Service = \$10

Prior Court Authorization Required to Perform Community Service to Satisfy Fines/Fees: YES

LVTJC:

The Las Vegas Justice Court credits community service at a rate of \$10 per hour. Yes, the Court requires defendants obtain authorization prior to performing community service to satisfy traffic fines/fees. While authorization is required and must be noted in the case, the Court affords all defendants the opportunity to complete community service in lieu of the fine upon request.

NLVTJC:

1 hour of community service per \$10 in fines owed; fees are generally not waived unless the defendant is determined to be indigent.

Prior Court Authorization Required to Perform Community Service to Satisfy Fines/Fees: Yes; only a judge can authorize conversion of monetary amounts to community service.

STJC:

\$10/hour

Prior Court Authorization Required to Perform Community Service to Satisfy Fines/Fees: Yes, review of ability to pay, and/or a motion may be filed.

TTJC:

\$10/hour

Prior Court Authorization Required to Perform Community Service to Satisfy Fines/Fees: Yes, judge must approve.

12. How much money is credited towards traffic fines/fees for each day of incarceration? Please indicate a range if the amount differs among judges.

(a) Does your court make a determination as to whether the defendant is indigent before imposing any incarceration in lieu of payment?

(b) If so, what criteria is used to determine whether a defendant is indigent?

CCJMC:

Amount Toward Fines/Fees: \$75.00 per day of incarceration

Determination of Indigency Before Incarceration: Yes, all defendants undergo a financial screening through pre-trial services prior to arraignment. This information is presented to the judge.

Criteria for Indigency: Financial ability to realistically pay without creating additional financial hardship.

LVMC:

Amount Toward Fines/Fees: \$75.00 per day of incarceration. Often defendants are credited with significantly more, including and up to full amounts due and credit for time served on minor offenses. The amount is often set in a plea agreement between the defense and prosecutor.

Determination of Indigency Before Incarceration: Yes,

Criteria for Indigency: Criteria is attached to the contracts the public attorneys sign. We have provided a copy with our responses.

RMC:

Amount Toward Fines/Fees: \$10.00 per hour up to \$100 per day.

Determination of Indigency Before Incarceration: Yes, Reno Municipal Court does not incarcerate for inability to pay

Criteria for Indigency: ADKT411, which are included in our Indigent Defense Application (attached).

HMC:

Amount Toward Fines/Fees: \$100 per day of incarceration.

Determination of Indigency Before Incarceration: Yes

Criteria for Indigency: Colloquy between judge and defendant

DTJC:

Amount Toward Fines/Fees: \$75 per day.

Determination of Indigency Before Incarceration: Yes

Criteria for Indigency: The defendant is asked if they are indigent and if needed an affirmation/affidavit of indigency is filled out.

HTJC:

Amount Toward Fines/Fees: \$75 per day.

Determination of Indigency Before Incarceration: Yes

Criteria for Indigency: Determination is made after discussion with defendant in court.

LVTJC:

The Las Vegas Justice Court credits \$75 towards traffic fines/fees for each day of incarceration. In traffic court, incarceration is never *imposed* in lieu of payment. Defendants who receive credit for time served are either in custody on a traffic warrant and/or on other charges. The Traffic Referee/Judicial Officer gives credit for any time already served; he does not *impose* additional jail time in lieu of payment.

It should be noted that there are rare instances where a defendant expresses an unwillingness to pay as ordered or specifically requests incarceration in lieu of payment. These matters are generally referred to the Chief Judge for review and heard in one of the criminal judicial departments. The following criteria are used to determine indigence in the Criminal Division: income, public assistance received, household composition.

NLVTJC:

Amount Toward Fines/Fees: \$75 per day.

Determination of Indigency Before Incarceration: Yes, community service is always offered as an alternative to fines or incarceration

Criteria for Indigency: None. Based on defendant's representations of indigency.

STJC:

The judges in the Sparks Justice Court uniformly give a \$100 credit for each day served in jail. The vast majority of these credit for time served cases are decided after the fact that is for time already served following an arrest on a bench warrant. During arraignments on Monday mornings it is common for numerous people who have been arrested over the weekend to be given credit for time served against their fines, closing their case. These credits would be applied to anyone who had been arrested regardless of indigency status.

Only on rare occasions in the Sparks Justice Court is someone sentenced to jail due to their failure to pay a fine. In order to do so, the Court must find that the defendant has willfully failed to pay the fine and had the resources to do so. This is based upon an order from the federal district court that fines can only be converted to jail time if: [options 1-4]. The judge directly addresses the defendant to determine whether fines should be converted to jail time. No set criteria is used at this time.

Options pursuant to NRS. Ch 176

1. Has willfully refused to pay same.
2. Could have paid same but did not make a bona fide effort to do so.
3. Has requested that the Court convert same to jail time.
4. Sheriff's Community Work Program in lieu of payment of the fine(s), assessments and/or fees

TTJC:

Amount Toward Fines/Fees: \$75 per day.

Determination of Indigency Before Incarceration: No, defendant is given a choice between incarceration or community service.

Criteria for Indigency: N/A

13. Does your court distinguish between warrants issued for failure to appear and failure to pay?

(a) Does your court consider a failure to make a payment when due as a failure to make an appearance?

(b) Does your court consider a failure to make a payment when due as a failure to pay?

(c) How many warrants were issued over the last two fiscal years (FY16 and FY17) for failure to appear?

(d) How many warrants were issued over the past two fiscal years (FY16 and FY17) for failure to pay?

CCJMC:

Distinguish Warrant for Failure to Appear and Failure to Pay: Yes

Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Appear: No

Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Pay: Yes

Warrants issued for Failure to Appear:

FY16: 727

FY17: 658

Warrants Issued for Failure to Pay:

FY16: 124

FY17: 130

Note: Prior to issuing a warrant, a letter is mailed to the defendant advising them that contact with the court is necessary to avoid a warrant from being issued. This process is performed a minimum of 10 business days before the warrant is processed and issued.

LVMC:

Distinguish Warrant for Failure to Appear and Failure to Pay: No

Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Appear: Yes. 14 day grace period between warrant being ordered and warrant being issued

Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Pay: Yes. 14 day grace period between warrant being ordered and warrant being issued

Unable to determine whether warrant is a result of failure to appear or failure to pay. Total traffic related warrants:

FY16: 64,303

FY17: 66,806

RMC:

Distinguish Warrant for Failure to Appear and Failure to Pay: Yes

Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Appear: No

Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Pay: Yes

Warrants issued for Failure to Appear:

FY16: 1,124

FY17: 1,139

Warrants Issued for Failure to Pay:

FY16: 807

FY17: 651

HMC:

Distinguish Warrant for Failure to Appear and Failure to Pay: Yes

Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Appear: No

Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Pay: Yes

Warrants issued for Failure to Appear:

FY16: 2,206

FY17: 2,437

FY18: 2,532

Warrants Issued for Failure to Pay:

FY16: 4,331

FY17:4,643
FY18: 4,277

DTJC:

Distinguish Warrant for Failure to Appear and Failure to Pay: Yes
Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Appear: No
Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Pay: Yes
Warrants issued for Failure to Appear:
FY16: Unknown
FY17: Unknown
Warrants Issued for Failure to Pay:
FY16: Unknown
FY17: Unknown

HTJC:

Distinguish Warrant for Failure to Appear and Failure to Pay: No
Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Appear: Yes
Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Pay: No
Warrants issued for Failure to Appear: The court does not distinguish between failure to appear and failure to pay for tracking warrants. Approximately 1400 traffic citations/year enter warrant status.

LVTJC:

No, the Las Vegas Justice Court does not currently distinguish between failure to pay and failure to appear. Yes, failure to make a payment is treated the same as a failure to appear. In FY2016, a total of 54,805 warrants were issued. Of those, approximately 29,001 were identified as haven been issued for failure to appear and approximately 25,674 were identified as having been issued for failure to meet a payment obligation. In FY2017, a total of 63,139 warrants were issued. Of those, approximately 32,432 were identified as haven been issued for failure to appear whereas about 30,432 were identified as haven been issued for failure to meet a payment obligation. Please note that because the court does not currently differentiate between a failure to appear and a failure to pay, the numbers on warrants issued for failure to pay versus failure to appear are not precise.

NLVTJC:

Distinguish Warrant for Failure to Appear and Failure to Pay: No
Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Appear: Yes
Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Pay: Yes, unless defendant contacts the court to make other arrangements or ask for a continuance.
Warrants issued for Failure to Appear: The court does not distinguish between failure to appear and failure to pay for tracking warrants. Approximately 330 traffic citations enter warrant status each year.

STJC:

Distinguish Warrant for Failure to Appear and Failure to Pay: Yes
Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Appear: No. If the defendant has not appeared in court on or before the assigned court date this is considered a failure to appear.
Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Pay: Yes. When a payment agreement is signed this is considered a Failure to comply with a court order.
Warrants issued for Failure to Appear:
FY16: 698
FY17: 892
Warrants Issued for Failure to Pay:
FY16: 603
FY17: 615

TTJC:

Distinguish Warrant for Failure to Appear and Failure to Pay: Yes
Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Appear: No
Failure to Pay When Due as Failure to Pay: Yes
Warrants issued for Failure to Appear: 1,002 over FY16 and FY17
Warrants Issued for Failure to Pay: 80 over FY16 and FY17

14. Do the judges in your court engage in ex parte settlement discussion with defendants and/or their attorneys as permitted under Judicial Ethics Opinion JE15-003 (2015)? If so, please provide a copy of any traffic settlement matrices provided to your judges by the prosecuting agency.

CCJMC: No

LVMC: No.

RMC: No. The judges do not amend charges and defendants are always referred to the Reno City Attorney's Office for negotiation.

HMC: No. All traffic negotiation requests are forwarded to the City Attorney's Office/Criminal Division for processing. Upon receipt of a proposed negotiation, then the case judge reviews and either approves or denies the proposal.

DTJC: Yes and attached

HTJC: Yes, See Attachment

LVTJC: Yes. Copy of memorandum dated December 22, 2015 from the District Attorney's Office and Traffic Citation Matrix for Moving Violations and Non-Moving Violations are enclosed.

NLVTJC: Yes. See Attachment.

STJC: The Sparks Justice Court has a long standing agreement with the Washoe County District Attorney that a few charges may be amended if the defendant cures the underlying problem. They include: amending a suspended driver's license to no valid driver's license if the license is reinstated; lowering the fine on no insurance tickets if new insurance is obtained, as well as registration and other driver's license tickets. We are in discussions with the DA's Office on the adoption of a written matrix which is attached as an exhibit.

TTJC: No. All negotiations are handled through the Nye County District Attorney's office and the defendants' attorney. Once a resolution has been agreed upon, a copy of the settlement (Memo of Plea) is drafted by the DA's office, signed by the defendant and returned to the Court for filing/processing.

15. Does your court or do your judges believe there is an unreasonable delay between the time a traffic citation is issued to an offender and the time the citing agency provides the citation to the court?

(a) If so, do you have a suggestion as to how quickly those citations should be transmitted to the court?

CCJMC: No

LVMC: *Yes. eCitations are received quickly, but manual citations can take upwards of 6 weeks from the violation until they are received at the court. Moving all law enforcement agencies and personnel to an eCitation capacity would significantly improve this period from violation to receipt. This in turn would greatly assist in resolving tickets for those citizens who attempt to resolve their matters within a few days.*

RMC: No.

HMC:

The Court is able to acquire citations very quickly due to the electronic transmission of citations via the Brazos system. Internally, we have asked our Police Department to use a 4-week turnaround from date of issue to next available court date to expedite the case flow. Receiving citations from other jurisdictions using the Brazos product is also timely; however, the parties need to discuss reducing the time between date issued and court date scheduled by the issuing officer.

Electronically is the most efficient system. If the technology is in place, then the office issues the citation and the data is synched and uploaded (should be uploaded by the end of the shift). If an internal department review of the citation is required, then the uploaded citation should be reviewed within 24-hours and then uploaded electronically to the Court's case management system. An electronically created citation should take no longer than 48-72 hours for issue to filing with the Court.

DTJC: Not any longer. Brazos System downloads citations in a timely manner. This process has resolved the delay in receiving the citations in a reasonable amount of time.

HTJC: NO, the Court receives citations due to the electronic transmission of citations via the Brazos system.

LVTJC:

Yes, with regard to handwritten citations. While electronic citations are generally in the court's system within one to two weeks, handwritten citations can take anywhere from six to eight weeks to appear. The delay is extremely inconvenient for many defendants, particularly for those who are transient.

The Court does not attribute the delay to the citing agency, but rather to the additional work that goes into processing a handwritten traffic citation. There is quality control, transfer of information and data entry involved. Since this is all necessary, there are no suggestions with regard to transmitting that information to the court any faster. Ideally, courts will see less and less handwritten citations as more officers become equipped with electronic citation machines.

NLVTJC: No; electronic citations have improved the process. Not all agencies are electronic; a standardized format among law enforcement agencies would be helpful.

STJC: There is no delay. However, a standard turnaround time should be no later than 24 hours. This will allow the court to be prepared if a defendant wishes to pay after issuance. Law Enforcement should sync their equipment at the end of their shift. Currently agencies with electronic means are filing the citation within three days.

TTJC: No

16. Does your court have a contract with a collection agency to collect unpaid fines, fees and administrative assessments? If so, please provide a copy of the contract.

CCJMC: Yes. See attached contract.

LVMC: *Yes, we have provided the contracts with this questionnaire.*

RMC: Yes. See Valley Collection Agency Contract (attached).

HMC: Expired contract with TSI

DTJC: Yes. Attached

HTJC: The County, including Justice Courts, have a contract with Valley Collections.

LVTJC: Yes, there is a contract with Harris & Harris Ltd. A copy of the contract is enclosed.

NLVTJC: Yes. See Attachment.

STJC: Yes with Valley Collections. As stated in the NOTE on item (7). SJC has a collection project progress and has a contract with Valley Collections for all Washoe County courts. The court estimated time of deployment is scheduled for October 2018. See attached.

TTJC: Yes, copy provided.