



WSBA COUNCIL ON PUBLIC DEFENSE MEETING AGENDA

October 18, 2024

Seattle University School of Law

CPD Meeting: 9:30am – 12:00pm, Sullivan 309

Student Panel Discussion: 12:00pm – 3:00pm, Sullivan 110

Join by Video Conference:

For video and audio: <https://wsba.zoom.us/j/86831734727?pwd=JdPRPtrj3zUwG7Vm54liXXDo85uKa5.1>

For audio only: **LOCAL OPTION:** (253) 215-8782 || **TOLL-FREE OPTION:** (888) 788-0099

Meeting ID: 868 3173 4727 || **Passcode:** 892144

The purpose of the meeting is for the Council to discuss, deliberate, and take potential final action regarding the following agenda items:

5 min	Welcome and Introductions	Maia Vanyo	Discussion	
3 min	September Meeting Minutes	Maia Vanyo	Action	pp 3-5
10 min	Welcoming New Members	Maia Vanyo	Discussion	
	CPD History			
	Recent and Current Initiatives			
20 min	Use of podcasts and social media in public defense advocacy	Hunter Parnell	Report	pp 2
20 min	OPD Budget Request and Updates	Larry Jefferson, Sophia Byrd McSherry	Report and Action	pp 6-7
15 min	Proposal to remove mandated reporting obligation for law school clinics	Paul Holland	Discussion and Action	pp 8-11
5 min	Recruitment Updates	Maia Vanyo	Discussion	
30 min	WA Supreme Court hearing on proposed amendments to Standards for Indigent Defense	Jason Schwarz	Action	pp 12-14
5 min	Announcements	Everyone	Announcement	
	Transition Law Student Panel and Lunch – Sullivan 110	Everyone		pp 15

The next regular CPD meeting will be November 1, 2024 via Zoom

Find Council on Public Defense guiding documents and initiatives online at <https://www.wsba.org/Legal-Community/Committees-Boards-and-Other-Groups/council-public-defense>.

Reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities will be provided upon request. Please email bonnies@wsba.org.

Hunter Parnell Bio: Hunter is currently a 2L at the University of Colorado and the host of the Public Defenseless Podcast. Each week, Hunter speaks with Public Defenders, criminal defense lawyers, academics, organizers, and community activities to shed light on the many failings of our criminal legal system. To date, Hunter has recorded and produced more than 280 episodes, reached over 6,000 listeners, and generated nearly 200k downloads.

Prior to attending law school, Hunter attended the Air Force Academy. While a cadet there, he was a member of the U.S. Air Force Parachute Team, the Wings of Blue. During his two-year career on the team, he taught more than 1,000 cadets how to skydive and performed skydiving demonstrations at professional/college football and baseball games and air shows around the country. He graduated in 2018 with a B.S. in legal studies, and then Hunter served as an Intelligence Officer from 2019-2023. Hunter is originally from Denver, Colorado but has also lived in Indiana, Texas, Florida, Alabama, and the United Kingdom.



Washington State Bar Association

COUNCIL ON PUBLIC DEFENSE
SEPTEMBER 20, 2024 - 9:30AM – 12:00PM
MINUTES

CPD Voting Members: Maia Vanyo (Vice-Chair), Jason Schwarz (Chair), Larry Jefferson, Paul Holland, Molly Gilbert, Rachel Cortez, Abraham Ritter, Kathy Kyle, Christie Hedman, Anita Khandelwal, Maya Titova, Judge Dee Sontag, Jonathan Nomamiukor, Chris Swaby, Justice Sheryl Gordon McCloud

CPD Emeritus members (non-voting members): Ann Christian, Travis Stearns, Bob Boruchowitz

WSBS Staff: Cate Shur, Bonnie Sterken

Guests: Laura Hughes, Sharea Moberly, Kate Benward, Molly Campera, Grace O’Conner, Sophia Byrd McSherry, Flint Stebbins, Katrin Johnson, Shelly Brown, Amanda Ulrich, Anya Perret, Tara, Gregory Link, Geoff Hulse, Shoshana Kehoe-Ehlers, Cameron Buhl, Jonathan Patnode, McKay Campbell, Taila AyAy, Katherine Kameron, George Yeannakis, Chris Graves, Melinda, Grainne Griffiths, Dana Halbert, Molly Fraser, Atharshna Singarajah, Emily Arneson, Anya Perret, Jacob D’Annunzio, Manek Misty, Connor O’Neil, Katie Farden, Byron Gale

Absent: Erica Rutter, Arian Noma, Leandra Craft, Judge Marla Polin, Anthony Powers, Abigail Pence

Membership Changes: Jason Schwarz acknowledged the outgoing members and thanked them for their service. He also acknowledged the incoming members.

July Meeting Minutes: The minutes were approved without edits.

Standards Updates: Jason Schwarz shared that the two items sent to the Board of Governors was passed. He thanked those who worked on those items and presented about them at the meeting.

Jason shared the details about the Court’s listening session on the proposed Standards. Several groups have been invited to testify, including CPD and WSBA representatives. There is also a public comment period. Jason encouraged members to ask their colleagues to comment. The Council discussed the testimonies and ways to frame the conversations.

The Council then had a discussed that there is a lack of unanimity around the state. Larry Jefferson shared his perspective that part of the issue is the decentralization of the state. He plans to ask the Court to pass the Standards but the implementation for different jurisdictions may be different. The Council had a discussion and Larry addressed questions. Others in the meeting shared their perspectives about how to align on the message and concerns about backing away the unified timeline.

For the next CPD meeting, they will discuss OPD's budget request and potentially take action to submit a letter to legislature in response to the request.

Office of Public Defense Budget Packet: Sophia Byrd McSherry shared that OPD has a budget request, and a summary document was shared with the advisory committee. The total request for new funds is more than \$137mil, which is almost double the existing budget. This includes increases for all vendor rates, funding for expert services, litigation costs, internal basic agency functions. One of the big new asks relates to building a pipeline to have attorneys available. They'll be working with the law schools to build a child welfare practicum to move along the training in that area. The legislature passed a bill last year to work with counties and cities to build and internship program that is administered by OPD, and a funding request will sustain that and increase training. They are looking to continue the Blake program. Larry Jefferson and Sophia Byrd McSherry addressed questions.

Race Equity Report: Abraham Ritter gave an overview the forum project from the past year to draft the race equity report, which was shared in April. That report is going to be sent out again to be reviewed again before the October meeting. He highlighted the challenges and key take aways in section five as a place to focus. Abe is also cycling off as the co-chair of the race equity committee and request volunteers to take the role and carry the report forward for next steps.

Standards Committee: Paul Holland gave an update on the committee's work to address implementation. The key themes of their discussions including needing some kind of mechanism for putting responsibility on the trial courts, the data system on public defense is lacking. They are putting out a survey to students to assess interest in a career in public defense.

October Meeting: Jason Schwarz shared about the October 18 meeting that will be held at Seattle University. It will have a morning CPD meeting and afternoon event with students. A Zoom link will be provided as well.

Recruitment: Jason Schwarz shared that we are still recruiting for a current or former prosecutor to fill an open seat. He asked others to share the information.

Charter: Jason Schwarz reported that the Board of Governors approved the Charter amendments.

The new BOG liaison Emily Arneson introduced herself.

The meeting adjourned at 11:13am

DRAFT

WSBA LETTERHEAD

January X, 2025

Need to double-check chairs after December Committee re-org

Senator June Robinson, Chair
Senate Ways and Means Committee
303 J.A. Cherberg Bldg.
P.O. Box 40423
Olympia, WA 98504

Representative Timm Ormsby, Chair
House Appropriations Committee
315 John L. O'Brien Bldg.
P.O. Box 40600
Olympia, WA 98504

Dear Chair Robinson and Chair Ormsby:

The Washington State Bar Association's Council on Public Defense writes in support of the Office of Public Defense's (OPD) 2025-2027 biennial budget request. In addition, the Council requests further appropriation to OPD to implement caseload standards and remedy the ongoing shortage of public defense attorneys.

The Council encourages the Legislature to fund OPD's requests for the following:

- **Provide a vendor rate adjustment for OPD contractors**, who represent indigent clients in dependencies, appeals, and forensic civil commitment matters. Washington state currently provides substantially lower compensation for OPD-contracted defenders than for state-employed assistant attorneys general. A vendor rate adjustment will bring defense closer to parity with prosecution resources in these cases, and is critically important to recruit and retain OPD contractors.
- **Cover defense experts, investigators, and litigation costs**, which are increasing due to inflation and case complexity. OPD must pay these costs as part of its obligation to provide statewide public defense in dependencies, appeals, and forensic civil commitment cases.
- **Respond to appellate workload issues**, by hiring contractors immediately to resolve a backlog of case assignments and adding resources in the biennial budget to further address attorney caseloads.
- **Continue the response to *State v. Blake*** to remedy unconstitutional drug convictions. Thousands of persons remain eligible to vacate convictions and many incarcerated people still must be resentenced. Funding OPD's request ensures that individuals' due process rights are upheld and that counties are sufficiently resourced to respond to *Blake*.
- **Sustain the Simple Possession Advocacy & Representation (SPAR) program**, which the Legislature created in SB 5536 to provide public defense services in newly authorized misdemeanor drug possession cases. The statute allows OPD to assist local jurisdictions by providing funding or by contracting directly with attorneys.

- **Build a pipeline to public defense practice** by expanding OPD’s criminal defense training for existing lawyers and by funding an OPD partnership with Washington law schools to attract new family defense practitioners.
- **Conduct a statewide public defense needs study** to analyze our current county-by-county model for criminal defense, identify quality gaps, and recommend reforms. The Council is familiar with similar state studies by the nonpartisan Sixth Amendment Center. Funding an independent study will help identify structural efficiencies and best practices.
- **Support nonprofit partners with pass-through funding** for the Washington Defender Association’s programs and for Akin, which administers Parent for Parent peer support services to families involved in dependency cases.
- **Increase state funding for counties and cities through RCW 10.101 grants**, which have remained substantially the same for nearly two decades. State funding covers less than 5 percent of public defense costs for criminal cases in county and city trial courts, putting Washington among states that provide the least support for trial-level criminal public defense.

While the Council supports OPD’s proposals, we find the agency’s \$40 million annual request for RCW 10.101 grant funding to be inadequate as Washington nears a constitutional emergency. Public defense is in crisis, and the crisis grows each time an attorney is so overwhelmed by workload they leave the practice and each time a person facing criminal charges can’t effectuate their most basic right to have a lawyer appointed. These events occur daily all across the state. To keep defenders in the practice and ensure timely appointment of counsel, Washington State should provide funding sufficient to implement caseload standards adopted by the WSBA and pending now before the Supreme Court. To that end, the Council urges the Legislature to appropriate \$XX million per year to OPD for RCW 10.101 grants for local public defense.

The WSBA Council on Public Defense unites members of the bar, the bench, and the public to address new and recurring issues that impact public defense services throughout Washington State. The Council believes quality public defense is essential to a fair legal system and is critical in the fight to reduce racial disparity. This Council’s statement has been approved through the WSBA’s legislative and court rule comment policy and the position is solely that of the Council on Public Defense.

Please fund the Office of Public Defense’s budget request in the upcoming 2025 legislative session, and please provide an additional \$XX million for RCW 10.101 grants to counties and cities.

Sincerely,

Terra Nevitt
Executive Director

Need to double-check Committee members and their roles after December Committee re-org.

Cc: Sunitha Anjilvel, President, Washington State Bar Association
Senator Joe Nguyen, Vice Chair, Senate Ways and Means Committee
Senator, Ranking Minority Member, Senate Ways and Means Committee
Representative Steve Bergquist, Vice Chair, House Appropriations Committee
Representative Drew Stokesbary, Ranking Member, House Appropriations Committee
Larry Jefferson, Director, Washington State Office of Public Defense

Re: Support for legislation to remove mandated reporting obligation from attorneys and staff working in law school clinics

Dear Members of the Board of Governors:

The Council on Public Defense urges the Board of Governors to support legislation that would relieve attorneys and other staff working in law school clinics from the statutory obligation currently imposed upon them to serve as mandated reporters of suspected child abuse or neglect.

In the aftermath of the Penn State child abuse scandal, the Washington Legislature included “administrative and academic or athletic department employees, including student employees, of institutions of higher education” within the class of mandated reporters of child abuse and neglect. See, RCW 26.44.030(1)(f). In light of this legislation, law school faculty and staff who work in law school clinics confront a tension between the apparent command of the statute and the long-standing and fundamental professional ethical obligation under Rule 1.6 of the Rules of Professional Conduct, which prohibits an attorney from disclosing information related to the representation of a client. These faculty and staff are not even afforded the exemption from disclosing privileged information extended to supervisors who learn of abuse by those whom they supervise under RCW 26.44.030(1)(b). Based on conversations between clinical law faculty at Washington law schools and legislative leaders at the time of this amendment, there was no specific consideration – or even general awareness—within the Legislature of the fact that the three Washington law schools house legal clinics providing representation to clients as part of students’ educational program and that these programs would be adversely affected by this amendment.

This reporting requirement distorts the relationship between law school clinics and their clients in ways that hamper the schools’ efforts to provide legal services to those unable to afford them and to prepare the next generation of lawyers to serve clients in Washington and beyond. If the Legislature had tried to impose a similar reporting requirement on attorneys generally, we are confident the bar would have quickly and firmly raised objections that would likely have stopped any such effort instantly. Students and faculty in law school clinics are doing the same work that attorneys do in other settings, and they are fully subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct when they do so. It makes no sense to force them to do this work in a way that compromises one of the cornerstones of effective representation, the confidentiality obligation. It does not make any sense, from a policy standpoint, to require faculty working in a law school clinic representing youths charged with crimes, survivors of domestic violence, or any other clients to make such reports when lawyers working for non-profit or government entities performing the same type of representation and privy to the same sort of information are not obligated and, per RPC 1.6, not permitted, to report.

It is our understanding that a bill is being drafted that would contain the following language:

The reporting requirement in (a) of this subsection does not apply to an attorney who is employed by an institution of higher education, as defined in RCW 28B.10.016, or private institution of higher education – or to any employee working under the supervision of such an attorney-- as it relates to information related to the legal representation to a client.

The Council supports this proposed revision of the statute, which is similar to that adopted in Oregon, but even more squarely aligned with Rule 1.6. Oregon’s mandated reporting statute reads:

An attorney is not required to make a report under this section by reason of information communicated to the attorney in the course of representing a client if disclosure of the information would be detrimental to the client. [ORS 419B.010](#).

Because it covers only information “communicated to the attorney”, this Oregon statute might not reach information the attorney observes on their own, which is plainly still “related to the representation” for purposes of Rule 1.6.

Action on this matter is more important now than ever. It is widely expected that hours representing clients under supervision as a limited license intern under Rule 9 are going to count toward one of the alternate pathways to a full license to practice. Accordingly, it is essential that students be able to get the same experience in a law school clinic as they would working in a public defense office. If we are hoping to produce the new wave of public defenders we need, we need them properly trained from the beginning, which starts with this fundamental orientation toward serving the client with full loyalty and confidentiality.



Maialisa Vanyo, Chair
WSBA Council on Public Defense

October 11, 2024

Re: Proposal to remove mandated reporting obligation for law school clinics

Dear Maia:

I write seeking support from CPD for a legislative change to relieve attorneys working in law clinics from the statutory obligation currently imposed upon them to serve as mandated reporters.

In the aftermath of the Penn State child abuse scandal, the Washington Legislature amended RCW 26.44.030 to include “administrative and academic or athletic department employees, including student employees, of institutions of higher education” within the class of mandated reporters of child abuse and neglect. In light of this legislation, law school faculty who work in law school clinics confront a tension between the apparent command of the statute and the long-standing and fundamental professional ethical obligation under Rule 1.6 of the Rules of Professional Conduct, which prohibits an attorney from disclosing information related to the representation of a client.

In the immediate aftermath of this change, my colleague Lisa Brodoff and I spoke to Senator Adam Kline and confirmed that this was never the Legislature’s intention. They were simply not thinking about the fact that there are little law firms embedded inside the three law schools in the state.

It does not make any sense, from a policy standpoint, to require faculty working in a law school clinic representing youths charged with crimes, survivors of domestic violence, or any other clients to make such reports when lawyers working for non-profit or government entities performing the same type of representation and privy to the same sort of information are not obligated and, per RPC 1.6, not permitted, to report.

Lisa and I reached out to some potential legislative champions at the time, but each of them left the Legislature in that period, and the matter slipped down the list of priorities. However, last week, I met with Representative Gerry Pollet, and he is interested in moving forward. I have directed him to Oregon's example, which includes the following language:

a psychiatrist, psychologist, member of the clergy, attorney or guardian ad litem appointed under ORS 419B.231 (Appointment) is not required to report such information communicated by a person if the communication is privileged under ORS 40.225 (Rule 503. Lawyer-client privilege) to 40.295 (Rule 514. Effect on existing privileges) or 419B.234 (Qualifications) (6). An attorney is not required to make a report under this section by reason of information communicated to the attorney in the course of representing a client if disclosure of the information would be detrimental to the client. [ORS 419B.010](#).

I have suggested this change, which more closely tracks RPC 1.6:

An attorney – and any employee working under the supervision of an attorney -- is not required to make a report under this section by reason of information **relating to the representation of a client** if disclosure of the information would be detrimental to the client. (supplemental language in bold).

Action on this is more important now than ever. If hours as a limited license intern under Rule 9 are going to count toward the alternate pathway to a full license, then students must be able to get the same experience in a law school clinic as they would working in a public defense office. If we are hoping to produce the new wave of public defenders we need, we need them properly trained from the beginning, which starts with this fundamental orientation toward serving the client.

Representative Pollet asked me to begin to do outreach to mobilize organizational support for this effort. I am hoping that we might be able to bring this to the CPD and then ultimately the WSBA for such support. Of course, I will be glad to discuss this with you at your convenience.

Thanks for your time and consideration,

Sincerely,



Paul Holland
Associate Dean for Experiential Learning

Colleagues,

After some reflection, I am asking the CPD to consider supporting approaching other stakeholders involved in the provision of public defense to discuss alternate public defense caseload implementation options. The goal of these discussions would be to try to obtain wider support for an implementation plan that could be put forward to the Supreme Court. Specifically, I am asking that you consider whether you would support discussing the implementation proposal included with this note with other stakeholders. I ask that you each read my proposal below and be prepared to discuss whether the WSBA should engage with other stakeholders about this alternate caseload implementation timeline. At the meeting on October 18, I will ask for a vote on whether the CPD would support this proposal.

This request comes after comments offered at the Court's September 25 hearing and the Court's questions made it apparent that the implementation timeline was a primary concern for many parties, including the Court. The Court heard from individuals and organizations at the September 25 comment forum about the need for a different timeline and the Court asked for suggestions for such timelines from several of the commenters. WSBA and other organizations have also been approached with requests to offer alternate implementation suggestions. At our September meeting, we heard from Larry Jefferson about his belief for the need for an alternate implementation timeline. Since then, others have also sought the WSBA and OPD's advice about what alternate implementation timelines might look like. Given the Court's interest in other implementation proposals, I believe it is prudent to devise a plan that could be supported by the CPD, the Court, local jurisdictions, and other stakeholders. Acknowledging that there is no perfect plan and understanding that there is limited opportunity to draft one ideal and flexible plan, I ask the CPD to consider the following alternate proposal *to begin discussions around a consensus plan*.

I don't mean to suggest that we are done discussing the necessity of statewide caseload standard adjustments. Each public defender and their clients should still be encouraged to share their opinion of the proposed Standards to the Supreme Court. That said, it speaks highly of this group that the Court and others have sought opportunities for dialogue about the Standards and wish to work with the CPD and WSBA to find common solutions, where possible. The willingness to cooperate and work collaboratively speaks to the moment we are having in public defense—a moment you all contributed to. I believe the willingness to gain consensus among groups, particularly with those we may not typically work with as public defenders, should be seen as a strength and as a recognition of the importance of the problems we are trying to address.

I offer this comment with the hope that it provides the opportunity for the WSBA to engage with other stakeholders more openly about common ground and perhaps come to some consensus about an implementation plan. It's clear to me that some jurisdictions could accomplish a three-year implementation timeline. But it's also equally clear that other jurisdictions need to focus on building support staff capacity and hiring while also hiring new lawyers. I am not convinced that we need to concede to the need for an alternate timeline in order to engage in conversations about those very alternatives. To do otherwise would be an opportunity missed. We should not maintain faithfulness to an implementation plan in the face of reasonable feedback from both in and out of the public defense community.

The option I describe below is based on ideas gathered from WDA Directors, conversations during our Standards meetings, and emails received from colleagues. Wherever our disagreements, I believe we all

are still unanimous in the need to insist on an outside timeline for statewide compliance with the Standards; they otherwise cease to be Standards. The dates below are suggested deadlines. The Justices may ultimately determine appropriate start dates based on the effective date of the Standards.

At our meeting, I will ask the CPD to vote on whether the CPD membership supports the WSBA approaching other organizations with the proposed implementation plan below. This vote is not binding. The WSBA can do what it wants with or without us, but we should, where we can, offer them our guidance and opinion and your support sends an important message to both the WSBA and the Court. This vote is an attempt to share the opinions of the CPD about alternative implementation options.

Best,

Jason

Proposed Implementation Plan

As with the originally proposed implementation schedule, under this plan, jurisdictions begin working towards the above caseload maximums and support staffing ratios beginning July 1, 2025. Jurisdictions would adhere to the caseload benchmarks already proposed as phases 1 and 2 of the proposed amendments to the Court Standards. These are described as Years 1 and 2 of the implementation plan below. Jurisdictions may phase in the standards more quickly if they choose. Again, as in the originally proposed schedule, implementation of support staffing ratios would occur by July 1, 2028.

Under this plan, jurisdictions would annually report their progress under the implementation schedule. By no later than June 1 of each year, jurisdictions will submit a report to the Washington Supreme Court that indicates the jurisdiction's compliance with the preceding year's benchmarks and progress toward support staffing ratios, includes the number of attorneys who represent clients as appointed counsel in public defense cases filed within the jurisdiction, and, if the jurisdiction is not in compliance with the benchmarks, indicates how they plan to come into compliance. The Washington Supreme Court may request that additional information be included in the report.

During Year 2, the Washington Supreme Court, in consultation with WSBA, the Washington Office of Public Defense, and Washington Defender Association, will review public defense staffing levels in each jurisdiction and jurisdictions' progress towards the benchmarks thus far and may make recommendations for the remaining implementation of the Standards for Indigent Defense. In developing recommendations, the Court may solicit feedback from stakeholders including the Washington Office of Public Defense; Washington Criminal Defense Lawyers; the Superior Court Judges Association; District and Municipal Court Judges Association; state, county, and municipal officials, or their representatives; and the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Following the Court's review and any recommendations, jurisdictions will submit compliance plans to the Court specifying the jurisdiction's plan to phase in the remainder of the caseload requirements and, if not yet met, support staffing requirements. Jurisdictions may create plans that account for conditions specific to their locality, but plans must include a minimum 15% reduction in caseload per year and must fully implement the Standards by no later than July 1, 2029. Jurisdictions may seek technical assistance from

OPD in creating their plans and meeting plan timelines. The compliance plans will be submitted to the Court by a date to be set by the Court that is no later than June 1, 2027. As in Years 1 and 2, jurisdictions will submit a written report to the Washington Supreme Court by June 1 of each year that indicates the jurisdiction's compliance with their plan, includes the number of attorneys who represent clients as appointed counsel in public defense cases filed within the jurisdiction, and, if the jurisdiction is not in compliance with their plan, indicates how they will come into compliance. The Washington Supreme Court may request that additional information be included in the report.

Implementation Timeline:

Year 1 (July 1, 2025 – July 1, 2026):	110 felony case credits 280 misdemeanor case credits Progress towards support staffing ratios
Year 2 (July 1, 2026 – July 1, 2027):	90 felony case credits 225 misdemeanor case credits Progress towards support staffing ratios Court review and recommendations
Year 3 (July 1, 2027 – July 1, 2028):	Implementation of jurisdiction compliance plans Completion of support staffing ratios
Year 4 (July 1, 2028 – July 1, 2029):	Completion of jurisdiction compliance plans

This plan responds to the immediate need to adjust caseload standards for current practitioners and to create more uniformity among jurisdictions to discourage movement of public defense attorneys to jurisdictions with lower caseloads. This plan also acknowledges the benefit of a mid-implementation review to inform future implementation. Given the potential for future changes in criminal case filing trends, legislation, caselaw, and funding, there is value in assessing progress and staffing levels after the initial phases of implementation. This timeline gives the Court leeway to plan for the review and to take into account any data about public defense filings compiled by AOC, OPD, local jurisdictions, etc. within the prior implementation years. Implementation during Years 1 and 2 could give us a better sense of public defense costs and successful methods for consistent and meaningful state contribution to local criminal trial public defense. In addition, multiple commenters at the September 25 hearing expressed a desire for jurisdiction-specific implementation. This plan balances a more uniform caseload adjustment upfront while providing the ability for jurisdictions to tailor the remaining implementation to local conditions. This option also maintains a deadline by which all jurisdictions will come into compliance with the caseload standards.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2024 | NOON – 3 P.M.

Seattle University School of Law - Sullivan 110

S E R V I N G Y O U R C O M M U N I T Y I N

PUBLIC DEFENSE

AGENDA

NOON – 12:30 P.M.
Lunch Available

12:30 – 2 P.M.
Panel Discussion

2 – 3 P.M.
Networking

MODERATORS

- **Maia Vanyo**, *Council on Public Defense Chair*
- **Christopher Swaby**, *Council on Public Defense Vice-Chair*

PANELISTS

- **Michael A. Schueler**, *Supervising Attorney, King County Public Defenders*
- **Judge Whitney M. Rivera**, *Snohomish County Superior Court Judge*
- **Rachel Cortez**, *Eastern Region Managing Attorney, Office of Public Defense*
- **Matthew Pang**, *Deputy Director, King County Department of Public Defense*

SPONSORS

WASHINGTON STATE
BAR ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL ON PUBLIC DEFENSE

SEATTLEU
SCHOOL OF LAW

W
SCHOOL OF LAW
UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

GONZAGA
UNIVERSITY
School of Law

Join local public defense leaders and passionate practitioners as they inspire the next generation of law students to explore impactful careers in public defense.

Speakers will highlight the urgent need for public defenders, share insights on shaping the future of public defense in their communities, and offer candid reflections on the rewards and challenges of the field. They'll also provide valuable advice on how to build a fulfilling and sustainable career advocating for justice.

After the panel, stick around to connect with the speakers! This is your chance to ask questions, seek personalized advice, and build meaningful connections with leaders in the field of public defense.



VIRTUAL OPTION

<https://wsba.zoom.us/j/82820181627?pwd=b1DrFdUobjSruXbFiYMqclNXvEzSSc.1.1>

OR SCAN TO JOIN ON ZOOM