



WASHINGTON  
COURTS

**DISTRICT AND MUNICIPAL  
COURT JUDGES' ASSOCIATION**

***BOARD MEETING***

**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014**

**AOC SEATAC OFFICE  
SEATAC, WASHINGTON**





**DMCJA BOARD MEETING**  
**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014**  
**12:30 P.M. – 3:30 P.M.**  
**AOC SEATAC OFFICE**  
**SEATAC, WA**

**PRESIDENT JUDGE DAVID SVAREN**  
**A G E N D A**

**TAB**

**Call to Order**

**Minutes – December 13, 2013**

**1**

**Treasurer’s Report – Judge Marinella**

**2**

**Special Fund Report**

- A. Banking Alternatives for Special Fund (discussion at April 2014 Board Retreat)

**JIS Status Update – Vicky Cullinane, AOC**

**Standing Committee Reports**

**3**

- A. Legislative Committee – Judge Meyer
- B. Nominating Committee – Judge Derr (action at March Board meeting)
- C. System Improvement Committee – Judge Steiner
- D. Technology Committee
  - JISC priorities

**Discussion**

**4**

- A. CLJ CMS Summit Meeting – Judge Svaren
- B. Trial Court Advocacy Board (TCAB) – Judge Svaren
- C. Proposed DMCJA By-Law Amendment – J Krebs, AOC (action at March Board meeting)
- D. Records Retention- Financial Records archived by AOC – Judge Svaren
- E. Trial Court Request Ideas to Suggest to the BJA Trial Court Funding Operations Committee – Judge Alicea-Galvan
- F. 2014 Spring Conference Registration or Incidental Fees – Judge Svaren & Judge Marinella (possible action)
- G. Board Retreat – April 25 & 26, Willows Lodge, Woodinville – Judge Alicea-Galvan

<p><b>Action</b></p> <p>A. Amendment to 2013-2014 Board Meeting Schedule due to April 25-26, 2014, Board Retreat – <i>Judge Svaren</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• April 26, 2014, Board Meeting (following Board Retreat)</li> <li>• Cancel April 11<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting?</li> <li>• Need May Board Meeting?</li> </ul>	<p><b>5</b></p>
<p><b>Liaison Reports</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">DMCMA   MCA   SCJA   WSBA   WSAJ   AOC   BJA</p>	
<p><b>Information</b></p> <p>A. Update on Public Record Request – <i>Judge Svaren</i></p> <p>B. Rules Committee Meeting Minutes</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>
<p><b>Other Business</b></p> <p>A. Next Meeting: Friday, March 14, 2014, AOC SeaTac Office Center, SeaTac, WA</p>	
<p><b>Adjourn</b></p>	





**DMCJA Board of Governors Meeting**  
Friday, January 10, 2013, 12:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.  
AOC SeaTac Office

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Members:**

Chair, Judge Svaren  
Judge Alicea-Galvan  
Judge Allen  
Judge Burrows  
Judge Derr  
Judge Garrow (non-voting)  
Judge Jahns  
Judge Jasprica (non-voting)  
Judge Lambo (non-voting)  
Judge Logan  
Judge Marinella  
Judge Meyer  
Judge Olwell  
Judge Ringus (non-voting)  
Judge Robertson  
Commissioner Smiley  
Judge Smith  
Judge Steiner

**Guests:**

Ms. Aimee Vance, DMCMA  
Deena Kaeling, MCA

**AOC Staff:**

Ms. J Krebs  
Ms. Vicky Cullinane  
Ms. Michelle Pardee  
Mr. Dirk Marler

President Svaren called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. and noted there was a quorum present.

**ASSOCIATION BUSINESS**

Minutes

*M/S/P to approve December 13, 2013 minutes with that amendment.*

Treasurer's Report

*M/S/P to approve the Treasurer's Report.*

**Action**

Policy for Payment of Dues when Vacant Positions Filled

Judges Marinella, Steiner and Lambo worked on this version of the policy to be a guide to the Secretary-Treasurer in properly accounting for dues paid and reimbursement.

*M/S/P to approve the policy.*

Special Fund Report

No report was available and no changes were reported.

JIS Status Update

Ms. Cullinane reported that AOC continues to work on trying to make security log in to JABS easier for users and that she will have more information next month on any changes. IT^ 87-changing password through JABS will be resolved through the security changes currently being looked at for JABS. The guidelines for flagging cases for permanent retention that the judges approved at the last board meeting will be sent to Data Dissemination in February to put those guidelines in to a policy and then that will go to JISC in March. Plain paper warrants are now in use by courts. ITG 156 was completed to put fail safes in the process of eticketing so that when court staff is presented with choosing between more than one person, there are enough identifies shown to ensue correct person is chosen. Access to DOL's the new version of Abstract of Driving Record in JABS is still being analyzed to see if it can work in JABS.

**DISCUSSION**

*A. ARLJ 9 Update*

Judge Svaren discussed the rescinding of ARLJ 9 on December 10, 2013, and that the DMCJA Rules Committee's opinion is that it applies prospectively only. There was discussion that probation staff and attorneys are reviewing and some revising what is on treatment assessments that are filed in court.

*B. Vehicle Registration and Fines for Non-Compliance – Judge Svaren*

Members of the House Transportation Committee sought judges' comments on the law related to violations of vehicle registration. Board members present who are in jurisdictions that border other states said that they have not seen these criminal violations and it is usually the lesser fail to renew tables. Judge Svaren will contact the presiding judge in Clark County District court for comments on the questions for the House Transportation Committee members.

*C. OTC*

Meeting was just prior to the Board meeting. The new name is Trial Court Advocacy Board (TCAB) and will meeting every other month after the BJA meeting. SCJA and DMCJA legislator contact lists will be combined for TCAB to assist with contacting newly elected legislators, mayors, and other officials in an effort to build relationships. In conjunction with discussion item Joint Security Committee, TCAB will work to create that committee and look at court rules and legislation regarding minimum court security standards and funding. 2 members each from SCJA and DMCJA and a member from DMCMA and AWSCA (superior court administrators). TCAB will support recommendations sent to BJA.

Judge Steiner asked if AOC will still have and administrative division title Office of the Trial Courts and if that TCAB is separate from that. Mr. Marler stated that the division in AOC is Office of the Trail Courts and Judicial Education and that the AOC staff support for TCAB will come from that division in AOC.

Currently the expenses for DMCJA members to attend the TCAB meetings will come out of the President's Expense and a new budget line item will be reviewed and created in the 2014-2015 budget during the budget review at the Board Retreat.

**D. Joint Security Committee**

*See comments above under OTC.*

**E. Judicial College-**

Judge Jahns invited Board members and Committee Chairs to the January 30, 2014, reception jointly sponsored by DMCJA & SCJA during Judicial College. The reception will be at 13 Coins Restaurant. Unique this year is that Justices are teaching a session during Judicial College and there is also a session directed to the Appellate Court Judges. Judge Svaren will send out an invitation to the entire Board and Committee Chairs inviting them to attend the reception.

**Other Business**

**Judicial Needs Estimate Workgroup**

Judge Burrowes gave an update on the Judicial Needs Estimate workgroup. Bench warrants are not included in the judicial needs estimate and last year there were 420 thousand bench warrants issued. Based on the bench warrant information alone, the judicial needs estimate would increase by seven percent. Search warrants are not included as well. It is clear that the current way of estimating judicial needs is under reporting. There is discussion on specialty courts and how to count their cases in the estimate. Ms. Vance reported that there is a request into the code committee to create a youth court code to track specialty court cases. Also an impact to accurate judicial needs estimate is courts that do not use JIS and AOC has to ask the courts for needed information. It is not readily available.

**Spring Conference**

Judge Svaren gave an update on the date and location for the Spring Conference at Semiamoo June 8-11, 2014. The co-chairs of the Conference Committee are Commissioner Smiley and Judge Gillings.

**LIAISON REPORTS**

**DMCMA-** Ms. Vance did not have a report as the DMCMA meeting was taking place the week after this board meeting.

**MCA –** They are planning their spring conference and the Judges are welcome to attend. Conference information is included in the Board packet. This association in response to the

action on ARLJ 9 is also reviewing the content of assessment reports filed in court and not including full details of the assessment.

**SCJA** – No liaison present.

**WSBA** – No liaison present.

**WSAJ** – No liaison present.

**AOC** – Mr. Marler reported

**BJA** - Judge Ringus reported that on January 16, 2014, there will be a BJA reception for legislators. At the January 17, 2014, BJA meeting the DMCJA legislative proposal regarding municipal court contracts NEED to figure out this language.

BJA has created 4 standing Committees and will populate them with current members- Budget and Funding, Education, Legislative, and Policy and Planning. Letter will be going out to associations encouraging the association to review their committees and recommend a charter process. This is to try to streamline committees and to better set out AOC resources needed by the associations.

Meeting Adjourned at 1:56 p.m.

DRAFT





**WASHINGTON  
COURTS**

# *District and Municipal Court Judges' Association*

February 4, 2014

**President**  
**JUDGE DAVID A. SVAREN**  
Skagit County District Court  
600 S 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
PO Box 340  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273-0340  
(360) 336-9319

**President-Elect**  
**JUDGE VERONICA ALICEA-GALVAN**  
Des Moines Municipal Court  
21630 11<sup>th</sup> Ave S Ste C  
Des Moines, WA 98198  
(206) 878-4597

**Vice-President**  
**JUDGE DAVID STEINER**  
King County District Court  
585 112th Ave. S.E.  
Bellevue, WA 98004  
(206) 205-9200

**Secretary/Treasurer**  
**JUDGE G. SCOTT MARINELLA**  
Columbia County District Court  
535 Cameron St  
Dayton, WA 99328-1279  
(509) 382-4812

**Past President**  
**JUDGE SARA B. DERR**  
Spokane County District Court  
Public Safety Building  
1100 W Mallon Avenue  
Spokane, WA 99260-0150  
(509) 477-2959

**Board of Governors**

**JUDGE SANDRA L. ALLEN**  
Ruston/Milton Municipal Courts  
(253) 759-8545

**JUDGE JOSEPH M. BURROWES**  
Benton County District Court  
(509) 7535-8476

**JUDGE JEFFREY J. JAHNS**  
Kitsap County District Court  
(360) 337-7033

**JUDGE MARY C. LOGAN**  
Spokane Municipal Court  
(509) 622-4400

**JUDGE SAMUEL MEYER**  
Thurston County District Court  
(360) 786-5562

**JUDGE KELLEY C. OLWELL**  
Yakima Municipal Court  
(509) 575-3050

**JUDGE REBECCA C. ROBERTSON**  
Federal Way Municipal Court  
(253) 835-3000

**COMMISSIONER PETE SMILEY**  
Bellingham Municipal Court  
(360) 778-8150

**JUDGE HEIDI SMITH**  
Okanogan County District Court  
(509) 422-7170

To: President Svaren, DMCJA Officers; DMCJA Board of Governors;  
From: G. Scott Marinella, DMCJA Treasurer  
Subject: Monthly Treasurer's Report for February, 2014

Dear President Svaren, Officers and Members of the DMCJA Board of Governors,

The following is a summary of the total DMCJA accounts, expenditures and deposits, as well as an update regarding the finances of our association.

ACCOUNTS

US Bank Platinum Business Money Market Account  
Fund Balance - \$100,356.63, as of December 31, 2013.

Bank of America Accounts  
Investment Account - \$200,680.86, as of January 31, 2014.  
Checking Account - \$12,191.39, as of January 31, 2014.

Total for all Accounts: \$313,228.88

EXPENDITURES

Total 2013/2014 adopted budget:	\$228,900.00
Total expenditures to date (2-4-2014):	<u>\$ 46,347.51</u>
Total remaining budget as of February 4, 2014:	\$182,552.49

DEPOSITS

Total deposits 2013/2014:	\$112,570.16
---------------------------	--------------

## DMCJA 2013-2014 Budget

ITEM	COMMITTEE	Beginning Balance	Total Costs	Ending Balance
1	Access to Justice Liaison	\$500.00		\$500.00
2	Audit	\$2,000.00		\$2,000.00
3	Bar Association Liaison	\$5,000.00		\$5,000.00
4	Board Meeting Expense	\$30,000.00	\$12,693.24	\$17,306.76
5	Bookeeping Expense	\$3,000.00	\$1,625.00	\$1,375.00
6	Bylaws Committee	\$250.00		\$250.00
7	Conference Committee	\$3,500.00		\$3,500.00
8	Conference Incidental Fees For Members Spring Conference 2012 & 2013	\$40,000.00		\$40,000.00
9	Diversity Committee	\$2,000.00	\$292.01	\$1,707.99
10	DMCMA Education	\$5,000.00		\$5,000.00
11	DMCMA Liaison	\$500.00		\$500.00
12	DOL Liaison Committee	\$500.00	\$50.82	\$449.18
13	Education Committee**	\$8,500.00	\$356.13	\$8,143.87
14	Educational Grants	\$5,000.00	\$830.44	\$4,169.56
15	Judicial Assistance Committee	\$10,000.00	\$7,006.74	\$2,993.26
16	Legislative Committee	\$6,000.00	\$999.39	\$5,000.61
17	Legislative Pro-Tem	\$2,500.00		\$2,500.00
18	Lobbyist Expenses	\$1,000.00		\$1,000.00
19	Lobbyist Contract	\$55,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$43,000.00
20	Long-Range Planning Committee	\$1,500.00	\$441.82	\$1,058.18
21	MCA Liaison	\$1,500.00	\$596.31	\$903.69
22	National Leadership Grants	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$0.00
23	Nominating Committee	\$400.00		\$400.00
24	President Expense	\$7,500.00	\$846.20	\$6,653.80
25	Reserves Committee	\$250.00		\$250.00
26	Rules Committee	\$1,000.00	\$63.47	\$936.53
27	Rural Courts Committee	\$0.00	Not Funded	\$0.00
28	Salary and Benefits Committee	\$0.00	***Not Funded	\$0.00
29	SCJA Board Liaison	\$1,000.00	\$21.48	\$978.52
30	Technology Committee	\$5,000.00	\$42.58	\$4,957.42
31	Therapeutic Courts	\$2,500.00	\$532.06	\$1,967.94
32	Treasurer Expense and Bonds	\$1,000.00		\$1,000.00
33	Judicial Community Outreach	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$0.00
34	Uniform Infraction Committee	\$1,000.00		\$1,000.00
35	Regional Courts (ad hoc to 2015)	\$5,000.00		\$5,000.00
36	Professional Services	\$15,000.00	\$1,949.82	\$13,050.18
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$228,900.00</b>	<b>\$46,347.51</b>	<b>\$182,552.49</b>
37	<b>TOTAL DEPOSITS MADE</b>	<b>\$112,570.16</b>		
38	<b>CREDIT CARD</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		
***funding will come from special funds				



## DEPOSITS MADE

Date	Chk. #	Item Committee	Debit	Deposit	Balance
					\$0.00
7/11/2013	DEP	Deposit - JASP		\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
8/16/2013	7171	Deposit - 2013 Dues Judge Kevin A. McCann		\$750.00	\$5,750.00
9/24/2013	DEP	Deposit - 2013 Dues Adams County - Tyson Hill		\$375.00	\$6,125.00
11/19/2013	DEP	Credit Card overpayment refund		\$506.16	\$6,631.16
12/3/2013	DEP	Deposit - Dues Paid		\$824.00	\$7,455.16
12/12/2013	DEP	Deposit - Dues Paid		\$9,825.00	\$17,280.16
12/16/2013	DEP	Deposit Dues Paid		\$22,161.00	\$39,441.16
12/19/2013	DEP	Deposit Dues Paid		\$6,075.00	\$45,516.16
12/27/2013	DEP	Deposit Dues Paid		\$18,261.00	\$63,777.16
1/2/2013	DEP	Deposit Dues Paid		\$4,500.00	\$68,277.16
1/15/2014	DEP	Deposit Dues Paid		\$8,624.00	\$76,901.16
1/23/2014	DEP	Deposit Dues Paid		\$24,147.00	\$101,048.16
1/28/2014	DEP	Deposit Dues Paid		\$4,499.00	\$105,547.16
1/31/2014	DEP	Deposit Dues Paid		\$7,023.00	\$112,570.16
		TOTAL DUES PAID	\$105,939.00		
		TOTAL DEPOSITS MADE	\$112,570.16		



DISTRICT AND MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGES' ASSOCIATION

DMCJA Executive Legislative Committee

POSITIONS TAKEN As of  
February 3, 2014

Bill	Bill Title	Position/Comments	Date	Leg Status
SHB 1047	<b>Traffic cameras, photo tolls</b>	No Position Continuation of 2013 no position; Requires law enforcement to obtain a search warrant prior to obtaining the photographs, images, and other records taken by a traffic safety camera or toll photo system for investigation and prosecution purposes.	01/27/2014	S Law & Justice
SHB 1098	<b>Bail practices</b>	Support Carryover position from 2013, placed on third reading of Rules (moving).	02/03/2014	H 3rd Reading
SHB 1292	<b>Prostitution convictions</b>	No Position Continuation of no position in 2013	01/27/2014	S Law & Justice
SHB 1771	<b>Unmanned aerial vehicles</b>	No Position Continuation of no position from 2013	01/27/2014	H 2nd Reading
2SHB 1902	<b>Trailer license plates</b>	No Position Adds a new section to Chap. 46.18 RCW regarding intermittent-use trailer license plates and creating a (or are there two?) new traffic infraction(s) for falsifying plates, also requires the person to pay for the cost of the plate.	01/27/2014	H 2nd Reading
SHB 1902	<b>Trailer license plates</b>	No Position	01/27/2014	H 2nd Reading
SHB 2057	<b>Arrest without warrant</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	H Rules R
HB 2057	<b>Arrest without warrant</b>	No Position Amends RCW 10.31.100 such that a police officer may arrest a person without a warrant for committing a misdemeanor or gross misdemeanor when the offense is committed in the presence of an (rather than the) officer.	01/21/2014	H Rules R
SHB 2080	<b>Tribal fishing/convictions</b>	No Position	01/27/2014	H 2nd Reading
HB 2080	<b>Tribal fishing/convictions</b>	No Position Modifies RCW 9.96.060 to require vacation of certain convictions related to tribal fishing before 1975; would be difficult to implement due to lack of records.	01/21/2014	H 2nd Reading
SHB 2086	<b>Smoking in motor vehicles</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	H TRDPS

	<b>Smoking in motor vehicles</b>	No Position Adds a new section to chapter 46.61 RCW creating a new infraction for smoking; amends RCW 46.63.110 to set penalties of \$125/\$250.	01/13/2014	H TRDPS
HB 2111 (5961)	<b>Regional transit authorities</b>	Oppose Amends RCW 81.112.210 to allow regional transit authorities (Sound Transit) to prescribe form & content of NOIs.	01/13/2014	H TRDPS
HB 2116	<b>Contr'd substance possession</b>	No Position Sec. 2 amends RCW 69.50.4013 to change the penalty for possessing certain controlled substances from a class C felony to a gross misdemeanor.	01/21/2014	H Public Safety
HB 2117	<b>Breed-based dog regulations</b>	No Position Would prohibit breed-based dog regulations & preempt current local regulations that are breed-based.	01/13/2014	H Judiciary
HB 2128	<b>Global positioning data</b>	Support Creating a public disclosure exemption for global positioning system data that shows the residence of an employee or agent of a criminal justice agency. Pre-filed 12/19.	01/13/2014	H Govt Operation
HB 2131 (5981)	<b>Mason Co. superior crt judge</b>	No Position BJA request - New superior court judge position in Mason County.	01/13/2014	H Apps Gen Govt &
HB 2143 (6184)	<b>Genetically modified finfish</b>	No Position Sec. 3 adds a new section to chapter 77.125 RCW to create a new gross misdemeanor for genetically engineering finfish.	01/13/2014	H Ag & Nat Res
HB 2156	<b>Discover pass display</b>	Support Amends RCW 79A.80.080 to require courts to waive the penalty for Discover Pass display violations if the offender can prove they possessed a Discover Pass at the time of the violation. Allows court admin costs of \$25 if penalty is waived; no fee split language is included.	01/13/2014	H Apps Gen Govt
HB 2163 (6032)	<b>Dextromethorphan</b>	No Position Adds new sections to Title 69 RCW regulating dextromethorphan & creating new misdemeanors & felonies for its sale or purchase; preempts local laws.	01/13/2014	H PSDPS
SHB 2178	<b>Unmanned aircraft</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	H 2nd Reading
HB 2178	<b>Unmanned aircraft</b>	No Position Adds a new chapter to Title 14 RCW regulating unmanned aircraft (drones); Sec.3 creates a new gross misdemeanor.	01/13/2014	H 2nd Reading
HB 2179	<b>Government surveillance</b>	No Position Adds new sections to chapter 9.73	01/13/2014	H TEDDPS

		RCW to curtail gov't surveillance. Odd provisions concerning jurisdiction and damages; seems unlikely to progress.		
SHB 2195 (6311)	<b>Involuntary medication/jails</b>	No Position	01/27/2014	H Rules R
HB 2195 (6311)	<b>Involuntary medication/jails</b>	No Position Amends RCW 10.77.092 to authorize courts to order involuntary medication to maintain an inmate's level of restoration in the jail following the restoration period.	01/21/2014	H Rules R
HB 2206 (5966)	<b>Alcohol, etc., in sentencing</b>	No Position Amends sentencing provisions to address cannabis prohibitions.	01/21/2014	H Public Safety
SHB 2215 (6015)	<b>Election laws, reconciling</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	H Rules R
		No Position	01/27/2014	H Rules R
HB 2235 (6279)	<b>Search warrant applications</b>	Support Adds a new section to Chap. 2.20 RCW allowing any magistrate to issue a search warrant for any person or evidence located anywhere within the state. Committee questions whether the bill is necessary under current law.	01/21/2014	H Rules R
HB 2272	<b>4th Amendment protection act</b>	No Position Adds a new chapter to Title 42 RCW prohibiting state agencies from participating with federal searches without a warrant.	01/21/2014	H Judiciary
HB 2289	<b>Legislator/traffic violation</b>	No Position Amends RCW 46.64.010 to provide that the issuance of a traffic citation to a legislator is not civil process under Article II, section 16 of the Washington state Constitution.	01/21/2014	H Govt Operation
HB 2303 (6158)	<b>Marijuana sales/compliance</b>	No Position Adds new sections to chapter 69.50 RCW to make unlawful the sale, purchase, etc. of marijuana to or by minors; creates new misdemeanors.	01/21/2014	H Govt Acct & Ov
SHB 2333	<b>Employee antiretaliation act</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	H Approps HHS
HB 2333	<b>Employee antiretaliation act</b>	No Position	01/27/2014	H Approps HHS
HB 2372	<b>Failure to register vehicle</b>	Support Amends RCW 46.16A.030 to allow courts to reduce the \$529 base penalty for the infraction of failure to make initial registration before operating a vehicle in this state.	01/27/2014	H Trans
HB 2399	<b>Opportunity restoration cert</b>	Oppose Adds a new chapter to Title 9 RCW to allow a person meeting the specified criteria to request a "Certificate of	01/21/2014	H Public Safety

		Restoration of Opportunity" from the court attesting to the fact that he or she has "restored" him or herself; provides for an application fee of \$50.		
HB 2426	<b>Traffic safety cameras</b>	No Position Amends RCW 46.63.170 to authorize local jurisdictions to continue to operate automated traffic safety cameras after participating in a pilot program for at least three consecutive years.	01/27/2014	H Trans
HB 2457	<b>Derelict &amp; abandoned vessels</b>	No Position	01/27/2014	H Ag & Nat Res
HB 2458 (6040)	<b>Invasive species</b>	No Position Creates a new aquatic invasive species management regime under Title 77 RCW, including new enforcement provisions under Chap. 77.15 RCW.	01/27/2014	H Ag & Nat Res
SHB 2459 (6039)	<b>Hunter safety</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	H Apps Gen Govt
HB 2459 (6039)	<b>Hunter safety</b>	No Position Amends statutes related to hunter safety & education requirements; adds a new section to Chap. 77.15 RCW creating a natural resource infraction that appears to be directed at a child.	01/27/2014	H Apps Gen Govt &
HB 2460 (6041)	<b>Fish &amp; wildlife enforcement</b>	No Position Amends various provisions of Chap. 77.15 RCW to modify certain fish-related definitions of misdemeanors and infractions; Sec. 13 creates a new criminal wildlife penalty assessment to be assessed by the court, which may not be suspended & which may be doubled.	01/21/2014	H Ag & Nat Res
HB 2463	<b>Parking, person w/disability</b>	No Position Sec. 5 amends RCW 46.19.050 to make unauthorized use of a disabled parking pass a misdemeanor rather than a parking infraction (directed to a vehicle?); creates procedure for person to sign statement or produce placard before court appearance to avoid liability - not sure how this would work in practice; creates a new infraction with a base penalty of \$250 and a special assessment of \$200 for failure to fully display placard; makes "illegal obtainment" of a placard a misdemeanor rather than an infraction; allows court to "confiscate" placard; creates a new infraction for sale of a placard.	01/27/2014	H Trans
HB 2468 (6310)	<b>Biological material/crimes</b>	Watch Sec. 2 creates a work group on preservation of evidence for criminal justice purposes, which includes a DMCJA representative.	01/27/2014	H Public Safety
HB 2470	<b>Rental car businesses</b>	No Position Amends RCW 46.16A.120 to provide	01/27/2014	H Trans

		that the registration on a rental vehicle cannot be renewed without the owner providing proof of an appeal of the violation; other provisions strengthen requirement to pay rental car tickets.		
HB 2497 (6249)	<b>Indigent defense/cost recrvy</b>	Watch Increases certain fees (Criminal conviction fee under RCW 3.62.085 - \$43 to \$55; Warrant service costs under RCW 10.01.160 - \$100 to \$175; Probation services costs under RCW 10.64.120 -- \$100/month to \$150/month), ostensibly to pay for increased indigent defense costs; per a new section in chap. 10.01 RCW, funds are to support local court operations, prosecutorial functions & other criminal justice matters connected with indigent defense.	01/21/2014	H Judiciary
HB 2503	<b>Vessel operation/intoxicated</b>	No Position Amends RCW 79A.60.040 to make blood draw rules for vessel DUIs congruent w/ auto DUIs.	01/27/2014	H Public Safety
HB 2543	<b>Electronic monitoring</b>	No Position Amends RCW 9.94A.030 to expand the definition of "home detention;" amends RCW 9.94A.734 to specify home detention timeframes and require a monitoring agency that meets the requirements of a new section added to Chap. 9.94A RCW (Sec. 3).	01/27/2014	H Public Safety
HB 2556	<b>Therapeutic courts</b>	Support Therapeutic courts bill – authorizes all trial & juvenile courts in WA to establish & operate therapeutic courts (defined).	01/27/2014	H Judiciary
HB 2601	<b>Municipal court terms</b>	Sponsor DMCJA-sponsored: adds new sections to Chap. 3.50 RCW and Chap. 35.20 RCW to provide that a city cannot terminate a municipal court during the judge's term.	01/27/2014	H Judiciary
HB 2630	<b>Transgenic fish labeling</b>	No Position Amends RCW 69.04.934 to expand the definition of salmon misbranding to include transgenic salmon.	01/27/2014	H Ag & Nat Res
HB 2649 (6395)	<b>Incompetent defendant</b>	No Position Amends RCW 10.77.086 (just felonies) and RCW 10.77.088 (non-felonies) to allow county jails to have custody of defendants who are found incompetent.	01/27/2014	H Judiciary
HB 2656	<b>Deeds of trust infractions</b>	No Position Adds a section to Chap. 61.24 RCW (Deeds of Trust) providing that any violation of the chapter is a class 1 civil infraction; amends RCW 7.80.120 to provide a penalty of \$500.	01/27/2014	H Judiciary
HB 2701 (6085)	<b>DUI violation prior offenses</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	H Public Safety

HB 2706	<b>Marijuana/adult acquisition</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	H Exec Action
HB 2707 (6260)	<b>Parks, rec, &amp; nat. resources</b>	Sponsor DMCJA-sponsored: amends RCW 3.62.020 and RCW 7.84.100 to restore fee split for Discover Pass violations.	02/03/2014	H Apps Gen Govt
HB 2728	<b>Impaired driving</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	H Public Safety
ESSB 5735	<b>Sex or kidnapping offenders</b>	No Position Continuation of no position - 2013	01/27/2014	S HumServ/Corr
SB 5961 (2111)	<b>Regional transit authorities</b>	Oppose Amends RCW 81.112.210 to allow regional transit authorities (Sound Transit) to prescribe form & content of NOIs.	01/13/2014	S Transportation
SSB 5966 (2206)	<b>Alcohol, etc., in sentencing</b>	No Position Amends sentencing provisions to address cannabis prohibitions.	01/21/2014	S Rules 2
SB 5998	<b>Warrant officers</b>	No Position Adds a new section to Chap. 35.20 RCW creating a position of "warrant officers" for first class cities.	01/21/2014	S Rules 2
SB 6012	<b>Judicial members, state bar</b>	No Position Amends RCW 2.48.130 to prohibit the WSBA from assessing fees against any full-time judicial officer who is not an active member of the bar as defined RCW 2.48.170, and to provide that a judicial member who applies to return to active status shall not be charged any fee for the period in which he or she was a judicial member, nor any investigation fee.	01/21/2014	S Rules 2
SSB 6014	<b>Vessel operation/intoxicated</b>	No Position Amends RCW 79A.60.040 to make blood test rules for vessel DUIs congruent with auto DUIs.	01/21/2014	S 2nd Reading
SSB 6015 (2215)	<b>Election laws, reconciling</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	S Rules 2
SB 6015 (2215)	<b>Election laws, reconciling</b>	No Position	01/27/2014	S Rules 2
SSB 6039 (2459)	<b>Hunter safety</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	S Ways & Means
SB 6039 (2459)	<b>Hunter safety</b>	No Position Amends statutes related to hunter safety & education requirements; adds a new section to Chap. 77.15 RCW creating a natural resource infraction that appears to be directed at a child.	01/27/2014	S Ways & Means
SB 6040 (2458)	<b>Invasive species</b>	No Position Creates a new aquatic invasive species management regime under Title 77 RCW, including new enforcement provisions under Chap. 77.15 RCW.	01/27/2014	S Natural Resour

SB 6041 (2460)	<b>Fish &amp; wildlife enforcement</b>	No Position Amends various provisions of Chap. 77.15 RCW to modify certain fish-related definitions of misdemeanors and infractions; Sec. 13 creates a new criminal wildlife penalty assessment to be assessed by the court, which may not be suspended & which may be doubled.	01/21/2014	S Rules 2
SB 6066	<b>Firearm rights restoration</b>	No Position Amends RCW 9.96.060 (vacation of misdemeanor & gross misdemeanor offenses) to prohibit a vacated domestic violence conviction from being used in a later crim prosecution unless the conviction was violating the provision of a protection order or stalking.	01/21/2014	S Law & Justice
SSB 6085 (2701)	<b>DUI violation prior offenses</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	S Ways & Means
SB 6085 (2701)	<b>DUI violation prior offenses</b>	No Position Amends RCW 10.31.100 to require officers to arrest a person if the person has committed a DUI and has a DUI prior w/in 15 (rather than 10) years; amends RCW 46.61.5055 to change the sentencing guidelines to include prior DUIs committed w/in 15 (rather than 7 or 10) years.	01/21/2014	S Ways & Means
SB 6088	<b>State supreme court size</b>	No Position Reduces the size of the Supreme Court to seven justices thru attrition.	01/21/2014	S Law & Justice
SB 6109	<b>Rental cars/violations</b>	No Position Amends RCW 46.63.073 to provide that a rental car driver may be responsible for an infraction. Referred to Leg Exec 1/21/14.	01/21/2014	S Rules 2
SB 6158 (2303)	<b>Marijuana sales/compliance</b>	No Position Adds new sections to chapter 69.50 RCW to make unlawful the sale, purchase, etc. of marijuana to or by minors; creates new misdemeanors.	01/21/2014	S Commerce and L
SSB 6178	<b>Medical and rec. marijuana</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	S Commerce and La
SB 6178	<b>Medical and rec. marijuana</b>	No Position Amends various statutes, primarily within Chap. 69.50 RCW and Chap. 69.51A RCW to align the medical marijuana system with the recreational marijuana system; Sec. 26 creates a new penalty section (felony).	01/27/2014	S Commerce and L
SB 6184 (2143)	<b>Genetically modified finfish</b>	No Position Sec. 3 adds a new section to chapter 77.125 RCW to create a new gross misdemeanor for genetically engineering finfish.	01/13/2014	S Natural Resour
SB 6217	<b>GPS data/law enforcement</b>	Support Amends RCW 42.56.240 to exempt	01/27/2014	S Rules 2

		from the PRA GPS data that shows the residence of an employee of a criminal justice agency.		
SSB 6227	<b>Distracted driving incidents</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	
SB 6227	<b>Distracted driving incidents</b>	No Position Amends RCW 46.20.075, RCW 46.61.667 & RCW 46.61.668 to increase infraction penalties related to cell phone use while driving; amends RCW 46.61.667 to remove provision that prevents these violations from going on driving record & doubles penalty for more than 1 violation in 5 years w/ 50% split to state.	01/27/2014	S Transportation
SB 6249 (2497)	<b>Indigent defense/cost recvry</b>	Watch Increases certain fees (Criminal conviction fee under RCW 3.62.085 - \$43 to \$55; Warrant service costs under RCW 10.01.160 - \$100 to \$175; Probation services costs under RCW 10.64.120 -- \$100/month to \$150/month), ostensibly to pay for increased indigent defense costs; per a new section in chap. 10.01 RCW, funds are to support local court operations, prosecutorial functions & other criminal justice matters connected with indigent defense.	01/21/2014	S Law & Justice
SB 6260 (2707)	<b>Parks, rec, &amp; nat. resources</b>	Sponsor DMCJA-sponsored: amends RCW 3.62.020 and RCW 7.84.100 to restore fee split for Discover Pass violations.	02/03/2014	S Ways & Means
		Sponsor DMCJA-sponsored: amends RCW 3.62.020 and RCW 7.84.100 to restore fee split for Discover Pass violations.	01/27/2014	S Ways & Means
SB 6278	<b>Killing big game by mistake</b>	No Position Amends RCW 77.15.410 to create an affirmative defense to the offense of unlawful big game hunting.	01/27/2014	S Natural Resour
SB 6279 (2235)	<b>Search warrant applications</b>	Support Adds a new section to Chap. 2.20 RCW allowing any magistrate to issue a search warrant for any person or evidence located anywhere within the state. Committee questions whether the bill is necessary under current law.	01/21/2014	S Law & Justice
SB 6301	<b>Bicycle operator ID</b>	Watch Adds a chapter to Title 46 RCW to require a bicycle operator identification number; Sec. 3 creates a new traffic infraction with a \$20/\$30/\$40 base penalty. Some concern about penalties & potential fee split.	01/27/2014	S Transportation
SB 6310 (2468)	<b>Biological material/crimes</b>	Watch Sec. 2 creates a work group on preservation of evidence for criminal justice purposes, which includes a DMCJA representative.	01/27/2014	S Law & Justice

(2195)	<b>Involuntary medication/jails</b>	No Position	01/27/2014	S HumServ/Corr
SB 6343	<b>Gen. engineered fin fish</b>	No Position Adds a new section to Chap. 77.125 RCW making it a gross misdemeanor to produce genetically engineered fin fish in state waters; amends RCW 69.04.934 to expand the definition of misbranded finfish.	01/27/2014	S Natural Resour
SB 6350	<b>St. constitution violations</b>	No Position Adds a chapter to Title 7 RCW to allow suits against state entities for constitutional rights violations.	01/27/2014	S Law & Justice
SB 6378	<b>Recreational passes, permits</b>	No Position Amends RCW 79A.80.080 (Disc Pass) to delete the provision that currently provides that the penalty must be reduced to fifty-nine dollars if an individual provides proof of purchase of a discover pass to the court within fifteen days after the notice of violation.	01/27/2014	S Natural Resourc
SB 6386	<b>Alcohol tasting by students</b>	No Position Amends RCW 66.44.270 to allow students under the age of twenty-one to taste alcohol as part of a school program.	01/27/2014	S Commerce and La
SB 6389	<b>Sentencing enhancements</b>	No Position Amends RCW 9.94A.535 to provide that as a mitigating factor in sentencing, the court may consider whether the operation of the mandatory multiple consecutive enhancements policy under RCW 9.94A.533 results in a presumptive sentence that is clearly excessive.	01/27/2014	S Law & Justice
SB 6395 (2649)	<b>Incompetent defendant</b>	No Position Amends RCW 10.77.086 (just felonies) and RCW 10.77.088 (non-felonies) to allow county jails to have custody of defendants who are found incompetent.	01/27/2014	S HumServ/Corr
SB 6410	<b>Marriage/surname changes</b>	No Position Adds a new section to chapter 26.04 RCW creating a new misdemeanor for offenders who do not inform DOC of a name change.	01/27/2014	S HumServ/Corr
SB 6413	<b>Prior offenses for DUI</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	S Law & Justice
SB 6415	<b>DUI consecutive sentences</b>	No Position	02/03/2014	S Law & Justice



## 2014 DMCJA Election Worksheet

Position	Current Member	Nominee	Court	Req. Attribute	PT muni	PT dist	Full T muni	Full T dist	Magis/Comm	East/West	Small/Large
Past Pres.	Sara Derr							X		W	Large
President	David Svaren	David Svaren	Skagit D					X		E	Large
	V. Alicea-Galvan	V. Alicea-Galvan	Des Moines M				X			W	Large
Pres. Elect	David Steiner	David Steiner	KCDC, East							W	Small
							X			W	Large
Vice Pres.	David Steiner		KCDC, East					X		W	Large
		G. S. Marinella	Columbia D					X		E	Small
Sec/Treas.	G. S. Marinella		Columbia D								
		Scott Ahlf	Olympia M				X			W	Small
Bd Pos 5	Mary Logan		Spokane M	Muni			X			E	Large
		Tracy Staab	Spokane M	Muni			X			E	Large
		Karli Jorgensen	Kent M	Muni			X			W	Small
Bd Pos 6	Sandra Allen		Ruston/Milton	PT Muni						W	Small
		Jennifer Fassbender	Airway Heights	PT Muni						E	Small
		Michelle Gehlsen	Bothell M	PT Muni						W	Small
Bd Pos 7	Pete Smiley		Bellingham M	PT Muni							
		Susan Noonan	KCDC	Commis					X	W	Small
				Commis					X	W	Large
Bd Pos 1	Jeffrey Jahns	N/A	Kitsap D	FT Dist			X		W	Large	
Bd Pos 2	Samuel Meyer	N/A	Thurston D	FT Dist				X	W	Large	
Bd Pos 3	Heidi Smith	N/A	Okanogan D	PT Dist		X			E	Small	
Bd Pos 4	Reb. Robertson	N/A	Federal Way	Muni			X		W	Small	
Bd Pos 8	Kelley Otwell	N/A	Yakima M	Open			X		E	Large	
Bd Pos 9	J. Burrowes	N/A	Benton D	Open				X	E	Large	

= remaining on the Board  
Small Court = 2 or less judicial officers

n:\programs & organizations\dmcja\committees\nominating\2014 position grid - as of 1-22-2014.docx



**DMCJA System Improvement Committee**  
**Final Report**  
**Tuesday, February 04, 2014**

**MEMBERS:**

Judge David Steiner, King County District Court, Chair  
Judge Steve Holman, Kitsap County District Court  
Judge David Larson, Federal Way Municipal Court  
Judge Kelly Olwell, Yakima Municipal Court  
Judge Sandy Allen, Milton & Ruston Municipal Courts  
Judge Linda Portnoy, Lake Forest Park Municipal Court  
Judge Douglas Goelz, South Pacific County District Court District Court  
Trish Kinlow, Tukwila Municipal Court Administrator  
Chris Ruhl, Pierce County District Court  
Candace Bock, Association of Washington Cities (AWC)  
Brian Enslow, Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC)

**The System Improvement Committee was tasked as follows:**

**CHARGE:** Evaluate the system of Courts of Limited Jurisdiction in Washington and make recommendations for steps that can be taken to improve service to the public while preserving the Court's role as a co-equal branch of government. Included within this charge are the following concepts:

1. **REGIONAL COURTS.** Study forms of court regionalization and report whether existing forms are adequate; whether new forms of regionalization are desirable; whether legislation should be drafted to facilitate new methods of regionalization; under what circumstances is regionalization desirable or undesirable from a service standpoint.
2. **PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS.** Whether performance benchmarks/best practices should be adopted to provide a baseline for evaluating court performance; identify a baseline of minimum services every court user can reasonably expect.
3. **UNIVERSAL PAYMENT.** Make recommendations regarding the desirability and feasibility of a universal payment system and whether one can be reasonably implemented prior to deployment of a new case management system.
4. **SERVICES.** Explore and recommend services beneficial to the public that can be implemented with minimal financial impact and, conversely, identify and evaluate efficiencies that can be employed without reducing service to the public.
5. **JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE.** Explore and recommend ways to elevate the independent services courts provide as essential to the well-being of individuals and communities at large. Recommend laws and rules that institutionalize the courts as the co-equal branch of government it is intended to be.

**The committee of the whole was divided into two subcommittees; the Regional Courts and Performance Benchmarks Subcommittee and the Services and Universal Payment Subcommittee.**

Each produced reports and recommendations. At our final meeting on January 31, 2014, the committee of the whole adopted the following reports and recommendations.

## REGIONAL COURTS

1. **Charge: Study forms of court regionalization and report whether existing forms are adequate.**

There have been several studies conducted over the past few years. Attachment A provides a summary of those studies. The BJA Municipal Court Study Oversight Workgroup reviewed the conclusions from the 2013 study by the National Center on State Courts and concluded in their own report to BJA, in part, as follows:

Evaluation projects. The workgroup is not supportive of an effort to promote regionalization projects for evaluation at this time. Members are aware that there have been discussions about municipal courts for a number of years, particularly regarding smaller and part-time municipal courts. The strategy of promoting regional courts appears to have emerged from those discussions several years ago as a remedy or solution to perceived shortcomings in those courts. The NCSC study, however, does not provide clear evidence of such shortcomings. The workgroup understands that this result may well be due to the fact that reliable and relevant data is not systematically collected and so not available to the researchers. In any event the fact is that the perceived problems of the municipal courts are not well defined. The workgroup feels that the board should more specifically articulate the concerns that it has with the municipal courts before attempting to fashion an appropriate remedy.

See Attachment B

The consensus is that there is no need to further study the formation of a formal regional court system. Instead, the focus should be on developing best practices that will provide optimum levels of service to the public through collaborative efforts.

2. **Charge: Determine whether new forms of regionalization are desirable.**

The consensus is that we need to develop a "culture of cooperation" among jurisdictions so that service can be provided to the public in the most independent, direct, and local fashion possible. We need to develop systems that empower local courts to cooperate with other courts in ways that bolster services to the public without threatening the local control and independence necessary to adapt to local needs.

3. **Charge: Determine whether legislation should be drafted to facilitate new methods of regionalization.**

The consensus is that the DMCJA should take the lead with the involvement of the DMMCA to create a "culture of cooperation" among local jurisdictions through changes to not only court rules and statutes, but also changes to attitudes on how local courts are perceived.

We also agree that the judiciary needs to have more influence when courts are formed or merged through interlocal agreements. The present statutory structure sees what we do as judges as a "service" rather than the exercise of power granted to us as a member of a co-equal

branch of government. The present statutory structure allows the executive and legislative branch to farm out judicial services to other government bodies in much the same way that the local government might contract with another jurisdiction to fill potholes. The judiciary's influence is effectively nullified under the present statutory structure. This is an affront to judicial independence because the other branches have undue influence to threaten existing arrangements as a way to influence judicial decisions and control judges. Judicial services need to be seen by policymakers and the public as holding a unique place in government because of its role in delivering justice and dignity independent of outside pressure and influence as a co-equal branch of government with distinct constitutional powers.

4. **Charge: Under what circumstances is regionalization desirable from a service standpoint?**  
The culture of cooperation would give power to localities through their judicial officers to develop ways to deliver service without threatening local control and independence.
5. **Under what circumstances is regionalization undesirable from a service standpoint?**  
Forced regionalization that feeds turf-oriented reactions will not be productive. There is not a systemic, structural issue with courts of limited jurisdiction that can or will be solved by a broad regionalization effort, mandate, or structure.

### **PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS**

1. **Charge: Whether performance benchmarks/best practices should be adopted to provide a baseline for evaluating court performance.**  
The National Center for State Courts CourTools program may be a good start <http://www.courtools.org/Trial-Court-Performance-Measures.aspx>. However, the consensus is that a group dedicated to this sole task be formed to make recommendations regarding voluntary performance benchmarks/best practices for courts of limited jurisdiction. In the meantime, we recommend that the DMCJA Education Committee develop a program on Performance Standards (focusing on CourTools) for the 2015 Joint DMCJA/DMCMA annual conference.
2. **Charge: Identify a baseline of minimum services every court user can reasonably expect.**  
The consensus is that a group dedicated to this sole task be formed to make recommendations.

### **Universal Cashiering**

1. **Charge: Make recommendations regarding the desirability and feasibility of a universal payment system and whether one can be reasonably implemented prior to deployment of a new case management system.**

**We recommend the new CLJ CMS have the capacity to do universal cashiering.** (Whether we go with Tyler/Odyssey or some other case management system.) We need to confirm whether Odyssey has the accounting functionality we would need in order to meet the needs of the CLJ's. In any event, this should be included as a priority in the requirements gathering for a CLJ CMS.

**We also recommend we obtain information from AOC about the overall CLJ collection rate on fines and fees, as well as the total number of DWLS 3rd's. See the attached spreadsheet on the latter with data on outstanding DWLS 3's provided by AOC.<sup>1</sup>**

The goal here is that a defendant can walk into any court in the state and pay fines, fees or other legal financial obligations from any other court. A more limited goal would be universal cashiering among all courts of limited jurisdiction. There may be more receptivity to this with the possibility of a new case management system (CMS) for CLJ's. It also may be more possible and practical to actually implement it with a new CMS, due to system obstacles in JIS/DISCIS as well as the issue of transfer fees. Otherwise, AOC would need to come up with a way of using the MSP screen for payment processing from one court to another.

We note though that one potential issue if and when some form of universal cashiering becomes a reality is that some of the more easily accessible courts may well become de facto "payment centers of choice" for many customers, and thus bear a disproportionate burden of providing this customer service.

We also recommend that a single statewide online payment system be created (presumably to be managed/operated by AOC).

Add language from a report provided by Judge Portnoy.

- 2. Charge: Explore and recommend services beneficial to the public that can be implemented with minimal financial impact and, conversely, identify and evaluate efficiencies that can be employed without reducing service to the public.**

#### **Referral of Cases to Collection Agencies**

We recommend development of a judicial educational program on collection practices with a view to creating greater consistency in such practices among the courts.

#### **Community Outreach**

- A. We recommend that Courts be encouraged to do more community outreach to educate the public about court processes (e.g. RE: license suspension process, DV, DUI); and
- B. We recommend that judges be able to receive CJE credits for offering this kind of community outreach/education.

---

<sup>1</sup> The attached report created by AOC shows the total number of DWLS cases that remain outstanding in the CLJ's as of early January 2014. The search criteria looks for "DWLS" in the charge name or a law number that contains "46.20.342" and those charges do not have a disposition code entered. Cases that qualify are then counted by filing year. Counting at the case level does not exclude warrants and/or FTA's.

# Attachment A

## Attachment A

### SUMMARY OF PAST REGIONAL COURT STUDIES

Year	Report	Recommendation(s)	Action(s) Taken
2001	<p>"Project 2001"- Statewide taskforce created by BJA including diverse stakeholders conduct a thorough review of the judicial system.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Trial Court Coordinating Councils to formalize cooperation and coordination of services among courts, including different levels of trial courts in jurisdictions across the state;</li> <li>2. Redefine the role of Presiding Judge by squarely placing the authority and responsibility for the effective management of the trial courts in their hands;</li> <li>3. Authorize the use of elected judges to serve at different level of court in a jurisdiction without the consent of the parties or their lawyers who are appearing before that judge (referred to as "portability" of judges).</li> <li>4. Regionalization:  <b>Report did not recommend full regionalization (defined as a unified court system, in which courts of limited jurisdiction would merge with superior courts). The report found the "functional equivalent" of unification could be achieved through implementing the three reforms recommended, while avoiding the increased costs and inefficiencies of actually merging or combining (unifying) superior and limited jurisdiction courts.</b> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recommendation for Trial Court Coordinating Councils implemented in some jurisdictions, but not required</li> <li>2. GR 29 adopted by Supreme Court</li> <li>3. Recommendation on "portability" implemented</li> </ol>

<p>October, 2003</p>	<p>"Always the People: Delivering limited jurisdiction court services throughout Washington". The Justice Management Institute (Denver, CO). Study was commissioned by BJA Statewide Court Funding Taskforce. This study was commissioned to supply information to the "Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Work Group"-a sub-group of the larger Funding Task Force</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Selection of judges and court staff that is merit based and independent of the funding authority;</li> <li>2. Recommend: emphasis on providing ongoing training and education to judges and staff;</li> <li>3. Presiding judge exercise of management and decisional authority free from inappropriate influence by executive or legislative branches;</li> <li>4. Judicial officers should have time for and specific training on management related activities;</li> <li>5. The public, including offenders, should have quick and convenient access to courts, probation services, defense services;</li> <li>6. Consideration should be given to evening court hours and establishing local offices separate from courthouses to receive payments and schedule hearings;</li> <li>7. Victims of domestic violence should have access to court services for protection;</li> <li>8. Develop a statewide protocol for providing DV protection orders and statewide training;</li> <li>9. Develop methods to ensure fines and costs are paid, including a statewide system for processing payments and one that permits acceptance by any local court of payment for infraction cases anywhere in the state;</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nothing done. Choices might include merit based selection and retention election system or election of all judges</li> <li>2. Ongoing training is being done with mandatory Judicial College and CJE hours.</li> <li>3. Presiding judge authority addressed in GR 29.</li> <li>4. Training on management issues occurs at DMCJA spring conferences</li> <li>5. There is no current minimum requirement for open court hours or minimum judicial days per week</li> <li>6. Courts establish night court at their discretion</li> <li>7. <u>RCW 10.99.040</u> provides DV victims protected by NCO have some process to address the issuing court regarding modification or rescission of the order.</li> <li>8. State law was amended to allow all courts of limited jurisdiction to handle any kind of DV protection orders (with municipal courts having an option for civil anti-harassment orders)</li> <li>9. There is no universal cashing at present</li> <li>10. Courts that wish to monitor their time to completion statistics do so voluntarily without mandate or assistance from AOC</li> <li>12. Courts may set up forums with stakeholders to discuss the criminal justice system if they wish</li> </ol>
----------------------	---	--	---

		<p>10. Courts should hold hearings with sufficient frequency to dispose of cases within acceptable time limits and courts should regularly monitor their completion of cases;</p> <p>11. Examine court procedures to minimize duplicate appearances and reduce FTAs;</p> <p>12. Provide courts forums to exchange ideas on problem solving and diagnose and evaluate performance of justice system;</p> <p>13. Connect probation department and court information services so offender information is entered once and can be shared;</p> <p>14. Gather and analyze data on collection effectiveness.</p>	<p>13. Probation departments across jurisdictions have no current way to share information</p> <p>14. Courts may analyze collection data on their own.</p>
<p>Dec, 2004</p> <p>BJA Court Funding Task Force: Justice in Jeopardy Report: The Court Funding Crises in Washington State"</p>	<p>1. All Judges in courts of limited jurisdiction should be elected.</p> <p>2. Re-organize courts of limited jurisdiction into regional courts funded by the state.</p> <p>3. RCW, Title 3 should be amended to provide different court options for local governments to provide court services to their community. Encourage regionalization of courts of limited jurisdiction by allowing interlocal agreement for court services.</p> <p>4. Provisions should be made for expanded subject matter jurisdiction in district and municipal courts.</p> <p>5. Courts of limited jurisdiction should be accessible to residents of the community it</p>	<p>1. Not implemented</p> <p>2. Not implemented</p> <p>3. Implemented by <u>RCW 39.34.180</u>, allowing for inter-local agreements between cities for court services. <u>City of Medina v. Primm, 160 Wn. 2d 268 (2007)</u>. Title 3.50 was amended in 2008 to effectuate.</p> <p>4. Municipal courts may hear all civil DV protection orders, but no further legislation was passed to allow for other civil cases, such as small claims.</p> <p>5. No action taken</p> <p>6. Action taken-<u>RCW 3.42.020</u> amended in 2008 regarding duties of commissioners.</p> <p>7. District Court District legislation in <u>RCW 3.38</u> (Districting Committee) has not been</p>	

			<p>amended since 1995.</p> <p>8. Legislation to allow municipal courts the option of hearing civil anti-harassment protection petitions passed. <u>RCW 10.14.150</u> (municipal court must pass local rule to exercise option).</p> <p>9. Unsure if any courts currently do not comply with assistance to DV victims who need protection orders. Gender and Justice Commission provides standard forms and assistance to courts.</p> <p>10. Legislation to raise jurisdiction amount to \$75,000 passed. <u>RCW 3.66.020</u></p> <p>11. Unsure if any rule or legislation to require dedicated civil calendars and case scheduling.</p>
		<p>serves, including providing services on a regularly scheduled bases at established hours that are posted for the public.</p> <p>6. Limit district and municipal court commissioner authority to differentiate their responsibilities from those of elected judges.</p> <p>7. Amend RCW Title 3 to emphasize a collaborative regional approach to the provision of court services by expanding the role and membership of the districting committee.</p> <p>8. Authorize municipal courts to hear anti-harassment protection petitions.</p> <p>9. Require courts of limited jurisdiction to timely hear DV protection orders or have clear, concise procedures to refer victims to courts where services are available.</p> <p>10. Increase civil jurisdiction amount in dispute for district courts to \$75,000.</p> <p>11. Recommend district courts implement dedicated civil calendars and case scheduling.</p>	<p>[NOTE: In September 2013, the BJA sent the recommendation on regional courts back to AOC staff to develop a proposal for looking at the history of regionalization and bring that back to the BJA to determine what the next steps should be. [BJA minutes, Sept. 20, 2013]]</p>
<p>May, 2013</p>	<p>Report by National Center for State Courts. Commissioned by BJA "Regional Courts Oversight Committee" to analyze effectiveness of CLI as a "prelude to possible court organization reform". Report requested in</p>	<p><b>Finding on regional courts by report:</b>  <b>"The regional courts concept can effectively help to achieve these goals [standardizing court procedures, providing for a consistent cost structure or advancing equal justice throughout the state]. However, because there appears to be such a wide degree of variation in the organization and operation of the municipal courts, a regional court approach may not be necessary for all jurisdictions. In addition, without a clear baseline defining the level of</b></p>	

	<p>furtherance of the BJA's policy position that Washington should establish a 'single regionally based court of limited jurisdiction'. [page 1]</p>	<p>services and performance that should be provided by the municipal courts, whether an individual jurisdiction is proving sufficient 'quality' of justice is a subjective determination.' [page 59]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development of a comprehensive set of standards applicable to all courts of limited jurisdiction, including standardized measures of performance.</li> <li>2. In some instances a regional court may provide the best alternative to improving delivery of court services.</li> <li>3. Conduct one or more evaluation projects with municipalities to further assess the impact of consolidation or regionalization. The selection of courts in such an evaluation project should be those interested in court consolidation and those that have the capability of providing all necessary evaluation data.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No action taken to date</li> <li>2. Options for interlocal agreements for municipal courts already exist. No current legislative options exist to allow for inter-local agreements between district and municipal courts. The only option under RCW Title 3 is for a city to contract for all court services with a district court.</li> <li>3. No action taken on study suggestion</li> </ol>
--	--	---	--

# Attachment B

## Court Structure by County

The attached chart has a summary of the following information organized by county:

- Total population;
- Percentage of population living in city limits that could be served by a municipal court;
- The physical location of district courts;
- A list of cities that contract with the county or that have RCW 3.46 municipal departments in district court;
- A list of cities with violation bureaus only;
- A list of cities with their own municipal court;
- A list of cities that contract with other cities;
- A list of cities with city limits in two or more counties (this is important for jury service);
- A list of cities not accounted for in AOC court directories sorted by county.

A quick review of county codes was conducted to look for references to district court structure (see attached).

Observations are as follows:

- 48 cities in Washington are not accounted for in the AOC court directory as having a court or a relationship with a county. Populations of those cities range from 100 to 90,110;
- 15 counties have no municipal courts;
- 21 cities have violations bureaus only;
- 11 counties have no recorded relationships with cities;
- 3 counties have no recorded relationship with a city and cities in that county have no record of having a court;
- 9 cities provide for municipal courts by local ordinance, but appoint district court judges to hear cases;
- 5 cities list their courts as departments of district court under RCW 3.46;
- 8 cities contract with one other city;
- 5 cities contract with 2 other cities;
- 1 city contracts with 4 other cities;
- 2 cities share space;
- 2 cities share an administrator, but seem to maintain separate courts;
- 6 cities have boundaries in 2 counties;
- 1 city has boundaries in 3 counties;
- The city of Republic in Ferry County is not mentioned as having a court or as being part of district court in the court directory, but shows up in caseload reports under Ferry County District Court;
- In Grant County, Electric City and Grand Coulee do not show in caseload reports, but do show as having municipal courts with district court judges in the court directory;

- In Lincoln County, Almira and Harrington do not show in caseload reports, but do show as served by district court in the court directory;
- Tonsaket shows as having a municipal court in the court directory in Okanogan County, but does not show up in caseload reports;
- Cusine, Lone, Metaline, Metaline Falls, and Newport do not show as being served by Pend Oreille County in the court directory, but do show in caseload reports as being served by district court;
- Several Spokane County cities are not mentioned, but the district court's website refers to those cities as covered by the court's jurisdiction. See <http://www.spokanecounty.org/districtcourt/content.aspx?c=1551>. Spokane Valley is provided for in caseload reports, but not listed in the court directory.
- In Stevens County, Northport does not show in caseload reports, but does show as served by district court in the court directory;
- In Thurston County, Rainier is shown as served by district court in the court directory, but shows in caseload reports as a standalone municipal court;
- Burbank, Prescott, Waitsburg, and Walla Walla do not show in caseload reports, but do show as served by district court in the court directory;
- Albion shows as having a municipal court in the court directory in Whitman County, but does not show up in caseload reports;
- The Pierce County Code still has Tacoma as a municipal department;
  - Tacoma still refers to a "police judge" with a code for its courts adopted in 1953;
- Several county codes still refer to justices of the peace;
- Many county codes have no mention of district courts;
- Several county codes have not been amended since the 1970s and 1980s;
- The San Juan County Code purports to set district court judges salaries while some other counties give county commissioners at least some authority to set salaries;
- The Skagit County Code requires that all city cases be heard at respective city halls;

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Adams (18,950) (52.7)	Ritzville Othello	Ritzville Othello	None	None	None	None	Hatton Lind Washtucna
Asotin (21,660) (39)	Asotin	Asotin Clarkston	None	None	None	None	None
Benton (177,900) (81.3)	Kennewick Prosser	Kennewick Prosser Richland West Richland	None	None	None	None	Benton City
Chelan (72,700) (58)	Wenatchee	Cashmere Leavenworth	Wenatchee	None	None	None	Entiat Chelan
Clallam (71,600) (40.8)	Port Angeles Forks	Port Angeles Forks Sequim	None	None	None	None	None
Clark (428,000) (52.2)	Vancouver	Vancouver Yacolt *Washougal and Camas contract with District Court, but each have a municipal court and the mayor selects judges from elected district court judges subject to confirmation by the city council.	Vancouver	Battleground	Battleground with LaCenter and Ridgefield Washougal with Camas	Woodland (Cowlitz)	None

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Columbia (4,100) (65)	Dayton	Dayton	None	None	None	None	Starbuck
Cowlitz (102,700) (56.9)	Kelso	Castle Rock Kalama Kelso Longview Woodland	Longview	None	None	Woodland (Clark)	None
Douglas (38,650) (46.7)	East Wenatchee Bridgeport	Bridgeport Rock Island Waterville	None	East Wenatchee	None	Coulee Dam (Okanogan and Grant)	Mansfield
Ferry (7,600) (14.2)	Republic	None	None	None	None	None	Republic
Franklin (80,500) (83)	Pasco	Connell	None	Pasco	None	None	Mesa Kahlotus
Garfield (2,250) (62.9)	Pomeroy	None	None	None	None	None	Pomeroy

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Along Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Grant (90,100) (55.2)	Ephrata Moses Lake	Coulee City Electric City Ephrata (3.46) George Grand Coulee Mattawa Moses Lake (3.46) Quincy (3.46) Royal City (3.46) Soap Lake Warden	None	See district court	None	Coulee Dam (Douglas and Okanagan)	Hartline Krupp Wilson Creek
Grays Harbor (72,900) (60.8)	Montesano Aberdeen	None	None	Aberdeen Cosmopolis Elma* Hoquim McCleary* Montesano Oakville Ocean Shores Westport	Elma/McCleary?	None	None
Island (78,800) (31.9)	Oak Harbor	Coupeville Langley Oak Harbor (Each city has an established court, but the judges are from district court)	None	*Same judge ??See City with County	None	None	None

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Jefferson (30,050) (29.6)	Port Townsend	Port Townsend	None	None	None	None	None
King (1,942,600) (85.3)	Seattle Bellevue Issaquah Redmond Auburn Burien Kent - MRJC Shoreline	Bellevue Carnation Duvall Kenmore North Bend Redmond Sammamish Shoreline Skykomish Snoqualmie Woodinville Burien Covington Auburn	North Bend	Black Diamond Bothell Des Moines Enumclaw* Federal Way Issaquah Kent Kirkland Lake Forest Park Maple Valley** Mercer Island Pacific Renton Sea-Tac Seattle Tukwila	Algona with Pacific Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Medina, and Yarrow Point with Kirkland Maple Valley shares space with Kent Newcastle with Mercer Island Normandy Park with Des Moines	Auburn (Pierce) Bothell (Sno.) Enumclaw (Pierce) Milton (Pierce) Pacific (Pierce)	Beaux Arts
Kitsap (253,900) (32.5)	Port Orchard	None	None	Bainbridge Island Bremerton Port Orchard Poulsbo	None	None	None

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Kititas (41,300) (55.7)	Ellensburg Cle Elum	Ellensburg Kititas Roslyn* Cle Elum*  *Each city has an established court per RCW 3.50, but a district court judge serves as muni court judge)	None	Roslyn and Cle Elum, but cases are heard by district court	None	None	South Cle Elum
Klickitat (20,500) (31.1)	Goldendale White Salmon	Bingen White Salmon Goldendale	None	None	None	None	None
Lewis (76,000) (40.4)	Chehalis	Morton Mossyrock Pe Ell Toledo	Morton Mossyrock Pe Ell Toledo	Centralia Chehalis Napavine Winlock	Vader with Winlock	None	None
Lincoln (10,600) (51.8)	Davenport	Almira Davenport Harrington Odessa Reardan Sprague Wilbur	None	None	None	None	None
Mason (61,100) (16.1)	Shelton	None	None	Shelton	None	None	None

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Okanogan (41,200) (39.8)	Okanogan	Coulee Dam Elmer City Okanogan Oroville Pateros Riverside	None	Brewster* Omak* Tonasket Twisp* Winthrop*  *Same judge	None	Coulee Dam (Douglas and Grant)	Concouilly Nespelem
Pacific (20,900) (32.7)	South Bend Long Beach	None	None	Ilwaco**^ Long Beach**^ Raymond* South Bend*  *Same Judge ^Same Administrator	Ilwaco Long Beach	None	None
Pend Oreille (13,000) (24.7)	Newport	None	None	None	None	None	Cusine Ione Metaline Metaline Falls Newport

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Pierce (802,150) (53.6)	Tacoma	DuPont	None	Bonney Lake Buckley Fife Fircrest Gig Harbor Lakewood Milton* Orting Puyallup Roy Ruston Sumner Tacoma Wilkeson** **Same judge as Enumclaw	Buckley with Carbonado Bonney Lake with Eatonville and South Prairie *Milton shares space and staff with Puyallup Lakewood with Steilacoom and University Place	Auburn (King) Enumclaw (King) Milton (King) Pacific (King)	Edgewood
San Juan (15,900) (13.7)	Friday Harbor	Friday Harbor	None	None	None	None	None
Skagit (117,400) (58.9)	Mount Vernon	Concrete LaConner Anacortes Burlington (3.46) Mount Vernon	None	Sedro Wooley	None	None	Hamilton Lyman
Skamania (11,150) (22.1)	Stevenson	None	None	North Bonneville Stevenson	None	None	None

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Snohomish (717,000) (57.5)	Everett Arlington Monroe Lynnwood	Brier Darrington Gold Bar Granite Falls Index Mill Creek Monroe Mountlake Terrace Mukilteo Snohomish Stanwood Sultan Woodway	Arlington Brier Darrington Gold Bar Granite Falls Lake Stevens Mill Creek Mountlake Terrace Mukilteo Snohomish Sultan Woodway	Marysville Edmonds Everett Lynnwood	Arlington with Lake Stevens, and Marysville	Bothell (King)	None
Spokane (472,650) (71.1)	Spokane	Cheney* Deer Park  *Has an established court but uses district court judge	None	Airway Heights Medical Lake Spokane	None	None	Fairfield Latah Liberty Lake Millwood Rockford Spangle Spokane Valley Waverly
Stevens (43,600) (22.1)	Colville	Chewelah Colville Kettle Falls Northport Springdale	None	None	None	None	Marcus

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two countries	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Thurston (254,100) (46.5)	Olympia	Lacey Rainier Tumwater	None	Lacey Olympia Tenino Tumwater Yelm	Bucoda with Tenino	None	None
Wahkiakum (4,000) (13.3)	Cathlamet	None	None	Cathlamet	None	None	None
Walla Walla (58,800) (71.4)	Walla Walla	Burbank Prescott Waitsburg Walla Walla	None	College Place	None	None	None
Whatcom (202,100) (56.7)	Bellingham	None	None	Bellingham Blaine* Everson- Nooksack* Ferndale Lynden Sumas*	Everson and Nooksack	None	None
				*Same judge			

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Whitman (44,800) (86.7)	Colfax Pullman	None	None	Albion Colfax Colton Uniontown	None	None	Endicott Farmington Garfield LaCrosse Lamont Malden Pullman Rosalia St. John Takoa
Yakima (244,700) (65.5)	Yakima Grandview	Grandview Tieton Union Gap*  *Has an established court	Mabton	Granger Moxee City Selah Sunnyside Toppenish Wapato Yakima Zillah	Mabton with Sunnyside	None	Harrah Naches

County	County Code Provisions
Adams	Not available
Asotin	Not available
Benton	No mention of district courts in county code
Chelan	Ch. 1.64 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/chelancounty.html">http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/chelancounty.html</a>
Clallam	No mention of district courts in county code
Clark	Ch. 1.08 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/clarkcounty.html">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/clarkcounty.html</a>
Columbia	Chg. 2.80 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/columbiacounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/columbiacounty/</a> Passed in 1980.
Cowlitz	Ch. 2.04 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/cowlitzcounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/cowlitzcounty/</a> Deals with municipal courts too.
Douglas	Ch. 2.10 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/douglascounty.html">http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/douglascounty.html</a> Seems to have been adopted in 1972
Ferry	Not available
Franklin	No mention of district courts in county code
Garfield	Not available
Grant	Ch. 2.08 <a href="http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16378">http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16378</a> 1972
Grays Harbor	Ch. 2.04 <a href="http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub_svcs/GHCCCode/pdf/GHC02.pdf">http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub_svcs/GHCCCode/pdf/GHC02.pdf</a> See 2.04.110 which addresses municipal courts
Island	Ch. 1.12 <a href="http://www.islandcounty.net/code/documents/ICC01.pdf">http://www.islandcounty.net/code/documents/ICC01.pdf</a> 1.12.080 establishes municipal courts of Coupeville, Langley, and Oak Harbor with time and salary allotted to each city. Passed in 1972 and last amended in 2010.
Jefferson	No mention of district courts in county code
King	Ch. 2.68 <a href="http://www.kingcounty.gov/council/legislation/kc_code/05_Title_2.aspx">http://www.kingcounty.gov/council/legislation/kc_code/05_Title_2.aspx</a> 5 electoral districts provided by county code, but only 3 districts provided by the court
Kitsap	Ch. 2.20 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/kitsapcounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/kitsapcounty/</a> Establishes municipal court of Bremerton
Kittitas	Ch. 2.08 <a href="http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/boc/countycode/title02.aspx#Chapter_2.08">http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/boc/countycode/title02.aspx#Chapter_2.08</a>
Klickitat	Not available
Lewis	Ch. 2.20 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/lewiscounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/lewiscounty/</a>

County	County Code Provisions
Lincoln	Not available
Mason	Ch. 2.40 <a href="http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16478">http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16478</a>
Okanogan	No mention of district courts in county code
Pacific	Ch. 2.04 <a href="http://www.co.pacific.wa.us/pdf%20files/pacificcofullcode0413.pdf">http://www.co.pacific.wa.us/pdf%20files/pacificcofullcode0413.pdf</a>
Pend Oreille	Not available
Pierce	Ch. 2.54 <a href="http://www.co.pierce.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/1137">http://www.co.pierce.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/1137</a> Ch. 2.54.020 Tacoma is listed as a department of district court. <a href="http://www.co.pierce.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/1137">http://www.co.pierce.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/1137</a>  Tacoma muni code (1.22) is interesting because it refers to "police judge" and was adopted in 1953 <a href="http://cms.cityoftacoma.org/cityclerk/Files/MunicipalCode/Title01-AdministrationAndPersonnel.PDF">http://cms.cityoftacoma.org/cityclerk/Files/MunicipalCode/Title01-AdministrationAndPersonnel.PDF</a>
San Juan	Ch. 2.16 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/sanjuancounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/sanjuancounty/</a> Salary of judges set by county commissioners
Skagit	Ch. 2.12 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/skagitcounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/skagitcounty/</a> All city cases shall be heard at city halls 2.12.040
Skamania	Ch. 2.16 <a href="http://skamaniacounty.org/ordinance/code/T02%20-%20Title%20%20%20ADMINISTRATION%20AND%20PERSONNEL.HTM">http://skamaniacounty.org/ordinance/code/T02%20-%20Title%20%20%20ADMINISTRATION%20AND%20PERSONNEL.HTM</a> 2.16.020 sets salary at 40%
Snohomish	Ch. 2.12 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/snohomishcounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/snohomishcounty/</a>
Spokane	Ch. 1.16 <a href="http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16337">http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16337</a>
Stevens	Not available
Thurston	Ch. 1.16 <a href="http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16720">http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16720</a>
Wahkiakum	Not available
Walla Walla	No mention of district courts in county code
Whatcom	Ch. 2.12 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/whatcomcounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/whatcomcounty/</a> Bellingham Muni Court department
Whitman	Not available
Yakima	Ch. 2.04 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/yakimacounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/yakimacounty/</a>



# Attachment C



Court Level	County	Court	2010	2011	2012	2013	Sum:
District Court	Adams	OTHELLO DISTRICT COURT	24	46	70	124	264
District Court	Adams	RITZVILLE DISTRICT COURT	58	48	36	94	236
District Court	Asotin	ASOTIN DISTRICT COURT	19	28	46	115	208
District Court	Benton	BENTON COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	70	95	145	736	1046
District Court	Chelan	CHELAN COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	32	25	39	266	362
District Court	Clallam	CLALLAM COUNTY DISTRICT COURT #1	13	30	46	139	228
District Court	Clallam	CLALLAM DISTRICT COURT #2	13	9	26	58	106
District Court	Clark	CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	249	325	439	1194	2207
District Court	Columbia	COLUMBIA COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	5	3	5	19	32
District Court	Cowlitz	COWLITZ COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	103	108	149	579	939
District Court	Douglas	BRIDGEPORT DISTRICT COURT	6	2	3	12	23
District Court	Douglas	DOUGLAS DISTRICT COURT	10	7	16	70	103
District Court	Ferry	FERRY COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	6	1	6	19	32
District Court	Franklin	FRANKLIN DISTRICT COURT	37	21	26	66	150
District Court	Garfield	GARFIELD COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	2	8	8	16	34
District Court	Grant	GRANT COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	142	169	123	430	864
District Court	Grays Harbor	#1 GRAYS HARBOR DISTRICT COURT	173	164	166	230	733
District Court	Island	ISLAND COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	29	33	90	227	379
District Court	Jefferson	JEFFERSON DISTRICT COURT	11	44	46	58	159
District Court	King	KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	290	383	1465	4004	6142
District Court	Kitsap	KITSAP DISTRICT COURT	43	112	209	611	975
District Court	Kititas	LOWER KITITAS DISTRICT COURT	27	55	49	221	352
District Court	Kititas	UPPER KITITAS DISTRICT COURT	18	25	37	88	168
District Court	Klickitat	E. KLICKITAT DISTRICT	20	26	18	42	106
District Court	Klickitat	W. KLICKITAT DISTRICT	5	8	9	26	48
District Court	Lewis	LEWIS COUNTY DISTRICT COURT LAW AND JUSTICE CENTER	70	73	98	303	544
District Court	Lincoln	LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	17	19	28	85	149
District Court	Mason	MASON COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	70	97	138	254	559
District Court	Okanogan	OKANOGAN COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	18	15	40	199	272
District Court	Pacific	NORTH PACIFIC DISTRICT COURT PACIFIC COUNTY COURTHOUSE	11	6	10	20	47
District Court	Pacific	SOUTH PACIFIC DISTRICT COURT	9	20	32	77	138
District Court	Pend Oreille	PEND OREILLE DISTRICT COURT	6	19	16	78	119

Court Level	County	Court	2010	2011	2012	2013	Sum:
District Court	Pierce	PIERCE COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	325	393	544	1469	2731
District Court	San Juan	SAN JUAN DISTRICT COURT		3	9	30	42
District Court	Skagit	SKAGIT COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	57	66	114	412	649
District Court	Skamania	SKAMANIA COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	16	16	31	69	132
District Court	Snohomish	SNO CO DIST CT CASCADE DIV	64	39	15	77	195
District Court	Snohomish	SNO CO DIST CT EVERETT DIV	48	51	36	121	256
District Court	Snohomish	SNO CO DIST CT EVERGREEN DIV	14	16	15	97	142
District Court	Snohomish	SNO CO DIST CT SOUTH DIV	51	90	98	349	588
District Court	Spokane	SPOKANE COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	171	349	378	1352	2250
District Court	Stevens	STEVENS COUNTY DISTRICT COURT		12	17	67	96
District Court	Thurston	THURSTON COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	192	326	396	979	1893
District Court	Wahkiakum	WAHIAKUM DISTRICT COURT	2	2	7	14	25
District Court	Walla Walla	WALLA WALLA DISTRICT COURT	231	247	156	273	907
District Court	Whatcom	WHATCOM COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	68	71	83	298	520
District Court	Whitman	WHITMAN COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	19	27	54	139	239
District Court	Yakima	YAKIMA CO DIST CT - YDC -	49	78	145	582	854
Municipal Court	Clark	BATTLE GROUND MUNICIPAL COURT	10	29	44	161	244
Municipal Court	Clark	CAMAS/WASHOUGAL MUNICIPAL COURT	14	20	28	173	235
Municipal Court	Douglas	E WENATCHEE MUNI CT(509)884-0680	6	5	9	53	73
Municipal Court	Franklin	PASCO MUNICIPAL COURT	4	9	19	75	107
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	ABERDEEN MUNICIPAL COURT	147	108	116	186	557
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	COSMOPOLIS MUNICIPAL COURT	13	22	20	14	69
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	ELMA MUNICIPAL COURT	16	32	28	45	121
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	HOQUIAM MUNICIPAL COURT	84	82	93	107	366
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	MCCLEARY MUNICIPAL COURT	3	5	19	27	54
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	MONTESANO MUNICIPAL COURT	4	15	25	41	85
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	OAKVILLE MUNICIPAL COURT	10	7	11	8	36
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	OCEAN SHORES MUNICIPAL COURT	17	31	26	43	117
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	WESTPORT MUNICIPAL COURT	31	16	7	22	76
Municipal Court	King	BLACK DIAMOND MUNICIPAL COURT	6	18	17	58	99
Municipal Court	King	BOTHELL MUNICIPAL COURT	16	13	41	96	166
Municipal Court	King	DES MOINES MUNICIPAL COURT	22	45	86	273	426

Court Level	County	Court	2010	2011	2012	2013	Sum:
Municipal Court	King	ENUMCLAW MUNICIPAL COURT	12	11	15	41	79
Municipal Court	King	FEDERAL WAY MUNICIPAL COURT	86	86	150	386	708
Municipal Court	King	ISSAQUAH MUNICIPAL COURT	20	37	55	132	244
Municipal Court	King	KCDC AUBURN COURTHOUSE	69	54	57		180
Municipal Court	King	KENT MUNICIPAL COURT	76	114	178	504	872
Municipal Court	King	KIRKLAND MUNICIPAL COURT	40	76	107	411	634
Municipal Court	King	LAKE FOREST PARK MUNICIPAL COURT	6	15	11	74	106
Municipal Court	King	MERCER ISLAND MUNICIPAL COURT	13	19	21	61	114
Municipal Court	King	PACIFIC MUNICIPAL COURT	13	34	17	69	133
Municipal Court	King	RENTON MUNICIPAL COURT	8	58	103	268	437
Municipal Court	King	SEATAC MUNICIPAL COURT	34	47	59	193	333
Municipal Court	King	TUKWILA MUNICIPAL COURT	73	79	160	270	582
Municipal Court	Kitsap	BAINBRIDGE ISLAND MUNICIPAL		6	4	14	24
Municipal Court	Kitsap	BREMERTON MUNICIPAL COURT	8	9	8	83	108
Municipal Court	Kitsap	PORT ORCHARD MUNICIPAL COURT	19	26	42	94	181
Municipal Court	Kitsap	POULSBO MUNICIPAL COURT	2	9	11	27	49
Municipal Court	Kititas	CLE ELUM MUNICIPAL COURT	5	4	6	14	29
Municipal Court	Kititas	ROSLYN MUNICIPAL COURT			3	5	8
Municipal Court	Lewis	CENTRALIA MUNICIPAL COURT	30	33	58	155	276
Municipal Court	Lewis	CHEHALIS MUNICIPAL COURT	8	11	16	28	63
Municipal Court	Lewis	NAPAVINE MUNICIPAL COURT		3	4	20	27
Municipal Court	Lewis	VADER MUNICIPAL COURT	1	1		3	5
Municipal Court	Lewis	WINLOCK MUNICIPAL COURT	3	3	1	3	10
Municipal Court	Mason	SHELTON MUNICIPAL COURT	17	61	63	106	247
Municipal Court	Okanogan	WINTHROP MUNICIPAL COURT		1	1		2
Municipal Court	Pacific	RAYMOND MUNICIPAL COURT		1	11	21	33
Municipal Court	Pacific	SOUTH BEND MUNICIPAL COURT	3	2	5	19	29
Municipal Court	Pierce	BONNEY LAKE MUNICIPAL COURT	41	33	104	259	437
Municipal Court	Pierce	BUCKLEY MUNICIPAL COURT	14	17	17	41	89
Municipal Court	Pierce	EATONVILLE MUNICIPAL COURT	1	5	4		10
Municipal Court	Pierce	FIFE MUNICIPAL COURT	58	66	115	305	544
Municipal Court	Pierce	FIRCREST MUNICIPAL COURT	10	14	29	96	149

52	Court Level	County	Court	2010	2011	2012	2013	Sum:
	Municipal Court	Pierce	GIG HARBOR MUNICIPAL COURT	5	12	13	32	62
	Municipal Court	Pierce	LAKEWOOD MUNICIPAL COURT	23	52	69	300	444
	Municipal Court	Pierce	MILTON MUNICIPAL COURT	13	14	29	145	201
	Municipal Court	Pierce	ORTING MUNICIPAL COURT	9	17	32	50	108
	Municipal Court	Pierce	PUYALLUP MUNICIPAL COURT	32	98	225	646	1001
	Municipal Court	Pierce	ROY MUNICIPAL COURT	5	13	13	19	50
	Municipal Court	Pierce	RUSTON MUNICIPAL COURT	17	24	27	45	113
	Municipal Court	Pierce	STEILACOOM MUNICIPAL COURT	2	2	4	1	9
	Municipal Court	Pierce	SUMNER MUNICIPAL COURT	7	4	12	33	56
	Municipal Court	Pierce	TACOMA MUNICIPAL COURT	200	179	261	447	1087
	Municipal Court	Pierce	WILKESON MUNICIPAL COURT	1	1	4	3	9
	Municipal Court	Skagit	ANACORTES MUNICIPAL COURT	16	21	39	82	158
	Municipal Court	Skagit	BURLINGTON MUNICIPAL COURT	21	29	20	70	140
	Municipal Court	Skagit	MT VERNON MUNICIPAL COURT	20	34	28	84	166
	Municipal Court	Skagit	SEDRO-WOOLLEY MUNICIPAL COURT	2	10	16	14	42
	Municipal Court	Skamania	STEVENSON MUNICIPAL COURT	3	4	3	7	17
	Municipal Court	Snohomish	EDMONDS MUNICIPAL COURT	15	19	19	139	192
	Municipal Court	Snohomish	EVERETT MUNICIPAL COURT	71	95	215	621	1002
	Municipal Court	Snohomish	LYNNWOOD MUNICIPAL COURT	35	45	51	93	224
	Municipal Court	Snohomish	MARYSVILLE MUNICIPAL COURT	17	50	62	394	523
	Municipal Court	Spokane	AIRWAY HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL	4	2	2	69	77
	Municipal Court	Spokane	CHENEY MUNICIPAL COURT	4	4	7	23	38
	Municipal Court	Spokane	MEDICAL LAKE MUNICIPAL COURT	1	2	7	19	29
	Municipal Court	Spokane	SPOKANE MUNICIPAL COURT	98	51	95	534	778
	Municipal Court	Thurston	OLYMPIA MUNICIPAL COURT	20	36	31	61	148
	Municipal Court	Thurston	TENINO MUNICIPAL COURT	6	12	13	20	51
	Municipal Court	Thurston	TUMWATER VIOLATIONS BUREAU				1	1
	Municipal Court	Thurston	YELM MUNICIPAL COURT	7	15	25	177	224
	Municipal Court	Walla Walla	COLLEGE PLACE MUNICIPAL COURT	6	7	12	38	63
	Municipal Court	Whatcom	BELLINGHAM MUNICIPAL COURT	33	24	39	163	259
	Municipal Court	Whatcom	BLAINE MUNICIPAL COURT	4	11	14	35	64
	Municipal Court	Whatcom	EVERSON-NOOKSACK MUNICIPAL COURT	4	11	5	34	54

Court Level	County	Court	2010	2011	2012	2013	Sum:
Municipal Court	Whatcom	FERNDALE MUNICIPAL COURT	8	7	15	108	138
Municipal Court	Whatcom	LYNDEN MUNICIPAL COURT	12	9	6	51	78
Municipal Court	Whatcom	SUMAS MUNICIPAL COURT	8	11	15	29	63
Municipal Court	Whitman	COLFAX MUNICIPAL COURT	2	2	1	13	18
Municipal Court	Whitman	COLTON MUNICIPAL COURT	1				1
Municipal Court	Yakima	GRANGER MUNICIPAL COURT	4	3	2	14	23
Municipal Court	Yakima	SELAH MUNICIPAL COURT	1	3	5	45	54
Municipal Court	Yakima	SUNNYSIDE MUNICIPAL COURT	34	52	48	229	363
Municipal Court	Yakima	TOPPENISH MUNICIPAL COURT	5	16	22	53	96
Municipal Court	Yakima	UNION GAP MUNICIPAL COURT	28	35	51	137	251
Municipal Court	Yakima	WAPATO MUNICIPAL COURT	19	51	65	134	269
Municipal Court	Yakima	YAKIMA MUNICIPAL COURT	11	42	71	216	340
Municipal Court	Yakima	ZILLAH MUNICIPAL COURT	1	2	1	12	16
		Sum:	4,821	6,333	9,450	27,312	47,916





# **Trial Court Advocacy Board (TCAB)**

## **Charter**

*Drafted January 2014*

### **Purpose**

The Trial Court Advocacy Board (Board) will coordinate issues and referrals made by the trial court associations. Uniquely identifying the Board as an advocacy body on behalf of trial courts enhances statewide awareness of trial court issues involving court policy, staffing, and budget. The Board will advance the trial courts' mission and create governance for judges and administrators to tailor their efforts for statewide advocacy related to local court operations. The Board will contribute to good governing and communication expectations. By creating TCAB, the trial courts commit to work together on issues and projects uniquely identified as related to trial court operations without duplication or miscommunication. Through the Board, trial court operational issues will be identified, staffed, detailed, vetted through stakeholders, and poised to advance changes to policy, programs, legislative, best practices, or funding requests.

The Board is prepared to advocate for adequate and stable state funding for statewide trial court purposes (programs, projects, staff, research capacity, etc.). The funding focus is to propose new funding requests, not supplant already dedicated funding to the judicial branch. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is mandated to "collect and compile statistical and other data" (RCW 2.56.030 (4)) which is an essential element of any policy, program, or funding request to the Legislature.

### **Scope**

Governance of the Board will be through a management structure at the direction of the trial court judges' associations. A unified message on behalf of the trial courts will enhance opportunities to address issues, promote solutions, and educate stakeholders about trial court operations. The Board is dedicated to work on issues and problems in an effort to develop comprehensive and workable solutions.

### **Membership**

TCAB will be equally populated by judicial officers representing the leadership of both the Superior Court Judges' Association (SCJA) and the District and Municipal Court Judges' Association (DMCJA). The associations' acting president, incoming president, and immediate past president will constitute the six voting members of the Board. The Board will communicate regularly with administrator associations to solicit ideas for projects and utilize court process expertise. The administrators for both trial court levels are welcome

to participate in Board meetings when relevant issues are scheduled for discussion or action. The Board intends to maximize the areas of trial court focus by incorporating the work of the administrator associations.

The chair of TCAB will rotate between trial court levels court and be an assignment of the immediate past presidents. For 2014-2015, Judge Charles Snyder (SCJA) will be chair. In June of 2015, Judge Alecia-Galvan (DMCJA) will chair TCAB. The chair's term expires in June of each year.

The general areas of concentration include budget, legislative coordination, policy and project planning, and research.

### **Expectations**

Because the TCAB Board membership includes leaders from both judges' trial court associations, the Association Boards will be kept current on projects and assignments.

Meeting schedule will be drafted and shared annually at the associations' Long Range Planning Retreats. The meeting schedule will generally be every other month with the ability to adjust the schedule as needed and agreed upon.

Below is a summary of expectations for the Board:

1. Annually TCAB will develop and support legislative requests on behalf of the trial courts and their associations. It may also be an advocacy source for court administrators and managers at the various trial court levels.
2. Identify, prioritize and support trial court funding requests. Work through the Supreme Court budget process or independently relevant committees of the BJA, to propose trial court funding. (this is confusing...we need clarification)
3. Play a significant role in the distribution and allocation of funds passed through AOC specifically for trial court operations or support whenever such funds are allocated by the legislature or received through grants or other sources.
4. Accept issues, problems or projects from trial court judges', administrator or clerks. These assignments will be staffed and returned to the Board for further direction.
5. Advocate for increased and functional technology and information systems for the trial courts.
6. AOC will provide resources, such as staffing, to support TCAB.

### **Budget**

TCAB-related expenses, such as travel reimbursement, will be paid by the judges' associations. If there are other related expenses, the presidents of each judges' association have the authority to approve.

**The TCAB membership will review the charter annually in June of each year.**

**Add Signature lines of all members and Callie**

**DRAFT**



**TRIAL COURT ADVOCACY BOARD**  
**SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES' ASSOCIATION**  
**DISTRICT AND MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGES' ASSOCIATION**

**MEETING SCHEDULE**  
**2014**

MEETING DATE	TIME	LOCATION
February 21, 2014	12:00 - 3:00	AOC Sea Tac Kilroy Airport Center 18000 Pacific Hwy/International Blvd S Suite 1106 - small conf room
March 21, 2014	12:00 - 3:00	AOC Sea Tac Kilroy Airport Center 18000 Pacific Hwy/International Blvd S Suite 1106 - small conf room
May 16, 2014	12:00 - 3:00	AOC Sea Tac Kilroy Airport Center 18000 Pacific Hwy/International Blvd S Suite 1106 - small conf room
July 18, 2014	12:00 - 3:00	AOC Sea Tac Kilroy Airport Center 18000 Pacific Hwy/International Blvd S Suite 1106 - small conf room
September 19, 2014	12:00 - 3:00	AOC Sea Tac Kilroy Airport Center 18000 Pacific Hwy/International Blvd S Suite 1106 - small conf room

\*\* PHONE ACCESS WILL BE AVAILABLE





**DMCJA Bylaws Committee**  
Tuesday, January 7, 2014 at Noon  
Telephone Conference

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Members:**

Commissioner Kipling (Chair)  
Judge Gregory  
Judge Phillips

**Guests:**

**AOC Staff:**  
Ms. J Krebs

The meeting was called to order at 12:17 p.m. with all members present.

There was one item to discuss:

1. Judge Jeffrey Jahns has proposed that the DMCJA Bylaws be amended to add the following new Section 4 to Article VII – Board of Governors to address Executive Sessions.

Section 4. Executive Session:

- (a) Upon a majority vote, the Board of Governors may call an executive session to discuss matters involving security, appointment to open positions, potential litigation or other matters deemed confidential. A motion to enter executive session shall set forth the general purpose of the executive session, which shall be included in the general minutes.
- (b) No active member of the Association present at a Board of Governors' meeting shall be excluded from attending an executive session.
- (c) Administrative Office of the Courts staff may be present during an executive session at the discretion of the President or Board member acting on the President's behalf.

The Committee discussed the proposal, particularly the omission of granting the Board President authority to call an Executive Session, and agreed to recommend that it proceed to a vote of the membership. The Committee noted that the proposed amendment would be subject to discussion and floor amendment during the Spring Conference.

It was motioned, seconded and passed that the Committee recommend to the DMCJA Board that Judge Jahns' proposal be presented to the membership for vote during the Spring Conference.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 12:24 p.m.



## Pardee, Michelle

---

**From:** DMCJA Board <DMCJABOARD@LISTSERV.COURTS.WA.GOV> on behalf of Hahn, Sondra  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 23, 2014 11:30 AM  
**To:** DMCJABOARD@LISTSERV.COURTS.WA.GOV  
**Subject:** [DMCJABOARD] DMCJA Board Retreat - April 25-26 in Woodinville - RSVP BY FEBRUARY 14  
**Attachments:** RSVP DMCJA.Board Retreat 2014 04 25.docx; Directions to Willows Lodge.docx

Greetings DMCJA Board Members, BJA Representatives, and Committee Chairs,

President Judge Svaren and President-Elect Judge Alicea-Galvan have scheduled the DMCJA's Board Retreat for April 25-26 in Woodinville, and new for this year, DMCJA committee chairs are invited to participate in Friday's meeting and group dinner. Friday's meeting includes a review of Association committees so all committee chairs are encouraged to participate.

Meeting times and locations are provided at the top of the attached RSVP form, and reservations will be made at Willows Lodge for Board members and BJA representatives staying overnight. Directions to the Lodge are attached, and you may also visit their website at [www.willowslodge.com](http://www.willowslodge.com). Lodging on Friday night, tax, and group meals will be direct-billed to the DMCJA. Spouses are welcome to join in the group dinner on Friday night, but on a separate check.

Please let me know if you have any questions, and I look forward to receiving your completed form **by February 14**.

*Sondra Hahn  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
PO Box 41170  
Olympia WA 98504-1170  
360-705-5276  
360-956-5700 FAX*

---

This e-mail has been sent to everyone in the DMCJABOARD@LISTSERV.COURTS.WA.GOV mailing list. To reply to the sender, click Reply. To reply to the sender and the mailing list, click Reply All.

You can remove yourself from this mailing list at any time by sending a "SIGNOFF DMCJABOARD" command to LISTSERV@LISTSERV.COURTS.WA.GOV.



# DMCJA BOARD RETREAT RSVP FORM

WILLOWS LODGE  
WOODINVILLE, WASHINGTON

## Friday, April 25

**Board Retreat**  
12:00 – 5:00 p.m.  
Location: *Sammamish Room 2*  
Lunch provided; group dinner planned

6:00 p.m.  
Location: TBD

## Saturday, April 26

**Board Retreat Continued**  
8:00 a.m. Breakfast  
8:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.  
Location: Sammamish Room 2

**Board Meeting**  
11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.  
Location: Sammamish Room 2  
Lunch provided; dinner on own

---

**NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DIETARY RESTRICTIONS OR SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS NEEDED:**

---

**NO**, I will not be able to attend.

### FRIDAY

**YES** to the meeting. Salmon and roasted chicken lunch buffet provided.

**YES**, I will attend the Friday night group dinner.

Please include my spouse in the participant count for dinner.

*(Note: The DMCJA will pay dinner costs for DMCJA members only.)*

### SATURDAY

**YES** to the Retreat and Board meeting. Group breakfast and lunch provided.

*Select a boxed lunch for Saturday (includes veggies & dip, fruit, chips & cookie).*

Muffaletta Sandwich with Mortadella, Soppressata, Arugula, Provolone & Olive Tapenade on a Demi Baguette

Southwest Grilled Chicken Wrap with Avocado, Red Bell Peppers, Chipotle Cheddar, Cilantro, Jalapenos & Black Bean Spread in a Tortilla

Greek Veggie Pita with Feta Cheese and Hummus

### LODGING

I need a room at Willows Lodge for Friday night. *(Open to Board & BJA Reps only)*

Single occupancy

Double occupancy

**Return by February 14 to:**

Sondra Hahn

FAX: (360) 956-5700

[sondra.hahn@courts.wa.gov](mailto:sondra.hahn@courts.wa.gov)





# DISTRICT AND MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGES' ASSOCIATION SCHEDULE OF BOARD MEETINGS

## 2013-2014

<i>DATE</i>	<i>TIME</i>	<i>MEETING LOCATION</i>
<b><i>Friday, Aug. 9, 2013</i></b>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<b><i>September 22, 2013</i></b>	9:00 – 12:00 noon	2013 Annual Judicial Conference, Wenatchee, WA
<b><i>Friday, Nov. 15, 2013</i></b>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<b><i>Friday, Dec. 13, 2013</i></b>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<b><i>Friday, Jan. 10, 2014</i></b>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<b><i>Friday, Feb. 14, 2014</i></b>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<b><i>Friday, March 14, 2014</i></b>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<b><i>Friday, April 11, 2014</i></b>	12:30 – 3:30 p.m.	AOC SeaTac Office Center
<b><i>May 2014 TBD</i></b>	TBD	TBD
<b><i>Sunday, June 8, 2014</i></b>	9:30 – 12:30 p.m.	Semiahmoo Resort, Blaine WA

AOC Staff: Michelle Pardee

(AOC Conference Room Reserved)

*Adopted May 4, 2013*

*Updated January 7, 2014 (June meeting)*

n:\programs & organizations\dmcja\board\2013-2014 final dmcja bog meeting schedule.doc







## DMCJA Rules Committee

Wednesday, December 18, 2013 (12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.)

Via Teleconference

### MEETING MINUTES

#### Members:

Chair, Judge Garrow  
Vice Chair, Judge Dacca  
~~Judge Buttoff~~  
~~Judge S. Buzzard~~  
Judge Fraser  
~~Judge Grant~~  
Judge Harmon  
~~Judge Heller~~  
~~Judge Robertson~~  
~~Judge Steiner~~  
~~Judge Szambelan~~  
Ms. Linda Hagert, DMCMA Liaison

#### AOC Staff:

Ms. J Krebs

Judge Garrow called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

The Committee discussed the following items:

#### 1. November 2013 meeting minutes

The November 2013 Rules Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented. Judge Fraser abstained.

#### 2. Amendments to CrRLJ 8.13 regarding communications with jurors, proposed by WACDL

Judge Harmon agreed to review this proposal. Judge Garrow suggested that she talk to Judge Robertson, the WSBA Rules Committee representative, to see if WSBA has taken a position or commented. Judge Fraser offered to help with this issue.

#### 3. Proposed RALJ amendments, published by the Supreme Court

These rule amendment proposals affect the courts of limited jurisdiction but do not seem too substantive. Judge Garrow will review the proposals and report back to the Committee.

#### 4. IRLJ 6.2 Update – Monetary Penalty Schedule for Infractions

The Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife requested an amendment to IRLJ 6.2, the monetary penalty schedule for infractions, to establish or change the monetary penalties for certain natural resource infractions. This Committee had declined to review the proposal due to

concerns about the propriety of a judge establishing a penalty amount. The Supreme Court adopted the proposal and the new penalties are effective as of December 10.

#### **5. Other Business**

- **ARLJ 9 Repeal** – ARLJ 9, CrRLJ 8.10 and CrRLJ 8.11 have been repealed and are no longer in effect as of December 10. Judge Garrow is concerned about the impact this will have on court staff. DMCJA President Judge Svaren and Judge Garrow requested a delay in implementing the rule but were not successful. Judge Garrow requested Committee members' assistance in educating the local bar and bar associations regarding the change. The DMCJA Education Committee may wish to present a program regarding the repeal of ARLJ 9 and its implications at the spring conference.
- **CrRLJ 2.2, 2.3 & 3.2.1** – The Supreme Court has published these DMCJA-proposed rule amendments for comment, with a comment deadline of April 30, 2014.

#### **6. Next Meeting Date**

During the November meeting, the Committee agreed to hold the next scheduled meeting on Wednesday, January 15 at noon via teleconference.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



<p><b>Action</b></p> <p>A. Amendment to 2013-2014 Board Meeting Schedule due to April 25-26, 2014, Board Retreat – <i>Judge Svaren</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• April 26, 2014, Board Meeting (following Board Retreat)</li> <li>• Cancel April 11<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting?</li> <li>• Need May Board Meeting?</li> </ul> <p>B. <b><i>Special Fund Money Allocation for Lobbying on Retirement Legislation- Judge Meyer</i></b></p>	5
<p>Liaison Reports</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">DMCMA   MCA   SCJA   WSBA   WSAJ   AOC   BJA</p>	
<p>Information</p> <p>A. Update on Public Record Request – <i>Judge Svaren</i> (<b><i>possible action</i></b>)</p> <p>B. Rules Committee Meeting Minutes</p>	6
<p>Other Business</p> <p>A. Next Meeting: Friday, March 14, 2014, AOC SeaTac Office Center, SeaTac, WA</p>	
<p><b>Adjourn</b></p>	

**DMCJA System Improvement Committee**  
**Final Report**  
**Tuesday, February 04, 2014**

**MEMBERS:**

Judge David Steiner, King County District Court, Chair  
Judge Steve Holman, Kitsap County District Court  
Judge David Larson, Federal Way Municipal Court  
Judge Kelly Olwell, Yakima Municipal Court  
Judge Sandy Allen, Milton & Ruston Municipal Courts  
Judge Linda Portnoy, Lake Forest Park Municipal Court  
Judge Douglas Goelz, South Pacific County District Court District Court  
Trish Kinlow, Tukwila Municipal Court Administrator  
Chris Ruhl, Pierce County District Court  
Candace Bock, Association of Washington Cities (AWC)  
Brian Enslow, Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC)

**The System Improvement Committee was tasked as follows:**

**CHARGE:** Evaluate the system of Courts of Limited Jurisdiction in Washington and make recommendations for steps that can be taken to improve service to the public while preserving the Court's role as a co-equal branch of government. Included within this charge are the following concepts:

1. **REGIONAL COURTS.** Study forms of court regionalization and report whether existing forms are adequate; whether new forms of regionalization are desirable; whether legislation should be drafted to facilitate new methods of regionalization; under what circumstances is regionalization desirable or undesirable from a service standpoint.
2. **PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS.** Whether performance benchmarks/best practices should be adopted to provide a baseline for evaluating court performance; identify a baseline of minimum services every court user can reasonably expect.
3. **UNIVERSAL PAYMENT.** Make recommendations regarding the desirability and feasibility of a universal payment system and whether one can be reasonably implemented prior to deployment of a new case management system.
4. **SERVICES.** Explore and recommend services beneficial to the public that can be implemented with minimal financial impact and, conversely, identify and evaluate efficiencies that can be employed without reducing service to the public.
5. **JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE.** Explore and recommend ways to elevate the independent services courts provide as essential to the well-being of individuals and communities at large. Recommend laws and rules that institutionalize the courts as the co-equal branch of government it is intended to be.

**The committee of the whole was divided into two subcommittees; the Regional Courts and Performance Benchmarks Subcommittee and the Services and Universal Payment Subcommittee.**

Each produced reports and recommendations. At our final meeting on January 31, 2014, the committee of the whole adopted the following reports and recommendations.

## REGIONAL COURTS

**1. Charge: Study forms of court regionalization and report whether existing forms are adequate.**

There have been several studies conducted over the past few years. Attachment A provides a summary of those studies. The BJA Municipal Court Study Oversight Workgroup reviewed the conclusions from the 2013 study by the National Center on State Courts and concluded in their own report to BJA, in part, as follows:

Evaluation projects. The workgroup is not supportive of an effort to promote regionalization projects for evaluation at this time. Members are aware that there have been discussions about municipal courts for a number of years, particularly regarding smaller and part-time municipal courts. The strategy of promoting regional courts appears to have emerged from those discussions several years ago as a remedy or solution to perceived shortcomings in those courts. The NCSC study, however, does not provide clear evidence of such shortcomings. The workgroup understands that this result may well be due to the fact that reliable and relevant data is not systematically collected and so not available to the researchers. In any event the fact is that the perceived problems of the municipal courts are not well defined. The workgroup feels that the board should more specifically articulate the concerns that it has with the municipal courts before attempting to fashion an appropriate remedy.

See Attachment B

The consensus is that there is no need to further study the formation of a formal regional court system. Instead, the focus should be on developing best practices that will provide optimum levels of service to the public through collaborative efforts.

**2. Charge: Determine whether new forms of regionalization are desirable.**

The consensus is that we need to develop a "culture of cooperation" among jurisdictions so that service can be provided to the public in the most independent, direct, and local fashion possible. We need to develop systems that empower local courts to cooperate with other courts in ways that bolster services to the public without threatening the local control and independence necessary to adapt to local needs.

**3. Charge: Determine whether legislation should be drafted to facilitate new methods of regionalization.**

The consensus is that the DMCJA should take the lead with the involvement of the DMMCA to create a "culture of cooperation" among local jurisdictions through changes to not only court rules and statutes, but also changes to attitudes on how local courts are perceived.

We also agree that the judiciary needs to have more influence when courts are formed or merged through interlocal agreements. The present statutory structure sees what we do as judges as a "service" rather than the exercise of power granted to us as a member of a co-equal

branch of government. The present statutory structure allows the executive and legislative branch to farm out judicial services to other government bodies in much the same way that the local government might contract with another jurisdiction to fill potholes. The judiciary's influence is effectively nullified under the present statutory structure. This is an affront to judicial independence because the other branches have undue influence to threaten existing arrangements as a way to influence judicial decisions and control judges. Judicial services need to be seen by policymakers and the public as holding a unique place in government because of its role in delivering justice and dignity independent of outside pressure and influence as a co-equal branch of government with distinct constitutional powers.

4. **Charge: Under what circumstances is regionalization desirable from a service standpoint?**  
The culture of cooperation would give power to localities through their judicial officers to develop ways to deliver service without threatening local control and independence.
5. **Under what circumstances is regionalization undesirable from a service standpoint?**  
Forced regionalization that feeds turf-oriented reactions will not be productive. There is not a systemic, structural issue with courts of limited jurisdiction that can or will be solved by a broad regionalization effort, mandate, or structure.

### **PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS**

1. **Charge: Whether performance benchmarks/best practices should be adopted to provide a baseline for evaluating court performance.**  
The National Center for State Courts CourTools program may be a good start <http://www.courtools.org/Trial-Court-Performance-Measures.aspx>. However, the consensus is that a group dedicated to this sole task be formed to make recommendations regarding voluntary performance benchmarks/best practices for courts of limited jurisdiction. In the meantime, we recommend that the DMCJA Education Committee develop a program on Performance Standards (focusing on CourTools) for the 2015 Joint DMCJA/DMCMA annual conference.
2. **Charge: Identify a baseline of minimum services every court user can reasonably expect.**  
The consensus is that a group dedicated to this sole task be formed to make recommendations.

### **Universal Cashiering**

1. **Charge: Make recommendations regarding the desirability and feasibility of a universal payment system and whether one can be reasonably implemented prior to deployment of a new case management system.**

**We recommend the new CLJ CMS have the capacity to do universal cashiering.** (Whether we go with Tyler/Odyssey or some other case management system.) We need to confirm whether Odyssey has the accounting functionality we would need in order to meet the needs of the CLJ's. In any event, this should be included as a priority in the requirements gathering for a CLJ CMS.

**We also recommend we obtain information from AOC about the overall CLJ collection rate on fines and fees, as well as the total number of DWLS 3rd's. See the attached spreadsheet on the latter with data on outstanding DWLS 3's provided by AOC.<sup>1</sup>**

The goal here is that a defendant can walk into any court in the state and pay fines, fees or other legal financial obligations from any other court. A more limited goal would be universal cashing among all courts of limited jurisdiction. There may be more receptivity to this with the possibility of a new case management system (CMS) for CLJ's. It also may be more possible and practical to actually implement it with a new CMS, due to system obstacles in JIS/DISCIS as well as the issue of transfer fees. Otherwise, AOC would need to come up with a way of using the MSP screen for payment processing from one court to another.

We note though that one potential issue if and when some form of universal cashing becomes a reality is that some of the more easily accessible courts may well become de facto "payment centers of choice" for many customers, and thus bear a disproportionate burden of providing this customer service.

We also recommend that a single statewide online payment system be created (presumably to be managed/operated by AOC).

It should also be noted that this is not a new recommendation. In October 2003 the Justice Management Institute conducted a study of the Washington Courts of Limited Jurisdiction, which included an assessment of CLJ service delivery. That report concluded:

Local courts or the AOC should develop methods to ensure that fines and costs are paid and that court judgments and orders are followed. A statewide system for processing payments of fines and costs would assist local courts in the management of this system, would assist offenders in making periodic payments on time, and would make the system more uniform across the state. A statewide system should be developed that permits acceptance by any local court of payments for infraction cases filed anywhere in the state. A statewide procedure governing the collection and monitoring of fines and costs should be developed. Technological support for such a process would be vital to its successful implementation.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The attached report created by AOC shows the total number of DWLS cases that remain outstanding in the CLJ's as of early January 2014. The search criteria looks for "DWLS" in the charge name or a law number that contains "46.20.342" and those charges do not have a disposition code entered. Cases that qualify are then counted by filing year. Counting at the case level does not exclude warrants and/or FTA's.

<sup>2</sup> Somerlot and Baehler, "Always the People: Delivering Limited Jurisdiction Court Services Throughout Washington", The Justice Management Institute (Oct. 2003), *Submitted to The Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Delivery of Services Work Group, Washington Court Funding Task Force.*

2. **Charge: Explore and recommend services beneficial to the public that can be implemented with minimal financial impact and, conversely, identify and evaluate efficiencies that can be employed without reducing service to the public.**

#### **Referral of Cases to Collection Agencies**

We recommend development of a judicial educational program on collection practices with a view to creating greater consistency in such practices among the courts.

#### **Community Outreach**

- A. We recommend that Courts be encouraged to do more community outreach to educate the public about court processes (e.g. RE: license suspension process, DV, DUI); and
- B. We recommend that judges be able to receive CJE credits for offering this kind of community outreach/education.

# Attachment A

## Attachment A

### SUMMARY OF PAST REGIONAL COURT STUDIES

Year	Report	Recommendation(s)	Action(s) Taken
2001	<p>"Project 2001"- Statewide taskforce created by BJA including diverse stakeholders conduct a thorough review of the judicial system..</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Trial Court Coordinating Councils to formalize cooperation and coordination of services among courts, including different levels of trial courts in jurisdictions across the state;</li> <li>2. Redefine the role of Presiding Judge by squarely placing the authority and responsibility for the effective management of the trial courts in their hands;</li> <li>3. Authorize the use of elected judges to serve at different level of court in a jurisdiction without the consent of the parties or their lawyers who are appearing before that judge (referred to as "portability" of judges).</li> <li>4. Regionalization: <b>Report did not recommend full regionalization (defined as a unified court system, in which courts of limited jurisdiction would merge with superior courts). The report found the "functional equivalent" of unification could be achieved through implementing the three reforms recommended, while avoiding the increased costs and inefficiencies of actually merging or combining (unifying) superior and limited jurisdiction courts.</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recommendation for Trial Court Coordinating Councils implemented in some jurisdictions, but not required</li> <li>2. GR 29 adopted by Supreme Court</li> <li>3. Recommendation on "portability" implemented</li> </ol>

<p>October, 2003</p>	<p>"Always the People: Delivering limited jurisdiction court services throughout Washington". The Justice Management Institute (Denver, CO). Study was commissioned by BJA Statewide Court Funding Taskforce. This study was commissioned to supply information to the "Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Work Group"-a sub-group of the larger Funding Task Force</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Selection of judges and court staff that is merit based and independent of the funding authority;</li> <li>2. Recommend: emphasis on providing ongoing training and education to judges and staff;</li> <li>3. Presiding judge exercise of management and decisional authority free from inappropriate influence by executive or legislative branches;</li> <li>4. Judicial officers should have time for and specific training on management related activities;</li> <li>5. The public, including offenders, should have quick and convenient access to courts, probation services, defense services;</li> <li>6. Consideration should be given to evening court hours and establishing local offices separate from courthouses to receive payments and schedule hearings;</li> <li>7. Victims of domestic violence should have access to court services for protection;</li> <li>8. Develop a statewide protocol for providing DV protection orders and statewide training;</li> <li>9. Develop methods to ensure fines and costs are paid, including a statewide system for processing payments and one that permits acceptance by any local court of payment for infraction cases anywhere in the state;</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nothing done. Choices might include merit based selection and retention election system or election of all judges</li> <li>2. Ongoing training is being done with mandatory Judicial College and CJE hours.</li> <li>3. Presiding judge authority addressed in GR 29.</li> <li>4. Training on management issues occurs at DMCA spring conferences</li> <li>5. There is no current minimum requirement for open court hours or minimum judicial days per week</li> <li>6. Courts establish night court at their discretion</li> <li>7. <u>RCW 10.99.040</u> provides DV victims protected by NCO have some process to address the issuing court regarding modification or rescission of the order.</li> <li>8. State law was amended to allow all courts of limited jurisdiction to handle any kind of DV protection orders (with municipal courts having an option for civil anti-harassment orders)</li> <li>9. There is no universal cashing at present</li> <li>10. Courts that wish to monitor their time to completion statistics do so voluntarily without mandate or assistance from AOC</li> <li>12. Courts may set up forums with stakeholders to discuss the criminal justice system if they wish</li> </ol>
----------------------	---	--	--

Dec, 2004	BJA Court Funding Task Force: Justice in Jeopardy Report: The Court Funding Crises in Washington State"	<p>10. Courts should hold hearings with sufficient frequency to dispose of cases within acceptable time limits and courts should regularly monitor their completion of cases;</p> <p>11. Examine court procedures to minimize duplicate appearances and reduce FTAs;</p> <p>12. Provide courts forums to exchange ideas on problem solving and diagnose and evaluate performance of justice system;</p> <p>13. Connect probation department and court information services so offender information is entered once and can be shared;</p> <p>14. Gather and analyze data on collection effectiveness.</p>	<p>13. Probation departments across jurisdictions have no current way to share information</p> <p>14. Courts may analyze collection data on their own.</p>
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All Judges in courts of limited jurisdiction should be elected.</li> <li>2. Re-organize courts of limited jurisdiction into regional courts funded by the state.</li> <li>3. RCW, Title 3 should be amended to provide different court options for local governments to provide court services to their community. Encourage regionalization of courts of limited jurisdiction by allowing interlocal agreement for court services.</li> <li>4. Provisions should be made for expanded subject matter jurisdiction in district and municipal courts.</li> <li>5. Courts of limited jurisdiction should be accessible to residents of the community it</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not implemented</li> <li>2. Not implemented</li> <li>3. Implemented by <u>RCW 39.34.180</u>, allowing for inter-local agreements between cities for court services. <u>City of Medina v. Primm, 160 Wn. 2d 268 (2007)</u>. Title 3.50 was amended in 2008 to effectuate.</li> <li>4. Municipal courts may hear all civil DV protection orders, but no further legislation was passed to allow for other civil cases, such as small claims.</li> <li>5. No action taken</li> <li>6. Action taken-RCW 3.42.020 amended in 2008 regarding duties of commissioners.</li> <li>7. District Court District legislation in <u>RCW 3.38</u> (Districting Committee) has not been</li> </ol>

	<p>amended since 1995.</p> <p>8. Legislation to allow municipal courts the option of hearing civil anti-harassment protection petitions passed. <u>RCW 10.14.150</u> (municipal court must pass local rule to exercise option).</p> <p>9. Unsure if any courts currently do not comply with assistance to DV victims who need protection orders. Gender and Justice Commission provides standard forms and assistance to courts.</p> <p>10. Legislation to raise jurisdiction amount to \$75,000 passed. <u>RCW 3.66.020</u></p> <p>11. Unsure if any rule or legislation to require dedicated civil calendars and case scheduling.</p>	<p>8. Legislation to allow municipal courts the option of hearing civil anti-harassment protection petitions passed. <u>RCW 10.14.150</u> (municipal court must pass local rule to exercise option).</p> <p>9. Unsure if any courts currently do not comply with assistance to DV victims who need protection orders. Gender and Justice Commission provides standard forms and assistance to courts.</p> <p>10. Legislation to raise jurisdiction amount to \$75,000 passed. <u>RCW 3.66.020</u></p> <p>11. Unsure if any rule or legislation to require dedicated civil calendars and case scheduling.</p>	<p>[NOTE: In September 2013, the BJA sent the recommendation on regional courts back to AOC staff to develop a proposal for looking at the history of regionalization and bring that back to the BJA to determine what the next steps should be. [BJA minutes, Sept. 20, 2013]]</p>
<p>serves, including providing services on a regularly scheduled bases at established hours that are posted for the public.</p> <p>6. Limit district and municipal court commissioner authority to differentiate their responsibilities from those of elected judges.</p> <p>7. Amend RCW Title 3 to emphasize a collaborative regional approach to the provision of court services by expanding the role and membership of the districting committee.</p> <p>8. Authorize municipal courts to hear anti-harassment protection petitions.</p> <p>9. Require courts of limited jurisdiction to timely hear DV protection orders or have clear, concise procedures to refer victims to courts where services are available.</p> <p>10. Increase civil jurisdiction amount in dispute for district courts to \$75,000.</p> <p>11. Recommend district courts implement dedicated civil calendars and case scheduling.</p>	<p>serves, including providing services on a regularly scheduled bases at established hours that are posted for the public.</p> <p>6. Limit district and municipal court commissioner authority to differentiate their responsibilities from those of elected judges.</p> <p>7. Amend RCW Title 3 to emphasize a collaborative regional approach to the provision of court services by expanding the role and membership of the districting committee.</p> <p>8. Authorize municipal courts to hear anti-harassment protection petitions.</p> <p>9. Require courts of limited jurisdiction to timely hear DV protection orders or have clear, concise procedures to refer victims to courts where services are available.</p> <p>10. Increase civil jurisdiction amount in dispute for district courts to \$75,000.</p> <p>11. Recommend district courts implement dedicated civil calendars and case scheduling.</p>	<p>serves, including providing services on a regularly scheduled bases at established hours that are posted for the public.</p> <p>6. Limit district and municipal court commissioner authority to differentiate their responsibilities from those of elected judges.</p> <p>7. Amend RCW Title 3 to emphasize a collaborative regional approach to the provision of court services by expanding the role and membership of the districting committee.</p> <p>8. Authorize municipal courts to hear anti-harassment protection petitions.</p> <p>9. Require courts of limited jurisdiction to timely hear DV protection orders or have clear, concise procedures to refer victims to courts where services are available.</p> <p>10. Increase civil jurisdiction amount in dispute for district courts to \$75,000.</p> <p>11. Recommend district courts implement dedicated civil calendars and case scheduling.</p>	<p>serves, including providing services on a regularly scheduled bases at established hours that are posted for the public.</p> <p>6. Limit district and municipal court commissioner authority to differentiate their responsibilities from those of elected judges.</p> <p>7. Amend RCW Title 3 to emphasize a collaborative regional approach to the provision of court services by expanding the role and membership of the districting committee.</p> <p>8. Authorize municipal courts to hear anti-harassment protection petitions.</p> <p>9. Require courts of limited jurisdiction to timely hear DV protection orders or have clear, concise procedures to refer victims to courts where services are available.</p> <p>10. Increase civil jurisdiction amount in dispute for district courts to \$75,000.</p> <p>11. Recommend district courts implement dedicated civil calendars and case scheduling.</p>
<p>May, 2013</p> <p>Report by National Center for State Courts. Commissioned by BJA "Regional Courts Oversight Committee" to analyze effectiveness of CLJ as a "prelude to possible court organization reform". Report requested in</p>	<p>Findings on regional courts by report: "The regional courts concept can effectively help to achieve these goals [standardizing court procedures, providing for a consistent cost structure or advancing equal justice throughout the state]. However, because there appears to be such a wide degree of variation in the organization and operation of the municipal courts, a regional court approach may not be necessary for all jurisdictions. In addition, without a clear baseline defining the level of</p>	<p>Findings on regional courts by report: "The regional courts concept can effectively help to achieve these goals [standardizing court procedures, providing for a consistent cost structure or advancing equal justice throughout the state]. However, because there appears to be such a wide degree of variation in the organization and operation of the municipal courts, a regional court approach may not be necessary for all jurisdictions. In addition, without a clear baseline defining the level of</p>	<p>Findings on regional courts by report: "The regional courts concept can effectively help to achieve these goals [standardizing court procedures, providing for a consistent cost structure or advancing equal justice throughout the state]. However, because there appears to be such a wide degree of variation in the organization and operation of the municipal courts, a regional court approach may not be necessary for all jurisdictions. In addition, without a clear baseline defining the level of</p>

<p>furtherance of the BJA's policy position that Washington should establish a 'single regionally based court of limited jurisdiction'. [page 1]</p>	<p>services and performance that should be provided by the municipal courts, whether an individual jurisdiction is proving sufficient 'quality' of justice is a subjective determination.' [page 59]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development of a comprehensive set of standards applicable to all courts of limited jurisdiction, including standardized measures of performance.</li> <li>2. In some instances a regional court may provide the best alternative to improving delivery of court services.</li> <li>3. Conduct one or more evaluation projects with municipalities to further assess the impact of consolidation or regionalization. The selection of courts in such an evaluation project should be those interested in court consolidation and those that have the capability of providing all necessary evaluation data.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No action taken to date</li> <li>2. Options for interlocal agreements for municipal courts already exist. No current legislative options exist to allow for inter-local agreements between district and municipal courts. The only option under RCW Title 3 is for a city to contract for all court services with a district court.</li> <li>3. No action taken on study suggestion</li> </ol>
--	---	--

**Attachment B**

## Court Structure by County

The attached chart has a summary of the following information organized by county:

- Total population;
- Percentage of population living in city limits that could be served by a municipal court;
- The physical location of district courts;
- A list of cities that contract with the county or that have RCW 3.46 municipal departments in district court;
- A list of cities with violation bureaus only;
- A list of cities with their own municipal court;
- A list of cities that contract with other cities;
- A list of cities with city limits in two or more counties (this is important for jury service);
- A list of cities not accounted for in AOC court directories sorted by county.

A quick review of county codes was conducted to look for references to district court structure (see attached).

Observations are as follows:

- 48 cities in Washington are not accounted for in the AOC court directory as having a court or a relationship with a county. Populations of those cities range from 100 to 90,110;
- 15 counties have no municipal courts;
- 21 cities have violations bureaus only;
- 11 counties have no recorded relationships with cities;
- 3 counties have no recorded relationship with a city and cities in that county have no record of having a court;
- 9 cities provide for municipal courts by local ordinance, but appoint district court judges to hear cases;
- 5 cities list their courts as departments of district court under RCW 3.46;
- 8 cities contract with one other city;
- 5 cities contract with 2 other cities;
- 1 city contracts with 4 other cities;
- 2 cities share space;
- 2 cities share an administrator, but seem to maintain separate courts;
- 6 cities have boundaries in 2 counties;
- 1 city has boundaries in 3 counties;
- The city of Republic in Ferry County is not mentioned as having a court or as being part of district court in the court directory, but shows up in caseload reports under Ferry County District Court;
- In Grant County, Electric City and Grand Coulee do not show in caseload reports, but do show as having municipal courts with district court judges in the court directory;

- In Lincoln County, Almira and Harrington do not show in caseload reports, but do show as served by district court in the court directory;
- Tonsaket shows as having a municipal court in the court directory in Okanagan County, but does not show up in caseload reports;
- Cusine, Lone, Metaline, Metaline Falls, and Newport do not show as being served by Pend Oreille County in the court directory, but do show in caseload reports as being served by district court;
- Several Spokane County cities are not mentioned, but the district court's website refers to those cities as covered by the court's jurisdiction. See <http://www.spokanecounty.org/districtcourt/content.aspx?c=1551>. Spokane Valley is provided for in caseload reports, but not listed in the court directory.
- In Stevens County, Northport does not show in caseload reports, but does show as served by district court in the court directory;
- In Thurston County, Rainier is shown as served by district court in the court directory, but shows in caseload reports as a standalone municipal court;
- Burbank, Prescott, Waitsburg, and Walla Walla do not show in caseload reports, but do show as served by district court in the court directory;
- Albion shows as having a municipal court in the court directory in Whitman County, but does not show up in caseload reports;
- The Pierce County Code still has Tacoma as a municipal department;
  - Tacoma still refers to a "police judge" with a code for its courts adopted in 1953;
- Several county codes still refer to justices of the peace;
- Many county codes have no mention of district courts;
- Several county codes have not been amended since the 1970s and 1980s;
- The San Juan County Code purports to set district court judges salaries while some other counties give county commissioners at least some authority to set salaries;
- The Skagit County Code requires that all city cases be heard at respective city halls;

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Adams (18,950) (52.7)	Ritzville Othello	Ritzville Othello	None	None	None	None	Hatton. Lind Washtucna
Asotin (21,660) (39)	Asotin	Asotin Clarkston	None	None	None	None	None
Benton (177,900) (81.3)	Kennewick Prosser	Kennewick Prosser Richland West Richland	None	None	None	None	Benton City
Chelan (72,700) (58)	Wenatchee	Cashmere Leavenworth	Wenatchee	None	None	None	Entiat Chelan
Clallam (71,600) (40.8)	Port Angeles Forks	Port Angeles Forks Sequim	None	None	None	None	None
Clark (428,000) (52.2)	Vancouver	Vancouver Yacolt *Washougal and Camas contract with District Court, but each have a municipal court and the mayor selects judges from elected district court judges subject to confirmation by the city council.	Vancouver	Battleground	Battleground with LaCenter and Ridgefield  Washougal with Camas	Woodland (Cowlitz)	None

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Columbia (4,100) (65)	Dayton	Dayton	None	None	None	None	Starbuck
Cowlitz (102,700) (56.9)	Kelso	Castle Rock Kalama Kelso Longview Woodland	Longview	None	None	Woodland (Clark)	None
Douglas (38,650) (46.7)	East Wenatchee Bridgeport	Bridgeport Rock Island Waterville	None	East Wenatchee	None	Coulee Dam (Okanogan and Grant)	Mansfield
Ferry (7,600) (14.2)	Republic	None	None	None	None	None	Republic
Franklin (80,500) (83)	Pasco	Connell	None	Pasco	None	None	Mesa Kahlotus
Garfield (2,250) (62.9)	Pomeroy	None	None	None	None	None	Pomeroy

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Grant (90,100) (55.2)	Ephrata Moses Lake	Coulee City Electric City Ephrata (3.46) George Grand Coulee Mattawa Moses Lake (3.46) Quincy (3.46) Royal City (3.46) Soap Lake Warden	None	See district court	None	Coulee Dam (Douglas and Okanagan)	Hartline Krupp Wilson Creek
Grays Harbor (72,900) (60.8)	Montesano Aberdeen	None	None	Aberdeen Cosmopolis Elma* Hoquim McCleary* Montesano Oakville Ocean Shores Westport *Same judge ?? See City with County	Elma/McCleary?	None	None
Island (78,800) (31.9)	Oak Harbor	Coupeville Langley Oak Harbor (Each city has an established court, but the judges are from district court)	None		None	None	None

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Jefferson (30,050) (29.6)	Port Townsend	Port Townsend	None	None	None	None	None
King (1,942,600) (85.3)	Seattle Bellevue Issaquah Redmond Auburn Burien Kent - MRJC Shoreline	Bellevue Carnation Duvall Kenmore North Bend Redmond Sammamish Shoreline Skykomish Snoqualmie Woodinville Burien Covington Auburn	North Bend	Black Diamond Bothell Des Moines Enumclaw* Federal Way Issaquah Kent Kirkland Lake Forest Park Maple Valley** Mercer Island Pacific Renton Sea-Tac Seattle Tukwila *Same judge as Wilkeson **Same judge as Pacific & Algona	Algona with Pacific Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Medina, and Yarrow Point with Kirkland Maple Valley shares space with Kent Newcastle with Mercer Island Normandy Park with Des Moines	Auburn (Pierce) Bothell (Sno.) Enumclaw (Pierce) Milton (Pierce) Pacific (Pierce)	Beaux Arts
Kitsap (253,900) (32.5)	Port Orchard	None	None	Bainbridge Island Bremerton Port Orchard Poulsbo	None	None	None

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Kittitas (41,300) (55.7)	Ellensburg Cle Elum	Ellensburg Kittitas Roslyn* Cle Elum*  *Each city has an established court per RCW 3.50, but a district court judge serves as muni court judge)	None	Roslyn and Cle Elum, but cases are heard by district court	None	None	South Cle Elum
Klickitat (20,500) (31.1)	Goldendale White Salmon	Bingen White Salmon Goldendale	None	None	None	None	None
Lewis (76,000) (40.4)	Chehalis	Morton Mossyrock Pe Ell Toledo	Morton Mossyrock Pe Ell Toledo	Centralia Chehalis Napavine Winlock	Vader with Winlock	None	None
Lincoln (10,600) (51.8)	Davenport	Almira Davenport Harrington Odessa Reardan Sprague Wilbur	None	None	None	None	None
Mason (61,100) (16.1)	Shelton	None	None	Shelton	None	None	None

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Okanogan (41,200) (39.8)	Okanogan	Coulee Dam Elmer City Okanogan Oroville Pateros Riverside	None	Brewster* Omak* Tonasket Twisp* Winthrop*  *Same judge	None	Coulee Dam (Douglas and Grant)	Conconully Nespelem
Pacific (20,900) (32.7)	South Bend Long Beach	None	None	Ilwaco*^ Long Beach**^ Raymond* South Bend*  *Same Judge ^Same Administrator	Ilwaco Long Beach	None	None
Pend Oreille (13,000) (24.7)	Newport	None	None	None	None	None	Cusine Ione Metaline Metaline Falls Newport

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Pierce (802,150) (53.6)	Tacoma	DuPont	None	Bonney Lake Buckley Fife Fircrest Gig Harbor Lakewood Milton* Orting Puyallup Roy Ruston Sumner Tacoma Wilkeson** **Same judge as Enumclaw	Buckley with Carbonado Bonney Lake with Eatonville and South Prairie *Milton shares space and staff with Puyallup Lakewood with Steilacoom and University Place	Auburn (King) Enumclaw (King) Milton (King) Pacific (King)	Edgewood
San Juan (15,900) (13.7)	Friday Harbor	Friday Harbor	None	None	None	None	None
Skagit (117,400) (58.9)	Mount Vernon	Concrete LaConner Anacortes Burlington (3.46) Mount Vernon	None	Sedro-Wooley	None	None	Hamilton Lyman
Skamania (11,150) (22.1)	Stevenson	None	None	North Bonneville Stevenson	None	None	None

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Snohomish (717,000) (57.5)	Everett Arlington Monroe Lynnwood	Brier Darrington Gold Bar Granite Falls Index Mill Creek Monroe Mountlake Terrace Mukilteo Snohomish Stanwood Sultan Woodway	Arlington Brier Darrington Gold Bar Granite Falls Lake Stevens Mill Creek Mountlake Terrace Mukilteo Snohomish Sultan Woodway	Marysville Edmonds Everett Lynnwood	Arlington with Lake Stevens, and Marysville	Bothell (King)	None
Spokane (472,650) (71.1)	Spokane	Cheney* Deer Park  *Has an established court but uses district court judge	None	Airway Heights Medical Lake Spokane	None	None	Fairfield Latah Liberty Lake Millwood Rockford Spangle Spokane Valley Waverly
Stevens (43,600) (22.1)	Colville	Chewelah Colville Kettle Falls Northport Springdale	None	None	None	None	Marcus

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Thurston (254,100) (46.5)	Olympia	Lacey Rainier Tumwater	None	Lacey Olympia Tenino Tumwater Yelm	Bucoda with Tenino	None	None
Wahkiakum (4,000) (13.3)	Cathlamet	None	None	Cathlamet	None	None	None
Walla Walla (58,800) (71.4)	Walla Walla	Burbank Prescott Waitsburg Walla Walla	None	College Place	None	None	None
Whatcom (202,100) (56.7)	Bellingham	None	None	Bellingham Blaine* Everson- Nooksack* Ferndale Lynden Sumas* *Same judge	Everson and Nooksack	None	None

County (Population) (% in a city)	District Court Location	City with County	Violations Bureau	Stand-Alone Municipal Courts	City with City	Cities in two counties	Cities not Mentioned in Court Directory
Whitman (44,800) (86.7)	Colfax Pullman	None	None	Albion Colfax Colton Uniontown	None	None	Endicott Farmington Garfield LaCrosse Lamont Malden Pullman Rosalia St. John Takoia
Yakima (244,700) (65.5)	Yakima Grandview	Grandview Tieton Union Gap*  *Has an established court	Mabton	Granger Moxee City Selah Sunnyside Toppenish Wapato Yakima Zillah	Mabton with Sunnyside	None	Harrah Naches

County	County Code Provisions
Adams	Not available
Asotin	Not available
Benton	No mention of district courts in county code
Chelan	Ch. 1.64 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/chelancounty.html">http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/chelancounty.html</a>
Clallam	No mention of district courts in county code
Clark	Ch. 1.08 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/clarkcounty.html">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/clarkcounty.html</a>
Columbia	Chg. 2.80 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/columbiacounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/columbiacounty/</a> Passed in 1980.
Cowlitz	Ch. 2.04 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/cowlitzcounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/cowlitzcounty/</a> Deals with municipal courts too.
Douglas	Ch. 2.10 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/douglascounty.html">http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/douglascounty.html</a> Seems to have been adopted in 1972
Ferry	Not available
Franklin	No mention of district courts in county code
Garfield	Not available
Grant	Ch. 2.08 <a href="http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16378">http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16378</a> 1972
Grays Harbor	Ch. 2.04 <a href="http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub_svcs/GHCCode/pdf/GHC02.pdf">http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub_svcs/GHCCode/pdf/GHC02.pdf</a> See 2.04.110 which addresses municipal courts
Island	Ch. 1.12 <a href="http://www.islandcounty.net/code/documents/ICC01.pdf">http://www.islandcounty.net/code/documents/ICC01.pdf</a> 1.12.080 establishes municipal courts of Coupeville, Langley, and Oak Harbor with time and salary allotted to each city. Passed in 1972 and last amended in 2010.
Jefferson	No mention of district courts in county code
King	Ch. 2.68 <a href="http://www.kingcounty.gov/council/legislation/kc_code/05%20Title%202.aspx">http://www.kingcounty.gov/council/legislation/kc_code/05 Title 2.aspx</a> 5 electoral districts provided by county code, but only 3 districts provided by the court
Kitsap	Ch. 2.20 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/kitsapcounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/kitsapcounty/</a> Establishes municipal court of Bremerton
Kittitas	Ch. 2.08 <a href="http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/boc/countycode/title02.aspx#Chapter%202.08">http://www.co.kittitas.wa.us/boc/countycode/title02.aspx#Chapter 2.08</a>
Klickitat	Not available
Lewis	Ch. 2.20 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/lewiscounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/lewiscounty/</a>

County	County Code Provisions
Lincoln	Not available
Mason	Ch. 2.40 <a href="http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16478">http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16478</a>
Okanogan	No mention of district courts in county code
Pacific	Ch. 2.04 <a href="http://www.co.pacific.wa.us/pdf%20files/pacificofullcode0413.pdf">http://www.co.pacific.wa.us/pdf%20files/pacificofullcode0413.pdf</a>
Pend Oreille	Not available
Pierce	Ch. 2.54 <a href="http://www.co.pierce.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/1137">http://www.co.pierce.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/1137</a> Ch. 2.54.020 Tacoma is listed as a department of district court. <a href="http://www.co.pierce.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/1137">http://www.co.pierce.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/1137</a>  Tacoma muni code (1.22) is interesting because it refers to "police judge" and was adopted in 1953 <a href="http://cms.cityoftacoma.org/cityclerk/Files/MunicipalCode/Title01-AdministrationAndPersonnel.PDF">http://cms.cityoftacoma.org/cityclerk/Files/MunicipalCode/Title01-AdministrationAndPersonnel.PDF</a>
San Juan	Ch. 2.16 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/saniuancounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/saniuancounty/</a> Salary of judges set by county commissioners
Skagit	Ch. 2.12 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/skagitcounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/skagitcounty/</a> All city cases shall be heard at city halls 2.12.040
Skamania	Ch. 2.16 <a href="http://skamaniacounty.org/ordinance/code/T02%20-%20Title%20%20%20ADMINISTRATION%20AND%20PERSONNEL.HTM">http://skamaniacounty.org/ordinance/code/T02%20-%20Title%20%20%20ADMINISTRATION%20AND%20PERSONNEL.HTM</a> 2.16.020 sets salary at 40%
Snohomish	Ch. 2.12 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/snohomishcounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/snohomishcounty/</a>
Spokane	Ch. 1.16 <a href="http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16337">http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16337</a>
Stevens	Not available
Thurston	Ch. 1.16 <a href="http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16720">http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16720</a>
Wahkiakum	Not available
Walla Walla	No mention of district courts in county code
Whatcom	Ch. 2.12 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/whatcomcounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/whatcomcounty/</a> Bellingham Muni Court department
Whitman	Not available
Yakima	Ch. 2.04 <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/yakimacounty/">http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/yakimacounty/</a>

# Attachment C

Court Level	County	Court	2010	2011	2012	2013	Sum:
District Court	Adams	OTHELLO DISTRICT COURT	24	46	70	124	264
District Court	Adams	RITZVILLE DISTRICT COURT	58	48	36	94	236
District Court	Asofin	ASOTIN DISTRICT COURT	19	28	46	115	208
District Court	Benton	BENTON COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	70	95	145	736	1046
District Court	Chelan	CHELAN COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	32	25	39	266	362
District Court	Clallam	CLALLAM COUNTY DISTRICT COURT #1	13	30	46	139	228
District Court	Clallam	CLALLAM DISTRICT COURT #2	13	9	26	58	106
District Court	Clark	CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	249	325	439	1194	2207
District Court	Columbia	COLUMBIA COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	5	3	5	19	32
District Court	Cowlitz	COWLITZ COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	103	108	149	579	939
District Court	Douglas	BRIDGEPORT DISTRICT COURT	6	2	3	12	23
District Court	Douglas	DOUGLAS DISTRICT COURT	10	7	16	70	103
District Court	Ferry	FERRY COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	6	1	6	19	32
District Court	Franklin	FRANKLIN DISTRICT COURT	37	21	26	66	150
District Court	Garfield	GARFIELD COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	2	8	8	16	34
District Court	Grant	GRANT COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	142	169	123	430	864
District Court	Grays Harbor	#1 GRAYS HARBOR DISTRICT COURT	173	164	166	230	733
District Court	Island	ISLAND COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	29	33	90	227	379
District Court	Jefferson	JEFFERSON DISTRICT COURT	11	44	46	58	159
District Court	King	KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	290	383	1465	4004	6142
District Court	Kitsap	KITSAP DISTRICT COURT	43	112	209	611	975
District Court	Kittitas	LOWER KITTITAS DISTRICT COURT	27	55	49	221	352
District Court	Kittitas	UPPER KITTITAS DISTRICT COURT	18	25	37	88	168
District Court	Klickitat	E. KLICKITAT DISTRICT	20	26	18	42	106
District Court	Klickitat	W. KLICKITAT DISTRICT	5	8	9	26	48
District Court	Lewis	LEWIS COUNTY DISTRICT COURT LAW AND JUSTICE CENTER	70	73	98	303	544
District Court	Lincoln	LINCOLN COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	17	19	28	85	149
District Court	Mason	MASON COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	70	97	138	254	559
District Court	Okanogan	OKANOGAN COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	18	15	40	199	272
District Court	Pacific	NORTH PACIFIC DISTRICT COURT PACIFIC COUNTY COURTHOUSE	11	6	10	20	47
District Court	Pacific	SOUTH PACIFIC DISTRICT COURT	9	20	32	77	138
District Court	Pend Oreille	PEND OREILLE DISTRICT COURT	6	19	16	78	119

Court Level	County	Court	2010	2011	2012	2013	Sum:
District Court	Pierce	PIERCE COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	325	393	544	1469	2731
District Court	San Juan	SAN JUAN DISTRICT COURT		3	9	30	42
District Court	Skagit	SKAGIT COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	57	66	114	412	649
District Court	Skamania	SKAMANIA COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	16	16	31	69	132
District Court	Snohomish	SNO CO DIST CT CASCADE DIV	64	39	15	77	195
District Court	Snohomish	SNO CO DIST CT EVERETT DIV	48	51	36	121	256
District Court	Snohomish	SNO CO DIST CT EVERGREEN DIV	14	16	15	97	142
District Court	Snohomish	SNO CO DIST CT SOUTH DIV	51	90	98	349	588
District Court	Spokane	SPOKANE COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	171	349	378	1352	2250
District Court	Stevens	STEVENS COUNTY DISTRICT COURT		12	17	67	96
District Court	Thurston	THURSTON COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	192	326	396	979	1893
District Court	Wahkiakum	WAHIAKUM DISTRICT COURT	2	2	7	14	25
District Court	Walla Walla	WALLA WALLA DISTRICT COURT	231	247	156	273	907
District Court	Whatcom	WHATCOM COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	68	71	83	298	520
District Court	Whitman	WHITMAN COUNTY DISTRICT COURT	19	27	54	139	239
District Court	Yakima	YAKIMA CO DIST CT - YDC -	49	78	145	582	854
Municipal Court	Clark	BATTLE GROUND MUNICIPAL COURT	10	29	44	161	244
Municipal Court	Clark	CAMAS/WASHOUGAL MUNICIPAL COURT	14	20	28	173	235
Municipal Court	Douglas	E WENATCHEE MUNI CT(509)884-0680	6	5	9	53	73
Municipal Court	Franklin	PASCO MUNICIPAL COURT	4	9	19	75	107
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	ABERDEEN MUNICIPAL COURT	147	108	116	186	557
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	COSMOPOLIS MUNICIPAL COURT	13	22	20	14	69
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	ELMA MUNICIPAL COURT	16	32	28	45	121
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	HOQUIAM MUNICIPAL COURT	84	82	93	107	366
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	MCCLEARY MUNICIPAL COURT	3	5	19	27	54
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	MONTESANO MUNICIPAL COURT	4	15	25	41	85
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	OAKVILLE MUNICIPAL COURT	10	7	11	8	36
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	OCEAN SHORES MUNICIPAL COURT	17	31	26	43	117
Municipal Court	Grays Harbor	WESTPORT MUNICIPAL COURT	31	16	7	22	76
Municipal Court	King	BLACK DIAMOND MUNICIPAL COURT	6	18	17	58	99
Municipal Court	King	BOTHELL MUNICIPAL COURT	16	13	41	96	166
Municipal Court	King	DES MOINES MUNICIPAL COURT	22	45	86	273	426

Court Level	County	Court	2010	2011	2012	2013	Sum:
Municipal Court	King	ENUMCLAW MUNICIPAL COURT	12	11	15	41	79
Municipal Court	King	FEDERAL WAY MUNICIPAL COURT	86	86	150	386	708
Municipal Court	King	ISSAQUAH MUNICIPAL COURT	20	37	55	132	244
Municipal Court	King	KCDC AUBURN COURTHOUSE	69	54	57		180
Municipal Court	King	KENT MUNICIPAL COURT	76	114	178	504	872
Municipal Court	King	KIRKLAND MUNICIPAL COURT	40	76	107	411	634
Municipal Court	King	LAKE FOREST PARK MUNICIPAL COURT	6	15	11	74	106
Municipal Court	King	MERCER ISLAND MUNICIPAL COURT	13	19	21	61	114
Municipal Court	King	PACIFIC MUNICIPAL COURT	13	34	17	69	133
Municipal Court	King	RENTON MUNICIPAL COURT	8	58	103	268	437
Municipal Court	King	SEATAC MUNICIPAL COURT	34	47	59	193	333
Municipal Court	King	TUKWILA MUNICIPAL COURT	73	79	160	270	582
Municipal Court	Kitsap	BAINBRIDGE ISLAND MUNICIPAL		6	4	14	24
Municipal Court	Kitsap	BREMERTON MUNICIPAL COURT	8	9	8	83	108
Municipal Court	Kitsap	PORT ORCHARD MUNICIPAL COURT	19	26	42	94	181
Municipal Court	Kitsap	POULSOBO MUNICIPAL COURT	2	9	11	27	49
Municipal Court	Kittitas	CLE ELUM MUNICIPAL COURT	5	4	6	14	29
Municipal Court	Kittitas	ROSLYN MUNICIPAL COURT			3	5	8
Municipal Court	Lewis	CENTRALIA MUNICIPAL COURT	30	33	58	155	276
Municipal Court	Lewis	CHEHALIS MUNICIPAL COURT	8	11	16	28	63
Municipal Court	Lewis	NAPAVINE MUNICIPAL COURT		3	4	20	27
Municipal Court	Lewis	VADER MUNICIPAL COURT	1	1		3	5
Municipal Court	Lewis	WINLOCK MUNICIPAL COURT	3	3	1	3	10
Municipal Court	Mason	SHELTON MUNICIPAL COURT	17	61	63	106	247
Municipal Court	Okanogan	WINTHROP MUNICIPAL COURT		1	1		2
Municipal Court	Pacific	RAYMOND MUNICIPAL COURT		1	11	21	33
Municipal Court	Pacific	SOUTH BEND MUNICIPAL COURT	3	2	5	19	29
Municipal Court	Pierce	BONNEY LAKE MUNICIPAL COURT	41	33	104	259	437
Municipal Court	Pierce	BUCKLEY MUNICIPAL COURT	14	17	17	41	89
Municipal Court	Pierce	EATONVILLE MUNICIPAL COURT	1	5	4		10
Municipal Court	Pierce	FIFE MUNICIPAL COURT	58	66	115	305	544
Municipal Court	Pierce	FIRCREST MUNICIPAL COURT	10	14	29	98	149

Court Level	County	Court	2010	2011	2012	2013	Sum:
Municipal Court	Pierce	GIG HARBOR MUNICIPAL COURT	5	12	13	32	62
Municipal Court	Pierce	LAKELAND MUNICIPAL COURT	23	52	69	300	444
Municipal Court	Pierce	MILTON MUNICIPAL COURT	13	14	29	145	201
Municipal Court	Pierce	ORTING MUNICIPAL COURT	9	17	32	50	108
Municipal Court	Pierce	PUYALLUP MUNICIPAL COURT	32	98	225	646	1001
Municipal Court	Pierce	ROY MUNICIPAL COURT	5	13	13	19	50
Municipal Court	Pierce	RUSTON MUNICIPAL COURT	17	24	27	45	113
Municipal Court	Pierce	STEILACOOM MUNICIPAL COURT	2	2	4	1	9
Municipal Court	Pierce	SUMNER MUNICIPAL COURT	7	4	12	33	56
Municipal Court	Pierce	TACOMA MUNICIPAL COURT	200	179	261	447	1087
Municipal Court	Pierce	WILKESON MUNICIPAL COURT	1	1	4	3	9
Municipal Court	Skagit	ANACORTES MUNICIPAL COURT	16	21	39	82	158
Municipal Court	Skagit	BURLINGTON MUNICIPAL COURT	21	29	20	70	140
Municipal Court	Skagit	MT VERNON MUNICIPAL COURT	20	34	28	84	166
Municipal Court	Skagit	SEDRO-WOOLLEY MUNICIPAL COURT	2	10	16	14	42
Municipal Court	Skamania	STEVENSON MUNICIPAL COURT	3	4	3	7	17
Municipal Court	Snohomish	EDMONDS MUNICIPAL COURT	15	19	19	139	192
Municipal Court	Snohomish	EVERETT MUNICIPAL COURT	71	95	215	621	1002
Municipal Court	Snohomish	LYNNWOOD MUNICIPAL COURT	35	45	51	93	224
Municipal Court	Snohomish	MARYSVILLE MUNICIPAL COURT	17	50	62	394	523
Municipal Court	Spokane	AIRWAY HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL	4	2	2	69	77
Municipal Court	Spokane	CHENEY MUNICIPAL COURT	4	4	7	23	38
Municipal Court	Spokane	MEDICAL LAKE MUNICIPAL COURT	1	2	7	19	29
Municipal Court	Spokane	SPOKANE MUNICIPAL COURT	98	51	95	534	778
Municipal Court	Thurston	OLYMPIA MUNICIPAL COURT	20	36	31	61	148
Municipal Court	Thurston	TENINO MUNICIPAL COURT	6	12	13	20	51
Municipal Court	Thurston	TUMWATER VIOLATIONS BUREAU				1	1
Municipal Court	Thurston	YELM MUNICIPAL COURT	7	15	25	177	224
Municipal Court	Walla Walla	COLLEGE PLACE MUNICIPAL COURT	6	7	12	38	63
Municipal Court	Whatcom	BELLINGHAM MUNICIPAL COURT	33	24	39	163	259
Municipal Court	Whatcom	BLAINE MUNICIPAL COURT	4	11	14	35	64
Municipal Court	Whatcom	EVERSON-NOOKSACK MUNICIPAL COURT	4	11	5	34	54

Court Level	County	Court	2010	2011	2012	2013	Sum:
Municipal Court	Whatcom	FERNDALE MUNICIPAL COURT	8	7	15	108	138
Municipal Court	Whatcom	LYNDEN MUNICIPAL COURT	12	9	6	51	78
Municipal Court	Whatcom	SUMAS MUNICIPAL COURT	8	11	15	29	63
Municipal Court	Whitman	COLFAX MUNICIPAL COURT	2	2	1	13	18
Municipal Court	Whitman	COLTON MUNICIPAL COURT	1				1
Municipal Court	Yakima	GRANGER MUNICIPAL COURT	4	3	2	14	23
Municipal Court	Yakima	SELAH MUNICIPAL COURT	1	3	5	45	54
Municipal Court	Yakima	SUNNYSIDE MUNICIPAL COURT	34	52	48	229	363
Municipal Court	Yakima	TOPPENISH MUNICIPAL COURT	5	16	22	53	96
Municipal Court	Yakima	UNION GAP MUNICIPAL COURT	28	35	51	137	251
Municipal Court	Yakima	WAPATO MUNICIPAL COURT	19	51	65	134	269
Municipal Court	Yakima	YAKIMA MUNICIPAL COURT	11	42	71	216	340
Municipal Court	Yakima	ZILLAH MUNICIPAL COURT	1	2	1	12	16
		Sum:	4,821	6,333	9,450	27,312	47,916