

# **BOARD FOR JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION**



**WASHINGTON  
COURTS**

## **MEETING PACKET**

**FRIDAY, MAY 18, 2012  
9:00 A.M.**

**AOC SEATAC OFFICE  
18000 INTERNATIONAL BOULEVARD, SUITE 1106  
SEATAC, WASHINGTON**

# Board for Judicial Administration Membership

## VOTING MEMBERS:

**Chief Justice Barbara Madsen**, Chair  
Supreme Court

**Judge Chris Wickham**, Member Chair  
Superior Court Judges' Association  
Thurston County Superior Court

**Judge Marlin J. Appelwick**  
Court of Appeals, Division I

**Judge Ronald Culpepper**  
Superior Court Judges' Association  
Pierce County Superior Court

**Judge Deborah Fleck**  
Superior Court Judges' Association  
King County Superior Court

**Judge Janet Garrow**  
District and Municipal Court Judges'  
Association  
King County District Court

**Judge Jill Johanson**  
Court of Appeals, Division II

**Judge Kevin Korsmo**  
Court of Appeals, Division III

**Judge Michael Lambo**  
District and Municipal Court Judges'  
Association  
Kirkland Municipal Court

**Judge Craig Matheson**, President-Elect  
Superior Court Judges' Association  
Benton and Franklin Superior Courts

**Judge Jack Nevin**  
District and Municipal Court Judges'  
Association  
Pierce County District Court

**Justice Susan Owens**  
Supreme Court

**Judge Kevin Ringus**  
District and Municipal Court Judges'  
Association  
Fife Municipal Court

**Judge Scott Sparks**  
Superior Court Judges' Association  
Kittitas County Superior Court

**Judge Gregory Tripp**, President  
District and Municipal Court Judges'  
Association  
Spokane County District Court

## NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

**Mr. Stephen Crossland**, President  
Washington State Bar Association

**Judge Sara Derr**, President-Elect  
District and Municipal Court Judges'  
Association  
Spokane County District Court

**Mr. Jeff Hall**  
State Court Administrator

**Ms. Paula Littlewood**, Executive Director  
Washington State Bar Association

**Judge Christine Quinn-Brintnall**  
Presiding Chief Judge  
Court of Appeals, Division II

**Ms. Michele Radosevich**, President-Elect  
Washington State Bar Association

**Judge Charles Snyder**, President-Elect  
Superior Court Judges' Association  
Whatcom County Superior Court



## Board for Judicial Administration (BJA)

Friday, May 18, 2012 (9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.)

AOC SeaTac Office, 18000 International Blvd., Suite 1106, SeaTac

### AGENDA

<b>1. Call to Order</b>	Chief Justice Barbara Madsen Judge Chris Wickham	9:00 a.m.
<b>2. Welcome and Introductions</b>	Chief Justice Barbara Madsen Judge Chris Wickham	9:00 a.m.
<b>Action Items</b>		
<b>3. April 20, 2012 Meeting Minutes</b> Action: Motion to approve the minutes of the April 20, 2012 meeting	Chief Justice Barbara Madsen Judge Chris Wickham	9:05 a.m.  Tab 1
<b>4. Appointment to the BJA Public Trust and Confidence Committee</b> Action: Motion to approve the appointment of Mr. Andrew Sachs to the BJA Public Trust and Confidence Committee	Ms. Mellani McAleenan	9:10 a.m.  Tab 2
<b>Reports and Information</b>		
<b>5. Interpreter Resolution</b>	Justice Susan Owens	9:15 a.m.  Tab 3
<b>Budget</b>		
Tab 4		
<b>6. Overview, History, and Context</b>	Mr. Ramsey Radwan	9:25 a.m.
<b>7. Trial Court Operations Funding Committee Budget Requests</b>	Judge Harold Clarke	9:35 a.m.
<b>8. Quality Assurance Transfer and Spokane Water Rights Budget Requests</b>	Ms. Bonnie Bush Mr. Ramsey Radwan	10:05 a.m.
<b>9. Administrative Office of the Courts Budget Requests</b>	Mr. Jeff Hall	10:15 a.m.
<b>Break (10:45-10:55 a.m.)</b>		
<b>10. Preliminary Decision Package Support and Further Discussion</b>	Mr. Ramsey Radwan	10:55 a.m.

<b>Budget (continued)</b>		
<b>11. Prioritization</b>	Mr. Ramsey Radwan	11:25 a.m.
<b>12. Other Business</b>  Next meeting: June 15 Beginning at 9:00 a.m. at the AOC SeaTac Office, SeaTac	Chief Justice Barbara Madsen Judge Chris Wickham	11:55 a.m.
<b>13. Adjourn</b>		12:00 p.m.
Persons with a disability, who require accommodation, should notify Beth Flynn at 360-357-2121 or <a href="mailto:beth.flynn@courts.wa.gov">beth.flynn@courts.wa.gov</a> to request or discuss accommodations. While notice five days prior to the event is preferred, every effort will be made to provide accommodations, when requested.		





## Board for Judicial Administration (BJA)

Friday, April 20, 2012 (9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.)

AOC SeaTac Office, 18000 International Blvd., Suite 1106, SeaTac

### MEETING MINUTES

#### Members Present:

Chief Justice Barbara Madsen, Chair  
Judge Marlin Appelwick  
Mr. Stephen Crossland  
Judge Ronald Culpepper  
Judge Deborah Fleck  
Judge Janet Garrow  
Mr. Jeff Hall  
Judge Laura Inveen  
Judge Jill Johanson  
Judge Kevin Korsmo (by phone)  
Judge Craig Matheson (by phone)  
Judge Jack Nevin  
Judge Christine Quinn-Brintnall  
Judge Kevin Ringus  
Judge Scott Sparks  
Judge Gregory Tripp

#### Guests Present:

Mr. Jim Bamberger  
Mr. Pat Escamilla  
Ms. Joanne Moore

#### Public Present:

Mr. Christopher Hupy  
Mr. Mark Mahnkey  
Mr. Rowland Thompson

#### AOC Staff Present:

Ms. Jennifer Creighton  
Ms. Beth Flynn  
Mr. Dirk Marler  
Ms. Mellani McAleenan  
Mr. Ramsey Radwan

Chief Justice Madsen called the meeting to order.

#### March 16, 2012 Meeting Minutes

**It was moved by Judge Ringus and seconded by Judge Garrow to approve the March 16, 2012 meeting minutes. The motion carried.**

#### Resolution in Support of the Guardian Accountability and Senior Protection Act

Ms. McAleenan stated that the resolution is basically the same as was presented last month with minor wording changes to make it relevant to the Board for Judicial Administration (BJA).

There was discussion about the timing of the decision on the resolution. Ms. McAleenan stated there was no hurry and a decision on the resolution could be delayed if needed.

It was decided to set this decision over to the next meeting so the judicial associations could have time to review it prior to making a decision.

Resolution Urging Congress to Respect the Separation of Powers and Principles of Federalism with Regard to Enacting Legislation to Address Child Custody

It was decided to set this decision over to the next meeting so the judicial associations could have time to review it prior to making a decision.

Filing Fee Workgroup Charter

Chief Justice Madsen stated it is time to review the fee structure for civil cases and determine if there is a need to change the filing fees or make a more substantive change to the fee structure.

Ms. McAleenan is working on filling in the workgroup members and the names of the members she has at this point in time are listed on the charter which is included in the meeting materials.

Judge Tripp stated that Judge Stephen Brown will be on the workgroup to represent the District and Municipal Court Judges' Association (DMCJA).

The first meeting will likely be scheduled in May.

Mr. Radwan noted that some legislators are very much interested in filing fees. Legislative staff know that the filing fees are scattered and may not be the best structure to have. In addition, the JSTA account will need to be backfilled. It is important to have legislative members involved so they can understand what is going on with filing fees.

**It was moved by Judge Culpepper and seconded by Judge Garrow to approve the Filing Fee Workgroup charter. The motion carried.**

Appointment to the Civil Legal Aid Oversight Committee

RCW 2.53.010(1)(e) gives the BJA the authority to appoint two members to the Civil Legal Aid Oversight Committee. Judge Lesley Allan's term expires on June 30, 2012 so the BJA needs to appoint a replacement. Ms. McAleenan e-mailed all judges soliciting volunteers to serve on the committee and Judge Michael Spearman submitted a letter of interest which is included in the BJA meeting materials.

Mr. Bamberger stated there has never been a member of the Court of Appeals to serve on the committee and he is very excited about Judge Spearman's willingness to serve on the committee.

**It was moved by Judge Culpepper and seconded by Judge Tripp to appoint Judge Michael Spearman to the Civil Legal Aid Oversight Committee. The motion carried.**

Washington State Medal of Valor Nomination

Chief Justice Madsen is on the Medal of Valor Nominating Committee and she would like to nominate Judge David Edwards for coming to the aid of staff in the courthouse during a recent court security incident. She would like the BJA to support the nomination.

Chief Justice Madsen learned that there was also a court clerk who intervened and played an important role in assisting during the incident and she is soliciting ideas regarding how best to honor the clerk. At the very least Chief Justice Madsen will write a letter to thank her.

There was some concern about the appearance of impartiality when the case is heard before a judge if the BJA supports the Medal of Valor nomination. Ms. McAleenan checked with Ms. Nan Sullins, of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), regarding any ethical issues with the nomination. Ms. Sullins stated that if there is an appearance of fairness issue in the case the nomination will not exacerbate the issue.

The BJA decided to make a decision on this issue during the May meeting.

### 2012 Legislative Session Budget Report

Mr. Radwan stated that the teamwork the judicial branch displayed was a tremendous asset during the session. Some of the issues regarding fund switches were good in the short term but they will just push the problem out into the future and will need to be addressed next year. There will be some challenges with the way the budget was developed and approved—systemically at the state level and in the judicial branch.

The Becca reduction was agreed to by the Superior Court Judges' Association (SCJA) and the Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators (WAJCA) because the Legislature changed the statute stating students 17-years-old and older do not have to go through truancy. The AOC will work with the juvenile court administrators to track this.

The Supreme Court Law Library has been under scrutiny by the Senate. A study was proposed, and approved by Chief Justice Madsen, to determine the footprint and funding mechanism for the Law Library. A consultant has been hired for the study and a workgroup has been created which is comprised of members from the Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, the University of Washington Law library, legislators, and private law librarians. The workgroup will look at state law libraries nationally and take best practices and see how they could be implemented in the Washington State Law Library. The goal is to complete the analysis by October so the information can be presented to the Legislature prior to the 2013 legislative session.

### WSBA Budget

Chief Justice Madsen gave Mr. Crossland some time to speak about the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) budget in light of the recent passage of the member referendum lowering license fees. Mr. Crossland stated that the referendum passed with 52% of the votes. 43% of the members voted so 22% of the WSBA membership passed the resolution.

The WSBA spent the last week trying to assess what the vote really means, what message the membership sent to them, and how to deal with \$3.6 million in budget reductions. A Board of Governors (BOG) meeting is scheduled at the end of the month and an additional meeting was set to discuss the budget following the BOG meeting. It will be the first time the Board has met about the issue. In terms of philosophy, nothing is sacred and the BOG will need to look at everything. Also, they will need to look at the WSBA mission and strategic priorities to help with the decision-making.



Mr. Crossland received several hundred e-mails from members after the vote and many of them asked what they could do to right this. One question from an attorney asked if the WSBA could add a checkbox to the license fee form for attorneys to voluntarily pay additional funds to the WSBA. Some of the comments were also in the other camp and stated they hoped the WSBA got their message. Mr. Crossland will begin having regular chats with the WSBA members and the first one is scheduled for next week.

#### Problem-Solving Courts Authorizing Legislation Workgroup

Ms. McAleenan drafted a charter for the Problem-Solving Courts Authorizing Legislation Workgroup for the BJA's review. Bills have been put forth in the Legislature for various specialty courts and the BJA took a position not to support or oppose any of those bills but stated they would like to create an overarching statutory development framework.

Judge Harold Clarke shared the charter with the Washington State Association of Drug Court Professionals and they are focused on anything that will help them move forward. After reviewing the charter, the association members suggested that in lieu of, or in addition to, a court administrator as a member of the workgroup, a drug court coordinator should be included. Judge Ken Williams volunteered to serve on the workgroup and also suggested that his drug court coordinator be included.

Judge Inveen stated that the SCJA has a workgroup working on this issue and Mr. Dick Carlson is the AOC staff to the workgroup. The BJA workgroup needs to include members of the SCJA workgroup so they are not duplicating efforts.

The BJA decided that a member of an advocacy group should be included in the workgroup membership and Chief Justice Madsen asked that the BJA members send Ms. McAleenan suggestions of an advocacy group that should be represented.

The BJA discussed whether or not the workgroup charge should focus on legislation. It was decided that "Authorizing Legislation" would be removed from the workgroup title but the charge should reflect that the workgroup will determine if legislation is needed to implement the problem-solving courts framework.

Mr. Hall suggested that the charter include in the charge a statement regarding the problem that needs to be solved by the workgroup such as a decrease in the proliferation of legislation regarding problem-solving courts. The focus should be narrow so it does not expand beyond the reason for the idea in the first place.

The charter will be revised and brought back for the BJA's review during the May meeting.

#### OPD Update on Implementation of SSB 6493 – Indigent Defense for RCW 71.09 Civil Commitment

Ms. Moore stated that the Office of Public Defense (OPD) was given the responsibility (through SSB 6493) for indigent defense related to RCW 71.09 civil commitment cases.

This year there was a series in the Seattle Times that focused on defense costs in civil commitment cases. Last year the Legislature put a proviso in the budget to look at this issue.

The Legislature appropriated sufficient funds to OPD to provide quality representation and they were given the necessary funds for legal experts.

Judges have a new duty to notify OPD of the need for representation and this is an improvement to the system. The judge shall appoint OPD contracted counsel to represent the indigent person.

For calendared trials the statute authorizes OPD to enter into a contract with an existing attorney, even if that attorney is not an OPD-contracted attorney, to minimize disruption in the case and the attorney will be paid on a pro-rated basis. Ms. Moore said there are about 24 cases in the six months that OPD is authorized to contract with attorneys for existing cases.

The statute states expert evaluation shall be capped at \$10,000 but if the judge determines the expert should be paid more OPD will pay it.

Ms. Moore presented a timeline for implementation and everything should be up and running by July 1, 2012.

OPD is planning to have a conference call for judges probably in early to mid-May and they are ready to provide support to courts on a case-by-case basis.

### 2013-15 Budget Submissions

A list of preliminary 2013-2015 budget requests was included in the meeting materials.

The list contains two groups of budget requests. The first group contains items generated from AOC staff and the second group contains items from outside entities.

The first group of requests has been vetted by the AOC Leadership Team. These are all individually supportable and Mr. Hall wants to hear what the BJA thinks of them. After hearing comments from the BJA Mr. Hall might pull some back and not submit them to the Supreme Court. He does not have any expectation that any of the requests will move forward to the Legislature next year.

- The first two requests, "Risk Assessment and Law Table Support" and "Criminal Justice Research Associate," are related to the adult risk assessment. When AOC gets a technology request AOC staff have to support it once the technology is developed. The first piece is to support the risk assessment primarily as it relates to the state law table and the second portion is to ensure AOC has the tools to maintain it after the assessment is up and running.
- The "AOC Court Access Forms" request is what it would take to fully staff and run a forms program that would create and maintain forms that are easily understood. In addition, the program would translate forms into several languages.
- The "Therapeutic Court Coordinator" request is to staff an area AOC does not anticipate going away, especially given the current activity surrounding therapeutic courts.

- The "Guardianship Service Expansion" request will expand the guardianship program into additional counties.

The Trial Court Operations Funding Committee (TCOFC) will most likely bring the externally generated budget requests to the BJA.

- The first three requests restore Justice in Jeopardy Implementation Committee (JJIC) funding in the areas of interpreters, CASA, and the Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program.
- The "Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ) Judges' Salaries" request is the same as the one submitted several years ago.
- The "Interpreter Services" and "Expand Interpreter Program" requests are the same request on two different levels. The first request would provide interpreter services prior to and after being in the courtroom. The second request allows for more instances where the interpreters would be used pre and post courtroom appearance.
- The "Quality Assurance Transfer" would transfer quality assurance funding and staff from the Department of Social and Health Services to AOC.

A similar list will be provided during the May BJA meeting and the BJA will review the requests, provide comments, make recommendations and prioritize. The decision packages are very rough so if there are questions, please funnel them through Mr. Radwan and he will forward the question to the sponsor of the decision package for a response.

There are potential funding concerns for the 2013-2015 budget. There are issues with the JSTA fund and, depending on the health of the state budget, it is possible there will be more issues. Just for the state judicial branch there is a potential \$30 million issue. Even though the judicial branch came out of the supplemental budget okay, the Legislature kicked the can and this is the can.

#### Other Business

Chief Justice Madsen thanked Judge Inveen for her service on the BJA.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

#### **Recap of Motions from April 20, 2012 meeting**

<b>Motion Summary</b>	<b>Status</b>
March 16 BJA Meeting Minutes	Passed
Approve the Filing Fee Workgroup Charter	Passed
Appoint Judge Michael Spearman to the Civil Legal Aid Oversight Committee	Passed

**Action Items updated for April 20, 2012 meeting**

Action Item	Status
<u>March 16, 2012 Meeting Minutes</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Send the approved minutes to Camilla Faulk for the En Banc binders</li> <li>• Post the approved minutes online</li> </ul>	Done (sent as draft to meet binder deadline) Done
<u>Resolution in Support of the Guardian Accountability and Senior Protection Act</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add to the May BJA agenda</li> </ul>	Done
<u>Resolution Urging Congress to Respect the Separation of Powers and Principles of Federalism with Regard to Enacting Legislation to Address Child Custody</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add to the May BJA agenda</li> </ul>	Done
<u>Filing Fee Workgroup Charter</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete the selection of workgroup members</li> <li>• Schedule first meeting</li> </ul>	In Process In Process
<u>Appointment to the Civil Legal Aid Oversight Committee</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Send appointment letter to Judge Michael Spearman</li> </ul>	Done
<u>Washington State Medal of Valor Nomination</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add to May BJA agenda</li> </ul>	Done
<u>Problem-Solving Courts Workgroup</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The BJA members will send suggestions to Ms. McAleenan regarding a potential workgroup member from an advocacy group</li> <li>• Change charter to remove "Authorizing Legislation" from the workgroup title and re-word the charge to reflect that the workgroup will determine if legislation is needed to implement the problem-solving courts framework</li> <li>• Add a statement to the charge regarding the problem that needs to be solved</li> <li>• Add to May BJA agenda</li> </ul>	Done



**Board for Judicial Administration  
Nomination Form for BJA Committee Appointment**

**BJA Committee:** Public Trust and Confidence Committee  
(i.e. Best Practices, Court Security, Justice in Jeopardy, Long-Range Planning, and Public Trust and Confidence)

**Nominee Name:** Andrew Sachs

**Nominated By:** Washington State Bar Association Board of Governors  
(i.e. SCJA, DMCJA, etc.)

**Term Begin Date:** May 18, 2012

**Term End Date:** December 31, 2013

**Has the nominee served on this subcommittee in the past?**      Yes       No

**If yes, how many terms have been served and dates of terms:** N/A

**Additional information you would like the BJA to be aware of regarding the nominee:**

Please send completed form to:

Beth Flynn  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
PO Box 41174  
Olympia, WA 98504-1174  
[beth.flynn@courts.wa.gov](mailto:beth.flynn@courts.wa.gov)



# WSBA

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Paula C. Littlewood  
Executive Director

direct line: 206-239-2120  
fax: 206-727-8310  
e-mail: paulal@wsba.org

May 9, 2012

Mellani McAleenan  
Associate Director, Board for Judicial Administration  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
P. O. Box 41174  
Olympia, WA 98504-1174

RE: Nomination of Andrew N. Sachs to the Board for Judicial Administration Public Trust & Confidence Committee

Dear Ms. McAleenan:

At its April meeting, the WSBA Board of Governors nominated Andrew N. Sachs for Board for Judicial Administration appointment to the Board for Judicial Administration Public Trust & Confidence Committee. The term would begin upon appointment and end December 31, 2013. Enclosed is a copy of Mr. Sach's letter of interest and résumé.

Thank you for considering this nomination for appointment to the Board for Judicial Administration Public Trust & Confidence Committee.

Sincerely,

Paula C. Littlewood  
Executive Director

Enclosure

cc: Justice Mary Fairhurst, Washington State Supreme Court  
Beth Flynn, Administrative Office of the Courts  
Andrew N. Sachs  
4515 Greenwood Ave. N. #101  
Seattle, WA 98103

*Working Together to Champion Justice*

**Andrew N. Sachs**

Seattle, WA 98103

February 13, 2012

WSBA Communications Department  
Washington State Bar Association  
1325 Fourth Ave., Ste. 600  
Seattle, WA 98101-2539

**Re: Application for appointment to the Public Trust and Confidence Committee**

SENT VIA E-MAIL

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to express my interest in the Board for Judicial Administration Public Trust and Confidence Committee. I have reviewed the work of the committee, and it would be an honor to serve and to help implement strategies for increasing public trust and confidence in our judicial system.

I believe one of the most important ways to increase public trust and confidence is to ensure that the judicial system is accessible and understandable to all – particularly those with diverse backgrounds, and people who may not have the means to hire an attorney. I believe my background shows a strong commitment to diversity and an understanding of the needs of those who may not feel they have a voice in our courts,

On my second day as a practicing attorney I began training for pro bono representation of court appointed special advocates (CASAs), who advocate for the best interests of abused and neglected children during dependency and termination cases. My second CASA case went to trial on a petition for termination of parental rights. That experience opened my eyes to the difficulty of gaining the confidence of the parties involved in litigation, particularly in cases such as that one, where emotions naturally run high.

The mother and the grandparents of the child in that case were deeply skeptical of the courts, the legal process, the State social worker, the CASA, and the judge. As a result, I believe the child suffered. The parents and grandparents did not trust that they would be reunited with the child if they followed the orders and advice of the court and the many court-appointed resources. They focused more on their distrust of the system than they did on reuniting with their daughter – even employing the assistance of their state senator, assuming they would achieve a better outcome through the legislature than they would through the court. The result was tragic for the parent, grandparents, and of course, the child.



February 13, 2012

Page 2

That experience led me to the understanding that there are many underrepresented groups who are not confident that they will achieve fair outcomes in our judicial system. I have been involved in the Task Force on Race and the Criminal Justice System since its inception. That work, too, reinforces the notion that large segments of the population feel that the courts work only for the few, and not for the masses. My work on the Task Force has deepened my resolve to work for social justice, access to justice, and to ensure that people trust they will be treated fairly by our legal system.

I also believe my perspective as an openly gay attorney would serve the PTC Committee well. As an active member of the GLBT community, and president for two years of QLaw (the GLBT bar association), I have worked to ensure equality for the GLBT community and other minority communities. QLaw has worked with the Loren Miller Bar Association (LMBA) and the Latina/o Bar Association of Washington (LBAW) on issues related to accountability for the Seattle Police Department. We have also worked with LBAW on the Washington Voting Rights Act. These initiatives are important because they focus not only on providing equal rights under the law, but also on building trust and confidence that our law enforcement agencies and our state and local governments will deliver on the promise of equal rights and equal representation. It would be my honor to continue this kind of work with respect to our judicial system.

My track record of community involvement shows a commitment to diversity and advocacy for those without a voice. Moreover, my experience also shows that when I take on a commitment my work ethic and judgment quickly earn me the trust of my fellow board members, who have consistently elected me to leadership positions.

It would be my honor and privilege to join the PTC Committee. I would welcome the opportunity to speak with you in further detail about about my background. Please feel free to contact me with any questions at 206.395.7623 (office) or 206.601.5548 (cell).

Very truly yours,



Andrew N. Sachs

Enclosure

# ANDREW N. SACHS

• Seattle, Washington 98103 •

---

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

### *The Wrenn Law Group, PLLC*

Litigation Attorney – Seattle

January 2011 - present

Practice Areas: Complex commercial litigation; insurance recovery; environmental litigation

- Experience: Representing a large landowner and manufacturer in a coverage dispute against multiple insurance carriers at the Superfund site on the Willamette River near Portland; representing a county in Washington against owner/operators of a landfill site in action under the Model Toxics Control Act

### *Bennett Bigelow & Leedom, P.S.*

Litigation Associate – Seattle

2010

Practice Areas: Complex commercial litigation; medical malpractice defense; labor and employment

- Experience: Defended one of the largest police departments in Washington against a claim of racial discrimination in the workplace; represented physicians groups, hospitals, and other medical professionals against claims of malpractice; defended a manufacturer in a claim under international law for alleged injuries sustained by factory workers

### *Davis Wright Tremaine LLP*

Litigation Associate – Seattle

2008-2009

Practice Areas: Complex commercial litigation; professional liability defense; intellectual property

- Experience: Defended a publicly traded biotech company in a dispute with a former vendor; first chair at oral arguments in Federal Court (E.D. Wash.) representing major national financial institution in mortgage foreclosure cases; lead counsel in W.D. Wash. on FOIA appeal against U.S. Customs and Border Patrol (prevailed on appeal to Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals); defended Seattle law firm in professional malpractice case

### *Heller Ehrman LLP*

Litigation Associate; Summer Associate – Seattle

2005, 2006-2008

Practice Areas: Trademark infringement/anti-counterfeiting; complex commercial litigation; antitrust

- Experience: Represented one of the world's largest manufacturers of consumer products in multiple cases in federal court on claims of trademark infringement and earned several judgments for maximum statutory damages under the Lanham Act; first chair at 10-day trial for termination of parental rights, representing the CASA for an abused and neglected child; first chair at appellate argument before Washington State Court of Appeals in adverse possession case; defended international luxury hotel chain against claims they violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act

### *Husch & Eppenberger, LLC*

Summer Associate – St. Louis

2004

### *Sourcebooks, Inc.*

Publicist – Naperville, IL

2002-2003

- Placed authors on Oprah, The Today Show, and numerous local network television affiliates

### *Focal Communications Corporation*

Public Relations Manager/Acting Director – Chicago

2001-2002

- Responsible for strategic public relations decisions, internal communications, external positioning, and media outreach for telecommunications competitive local exchange carrier
- Placed stories in *The Wall Street Journal*, *The New York Times*, and other daily newspapers

### *WCIA-TV (CBS)*

General Assignments Reporter/Consumer Reporter/Anchor – Champaign, IL

1998-2001

- Created "Ask Andy" consumer segment, answering viewer questions with on-air reports

## EDUCATION

### *University of Chicago Law School*

Juris Doctor

2006

### *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

Bachelor of Science – Marketing

1998

- Mortar Board national honorary; Senior 100 (Top 100 seniors based on academics and leadership)

### *Senshu University, Tokyo, Japan*

Study abroad curriculum focused on international business and Japanese language

1996

## COMMUNITY/PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

- QLaw: the GLBT Bar Association of Washington (President, 2010-12)
- Access to Justice Task Force on Race and the Criminal Justice System (executive committee member)
- Washington State CASA board of directors (chair-elect)
- Equal Rights Washington board of directors (vice chair)
- Justice Gonzalez Retention Campaign (finance committee member)
- Washington State Bar Association Young Lawyers Division
- Rebuilding Together Seattle

## INTERESTS

- Triathlons (completed two full Ironmans); Marathons; Skiing; Backpacking; Travel; Politics; Indie music; Searching for good deep dish pizza in Seattle



## Resolution Request Cover Sheet

### Resolution Regarding Language Access Services in Court Submitted By:

- 
- 1) Names of Proponent(s): Interpreter Commission
  - 2) Spokesperson(s): Justice Susan Owens
  - 3) Purpose

This Resolution seeks to create greater access to courts for limited-English proficient (LEP) individuals by promoting the value of utilizing court interpreters in all case types, and providing interpreters at court expense. According to 2010 U.S. Census Bureau data from the 2010 American Community Survey, 8.1 percent of Washington's population are LEP. Washington State ranks among the top ten states with the highest growth in LEP population between 1990 and 2010, with a 209.7 percent increase. (Migration Policy Institute, LEP Data Brief, December, 2011).

Access to courts for LEP litigants and the court's ability to communicate effectively with LEP persons depends upon the provision of competent interpreter services. However, under the current RCW (2.43.040), non-indigent LEP litigants in some civil matters are required to pay for interpreter services, or proceed without such services. Language barriers thus create impediments to access to justice for individuals who are limited-English proficient. To appoint an interpreter but to hold the litigant liable to pay for those services may deter many who need an interpreter from accessing court services.

Washington State has long recognized the need for interpreter services to allow access to courts for LEP persons. The legislative intent behind the adoption of RCW 2.43 was to establish the policy of the State of Washington "to secure the rights, constitutional or otherwise, of persons who, because of a non-English-speaking cultural background, are unable to readily understand or communicate in the English language, and who consequently cannot be fully protected in legal proceedings unless qualified interpreters are available to assist them." RCW 2.43.010. As written, RCW 2.43.040 requires non-indigent litigants in some civil legal proceedings to pay for interpreter services. But an increasing number of courts in Washington provide and pay for interpreter services in all civil matters.

The provision of free and qualified interpreter services in all legal proceedings promotes the Principal Policy Objectives of the State Judicial Branch regarding fair and effective administration of justice in all civil and criminal cases, and accessibility to Washington courts. Furthermore, this Resolution is consistent with the prior Resolution adopted by the Board of Judicial Administration to, among other things, "remove impediments to access to the justice system, including physical and language barriers, rules and procedures, disparate treatment

and other differences that may serve as barriers.” (Board of Judicial Administration, Civil Equal Justice).

4) Desired Result

- 1) The BJA should endorse the provision of interpreter services, at court expense, in all legal proceedings, both criminal and civil; and
- 2) Pursuant to the prior Resolution on Civil Equal Justice, the BJA should re-commit to work to remove similar language – related impediments to access to the justice system for limited English proficient litigants.

5) Expedited Consideration: Expedited consideration is not being requested.

6) Supporting Materials:

- a. Proposed Resolution

## **Proposed Resolution**

### BJA Resolution Regarding Language Access Services In Court

**Whereas**, equal access to courts is fundamental to the American system of government under law; and

**Whereas**, language barriers can create impediments to access to justice for individuals who are limited-English proficient; and

**Whereas**, it is the policy of the State of Washington “to secure the rights, constitutional or otherwise, of persons who, because of a non-English-speaking cultural background, are unable to readily understand or communicate in the English language, and who consequently cannot be fully protected in legal proceedings unless qualified interpreters are available to assist them.” RCW 2.43.010 (Interpreters for non-English speaking persons); and

**Whereas**, courts rely upon interpreters to be able to communicate with limited-English proficient litigants, witnesses and victims in all case types; and

**Whereas**, the Board for Judicial Administration recognizes the benefit that interpreting services provide to limited English proficient litigants and to the fact-finder in the efficient and effective administration of justice; and

**Whereas**, the Board for Judicial Administration previously adopted a Resolution to, among other things, “remove impediments to access to the justice system, including physical and language barriers, rules and procedures, disparate treatment and other differences that may serve as barriers.” (Board for Judicial Administration, Civil Equal Justice); and

**Whereas**, the provision of free and qualified interpreter services in all legal proceedings promotes the Principal Policy Objectives of the State Judicial Branch regarding fair and effective administration of justice in all civil and criminal cases, and accessibility to Washington courts;

#### **Now, Therefore, Be it Resolved:**

That the Board for Judicial Administration:

- 1) Endorses the provision of interpreter services, at public expense, in all legal proceedings, both criminal and civil; and
- 2) Commits to work to remove similar language – related impediments to access to the justice system for limited English proficient litigants.





**Board for Judicial Administration**  
2013-2015 Preliminary Budget Request Review Process  
May 18, 2012

---

**Purpose**

To review, discuss and prioritize preliminary budget requests that would impact the budget of the Administrative Office of the Courts.

**Process**

The following materials are included in your packet:  
Purpose and process overview  
Budget context spreadsheet  
Preliminary budget request spreadsheet summary  
Preliminary budget request prioritization tables

**Staff Presentation**

AOC staff will present information regarding the current budget context within which the requests for funding should be viewed.

AOC staff will present a summary of the preliminary requests received.

**Presentation by Requesting Groups**

Judge Harold Clarke will present the Trial Court Operations Funding Committee preliminary budget requests.

Bonnie Bush will present the Quality Assurance Transfer preliminary budget request and Ramsey Radwan will present the Spokane Water Rights Adjudication preliminary budget request.

Jeff Hall will present the Administrative Office of the Courts' preliminary budget requests.

Discussion and clarifying questions will take place after the presentation each presentation.

Groups that have submitted requests (AOC, BJA/TCOFC) may withdraw preliminary decision packages at any time during the discussion or prioritization process.

BJA members are asked to consider the priority of decision packages during presentations.

**Preliminary Decision Package Support and Further Discussion**

BJA members may:  
Support a package as presented.  
Recommend that the Supreme Court Budget Committee not move a package forward.

The BJA will be asked whether the package is supported as presented or if the recommendation is that a package not move forward. Decisions will be made by majority vote.

**Prioritization**

Packages supported by the BJA (those that have not been withdrawn by the requesting group or given 'Do Not Recommend' status) will be prioritized.

Prioritization will be based upon a BJA majority vote in support of a particular priority. As an example, if the majority of BJA members believe that the Guardianship Service Expansion preliminary decision package should be the highest priority, that decision package will be assigned priority number 1.

**Washington State Judicial Branch  
2013-2015 Potential Funding Concerns**

<b>Potential Fund Source Issue</b>	
Judicial Stabilization Trust Account (JSTA)	
Admin. Ofc of the Courts	\$6,000
Ofc of Public Defense	\$4,400
Ofc of Civil Legal Aid	\$2,100
Total JSTA	\$12,500
Judicial Information System Account (JIS)	
Admin. Ofc of the Courts	\$6,000
Law Library	\$1,500
Total JIS	\$7,500
<b>Sub-Total Fund Source Issue</b>	<b>\$20,000</b>
<b>Potential Budget Reduction</b>	
State General Fund Deficit	
Statewide*	\$1,519,000
Judicial Branch Share	\$10,633
<b>Total Potential Funding Concerns</b>	<b>\$30,633</b>
* The estimated deficit is NOT official, it is merely an estimate.	
Dollars in thousands (000)	

<b>2013-2015 Preliminary Budget Requests</b>		
	<b>FTEs</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)</b>		
Interpreter Restoration	0.0	\$679,000
CASA Restoration	0.0	\$1,242,000
FJCIP Restoration	0.0	\$234,000
CLJ Judges' Salaries	0.0	\$6,269,000
Interpreter Services for Court-Managed Functions	0.0	\$1,231,000
Expand Interpreter Program Funding Statewide	0.5	\$3,829,000
Video Remote Interpretation	1.0	\$370,000
QA Transfer	5.0	\$1,337,000
Water Rights Adjudication	7.0	\$1,308,000
<b>Total External Requests-AOC</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>\$16,499,000</b>
Law Table/Adult Risk Assessment (ARA)	1.0	\$169,000
Research Associate	1.0	\$196,000
AOC Court Access Forms	5.0	\$1,046,000
Therapeutic Court Coordinator	1.0	\$170,000
Guardianship Services	1.0	\$708,000
<b>Total Internal Requests-AOC</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>\$2,289,000</b>
<b>Total Request-Administrative Office of the Courts</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>\$18,788,000</b>
<b>2011-2013 State General Fund Base-AOC</b>		<b>\$99,154,000</b>
<b>Preliminary Budget Request-Percent Change</b>		<b>18.95%</b>
<b>Supreme Court</b>		
Access to Justice	0.0	\$200,000
<b>Total Request-Supreme Court</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>
<b>2011-2013 State General Fund Base-Supreme Court</b>		<b>\$13,318,000</b>
<b>Preliminary Budget Request-Percent Change</b>		<b>1.50%</b>
<b>Court of Appeals</b>		
In Process		
<b>Total Request-Court of Appeals</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>2011-2013 State General Fund Base-Court of Appeals</b>		<b>\$30,443,000</b>
<b>Preliminary Budget Request-Percent Change</b>		<b>0.00%</b>

<b>2013-2015 Preliminary Budget Requests</b>		
	<b>FTEs</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Law Library</b>		
In Process		
<b>Total Request-Law Library</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>2011-2013 State General Fund Base-Law Library**</b>		<b>\$2,954,000</b>
<b>Preliminary Budget Request-Percent Change</b>		<b>0.00%</b>
<b>**Prior to 2012 Fund Swap</b>		
<b>Office of Civil Legal Aid</b>		
Mitigate Client Service Capacity Losses		\$2,800,000
<b>Total Request-Office of Civil Legal Aid</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$2,800,000</b>
<b>2011-2013 State General Fund Base-Office of Civil Legal Aid</b>		<b>\$21,592,000</b>
<b>Preliminary Budget Request-Percent Change</b>		<b>12.97%</b>
<b>Office of Public Defense</b>		
Caseload Maintenance	0.0	\$683,000
Parents Representation	0.0	\$7,700,000
<b>Total Request-Office of Public Defense</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$8,383,000</b>
<b>2011-2013 State General Fund Base-Office of Public Defense</b>		<b>\$54,163,000</b>
<b>Preliminary Budget Request-Percent Change</b>		<b>15.48%</b>
<b>Total Preliminary Budget Requests</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>\$30,171,000</b>
<b>2011-2013 State General Fund Base-Judicial Branch</b>		<b>\$221,624,000</b>
<b>Preliminary Budget Request-Percent Change</b>		<b>13.61%</b>

**Board for Judicial Administration  
2013-2015 Preliminary Budget Request Review  
May 18, 2012  
Externally Generated Preliminary Budget Requests**

Title	FTE	Request	Support as Submitted	Do Not Recommend	Priority
<b>Interpreter Restoration</b>	<b>FTE 0.0</b>	<b>\$679,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested to restore program reductions implemented during the last two biennia.</p> <p>In 2007 the legislature provided \$1.9 million (approximately 25% of the original \$7.8 million request) to the AOC for a program to reimburse participating courts 50% of their eligible interpreter costs. This amount was subsequently reduced to \$1.2 million for the 2011-2013 biennium. Participating courts submitted eligible reimbursement requests totaling more than \$1.2 million for fiscal year 2010 alone. RCW 2.43.030 requires courts to use language interpreters who have been certified by the AOC. In addition the U.S. Dept. of Justice has taken the position that courts receiving federal funding are required to take reasonable steps to meet Title VI requirements ensuring language access. Without additional funding many courts may not meet the US DOJ requirements and courts may drop from the program because reimbursement amounts do not offset the costs of hiring certified interpreters.</p>					
<b>CASA Restoration</b>	<b>FTE 0.0</b>	<b>\$1,242,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested to restore program reductions implemented during the last two biennia.</p> <p>Chapter 13.34 RCW requires the superior court to appoint a guardian ad litem to represent the best interest of dependent children in state child welfare cases. CASA volunteers are an inexpensive way to provide guardian ad litem services that are based upon case management advocacy techniques rather than legal advocacy techniques. If funding is restored an additional 1,100 additional children may be represented each year.</p>					
<b>FJCIP Restoration</b>	<b>FTE 0.0</b>	<b>\$234,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested to restore program reductions implemented during the last two biennia.</p> <p>The Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Plan (FJCIP), as authorized by RCW 2.56.030, promotes coordination between Superior and Juvenile courts when implementing the principles of the Unified Family Court. There are currently 13 FJCIP sites. These sites, which represent 65% of dependency case filings have shown better compliance with six (6) timeliness objectives than non-FJCIP sites.</p>					
<b>CLJ Judges' Salaries</b>	<b>FTE 0.0</b>	<b>\$6,269,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested to increase the state contribution to district court and qualifying municipal court judges' salaries to 50% over three years.</p> <p>In Chapter 457, Laws of 2005, the Legislature recognized that "trial courts are critical to maintaining the rule of law in a free society and that they are essential to the protection of the rights and enforcement of obligations for all" and began contributing toward the salaries of district and eligible elected municipal court judges as a step toward meeting a state commitment to improving trial courts in the state.</p> <p>This proposal fulfills that commitment for the state to contribute equally to the salaries of district and elected municipal court judges. The savings realized by the local jurisdictions are to accrue in a Trial Court Improvement Account to be used to improve local court processes.</p>					

**Board for Judicial Administration  
2013-2015 Preliminary Budget Request Review  
May 18, 2012**

Title	FTE	Request	Support as Submitted	Do Not Recommend	Priority
<b>Interpreter Services</b>	<b>FTE 0.0</b>	<b>\$1,231,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested to provide 50% reimbursement to courts for interpreter services occurring prior and subsequent to in-court visits. Reimbursement would be made for interpreter services performed at information counters, cashiers, file room, etc.</p> <p>Interpreter services at information counters, cashiers, or other court managed operations are not consistently provided. Persons with limited English proficiency cannot participate fully in the process of their case without the ability to understand all facets of it, including those outside the courtroom. Funding would be used to reimburse 50% of the costs of contracted telephonic interpreting services for the courts.</p>					
<b>Expand Interpreter Program</b>	<b>FTE 0.5</b>	<b>\$3,829,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested to provide 50% reimbursement to courts for interpreter services occurring prior and subsequent to in-court visits. Reimbursement would be made for interpreter services performed at information counters, cashier counters and for other pre and post court interactions.</p> <p>In 2007 the legislature provided \$1.9 million (approximately 25% of the original \$7.8 million request) to the AOC for a program to reimburse participating courts 50% of their eligible interpreter costs. This amount was subsequently reduced to \$1.2 million for the 2011-2013 biennium. Participating courts submitted eligible reimbursement requests totaling more than \$1.2 million for fiscal year 2010 alone. RCW 2.43.030 requires courts to use language interpreters who have been certified by the AOC. In addition the U.S. Dept. of Justice has taken the position that courts receiving federal funding are required to take reasonable steps to meet Title VI requirements ensuring language access. Without additional funding many courts may not meet the US DOJ requirements and courts may drop from the program because reimbursement amounts do not offset the costs of hiring certified interpreters.</p> <p>This request would fully fund the state contribution for interpreter services.</p>					
<b>Video Remote Interpretation</b>	<b>FTE 1.0</b>	<b>\$370,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested for a video remote interpretation (VRI) pilot project that will allow the selected court to access interpreters in any language. Full VRI implementation would allow any court in the state to access interpreters.</p> <p>Funds would be used to hire a full-time bilingual staff to coordinate with interpreters, to provide back-up telephonic and video interpreting services and to install VRI equipment and software in courts that have difficulty scheduling interpreters due to distance and language requirements.</p>					

**Board for Judicial Administration  
2013-2015 Preliminary Budget Request Review  
May 18, 2012**

Title	FTE	Request	Support as Submitted	Do Not Recommend	Priority
<b>Quality Assurance Transfer</b>	<b>FTE 5.0</b>	<b>\$1,337,000</b>			
<p>Transfer existing quality assurance funding and staff from the Dept. of Social and Health Services to AOC. The existing program would be redefined by implementing consistent standards and practices used to evaluate assessment delivery and evidence based programs. Consolidating and redefining the quality assurance functions will provide an organized, streamlined, and professional system of quality assurance housed at AOC within the Washington State Center for Court Research. The redefined quality assurance system will be based on standard principles to evaluate assessment delivery and evidence based practices. Resources will be dedicated to improving and expanding the role of quality assurance to meet the increasing demands for reporting and program evaluation.</p>					
<b>Spokane Water Rights Adjudication</b>	<b>FTE 7.0</b>	<b>\$1,308,000</b>			
<p>The Department of Ecology is planning to file a general water right adjudication in Spokane during the 2013-2015 biennium. Previously, funding for judicial operations water rights adjudication was appropriated through the Department of Ecology, to be distributed to the trial court and clerk's office via contract. Chapter 332, Laws of 2009 changed this funding approach, allowing funding for water right adjudications to be appropriated to the Administrative Office of the Courts or by direct appropriation to the county involved.</p>					
<b>Total External Requests-General Fund</b>	<b>FTE 13.5</b>				<b>\$16,499,000</b>

**Internally Generated Preliminary Budget Requests-General Fund**

Title	FTE	Request	Support as Submitted	Do Not Recommend	Priority
<b>Risk Assessment and Law Table Support</b>	<b>FTE 1.0</b>	<b>\$169,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested for an additional staff position that will ensure risk assessment and other data is properly reflected in local and statewide law tables.</p> <p>There are three (3) statewide law tables and over 180 local law tables. Law tables are used by the courts to file charges and law enforcement to cite offenders. Data in the tables is used by a number of "systems" including SECTOR, the adult static risk assessment and positive achievement change tool (PACT) used by juvenile departments. Data integrity and accuracy is essential for the assessment tools, revenue allocation and information sharing among local, state and federal justice agencies. Recent quality assurance reviews have revealed severe data quality issues, thereby necessitating this request.</p>					

**Board for Judicial Administration  
2013-2015 Preliminary Budget Request Review  
May 18, 2012**

Title	FTE	Request	Support as Submitted	Do Not Recommend	Priority
<b>Criminal Justice Research Associate</b>	<b>FTE 1.0</b>	<b>\$196,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested for an additional staff position that will support existing adult and juvenile assessments, maintain legislatively mandated evaluation and reporting requirements and work with the court community to develop new or alter existing funding and alternative disposition programs.</p> <p>Information produced by the juvenile and adult assessment applications requires analysis, interpretation and validation in order to help courts better understand offender population risk levels. Further additional assessment modules may be developed to address specific criminal behavior related to domestic violence, mental health and substance abuse. Research staff is necessary to ensure that these tools are validated and that data produced is not only accurate but provides court leadership specific outcome feedback regarding reoffending behavior (juvenile) or pre-trial risk levels (adult).</p>					
<b>AOC Court Access Forms</b>	<b>FTE 5.0</b>	<b>\$1,046,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested for additional staff and resources to develop, assemble and, translate documents containing information that is critical for obtaining court services including program information and outreach materials.</p> <p>Federal Executive Order 13166 requires recipients of federal funds to develop and implement a system to provide services to those with limited English proficiency (LEP). State statute requires translation of forms into the languages spoken by the five most significant LEP populations in the state. The proposed solution would develop, assemble and translate forms as well as create multi-media resources to assist the public in efficiently accessing and utilizing court services.</p>					
<b>Therapeutic Court Coordinator</b>	<b>FTE 1.0</b>	<b>\$170,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested for an additional staff position that will work with existing therapeutic courts, committees and associations to develop and strengthen evaluation and reporting standards and policies.</p> <p>There are more than 70 therapeutic courts in 26 counties. There are 8 different types of therapeutic courts. There are currently no standards, measures or centralized repository of information. The current haphazard approach does not foster best practices, outcome or performance measurement or common implementation strategies. The coordinator will provide a central point of contact and be the statewide lead in developing best practices and policies, providing technical assistance and developing training curriculum.</p>					



**Board for Judicial Administration  
2013-2015 Preliminary Budget Request Review  
May 18, 2012**

Title	FTE	Request	Support as Submitted	Do Not Recommend	Priority
<b>Guardianship Service Expansion</b>	<b>FTE 1.0</b>	<b>\$708,000</b>			
<p>Funding is requested for an additional staff position and resources to expand services in three to five additional counties and to begin development of a statewide funding and implementation strategy.</p> <p>Services are currently provided in 10 counties, additional funding will allow expansion in three to five additional counties. Incapacitated persons in the counties not currently being served face significant risk of personal or financial harm because they are unable to adequately provide for nutrition, health, and housing or physical safety. The Washington Institute for Public Policy recently completed legislatively mandated reports identifying the costs and benefits of providing public guardianship services. The study found residential costs decreased over a 30 month period; personal care decreased by an average of 29 hours; 20% of public guardianship clients showed improvements in self sufficiency.</p>					
<b>Total Internal Requests-General Fund</b>		<b>FTE 9.0</b>			<b>\$2,289,000</b>

<b>Total General Fund Requests</b>	<b>FTE 22.5</b>			<b>\$14,510,000</b>
------------------------------------	-----------------	--	--	---------------------

**Information Only**

**Information Technology**

<b>Information Technology Requests</b>	<b>FTE 20.5</b>	<b>JIS Account</b>	<b>\$14,510,000</b>		
<p>Funding is requested for additional staff and resources that will allow AOC to continue the SC-CMS project; continue with the development and implementation of the information networking hub (INH); continue funding small/medium information technology projects; provide equipment replacement to the appellate, trial and limited jurisdiction courts; provide ongoing support to the appellate electronic document management system and; begin a feasibility analysis for a limited jurisdiction court case management system.</p>					
<b>Total Preliminary Budget Requests All Sources</b>		<b>FTE 43.0</b>			<b>\$33,298,000</b>

United States Senate  
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-4704

COMMITTEES:  
APPROPRIATIONS  
BUDGET  
HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR  
AND PENSIONS  
RULES AND ADMINISTRATION  
VETERANS' AFFAIRS

April 24, 2012

The Honorable Barbara Madsen  
Supreme Court of Washington  
Temple of Justice  
PO Box 41174  
Olympia, Washington 98504

Dear Barbara:

Thank you for contacting me to share your support for S.1925, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2011 (VAWA). It is good to hear from you on this important piece of legislation of which I am a cosponsor.

As you may know, I proudly helped write and pass the original Violence Against Women Act, which was signed into law by President Clinton on September 13, 1994. In the eighteen years since its passage, VAWA has helped provide life-saving assistance to victims across the United States, decreasing incidences of domestic violence by 53 percent. With more individuals coming forward, more women, men, and families are getting the support and care they need to move themselves out of dangerous situations. Furthermore, as a result of this law, every single state has made stalking a crime and all have strengthened criminal rape statutes.

However, there still remains work to be done. Every minute, twenty people across America are victims of violence by an intimate partner – this equates to more than 12 million every year. We also know that 45 percent of the women killed in the United States die at the hands of their partner. In just one day last year, there were more than 10,000 requests for services and support by victims of domestic violence that were unable to be met due to lack of funding.

This bipartisan legislation reauthorizes critical programs that help keep victims safe and hold perpetrators accountable. It also strengthens the ability of the federal government, states, law enforcement, and service providers to combat domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. S.1925 takes new steps to ensure that VAWA programs reach victims who need help – including provisions that ensure services are available regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity.

Additionally, for the first time, the proposed VAWA reauthorization includes provisions for Native Americans assaulted by non-Native abusers. S.1925 includes provisions from a bill that I am an original co-sponsor of, S.1763, the Stand Against Violence and Empower Native Women Act. Non-Indian abusers commit domestic violence against Native women within tribal jurisdiction and often face no criminal consequences. VAWA reauthorization ensures that tribes

have the criminal jurisdiction to investigate, prosecute, convict, and sentence both Indians and non-Indians who commit a variety of crimes against Native women on tribal land. It also amends sentencing laws to bring sentences for crimes committed by abusers in Indian country on par with sentences under state statutes. I believe these provisions provide critical support to Native women and will work to ensure they are included in the final legislation.

As you know, VAWA passed out of the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 12, 2012 and currently awaits action on the Senate floor. This legislation builds on what works in the current law while making the necessary improvements so we can continue on the path of reducing violence against women. Please be assured that I will continue to closely monitor this legislation and work with my Senate colleagues to ensure VAWA is reauthorized.

Again, thank you for taking the time to share your support of this important issue. If you would like to know more about my work in the Senate, please feel free to sign up for my weekly updates at <http://murray.senate.gov/updates>. Please keep in touch.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patty" in a cursive, flowing script.

Patty Murray  
United States Senator

PM\an