

Washington State Judicial Branch

2023-25 Biennial Budget

Vendor Rate Adjustment for Client Legal Services

Agency: Office of Public Defense

Decision Package Code/Title: AA – Vendor Rate Adjustment

Agency Recommendation Summary Text:

OPD requests funding to adjust vendor rates for contracted attorneys who represent indigent clients on appeal, in dependency/termination cases, and in RCW 71.09 cases. The rate adjustment is critical to recruit and retain qualified attorneys for these specialized contracts. Over four years the rate adjustment would provide contracted defense attorneys with compensation and resources comparable to government attorneys who prosecute the cases, consistent with state and national public defense standards. Federal funds would partially reimburse expenditures for Parent Representation and some Appeals. (General Fund-State)

Fiscal Summary:

	FY 2024	FY 2025	Biennial	FY 2026	FY 2027	Biennial
Staffing						
FTEs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Operating Expenditures						
Fund 001-1	\$3,599,882	\$3,137,580	\$6,737,462	\$2,478,483	\$2,195,382	\$4,673,865
Object of Expenditure						
N – Appellate Atty Contracts	\$1,001,655	\$767,935	\$1,769,590	\$422,364	\$310,438	\$732,802
N – Parent Rep Contracts	\$3,221,825	\$2,470,066	\$5,691,891	\$2,037,804	\$2,117,618	\$4,155,422
N – 71.09 Contracts	\$0	\$383,350	\$383,350	\$421,685	\$185,541	\$607,223
S – Federal Reimbursement Parents Rep Vendor Rate /Dependencies & Terminations on Appeal	(\$623,598)	(\$483,771)	(\$1,107,369)	(\$403,370)	(\$418,215)	(\$821,585)
Total Expenditures	\$3,599,882	\$3,137,580	\$6,737,462	\$2,478,483	\$2,195,382	\$4,673,865

Package Description:

Background:

OPD contracts with attorneys statewide to provide mandatory defense services funded by the state.

The Washington State Office of Public Defense (OPD) provides legal services through contracts with qualified attorneys to represent indigent clients in the trial courts in certain specialized types of non-criminal cases -- primarily parent representation in dependency and termination cases, and civil commitments under Chapter 71.09 RCW. OPD also contracts with attorneys for indigent appeals in all criminal and certain non-criminal matters to the Washington Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court. These are all mandatory services to which indigent persons are entitled under state statutes as well as the U.S. and Washington constitutions.

- *Parent Representation Program.* OPD contracts for 133 FTE attorneys throughout Washington to represent parents involved in dependency cases and in cases where the state's Department of Children, Youth, and

Families (DCYF) seeks to permanently terminate parental rights. OPD-contracted defense attorneys represent approximately 10,000 parents a year. (In order to avoid legal conflicts of interest, children in these cases are represented by the state Office of Civil Legal Aid (OCLA)).

- *RCW 71.09 Program.* OPD contracts for 20.5 FTE attorneys throughout Washington to represent respondents facing indefinite civil commitment under Chapter 71.09 RCW. OPD-contracted attorneys represent about 235 respondents, with each case extending over many years from initial filing through release.
- *Appellate Program.* OPD contracts for 39 FTE attorneys throughout Washington to represent indigent persons who have a right to appeal a Superior Court decision to the Washington Court of Appeals or Supreme Court. These comprise appeals in criminal and juvenile offender cases as well as certain non-criminal matters, including dependencies, parental terminations, RCW 71.09 cases, as well as other types of civil commitment cases. OPD-contracted attorneys represent about 1,000 indigent appellants a year.

In all of these program areas, OPD contracts with a variety of highly qualified individual practitioners, non-profit entities, county agencies, and small law firms.

Problem:

OPD vendor rates are low.

OPD vendor rates are too low to fund public defense contracts commensurate with national principles and state standards, which are grounded in the concept of parity of resources for public defense and prosecution.

- Principle Eight of the American Bar Association (ABA) [Ten Principles of a Public Defense Delivery System](#) requires “parity between defense counsel and the prosecution There should be parity of workload, salaries and other resources (such as benefits, technology, facilities, legal research, support staff, paralegals, investigators, and access to forensic services and experts) between prosecution and public defense.”¹
- Standard One of the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) [Standards for Indigent Defense Services](#) directs that “Public defense attorneys and staff should be compensated at a rate commensurate with their training and experience. To attract and retain qualified personnel, compensation and benefit levels should be comparable to those of attorneys and staff in prosecutorial offices in the area.”²

OPD’s contracted defense counsel receive fewer resources than state attorneys prosecuting the cases.

OPD’s opposing counsel in all dependency and RCW 71.09 cases and in many appeals are Assistant Attorneys General (AAGs) -- state government employees compensated according to progressive salary schedules with routine cost-of-living increases, pensions, paid holidays, significant other paid time off, and robust health insurance and other benefits. Many are represented by employee bargaining units. AAGs also are fully supported by professional staff, such as legal assistants and paralegals.

¹ American Bar Association Ten Principles of a Public Defense Delivery System (2002). Approved by the ABA House of Delegates February 2002. The more extensive ABA policy statement dealing with indigent defense services is contained within the ABA Standards for Criminal Justice, Providing Defense Services (3d ed. 1992).

² Standard One, Washington State Bar Association Standards for Indigent Defense Services (revised September 1, 2021), further citing American Bar Association, *Standards for Criminal Justice*, 5-2.4 and 5-3.1. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Task Force on Courts*, 1973, Standards 13.7 and 13.11. National Legal Aid and Defender Association, *Standards for Defender Services*, Standard IV-4. National Legal Aid and Defender Association, *Guidelines for Negotiating and Awarding Indigent Legal Defense Contracts*, 1984, Standard III-10 and III-11. 2

By contrast, OPD contracted defense attorneys receive an annual contract fee from which they must cover all attorney salaries and business expenses, including office lease and equipment, staffing costs, retirement contributions, vacations and sick leave, health and other insurance, and all applicable taxes.

- **OPD:** In Fiscal Year 2022 the OPD vendor rate for 1 FTE contract attorney ranged from **\$161,495 to \$187,000**, depending on the OPD program and contractor experience. The vendor rate must cover all salary and business costs, including support staff, for 1 FTE contract defense attorney.
- **AAG:** In Fiscal Year 2022, a “fully loaded” 1 FTE AAG with a quarter-time support staff (legal assistant/paralegal) cost the state **\$261,863 per year in Seattle, and \$249,922 in other locations** throughout the state.³
- **Equity gap:** AAGs in Seattle have between \$74,863 and \$100,368 more in basic resources than OPD-contracted defense attorneys. AAGs outside Seattle have between \$62,922 and \$88,427 more in basic resources than OPD defense attorneys. **This resource gap presents significant inequities between defense and prosecution, and is at odds with ABA and WSBA public defense standards. OPD contractors are disadvantaged in defending indigent clients against State action.**

Shortage of qualified counsel.

Lack of parity in resources contributes to difficulty in recruiting and retaining sufficient numbers of qualified contract defense attorneys to ensure that mandatory counsel can be appointed in a timely manner. For example, for several months in 2022, OPD received no qualified applicants for open contracts to represent parents in dependency cases in several counties.

Difficulty recruiting for Parent Representation Program contracts can cause serious case delays, directly and negatively impacting families involved in the dependency process. Supreme Court Standards currently establish a full-time Parent Representation Program caseload of up to 80 dependency cases, so delay in filling even one contract FTE will impact up to 80 parents and their children. Delays in dependency cases can mean longer stays for children in foster care, at significant state expense and personal harm for families.

In OPD’s Appellate Program, two Puget Sound-area firms report substantial difficulty hiring and retaining qualified attorneys to fulfill their OPD contract due to the low vendor rate. In addition, when a Spokane-area contractor retired from practice, few qualified applicants were interested in the Eastern Washington opportunity.

To date, OPD has managed to avoid the chaotic attorney shortage experienced in other states, including Oregon. Ensuring equitable resources is necessary to avoid such dire situations.⁴

The Solution:

OPD requests funding to significantly narrow the prosecutor-defense resource gap and support OPD’s recruitment and retention of qualified contract attorneys to perform vital constitutional services.

- Funding would be provided over four years to increase attorney vendor rates in all OPD programs to an average contract value of \$235,400 per FTE contract attorney by FY 2027. While still below the AG’s per-FTE resources, it would make meaningful progress toward narrowing the gap.
- The annual percentage increase per FTE contract attorney would vary depending on the OPD Program. By FY 2027 the vendor rate for contract attorneys in all OPD Programs would be roughly equivalent.

³ Data provided by Washington Attorney General’s Office on May 25, 2022, pursuant to OPD public records request.

⁴ [*'I'm so confused': People without public defenders in Oregon speak out amid crisis*](#), Albany Democrat-Herald

- By FY 2027, compensation for OPD contract attorneys also would be comparable to compensation for representation of children provided by the Office of Civil Legal Aid (OCLA). (See OCLA Decision Package for Vendor Rate Adjustment.)
- The vendor rate adjustment would allow OPD-contracted attorneys to cover basic business expenses, purchase health and disability insurance for themselves, pay into a retirement plan, employ necessary law office staff, and take home a salary comparable with their professional peers in the AG's Office.

Federal Reimbursement Provided.

Title IV-E of the federal Social Security Act provides partial reimbursement to states for qualifying expenditures on child welfare activities, including legal services for parents involved in dependency and termination cases. OPD has an approved Interagency Agreement in place with the Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) to secure partial reimbursement to the state for all vendor fees for Parent Representation Program contract attorneys and for Appellate representation in dependency and termination appeals.

- Current IV-E reimbursement is calculated at 18.6% of costs for all OPD Parent Representation Program cases and for the Appellate Program cases associated with dependency and termination appeals.

Fully describe and quantify expected impacts on state residents and specific populations served:

OPD is legally obligated to ensure that public defense counsel is appointed to represent all indigent persons who have constitutional and statutory rights to appeal a decision in the state appellate courts; all indigent parents whose children are removed by CPS; and all indigent persons facing indefinite civil commitment under Chapter 71.09 RCW.

OPD provides the right to counsel for more than 11,000 clients per year. OPD's public defense clients are from every geographic area of Washington State, but they are more likely to be from poor neighborhoods and to be people of color than non-indigent people who can afford to pay for an attorney of their own choosing.

A Vendor Rate Adjustment for OPD's contracted public defense attorneys would allow nearly 200 FTE contracted attorneys to be resourced comparably to the attorneys who prosecute these cases, consistent with ABA national principles and WSBA public defense standards.

An OPD Vendor Rate Adjustment would ensure that thousands of Washingtonians who are entitled to public defense counsel will receive timely appointment of qualified, effective attorneys.

Explain what alternatives were explored by the agency and why they were rejected as solutions:

OPD considered the following alternatives and rejected each for the reasons noted:

- *Doing nothing.* Rejected because it would put the state's public defense contracts even further behind national principles and state standards of parity, and would risk the due process rights of thousands of clients.
- *Converting all public defense contracts to state employees.* Rejected because the Legislature has previously declined opportunities to provide mandatory defense services with employees instead of contractors. Most recently the Legislature specifically chose a contract model for defense attorneys when it transferred RCW 71.09 defense duties from DSHS to OPD.

What are the consequences of not funding this request?

Not funding this budget request would perpetuate inequities between AAGs and OPD-contracted defense counsel, and would put OPD further behind in complying with national and state-endorsed standards for public defense. Not funding this request likely would exacerbate current difficulties recruiting and retaining attorneys who are qualified to accept an OPD contract to represent indigent persons. OPD's inability to contract with qualified attorneys would delay appointment of counsel for indigent persons involved in certain types of cases for which OPD is solely obligated to provide effective counsel. Potential consequences of failure to appoint counsel include:

Office of Public Defense
Policy Level – AA – Vendor Rate Adjustment

- Violating clients’ constitutional rights to due process. The Washington Supreme Court has overturned convictions for failure to appoint counsel. For example, see *City of Seattle v. Ratliff*, 100 Wn.2d 212, 667 P.2nd 630 (1983).
- In dependency cases, children could spend more time in foster care at substantial state expense and personal harm.
- The contract attorney recruitment difficulties in Washington could escalate and require urgent intervention, as currently is happening in Oregon. In July 2022, a lack of state-contracted public defense attorneys left more than 180 Oregonians without counsel for an extended period of time. The Oregon Legislature in June approved \$100 million in emergency state public defense funding, including a vendor rate adjustment to \$158 per hour or approximately \$284,400 per year per FTE contract attorney.

Is this an expansion or alteration of a current program or service?

This budget request would adjust vendor rates for OPD’s existing public defense attorney contracts.

Decision Package expenditure, FTE and revenue assumptions:

Staffing Assumptions

This Decision Package would not change agency staffing levels.

Contracting Assumptions

This Decision Package would fund a Vendor Rate Adjustment, which is implemented through existing client services contracts. A portion of the Vendor Rate Adjustment would generate a partial federal reimbursement to the state, under Title IV-E of the federal Social Security Act, pursuant to an inter-agency agreement with the Department of Children, Youth, and Families.

	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027
Appellate atty contracts	\$1,001,655	\$767,935	\$422,364	\$310,438
71.09 atty contracts	\$0	\$383,350	\$421,685	\$185,541
Parent Rep atty contracts	\$3,221,825	\$2,470,066	\$2,037,804	\$2,117,618
Interagency Reimbursement for Parent Rep (Federal Title IV-E)	(\$599,259)	(\$459,432)	(\$379,032)	(\$393,877)
Interagency Reimbursement for Parent Rep Appeals (Federal Title IV-E)	(\$24,338)	(\$24,338)	(\$24,338)	(\$24,338)

How does the package relate to the Judicial Branch principal policy objectives?

Access to Necessary Representation: A Vendor Rate Adjustment will help ensure that OPD can recruit and retain adequate numbers of qualified attorney contractors to effectively represent indigent persons who have a right to legal counsel in certain types of cases. OPD has sole responsibility on behalf of the state to ensure counsel in these cases.

Are there impacts to other governmental entities?

Funding this request would not create any impact or obligation on other state agencies, courts, or governments.

Stakeholder response:

Non-governmental stakeholders include existing and potential future contract defense attorneys as well as clients. OPD anticipates that both groups would support the Decision Package.

Are there legal or administrative mandates that require this package to be funded?

Chapter 2.70 RCW requires OPD to ensure the statutory and constitutional rights to counsel and directs OPD to provide counsel to indigent persons on appeal, to parents in child dependency and termination cases, and to respondents facing civil commitment under Chapter 71.09 RCW.

Does current law need to be changed to successfully implement this package?

This decision package does not require any changes to statutes or court rules.

Are there impacts to state facilities?

No impacts to state facilities.

Are there other supporting materials that strengthen the case for this request?

- American Bar Association (ABA) [Ten Principles of a Public Defense Delivery System](#)
- Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) [Standards for Indigent Defense Services](#)
- [*'I'm so confused': People without public defenders in Oregon speak out amid crisis*](#), Albany Democrat-Herald
- AGO-provided data showing state expenditures for fully-loaded AAGs.

Are there information technology impacts?

No

Agency Contacts:

Sophia Byrd McSherry, Deputy Director
360-586-3164, ext. 107
sophia.byrdmcsherry@opd.wa.gov

STAFF RESOURCES COMMITTED TO JUVENILE LITIGATION
By AGO Division or Office
Effective: 4/13/20

DIVISION	Attorney (FTE)	Paralegal (FTE)	AAG:PL Ratio	Legal Assistant (FTE)	AAG : LA Ratio	LOA, OA, OSS (FTE)	LOA : AAG Ratio
RSD-BEL	5.5	1.0	5.5 : 1	3.5	1.6 : 1	1.6	3.4 : 1
RSD-EVE	10.5	3.75	2.8 : 1	6.25	1.7 : 1	2.5 (LOA)	4.2 : 1
RSD-KEN	2.5	1.0	2.5 : 1	2.0	1.25 : 1	.5 (LOA)	5 : 1
RSD-POR	2.7**	0.0	**	1.5	1.8 : 1	0.75	3.6 : 1
RSD-VAN	9.0**	3.0	3 : 1	4.5	2 : 1	1.0	9 : 1
RSD-WEN	4.8	1.0	4.8 : 1	2.5	1.9 : 1	1.0	4.8 : 1
RSD-YAK	6.0	1.0	6 : 1	3.0	2 : 1	1.5	4 : 1
RSD TOTAL	41.0	10.75	3.8 : 1	23.25	1.7 : 1	4.25	9.6 : 1
SHO-OLY	8.0	3.0	2.6 : 1	5.0	1.6 : 1	1.0	8: 1
SHS-SEA	26.0	6.0	4.3 : 1	12.0	2.2 : 1	4.0	6.5 : 1
SPO-SHS	11.3	3.6	1.8 : 1	6.5	1.7 : 1	See footnote ¹	
TAC-SHS	18.5	5.25	3.5 : 1	11.0	1.7 : 1	3.0 (LOA) 1.0 (OSS)	4.6 : 1

Note: Most of the entries for paralegals and legal assistants were based on estimates by section heads or leads. The entries for attorney FTEs were based on information provided by each division. These figures represent the total FTE currently assigned.

**1.0 FTE for Vancouver and .6 FTE for Port Angeles represent Appeals, which are also shared by all other RSD locations.

¹ SHS-Spokane relies heavily on other divisions for support (OA – GSE .75, LA – GSE .4, LA – EDU .3, and LA – ADM .5).

STAFF RESOURCES COMMITTED TO JUVENILE LITIGATION
By AGO Division or Office
Effective: 11/13/20

DIVISION	Attorney (FTE)	Paralegal (FTE)	AAG:PL Ratio	Legal Assistant (FTE)	AAG : LA Ratio	LOA, OA, OSS (FTE)	LOA : AAG Ratio
RSD-BEL	6.5	2.0	3.3 : 1	3.5	1.9 : 1	1.6	4.1 : 1
RSD-EVE	12.5	3.75	3.3 : 1	7.25	1.7 : 1	2.5 (LOA)	5 : 1
RSD-KEN	2.5	1.0	2.5 : 1	2.0	1.25 : 1	.5 (LOA)	5 : 1
RSD-POR	2.7**	1.0	2.7 : 1	1.0	2.7 : 1	1.5	1.8 : 1
RSD-VAN	11.0**	3.0	3.7 : 1	6.5	1.7 : 1	1.0	11 : 1
RSD-WEN	6.8	1.0	6.8 : 1	3.5	1.9 : 1	1.0	6.8 : 1
RSD-YAK	5.75	1.0	5.75 : 1	3.0	1.9 : 1	1.5	3.7 : 1
RSD TOTAL	47.75	12.75	3.7 : 1	26.75	1.8 : 1	5	9.6 : 1
SHO-OLY	9.0	3.0	3 : 1	5.0	1.8 : 1	1.0	9 : 1
SHS-SEA	25.0	8.0	3.1 : 1	11.0	2.3 : 1	4.0	6.3 : 1
SPO-SHS	14.2	3.6	3.9 : 1	8.35	1.7 : 1	2.75 ¹	5.2 : 1
TAC-SHS	20.5	7.25	2.8 : 1	10.5	2.0 : 1	3.0 (LOA) 1.0 (OSS)	5.1 : 1

Note: Most of the entries for paralegals and legal assistants were based on estimates by section heads or leads. The entries for attorney FTEs were based on information provided by each division. These figures represent the total FTE currently assigned.

**1.0 FTE for Vancouver and .6 FTE for Port Angeles represent Appeals, which are also shared by all other RSD locations.

¹ SHS-Spokane also relies heavily on other divisions for support (OA – GSE .75, LA – GSE .4, LA – EDU .3, and LA – ADM .5)

STAFF RESOURCES COMMITTED TO JUVENILE LITIGATION
By AGO Division or Office
Effective: 4/15/21

DIVISION	Attorney (FTE)	Paralegal (FTE)	AAG:PL Ratio	Legal Assistant (FTE)	AAG : LA Ratio	LOA, OA, OSS (FTE)	LOA : AAG Ratio
RSD-BEL	6.5	2.0	3.3 : 1	3.5	1.9 : 1	1.6	4.1 : 1
RSD-EVE	12.5	3.75	3.3 : 1	7.25	1.7 : 1	2.5 (LOA)	5.0 : 1
RSD-KEN	2.5	1.0	2.5 : 1	2.0	1.3 : 1	.5 (LOA)	5.0 : 1
RSD-POR	2.7**	1.0	2.7 : 1	2.0	1.4 : 1	1.0	2.7 : 1
RSD-VAN	12.0**	3.0	4.0 : 1	6.5	1.8 : 1	1.0	12.0 : 1
RSD-WEN	6.8	1.0	6.8 : 1	3.5	1.9 : 1	1.0	6.8 : 1
RSD-YAK	5.75	1.0	5.75 : 1	3.0	1.9 : 1	1.5	3.8 : 1
RSD TOTAL	48.75	12.75	3.8 : 1	27.75	1.8 : 1	4.5	10.8 : 1
SHO-OLY	9.0	3.0	3.0 : 1	5.0	1.8 : 1	1.0	9.0 : 1
SHS-SEA	24.0	8.0	3.0 : 1	11.0	2.2 : 1	4.0	6.0 : 1
SPO-SHS	14.3	5.1	2.8 : 1	8.35	1.7 : 1	1.95 ¹	7.3 : 1
TAC-SHS	20.5	7.25	2.8 : 1	10.5	2.0 : 1	3.0 (LOA) 1.0 (OSS)	5.1 : 1

Note: Most of the entries for paralegals and legal assistants were based on estimates by section heads or leads. The entries for attorney FTEs were based on information provided by each division. These figures represent the total FTE currently assigned.

** .8 FTE for Vancouver and .6 FTE for Port Angeles represent Appeals, which are also shared by all other RSD locations.

¹ SHS-Spokane also relies heavily on other divisions for support (OA – GSE .75, LA – GSE .4, LA – EDU .3, and LA – ADM .5)

STAFF RESOURCES COMMITTED TO JUVENILE LITIGATION
By AGO Division or Office
Effective: November 2021

DIVISION	Attorney (FTE)	Paralegal (FTE)	AAG:PL Ratio	Legal Assistant (FTE)	AAG : LA Ratio	LOA, OA, OSS (FTE)	LOA : AAG Ratio
RSD-BEL	6.5	2.0	3.3 : 1	3.5	1.9 : 1	1.6	4.1 : 1
RSD-EVE	12.5	3.75	3.3 : 1	7.25	1.7 : 1	2.5 (LOA)	5.0 : 1
RSD-KEN	3.4	1.0	3.4 : 1	3.0	1.1 : 1	.5 (LOA)	6.8 : 1
RSD-POR	2.7**	1.0	2.7 : 1	2.0	1.4 : 1	1.0	2.7 : 1
RSD-VAN	13.0**	3.0	4.3 : 1	6.5	2.0 : 1	1.0	13.0 : 1
RSD-WEN	6.8	1.0	6.8 : 1	3.5	1.9 : 1	1.0	6.8 : 1
RSD-YAK	5.75	1.0	5.75 : 1	3.0	1.9 : 1	1.5	3.8 : 1
RSD TOTAL	50.65	12.75	4.0 : 1	28.75	2.8 : 1	9.1	6 : 1
SHO-OLY	13.0	4.0	3.3 : 1	6.0	2.2 : 1	2.0	6.5 : 1
SHS-SEA	25.5	9.5	2.7 : 1	14.5	1.8 : 1	4.0	6.4 : 1
SPO-SHS	16.0	4.8	3.3 : 1	10.35	1.6 : 1	1.4 ¹	11.4 : 1
TAC-SHS	20.5	7.25	2.8 : 1	10.5	2.0 : 1	3.0 (LOA) 1.0 (OSS)	5.1 : 1

Note: Most of the entries for paralegals and legal assistants were based on estimates by section heads or leads. The entries for attorney FTEs were based on information provided by each division. These figures represent the total FTE currently assigned.

** .8 FTE for Vancouver and .6 FTE for Port Angeles represent Appeals, which are also shared by all other RSD locations.

¹ SHS-Spokane also relies heavily on other divisions for support (OA – GSE .4, LA – GSE 1.0)

STAFF RESOURCES COMMITTED TO JUVENILE LITIGATION
By AGO Division or Office
Effective: April 2022

DIVISION	Attorney (FTE)	Paralegal (FTE)	AAG:PL Ratio	Legal Assistant (FTE)	AAG : LA Ratio	LOA, OA, OSS (FTE)	LOA : AAG Ratio
RSD-BEL	6.5	2.0	3.3 : 1	4.5	1.4 : 1	1.6	4.1 : 1
RSD-EVE	12.5	3.75	3.3 : 1	7.25	1.7 : 1	2.5 (LOA)	5.0 : 1
RSD-KEN	4.4	2.0	2.2 : 1	3.8	1.2 : 1	.5 (LOA)	8.8 : 1
RSD-POR	2.7**	1.0	2.7 : 1	.5	5.4 : 1	1.0	2.7 : 1
RSD-VAN	13.0**	3.0	4.3 : 1	6.5	2.0 : 1	2.0	6.5 : 1
RSD-WEN	7.8	1.0	7.8 : 1	4.5	1.7 : 1	2.0	3.9 : 1
RSD-YAK	7.75	2.0	3.9 : 1	5.0	1.6 : 1	1.5	5.2 : 1
RSD TOTAL	54.65	14.75	3.7 : 1	32.05	1.7 : 1	6.5	8.4 : 1
SHO-OLY	13.0	4.0	3.3 : 1	8.0	1.6 : 1	2.0	6.5 : 1
SHS-SEA	27.9	8.0	3.5 : 1	16.0	1.7 : 1	6.0	4.7 : 1
SPO-SHS	17.25	6.0	2.9 : 1	16.75	1.0 : 1	2.0 ¹	8.6 : 1
TAC-SHS	20.5	7.25	2.8 : 1	10.5	2.0 : 1	3.0 (LOA) 1.0 (OSS)	5.1 : 1

Note: Most of the entries for paralegals and legal assistants were based on estimates by section heads or leads. The entries for attorney FTEs were based on information provided by each division. These figures represent the total FTE currently assigned.

** .8 FTE for Vancouver and .6 FTE for Port Angeles represent Appeals, which are also shared by all other RSD locations.

¹ SHS-Spokane also relies heavily on other divisions for support (OA – GSE .5, LA – GSE .5)

*HRMS Data as of 4-30-22

Non-Seattle				Seattle			
AAGs (Non-Seattle)				AAGs (Seattle)			
Position Title	(Multiple Items)	-Y		Position Title	(Multiple Items)	-Y	
Seattle vs Non-Seattle	Non-Seattle	-Y		Seattle vs Non-Seattle	Seattle	-Y	
Average of Annual Salary				Average of Annual Salary			
114,211				118,961			
Paralegals (Non-Seattle)				Paralegals (Seattle)			
Position Title	(Multiple Items)	-Y		Position Title	(Multiple Items)	-Y	
Seattle vs Non-Seattle	Non-Seattle	-Y		Seattle vs Non-Seattle	Seattle	-Y	
Average of Annual Salary				Average of Annual Salary			
69,284				72,420			
Legal Assistants (Non-Seattle)				Legal Assistants (Seattle)			
Position Title	(Multiple Items)	-Y		Position Title	(Multiple Items)	-Y	
Seattle vs Non-Seattle	Non-Seattle	-Y		Seattle vs Non-Seattle	Seattle	-Y	
Average of Annual Salary				Average of Annual Salary			
53,026				63,066			

Position	Non-Seattle	Seattle	Notes
AAG	\$ 249,922	\$261,863	Fully loaded AAG costs include 0.5 LA3 and 0.25 MA5 for overhead
PL	\$ 115,672	\$119,432	Includes benefits and other employee costs like equipment and travel