

BOARD FOR JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION



**WASHINGTON
COURTS**

MEETING PACKET

**FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2024
9:00 A.M.**

VIDEOCONFERENCE

Board for Judicial Administration Membership

VOTING MEMBERS:

Chief Justice Steven González, Chair
Washington State Supreme Court

Judge Alicia Burton, Member Chair
Superior Court Judges' Association
Pierce County Superior Court

Judge Tam T. Bui
District and Municipal Court Judges' Association
Snohomish County District Court

Judge Kristin Ferrera, President
Superior Court Judges' Association
Chelan County Superior Court

Judge Rebecca Glasgow
Court of Appeals, Division II

Judge Marilyn Haan
Superior Court Judges' Association
Cowlitz County Superior Court

Judge John Hart
District and Municipal Court Judges' Association
Whitman County District Court

Judge Mary Logan
District and Municipal Court Judges' Association
Spokane Municipal Court

Judge David Mann
Court of Appeals, Division I

Justice Raquel Montoya-Lewis
Washington State Supreme Court

Judge Rebecca Pennell
Court of Appeals, Division III

Judge Rebecca Robertson
District and Municipal Court Judges' Association
King County District Court

Judge Diana N. Ruff
Superior Court Judges' Association
Benton/Franklin Superior Court

Judge Michael Scott
Superior Court Judges' Association
King County Superior Court

Judge Jeffrey Smith, President
District and Municipal Court Judges' Association
Spokane County District Court

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

Hunter Abell, President
Washington State Bar Association

Judge Cindy Larsen, President-Elect
Superior Court Judges' Association
Snohomish County Superior Court

Judge Karl Williams, President-Elect
District and Municipal Court Judges' Association
Pierce County District Court

Terra Nevitt, Executive Director
Washington State Bar Association

Dawn Marie Rubio
State Court Administrator



Board for Judicial Administration (BJA)

May 17, 2024 (9 a.m. – 12:00 a.m.)

Zoom Meeting

AGENDA

1. Call to Order Welcome and Introductions	Judge Alicia Burton Chief Justice Steven González	9:00 a.m.
2. BJA Equity Impact Assessment Tool <i>Interactive presentation and training on the tool</i>	Michael Roosevelt	9:05 Tab 1
Break		10:35
3. BJA Task Forces and Work Groups <i>(See packet for reports. Presentations on funding/policy proposals and work activities are schedule for the June meeting.)</i> Alternatives to Incarceration Motion: <i>Approve additional year for Task Force through June 2025</i> Remote Proceedings Motion: <i>Approve additional year for Work Group through June 2025</i> Electronic Monitoring with Victim Notification Technology	Judge Mary Logan/Jeanne Englert Penny Larsen Joslyn Nelson	11:00 Tab 2
4. Standing Committee Reports Budget and Funding Committee Court Education Committee Legislative Committee Policy and Action Committee	Judge Mary Logan/ Chris Stanley Judge Rebecca Pennell/Scott Hillstrom Judge Michael Scott/ Brittany Gregory Judge Carolyn Jewett/ Penny Larsen	11:05 Tab 3

5. Presentation: Voices for Justice – Collecting Court User Feedback Information Sharing	Sarah Boege and Carl McCurley <i>Washington State Center for Court Research</i>	11:20 Tab 4
6. Presentation: OCLA priority sharing	Sara Robbins	11:30
7. Appellate Members Information Sharing Supreme Court Court of Appeals	Chief Justice Steven González Judge Rebecca Glasgow	11:40
8. Motions: <i>Approve March 15, 2024, Minutes</i> <i>Approve OCLA BJA representative, Judge Janet Chung (letter of interest in the meeting packet)</i> <i>Approve 2024–2025 Meeting Schedule</i>	Judge Alicia Burton	11:55 Tab 5
9. Information Sharing Interbranch Advisory Committee April 19 Meeting Recording and Materials Communication Skills to De-Escalate Hostile Customers You must register to attend the live or recorded webinar June 18 Registration	Judge Alicia Burton	
10. Adjourn		12:00
Persons who require accommodations should notify Jeanne Englert at 360-705-5207 or jeanne.englert@courts.wa.gov 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.		

Next meeting:

June 21, 2024 — 9:00–12:00 – Zoom

Board for Judicial Administration

Draft Equity Impact Assessment Tool

The Equity Impact Assessment Tool (EIAT) is an intentional analysis of a policy, program, or project with the goal of identifying areas, communities, and populations likely to be affected, mitigating any unintended consequences, and taking steps to close existing gaps.

Contents

Part I: Project Overview	1
Part II: Key Considerations.....	2
Part III: Determining the Impact for Target Population(s).....	4
Part IV: Summary of Equity Impact Assessment.....	5
Part V: Recommendation.....	5

Part I: Project Overview

Use this tool for the assessment of any committee work activities, broadly defined here as a “project,” to identify inequities and explore opportunities to promote equity. Examples of projects in Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) committees are developing policy proposals or recommendations, strategic initiatives, soliciting and reviewing policy proposals, and developing resources for courts and court users. Look at your committee work plans and charters to see how you can apply this tool to ensure that your work promotes equity.

Instructions:

- 1) Describe the key **issues, problems, or needs** that this project or proposal addresses.
- 2) Is one or more specific **groups or communities targeted to benefit from this project** or activity? For each targeted population briefly describe your pre-assessment assumptions:
 - a. What will be the likely impact, if any, on other population groups?
 - b. Is there data to support the need and benefit to the target group?
- 3) What are the **intended outcomes** of the action or project?

Part II: Key Considerations

Instructions: For each domain, provide a response to the key considerations question to determine the range of factors impacted by proposed actions in the project.

Domain	Key Considerations	Response
Data to assess needs and measure impacts		
Is there data available that will be useful to inform this project?	Demographic data for target population(s)	
	Geographic data for State/County/Region	
	Will you collect new data for this project? Or is data related specifically to this project available?	
	Do you have trained staff to analyze data?	
Domain	Key Considerations	Response
Community and justice partner engagement		
Are there opportunities for community/target population engagement relative to the project?	How can you get input from the likely impacted communities or target populations in the development, implementation, or evaluation stages of your project/policy proposal?	
	What formal or informal relationships with community-based organizations or justice partners can you access to get input on equity issues you have identified for this project?	
	What community-based organization or justice partners' collaborations can enhance the equity of this project successful?	
Community/Target Needs		
Does the proposed project reflect the specific needs of the population(s)?	How have the needs of the target population been determined?	
	Do any parts of this project need to consider translated materials or interpreter services?	

	Are there access to justice barriers your project can address? Flexible hours? Transportation? Child care? Welcoming environment? Convenient location? Access to technology? Access to counsel?	
Committee Member Diversity and Equity Responsiveness		
Domain	Key Considerations	Response
How diverse is your committee? What strategies do you have for enhancing diversity?	Does the diversity of your members reflect the diversity of target populations communities?	
	What kind of support or training would enhance the members' understanding of the impacts the project/policy/action could have on target populations?	
	Is there opportunity for an ad-hoc or at-large member on your committee, for instance a cultural leader, person with lived experience, or subject matter expert?	
Domain	Key Considerations	Response
Project Marketing		
Is the messaging strategy for the project culturally relevant? This question can refer to marketing to the public (external) or within (internal) the organization.	How does the committee plan to promote the project within the court community or to public?	
	Is this project aligned with the BJA vision, mission, or goals?	

Domain	Key Considerations	Response
Leadership/Organizational Support		
What infrastructure exists to support equity-related projects within the board?	Will the board assemble an advisory team to help the EIAT and other equity initiatives evolve?	
	Is there a budgetary allotment to support the equity assessment portions of the proposed project?	

Part III: Determining the Impact for Target Population(s)

Instructions: Consider the factors identified in Part II to provide your responses. Complete the section below to assess the scope and magnitude of the impact (either positive or negative) for target population(s) and when applicable, the unintended consequences for racial and ethnic populations. If the proposed action will uniquely impact multiple populations, please address the impact for each population group.

1) What adverse impacts or unintended consequences could arise from the project or proposed action?
2) Does the assessment suggest that there a disparate racial impact from this project or policy? How do you know if there will be a disparate impact? If there is an impact, which populations will be impacted?
3) Can these impacts contribute to systemic disparities and disproportionality?
4) What specific impacts can be identified (e.g., less available resources, racial disparities in access to court services, removal of children, access to services)?
5) Can the (negative) impact be mitigated by a change in action (i.e., modify policy, change program/strategy, revise recommendations, etc.)?
6) What are the consequences (i.e., fiscal, regulatory, etc.) of NOT proceeding with proposed action, as indicated?

7) Can the (positive) impact be enhanced? Can the positive impact be generalized to other population groups? If so, which population groups may benefit?

Part IV: Summary of Equity Impact Assessment

Instructions: Based on your findings in Parts II–III of this assessment, please choose the statement(s) that pertains to this proposed project. This section certifies the findings of the assessment.

- ☐ The proposed policy, service, strategy, or recommendation could have a disparate, disproportionate, or unique **positive** impact on target population(s).

Please specify which population(s) is positively impacted:

- ☐ The proposed policy, service, strategy, or recommendation could have a disparate, disproportionate, or unique **negative** impact on target populations.

Please specify which population(s) is negatively impacted:

- ☐ The proposed policy, service, strategy, or recommendation is **not expected to have impact** that is disparate, disproportionate, or unique on target populations.

Part V: Recommendation

Instructions: Based on your findings, please make a recommendation about the appropriate course of action and next steps for the project. Describe your rationale for making the recommendation.

- ☐ **Recommend NO change because of the findings of this EIA**

- Describe your rationale for this recommendation.

- ☐ **Recommend MINOR changes because of the findings of this EIA**

- Describe your rationale for this recommendation.
- Detail recommendations for changes and/or next steps for the proposed action.

- ☐ **Recommend SIGNIFICANT changes because of the findings of this EIA**

- Describe your rationale for this recommendation.
- Detail recommendations for changes and/or next steps for the proposed action.

TAB 2

May 17, 2024

RE: Alternatives to Incarceration Task Force Report

Motion Request:

The Task Force requests a motion to extend the Task Force work until June 2025 to continue working on identified activities including advocating for budget and policy requests and developing guidance documents.

The goal of this strategic initiative is for pre-trial and post-sentencing incarceration alternatives to be uniformly available to courts throughout the state regardless of the court's resources and the person's ability to pay.

The Task Force met March 27. All meetings are TVW livestreamed and recorded. The Task Force workgroups identified policy and funding recommendations that will be presented to BJA in June.

Legal Authority – identified judicial authority questions for alternative options/use. The work group is prioritizing final policy, education, and best practices recommendations.

Policy recommendation: Immunity for voluntary treatment for pretrial release

As to the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination, we could propose a legislative fix, similar to what was done with regards to weapons surrender, see RCW 9.41.801(9), and the “Blake fix” law, RCW 69.50.4017(8), to ensure that statements made by defendants during evaluation and/or treatment could not be used against them. This seems doable and consistent with other recent actions by the Legislature. In order to avoid any Fifth Amendment issues, and in order to protect candor in any evaluation and treatment, the legislation would need to include both use and derivative use immunity.

Community Mapping – explored community-based tools/mapping to better help local jurisdictions/communities identify points of entry into the system, barriers and opportunities to alternatives, and community-based resources that can provide an alternative to incarceration. They will provide links to community mapping tools that can be used at the local level.

This group is working on final funding recommendations to include a resource person to connect individuals to community resources at the start of the process, especially focused on pre-trial, to better identify supports and lead to successful alternatives.

Assessment and Information –They have identified several recommendations which include funding to bridge the gap for those that are considered indigent pretrial and/or post-conviction and a general increase in overall funding for pretrial services.

Education Work Group started in March to identify and possibly implement training opportunities to address some of the education needs and issues identified through Task Force efforts.

May 17, 2024

TO: Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) Members

FR: Judge Jim Rogers and Judge Angelle Gerl
Co-Chairs, BJA Remote Proceedings Work Group

RE: REPORT OF THE REMOTE PROCEEDINGS WORK GROUP

The Best Practice Guidelines Subgroup met on April 23. Here is an update on the projects in progress:

- The Remote Bench Card is near-final review. Members are deciding whether to create a separate bench card that focuses on the considerations before the hearing.
- Members viewed examples of court user instructions for participating in remote proceedings. The work group plans to develop a “model webpage” that courts can use to inform court participants and the public about how to prepare and participate remotely.
- The follow up survey of hybrid proceedings in Washington Courts closed on May 1, 2024. There were 91 responses and the data support the need for funding technology resources. The summary report will be available in late May.
- Members viewed the Courts of the Future presentation given at the March BJA meeting. The Work Group supports the hosting of a remote technology roundtable for court and IT personnel who operate, maintain and purchase equipment and services to share ideas and experiences about products and solutions for virtual courtrooms. The preliminary planning will begin in May.
- The Work Group requests a one-year extension to finish the best practice guidelines and to field any follow up that may be needed on the Court Rules Project.



May 17, 2024

TO: Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) Members

FR: Judge Jim Rogers and Judge Angelle Gerl, Co-Chairs, Remote Proceeding Work Group

RE: MOTION for WORK GROUP EXTENTION

Motion Request: Extend the Remote Proceedings Work Group until June 30, 2025.

The Work Group requests a one-year extension to complete their work the best practice guidelines, to potentially submit a funding request for remote technology resources and to field potential follow up questions from the Supreme Court regarding the slate of Remote Proceeding Court Rules.

May 17, 2024

RE: BJA Electronic Monitoring and Victim Notification Technology (EMVNT) Workgroup

The EMVNT Work Group is finalizing their activities and documents.

They are finalizing:

EMVNT Best Practices

EMVNT Policy Document

Training Templates and Webinar

They are also working on their final report and recommendations and identifying possible training opportunities.

They will present their work and final materials at the June BJA Meeting.

If they have any questions or comments please contact Joslyn.Nelson@courts.wa.gov

TAB 3

May 10, 2024

Court Education Committee (CEC) Report

- Previous CEC Meeting: May 8, 12:15pm-1:00pm
- Judge Pennell will Chair her final CEC meeting in June. Discussed next CEC Chair, Judge Bui, starting July 2024.
- FY25 Supplemental Funding: Conducting needs assessment with SCJA and DMCJA – for CEC allocation process
- SCJA and SC Administrators' Spring Programs (April 28-May 1, Yakima)
- DMCMA Spring Program and CLJ Court Administrators' Academy are coming soon (May 19-22, Spokane)
- Updated CEC policy document – Approved May 8, 2024
- Next CEC Meeting: June 12, 12:15pm - 1:00pm



May 17, 2024

TO: Board for Judicial Administration (BJA)

FROM: Judge Michael Scott, BJA Legislative Committee Chair
Brittany Gregory, AOC Associate Director, Judicial and Legislative Relations

RE: BJA Legislative Committee 2024 Session Summary

2024 Legislative Session

The 2024 Legislative Session ended on March 7, 2024, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) staff have transitioned from legislative analysis to legislative implementation, and are working to produce bill summaries and complete other implementation tasks for bills that impact the judicial branch.

2024 AOC Request-Legislation Update

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), on behalf of the Board for Judicial Administration (BJA), filed six agency request bills in the 2024 legislative session. Five of which successfully passed and were signed into law.

- [HB 1992](#): Additional judicial position in Whatcom County Superior
 - Prime Sponsor: Representative Timmons
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/15; Chapter 112, 2024 Session Laws
- [ESSB 5828](#): Statutory commissioner/referee authority
 - Prime Sponsor: Senator Shewmake
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/26; Chapter 268, 2024 Session Laws
- [HB 2006](#): Concerning court interpreters
 - Prime Sponsor: Representative Peterson
 - Last Action: This bill did not pass
 - Note: The interpreter funding shift to authorize reimbursement up to 100% of costs was included in a budget proviso in [SB 5950](#).
- [HB 2034](#): Notice of Court Reorganization
 - Prime Sponsor: Representative Cheney
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/13; Chapter 61, 2024 Session Laws

- [SHB 2056](#): Supreme Court Bailiff information sharing & limited investigative authority
 - Prime Sponsor: Representative Goodman
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/26; Chapter 303, 2024 Session Laws
- [SB 5836](#): Additional judicial position in Clark County Superior
 - Prime Sponsor: Senator L. Wilson
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/15; Chapter 125, 2024 Session Laws

Legislative Topics of Interest to the Judiciary

The focus this legislative session was on bills addressing the attorney shortage and increasing resources for the Office of Public Defense (OPD); increasing support for parents and children going through the dependency process; discussing and restricting the use of artificial intelligence (AI); and juvenile justice.

- [SHB 1911](#) – Concerning activities in which the office of public defense may engage without violating the prohibition on providing direct representation of clients.
 - OPD Request Legislation
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/26; Chapter 294, 2024 Session Laws
- [SB 6068](#) – Reporting on dependency outcomes
 - AOC supported this bill and testified in Support
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/28; Chapter 326, 2024 Session Laws
- [SB 6109](#) – Supporting children and families
 - AOC signed in and testified as Other
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/28; Chapter 328, 2024 Session Laws
- [SB 5838](#) – Establishing an artificial intelligence (AI) task force
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/18; Chapter 163, 2024 Session Laws
- [SHB 2217](#) – Concerning authority over individuals found guilty or accused of criminal offenses that occurred when the individual was under age 18
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/15; Chapter 117, 2024 Session Laws
- [ESSB 5974](#) – Concerning the disposition of unenforceable LFOs other than restitution imposed by a court or an agent of the court against a juvenile prior to 7/1/23
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/13; Chapter 38, 2024 Session Laws

Legislative Priorities for BJA

Prior to the start of session, the BJA chairs sent a letter supporting the OPD funding request and efforts addressing attorney shortages. In addition, the BJA Legislative Committee discussed and voted to formally take a position on the following bills this session:

Support:

- [2SSB 5780](#): Encouraging participation in public defense and prosecution professions
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/26; Chapter 293, 2024 Session Laws
- [SHB 1911](#): Concerning activities in which the office of public defense may engage
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/26; Chapter 294, 2024 Session Laws
- [SB 6063](#): Modifying the definition of persistent offender
 - Last Action: This bill did not pass
- [SSB 6146](#): Concerning tribal warrants.
 - Last Action: Signed by the Governor on 3/19; Chapter 207, 2024 Session Laws

Oppose/Concerns:

- [SB 6073](#): Concerning the use of artificial intelligence language learning models in official court filings
 - Last Action: This bill did not pass

Interim Priorities

- [2024 Legislative Session Summary Report](#)
 - AOC legal analysts worked hard to put together the 2024 Legislative Session Summary Report which includes bill summaries for all of the applicable bills we tracked this session with court impacts.
- Electronic Monitoring and Victim Notification Technology (EMVNT) Best Practices
 - This BJA workgroup has concluded work and completed their report with recommendations.
 - Next Steps: The report is being finalized and will be submitted on May 15, 2024.
- Childcare Assistance Workgroup
 - Survey complete
 - Next Steps: Analysis of results, recommendations, final report to the legislature on December 1, 2024.
- Juror Pay Pilot Project – Pierce County Superior Court
 - 2024 Budget Proviso allowed for flexibility in the amount paid to jurors.

- Next Steps: This project will begin in late summer and will run for approximately 6 months before data analysis, findings, and reporting on results.

BJA Legislative Committee Next Steps

The BJA Legislative Committee is soliciting proposals for BJA request legislation for the 2025 legislative session. Proposals and supporting documentation are due July 12, 2024. The proposal forms were sent out on May 1 and will be disseminated to the court community through judicial leadership.

cc: Dawn Marie Rubio, State Court Administrator
Haily Perkins, Senior Court Program Analyst



May 1, 2024

TO: Chief Justice Steven C. González, BJA Chair
Judge Alicia Burton, BJA Co-Chair
Judge Lori K. Smith, COA Presiding Chief
Judge Sam Chung, SCJA President
Judge Jeffrey Smith, DMCJA President
Justice Barbara Madsen & Mr. Ross Hunter, Commission on Children in Foster Care Co-Chairs
Justice Barbara Madsen, Judicial Information System (JIS) Committee Chair
Judge Michael Diaz, Interpreter Commission Chair
Justice Sheryl Gordon McCloud, Gender and Justice Commission Chair
Justice Mary I. Yu, Minority and Justice Commission Chair
Judge Mary Logan, BJA Budget and Funding Committee Chair
Judge Kathryn C. Loring, BJA Public Education and Engagement Committee Chair
Judge Carolyn Jewett, BJA Policy and Action Committee Chair
Judge Sean P. O'Donnell, Court Security Committee SCJA Co-Chair
Judge Jim Rogers & Judge Angelle Gerl, BJA Remote Proceedings Work Group Co-Chairs
Ms. LaTricia Kinlow, Court Management Council Co-Chair
Ms. Dawn Marie Rubio, State Court Administrator & CMC Co-Chair

FROM: Judge Michael Scott, BJA Legislative Committee Chair

RE: BOARD FOR JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION 2025 LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

The Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) has a standing Legislative Committee, which consists of judges from all levels of court. The purpose of the Legislative Committee is to develop a proactive legislative agenda on behalf of the BJA as well as recommend positions on legislation of interest to the BJA.

In order to prepare for the 2025 Legislative Session that convenes on January 6, 2025, we are soliciting legislative proposals. An example from the 2024 session is [HB 2034](#) (notice of court reorganization). The Legislative Committee will review all proposals and make recommendations to the BJA this fall.

While the Legislative Committee will consider all legislative proposals from the court community, we are particularly interested in proposals that further the Principal Policy Goals of the Judicial Branch (attached) and are at the request of a court, board, commission, association, or BJA committee. We invite you to submit ideas for our consideration using the attached form by July 12, 2024.

Please do not hesitate to reach out to Brittany Gregory, AOC Associate Director, Judicial and Legislative Relations at Brittany.Gregory@courts.wa.gov or Haily Perkins, Sr. Court Program Analyst at Haily.Perkins@courts.wa.gov. As staff to the Legislative Committee, Brittany & Haily are able to help with any questions about the process.

Thank you in advance for your proposals. We look forward to working with you to improve Washington's justice system.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

1112 Quince Street SE • P.O. Box 41170 • Olympia, WA 98504-1170
360-357-2121 • 360-956-5711 Fax • www.courts.wa.gov

cc: BJA Legislative Committee
Judge David S. Mann, COA
Judge Rachelle Anderson, SCJA
Superior Court Judges' Association
Judge Kevin Ringus, DMCJA
District and Municipal Court Judges' Association
Ms. Ashley Callan, AWSCA President
Superior Court Administrators
Ms. LaTricia Kinlow, DMCMA President
District and Municipal Court Managers
Ms. Tori Peterson, WAJCA President
Juvenile Court Administrators
Mr. Reza Pazooki, Judicial Administrative Asst. to Chief Justice Gonzalez
Ms. Julie Keown, Judicial Administrative Asst. to Justice Madsen
Ms. Lynda Zeis, Judicial Administrative Asst. to Justice Gordon McCloud
Ms. Christine Lawrence, Judicial Administrative Asst. to Justice Yu
Ms. Erin Lennon, Supreme Court Clerk
Mr. Derek Byrne, COA Division II Clerk
Mr. Lea Ennis, COA Division I Clerk
Ms. Tristen Worthen, COA Division III Clerk
Ms. Nicole Ack, AOC
Mr. Scott Ahlf, AOC
Ms. Kelley Amburgey-Richardson, AOC
Ms. Crissy Anderson, AOC
Ms. Cynthia Delostrinos, AOC
Ms. Vonnie Diseth, AOC
Ms. Jeanne Englert, BJA
Ms. Brittany Gregory, AOC
Dr. Scott Hilstrom, AOC
Ms. Penny Larsen, AOC
Ms. Allison Lee Muller, AOC
Ms. Stephanie Oyler, AOC
Mr. Christopher Stanley, AOC
Ms. Ashley Tam, AOC
Mr. Frank Thomas, AOC
Ms. Kelly Warner-King, AOC
Mr. James Wells, AOC

Attachments

N:\Legislative Relations\BJA Legislative\2025\Legislative Proposal Forms\Judicial Branch Policy Objectives
N:\Legislative Relations\BJA Legislative\2025\Legislative Proposal Forms\2025_Request Form for BJA Legislation
N:\Legislative Relations\BJA Legislative\2025\Legislative Proposal Forms\FAQ



Board for Judicial Administration Legislative Committee – *Legislation Request Form*

Please submit completed forms and supporting documentation/drafts to Haily.Perkins@courts.wa.gov.

Proposals should be submitted by July 12.

WHEN TO USE THIS FORM:

This form is **only** used when: 1) a proposal requires statutory amendment (i.e., changes to language in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW)); **and** 2) the judicial branch proponent of the proposal wishes to request support and action for it from the Board for Judicial Administration (BJA).

Please consider these questions to guide you to the correct process.¹ If you need assistance with the form or have questions, contact Haily.Perkins@courts.wa.gov.

Question 1: Is your proposal *exclusively* a fiscal request (i.e., a request for state funding for the judiciary or a new or expanded judicial program, where no legislation other than a state budgetary appropriation is required)?

- *If no, please proceed to Question 2.*
- *If yes, STOP. You DO NOT need to complete this form.*

Please visit https://www.courts.wa.gov/appellate_trial_courts/aocwho/?fa=atc_aocwho.display&fileID=msd/budgetDevelopment for information about the Washington Courts budget submittal process. The budget submittal process is administered by Mr. Christopher Stanley and involves review of proposals and documentation by the BJA and the Supreme Court.

Question 2: Does your proposal require new or amended statutory language (i.e., changes to the RCW)?

- *If no, STOP. You DO NOT need to complete this form.*

You may wish to pursue the proposal in discussion with judicial branch committees, associations, commissions, and/or directly with stakeholders and legislators. For example, convening a task force or work group, including invitations for legislators to participate, does not require legislation.

- *If yes, please proceed to Question 3.*

¹ The state legislature establishes and amends the state's budgets and statutes. Various court associations, jurisdictions, and entities participate independently in Washington's legislative processes. Sometimes, a court entity would like the support of the BJA for a particular proposal. The BJA has two separate processes for developing and reviewing proposals and submitting them to the legislature: one for budget proposals (i.e., "decision packages") and one for bill drafts (i.e., changes to the Revised Code of Washington).

Question 3: Is your local court, association, or judicial entity asking the BJA to support your proposal by working with legislator(s) to sponsor it as BJA's request?

- *If no, STOP. You DO NOT need to complete this form.*

You may wish to pursue the proposal in discussion with judicial branch committees, associations, commissions, and/or directly with stakeholders and legislators. For example, if a particular court level association wishes to pursue legislation at its own request, then sharing information about it with the BJA Legislative Committee is appreciated, but obtaining BJA support using this form is not necessary.

- *If yes, please proceed to Question 4.*

Question 4: Is the proposal to request an additional judge position within a specific judicial district in chapter 2.08 or 3.34 RCW?

- *If yes, please complete PART I only of this form, and submit the completed form and the required supporting documentation to Haily.Perkins@courts.wa.gov by July 12. You may skip PART II of this form.*
- *If no, please complete PART II only of this form, and submit the completed form and the required supporting documentation to Haily.Perkins@courts.wa.gov by July 12. You may skip PART I of this form.*

PART I – Used to request additional judge positions in chapter 2.08 or 3.34 RCW

Judicial District

Provide judicial district name/count(ies) impacted by request.

Contact Person

Provide requestor contact name, telephone, and email address.

Request Background—What precipitated the request?

Explain what prompted the request for an additional judge(s).

Judicial Needs Estimate (JNE) Support

How does the JNE support the request? For example, the court currently has 5 judges and 1 commissioner, and the JNE states a workload appropriate for 8 judicial officers.

Local Funding and Supporting Documentation

Detail support for the proposal secured so far. Attach documentation of *approved* local/county budget(s) that include funding for the count(ies)' portion(s) of the judicial salary.

Stakeholder Support or Opposition

Have legislators or their staff participated in any discussions about the proposal? If known, identify specific legislators that could be champions or allies as well as a list of entities that may oppose adding a judicial position(s) with a brief explanation of why, if known.

PART II – Used for all bill draft proposals *other than* additional judge positions**Request Title**

Provide a brief title for the proposal.

Requesting Entity (Organization & Contact Person)

Provide organization name, contact person, telephone, and email.

Request Background—What precipitated the request?

Provide a paragraph explaining how and why the proposal was developed. Is the proposal a product or result of a work group, task force, study, ruling, etc.?

Summary/Request Justification

Provide a list of organizations or entities that may oppose the legislation and a brief explanation of why, if known.

RCW(s) Impacted (please provide potential bill draft language: underlined additions to RCW, strikeouts for deletions, and identify new sections—attach additional sheet, if needed)

Provide RCWs and the requested changes to existing statutes. If requesting a new statute, identify RCW chapter(s) where it should be added. Please provide the contact information for the author(s) of the draft.

Court Level Impact

Summarize the court level impact and identify specific court levels (i.e., CLJ, Superior Court, Court of Appeals, Supreme Court).

Fiscal Impact

If enacted, will there be costs to implement this proposal? Will AOC, courts, local government(s), or other agencies have any fiscal impact as a result? If there is a fiscal impact, is it likely to be one-time or on-going?

Funding Available/Secured

If there is a fiscal impact, please document funding already secured or available to fund the proposal (i.e., grants, local appropriation, etc.). If state funding may be needed, please identify additional revenue that the legislature could generate to apply to the expenditure and include needed adjustments in the bill draft submitted.

Legislative Strategy Recommendations

Identify potential messages/talking points to legislators and advocates from within and outside the judicial branch. Have legislators or staff participated in any discussions about the proposal? If known, identify specific legislators that could be champions or allies.

Stakeholder Impact

Provide a list of all stakeholders and whether they are likely to support or oppose the proposal. Identify contact information for constituencies outside of the judicial branch who will be positively impacted by the proposal and would be willing to advocate for it.

Potential Opposition

Provide a list of organizations or entities that may oppose the legislation and a brief explanation of why, if known.

Revised April 2024

N:\Legislative Relations\BJA Legislative\2025\Legislative Proposal Forms\2025_REQUEST FORM for BJA Legislation.docx

PRINCIPAL POLICY GOALS OF THE WASHINGTON STATE JUDICIAL BRANCH

“Justice in all cases shall be administered openly, and without unnecessary delay.”
Washington State Constitution, Article I, Section 10.

Washington State’s judicial branch is a constitutionally separate, independent and co-equal branch of government. It is the duty of the judicial branch to protect rights and liberties, uphold and interpret the law, and resolve disputes peacefully through the open and fair administration of justice in the state.

The judicial branch in Washington State is a local and state partnership where local courts, court managers and court personnel work in concert with statewide courts, judicial branch agencies and support systems.

The judicial branch maintains effective relations with the executive and legislative branches of state and local governments, which are grounded in mutual respect.

The Principal Policy Goals of the Washington State Judicial Branch

1. **Fair and Effective Administration of Justice.** Washington courts will openly, fairly, efficiently and effectively administer justice in all cases, consistent with constitutional mandates and the judiciary’s duty to maintain the highest level of public trust and confidence in the courts.
2. **Accessibility.** Washington courts, court facilities and court systems will be open and accessible to all participants regardless of income, language, culture, ability, or other access barrier.
3. **Access to Necessary Representation.** Constitutional and statutory guarantees of the right to counsel shall be effectively implemented. Litigants with important interests at stake in civil judicial proceedings should have meaningful access to counsel.
4. **Commitment to Effective Court Management.** Washington courts will employ and maintain systems and practices that enhance effective court management.
5. **Sufficient Staffing and Support.** Washington courts will be appropriately staffed and effectively managed, and court personnel, court managers and court systems will be effectively supported and trained.

FAQ - Legislative Proposal Request

General Request Information:

- You must submit a policy proposal form for any proposal that will require a change in statute (including requesting an additional judicial position), it is not sufficient to fill out the decision package form. If you don't submit a policy proposal form by the deadline the BJA Legislative Committee cannot consider your proposal for the upcoming session due to an increase in the number of proposals submitted.
- You are allowed to submit more than 1 proposal, but please number them in order of priority.
- Please let us know if you have another legislative liaison who is available to lobby in support of the submitted proposals (depending on resources priority might be given to groups with limited/no outside legislative liaison).
- If your proposal will impact a stakeholder group directly (e.g. level of court or commission), you must make that group aware of the proposal before it is submitted for consideration.
- If your proposal will have a fiscal impact, please also connect with Chris Stanley to ask what information will need to be submitted to be included in the budget.

Judicial Officer Request Information:

- If you are requesting a new judicial officer for your Superior Court, you will need to complete Part I of the attached 'REQUEST FORM FOR BJA LEGISLATION'.
- In addition to the request, you will need to provide proof of support from your county commission that notes their ability and willingness to fund 50% of the requested position.
 - FYI - If county commission support is not obtained for superior court judicial officer requests, legislative committees have indicated that they will not consider the bill.
- Formal proof of support (i.e., letter) does not need to be provided at the time the request is submitted, but your county commission should be aware of the request.
 - Formal proof of support will be needed prior to the start of session and the bill being filed.

May 17, 2024

TO: Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) Members
FROM: Judge Carolyn Jewett, Chair, Policy and Action Committee (PAC)
RE: REPORT OF POLICY AND ACTION COMMITTEE

The committee met on March 15, 2024. Here is an update on projects in progress:

BJA Equity Impact Assessment Tool Pilot Project

The PAC members reviewed the Racial Impact Assessment Tool author of the tool, Mr. Michael Roosevelt. Members discussed how this tool could be adapted for BJA committees to use at the March meeting. The plan to work with Mr. Roosevelt was developed. On April 24, 2024, Mr. Roosevelt facilitated a meeting with BJA committee staff and the staff from the Judicial Associations, the Supreme Court Commission and two researchers from the Washington Center for Court Research on to get feedback on how to customize the tool for committee work project.

Mr. Roosevelt will conduct a presentation and training on using equity impact assessment tools at the BJA May meeting and will conduct skill-building workshops for staff to learn how to use the tool in BJA committee work in June 2024.

Workplace Anti-Harassment Project

The committee reviewed the materials from a training titled “Leading a Workplace Free from Harassment and Discrimination” that is part of the leadership series sponsored by the Washington Counties Risk Pool. Penny Larsen is working with the training sponsor and the staff of the Gender and Justice Implementation Committee on the feasibility of this training for judicial officers, court administrators.

The committee will meet on May 17, 2024 to discuss next steps for both projects.

Collecting Court User Feedback

About the Voices for Justice Program

We provide technical assistance to support courts in collecting feedback from court-involved people and court staff. Our goal is to advance the equitable and effective administration of justice.

Why participate?

*Use data to prove what is working well and improve what is not.
Even high-performing courts have opportunities for improvement.*



It's Court-Led and Free

Courts drive this program and the service is funded by the state. We will partner with your court to create a feedback plan tailored to your needs, interests, local context, and capacity. You can choose to get general feedback or to focus on a specific program or population of the court-involved.



Examine User Experiences & Program Effectiveness

While court processes and programs may be fair, it matters whether court users *perceive them* to be fair, respectful, and accessible. Many elements outside the courtroom impact user experience, such as parking, service counter interactions, etc.



Get Actionable Feedback, Not Complaints

Research consistently shows that court user experiences are shaped more by their perception of fairness than by case outcome. Fairness matters more than “winning.” Feedback can offer insight into what aspects work well or can be improved.



Many Improvements Are Low Cost

There are many low/no cost opportunities - for example, rewording a form to be clearer.

Ways courts have used feedback

A court in Ohio found that court users perceived remote hearings to be more accessible and fair. This solidified the court's plan to continue offering hybrid hearings.

Another court found that their website was not very useful. This was a surprise as they had recently improved the website and thought it was more user-friendly.

Collecting Court User Feedback

Ways Courts Can Collect Feedback



Option 1. Survey - Online

An online survey asking court users about their experiences.



Option 2. Survey - Online and Paper

In addition to an online survey, this option would also include a physical paper survey that court users can fill out.



Option 3. Focus Groups

Small group discussions in which court users are asked open-ended questions, allowing them to elaborate on their experiences.



Option 4. Interviews

One-on-one, in-depth conversations with court users.



Option 5. Observations

Observers watch a courtroom or other location and answer a set of questions (for example, indicating whether the judge was audible, etc.).

- **Any combination of options can be selected. Choosing more than one is encouraged.** For instance, your court may decide to use both an online survey and focus groups.
- **You do not need to have any expertise in an option to select it.** Our team can conduct the research or provide support throughout the entire process.
- **These high-level options are meant to serve as a starting point.** More detailed research methods will be co-developed based on court needs, local context, and capacity. For example, survey questions will be tailored to the court's interests.

To get started or learn more, contact Sarah Boege at sarah.boege@courts.wa.gov



Board for Judicial Administration (BJA) Meeting
Friday, March 15, 2024, 9:00. – 12:00 p.m.
Videoconference

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

BJA Members Present:

Chief Justice Steven González, Chair
Judge Alicia Burton, Chair
Judge Tam Bui
Judge Sam Chung
Judge Kristin Ferrera
Judge Marilyn Haan
Judge John Hart
Judge Mary Logan
Judge David Mann
Raquel Montoya-Lewis
Judge Rebecca Robertson
Judge Michael Scott
Judge Karl Williams

Guests Present:

Jim Bamberger
TJ Bohl
Melissa Beaton
Elena Becker
Ashley Callan
Judge George Fearing
Isaac Jarret
Kristin Jensen
Judge Carolyn Jewett

LaTricia Kinlow
Judge Annette Plese
Sara Robbins

**Administrative Office of the Courts
(AOC) Staff Present:**

Scott Ahlf
Kelley Amburgey-Richardson
Jeanne Englert
Heidi Green
Scott Hillstrom
Kyle Landry
Penny Larsen
Joslyn Nelson
Stephanie Oyler
Chris Stanley
Caroline Tawes
Evan Walker

Call to Order and Welcome

Judge Burton called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. and welcomed the participants.

Biennium Budget Process and 2024 Legislative Budget Update

Christopher Stanley thanked everyone who advocated for the Judicial Branch budget to the Legislature. The Judicial Branch received the funding that was requested; some funding was from the Judicial Stabilization Trust Account (JSTA).

Christopher Stanley presented the 2025–27 biennium budget outlook and forecast. The Legislature may have to work with a deficit of around \$2.6 billion. He recommended aiming for a Judicial Branch budget request of \$40–50 million for policy items. This figure does not include maintenance requests.

Christopher Stanley reviewed the decision package cover sheet guide. He walked through the section of the decision package, including the introduction, summary, and collaboration

sections. Budget submissions must be affiliated with a BJA, member. A goal of the new budget submission process is to encourage better communication across the system for this budget. The budget submission must include one of BJA's core budget topic areas: support trial courts; improve access to justice; and maintain critical IT infrastructure.

The decision package will be due to AOC June 28, 2024. Chief Justice González will send an official letter in the next week or two regarding decision package submission. The BJA will make budget recommendations at the September 13, 2024 BJA meeting, and the budget requests will be submitted to the Legislature on October 14 or 21, 2024. Three new questions on diversity and inclusion have been added to the decision package template. Christopher Stanley is available for assistance on the decision packages.

Judge Logan said it was important for the Legislature to know and trust that the judicial branch is speaking with one voice.

It was moved by Chief Justice Gonzalez and seconded by Judge Logan to approve the new biennium budget process. The motion carried unanimously.

Presentation: Courts of the Future

AOC was allocated \$5 million for audio visual upgrades in the FY23 supplemental budget, and some of that funding was allocated to the Courtroom of the Future Program. Judge Please and Ashley Callan from Spokane Superior Court, and Kristin Jensen and Isaac Jarrett from Thurston County Superior Court reviewed updates in their courtrooms using the funding they received.

Spokane Superior Court is in an old building, and upgrades required quite a bit of new technology and wiring. Judge Please reviewed the courtroom infrastructure prior to the upgrade. Improvements include a large screen behind the witness stand with a monitor for the witness and cameras throughout the courtroom. The jury box is not shown on camera. Those participating in proceedings by Zoom are able to see the entire courtroom. Evidence may be shared with the judge electronically from the counsels' tables, and laptops at the counsel tables may be plugged into the court system. Sound quality has also improved. It was a challenge for the court staff to learn the system, but they all liked it once they learned how to use it.

Kristin Jensen from Thurston County Superior Court thanked the BJA for inviting her. Upgrades to an old building have been challenging. Isaac Jarrett with Thurston Superior Court reviewed the courtroom upgrades at that court.

Thurston County Superior Court first identified its goals and how they should use the funds. They addressed connectivity, sound reinforcement, and the ability to share evidence during trials so counsel would be prepared in whatever courtroom they were assigned. The goal was to create a baseline for all courtrooms where either digital or paper evidence would work.

Isaac Jarrett reviewed the cameras added to each room, the sound reinforcement system, and monitors. All the technology connects to the computer at clerk's station, and the clerk starts the remote meetings at that station.

The presenters were asked how they addressed disability challenges. Old courthouses were not built with accessibility in mind, and that has been a challenge. Spokane Superior Court has lapel microphones for interpreters, and the participant requiring an interpreter has a headset. Thurston County Superior court has handheld receivers for earbuds so participants can boost

the audio if someone has hearing issues. The Washington Supreme Court Disability Justice Task Force (DJTF) is working on an accessibility study.

These courts may be used as a model for other courts to see what upgrades are possible and may also be used for future funding justification. Kristin Jensen will be happy to coordinate visits from those who want to see the upgrades in person.

The Remote Proceedings Workgroup would like to include this information in their upcoming survey and discussed having a technology roundtable at their next meeting. Penny Larsen would like to invite today's presenters.

Chief Justice González thanked the presenters.

Courts of the Future: Large Group Discussion

Chief Justice González hopes to identify and promote innovative court programs. He asked the participants what they want to adopt in the courtrooms and what plans they have in the next two or three years.

Participants were asked to discuss two questions:

- What is one thing your court has or wants to implement in the near future?
- How else can courts be responsive to changing needs and issues?
 - The Court of Appeals Division I courtroom lacks ADA access and security. They are currently in the process of making it more accessible, are adding security, and improving audio visual capability for all proceedings.
 - King County has good technology, and is working on x-ray machines.
 - Judge Robertson expressed concern on how to get interpreters to appear in person for court. This is an ongoing problem and more than just a pay issue. Interpreters have no incentive to appear in person when they can book jobs remotely. There was a discussion on how to ensure adequate pay and benefits for interpreters and the need to recruit people into the interpreter profession. Chief Justice González will consult with the Interpreter Commission.
 - Tukwila built a new justice center with a focus on the court customer perspective. The building is accessible, and IT people were involved in the early planning. The courtroom is fully equipped, and court proceedings can be fully remote, hybrid, or in person. Staff can work remotely. They use technology to assist with interpreters, using a robot that goes from courtroom to courtroom. They also produce videos to provide customers with court information. There are a lot of opportunities for courts; the hardest thing is the court business is so traditional that advancement and changes are difficult. Courts will be serving a technically-savvy group of customers with different social skills, and courts need to make justice accessible and inclusive. Before moving to a new facility, Tukwila gave tours to residents to obtain feedback, and also received feedback from colleagues. All feedback was considered in designing the new facility.
 - We need to assess what the issues are. Audio and microphone systems need to be upgraded; Zoom participants have trouble hearing. The accessibility needs to be assessed.

- Interpreters are a significant problem. There needs to be improvement in ADA accessibility. The systems for evidence and how it is processed and viewed is important.

Jeanne Englert invited participants to let her know if there are issues on this subject that they would like discussed or shared at BJA.

BJA Task Forces and Workgroups

Alternatives to Incarceration Task Force

The Task Force will meet on March 27 and discuss funding recommendations from the workgroups. The funding request guide will assist their discussions. On March 18, the Task Force will be working on ideas on how and what to present to judges regarding alternatives. They are starting work on concept papers and focus on the budget. There will be a presentation at the June BJA meeting. Materials were included in the meeting packet.

Remote Proceedings Workgroup

The Workgroup will issue a survey soon that will include questions about technology needs. Penny Larsen posted a link to an article in the Washington State Bar Association *Bar News* (<https://wabarnews.org/2024/03/07/rules-of-the-remote/>). There have been a few comments on the Workgroup's proposed rules. More information will be presented at the May BJA meeting.

Electronic Monitoring and Victim Notification Technology (EMVNT) Work Group

The Workgroup is finalizing best practices for training protocols, and training modules. They plan to have a presentation at the May BJA meeting. Materials were included in the meeting packet.

Standing Committee Reports

Budget and Funding Committee

There was no further report.

Court Education Committee (CEC)

The last CEC meeting was March 13 where they discussed allocation requests. The Executive Committee is editing the policy document and will send a draft to the CEC. It will be reviewed next month and discussed at the April 12 meeting. Materials were included in the meeting packet.

Legislative Committee (LC)

Materials were included in the meeting packet.

Policy and Action Committee (PAC)

Updates on the Anti-Harassment Project were included in the materials. Judge Jewett will discuss three recommendations in response to their survey, including training. The PAC is also discussing an equity assessment tool. They plan to have a presentation at the next BJA meeting.

Interbranch Advisory Committee

The next Interbranch Advisory Committee meeting will be April 19 from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at the Kitsap County Administration Building. The meeting will be live-streamed on TVW.

Information Sharing

Chief Justice González: The American Bar Association and the Rand Corporation developed caseload standards for public defense attorneys. The recommendations were referred to the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) Board to review. The Board voted to adopt the recommendations, and the Supreme Court will now review the recommendations. Some recommendations will require a change in court rules. There may be significant changes statewide with funding requirements.

The Bar Licensure Task Force, led by Justice Montoya-Lewis, made recommendations about future admissions to the Bar and a joint request from the three state law school deans asking to change the cut score until the NextGen test is adopted in July 2026. If the recommendations from the Licensure Task Force are adopted, it will create two pathways to licensure in Washington State. The WSBA will be asked to staff those efforts and make recommendations to the Task Force. The NextGen Bar Exam will be used beginning in the summer of 2026. It is reputed to be a better exam and will reduce disproportionality. There was another motion to address cut score recommendations. That was not adopted but the Task Force did adopt the 266 score which was used during pandemic, and that score will be made retroactive. The cut score for the next iterations of the bar exam will be 266. The NextGen test does not have scoring protocol yet.

Regarding the lack of attorneys in some parts of the state, the law school deans are planning to consider approaches including recruiting from diverse populations, increasing recruitment, and instituting loan forgiveness programs for some kinds of practice. The Office of Public Defense is funding a program that created a recruiting program.

Judge Chung: The Superior Court Judges' Association (SCJA) Spring Conference will be April 28–May 1 in Yakima. A registration e-mail will be sent today. There will be a session on work-life balance, and there will be a relaxed gathering on Monday evening. Judge Chung will be stepping down as SCJA President and Judge Ferrera will be the new president.

Judge Logan: Gonzaga University School of Law held a convening of judges to discuss curriculum changes designed to increase enrollment by making sure students are prepared for next steps and there is more applied skill learning. Cities and counties are sensitive to attorney wage issues and are considering steps to even out pay. Judges are also taking steps to help.

Judge Robertson: King County District Court is planning an April retreat on racial and cultural bias. There will be many speakers, including National Center for State Courts (NCSC) president Mary McQueen. NCSC may be available at no cost to help courts.

As part of the BJA court wellness goal, Kyle Landry is working on two BJA-funded trainings. The first is a statewide de-escalation training from Aperture EQ. Kyle Landry is also in the initial stages of working with the University of Washington School of Law on a seminar on First Amendment Auditors.

Motions

It was moved by Chief Justice Gonzalez and seconded by Judge Scott to approve the February 16, 2024, meeting minutes. The motion carried unanimously with one abstention.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:51 am.

Recap of Motions from the March 15, 2024 Meeting

Motion Summary	Status
Approve the new biennium budget process.	passed
Approve the February 16, 2024 meeting minutes.	passed

Action Items from the February 16, 2024 Meeting

Action Item	Status
The Alternatives to Incarceration Task Force will have a presentation at the June BJA meeting.	
The Remote Proceedings Workgroup will present at the May BJA meeting.	
The Electronic Monitoring and Victim Notification Technology Work Group will have a presentation at the May BJA meeting.	
The Court Education Committee policy document will be discussed at the April 12 meeting.	
The Policy and Action Committee will have a presentation at the next BJA meeting.	
<u>February 16, 2024 BJA Meeting Minutes</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Post the minutes online• Send minutes to the Supreme Court for inclusion in the En Banc meeting materials.	done done

April 4, 2024

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a judge on the Washington Court of Appeals, Division One and write to express my interest in serving on the Civil Legal Aid Oversight Committee as one of the members appointed by the Board for Judicial Administration.

Prior to joining the bench in 2022, I was the Advocacy Director for Columbia Legal Services. In that capacity, I became familiar with the work of the Office of Civil Legal Aid and worked with other civil legal aid organizations to coordinate delivery of legal aid services. Prior to that, I spent a large portion of my legal career engaged in nonprofit legal advocacy on gender justice issues, including legislative advocacy and impact litigation. One highlight of that work was being part of the team that, on behalf of our client Abeda Jafar, secured a unanimous opinion from the Washington Supreme Court holding that courts must waive all fees for indigent litigants under GR 34. Through these experiences, I developed an understanding of the many challenges that low-income Washingtonians face in obtaining assistance with their legal needs – and some possible systemic solutions.

As a former employment law attorney, manager, and professor who has worked with students and developing attorneys for many years, I also have always been interested in the human resources aspect of ensuring competent legal representation. It is in the public interest that attorneys doing the important work of civil legal aid are fairly compensated, trained, and supported.

While I now have a different vantage point as a member of the judiciary, I continue to see the importance of access to competent legal representation. I am very interested in serving on the Oversight committee to bring my experience as a former civil legal aid attorney and to continue contributing to providing robust civil legal aid services to the many who need it.

Thank you very much for considering me for this appointment.

Sincerely,

Janet S. Chung
Washington State Court of Appeals

**Board for Judicial Administration
2024–2025 Meeting Schedule**

All meetings 9:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m. unless otherwise specified

Date	Location
September 20, 2024	TBD
October 18, 2024	TBD
November 15, 2024	TBD

Location - Zoom or SeaTac Location

AOC SeaTac Facility
SeaTac Office Center-South Tower
18000 International Blvd., Suite 1106
SeaTac WA 98188-4251

**Board for Judicial Administration
2025 Meeting Schedule**

Date	Location
February 21	TBD
March 21	TBD
May 16	TBD
June 20	TBD
September 19	TBD
October 17	TBD
November 21	TBD