

## Faulk, Camilla

---

**From:** Helen Gerde [helengerde@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 23, 2008 12:55 PM  
**To:** Faulk, Camilla  
**Subject:** CrRLJ 4.1

Dear Supreme Court,

Being a city council member, I would like to express my concerns on the proposed court rule CrRLJ 4.1. Requiring a public defender to be present at arraignments before a court can accept a plea would put an additional and unnecessary financial burden on small city governments. Unfunded mandates placed on the cities means that within our current tight budgets other services to our citizens will need to be reduced. Since there is no constitutional right to an attorney at arraignment, why would the citizens want other important services to be cut to accomplish this.

In our local Camas/Washougal Court, the judge rarely, if ever, allows a 'not guilty' plea from the accused. Why require an additional expense to get the same results. Therefore, I sincerely would hope that the Washington State Supreme Court will take into consideration the budgetary ramifications on cities before approving CrRLJ 4.1.

Sincerely,

Helen Gerde  
Camas City Council Member  
Ward 1, Position 1

---

Back to work after baby– how do you know when you're ready?