# Indigent Defense Update

August 24, 2009



#### Indigent Defense

- Focus Issues:
  - Conflict Panel Control Costs
  - Ability to Pay Increase Revenue
  - Cost of Indigent Defense



#### Indigent Defense Budget

- No Conflict Panel Reductions made to address Tier 1 or Tier 2
  - Based on Staff "Furlough" Value
- Tier 3 Reduction
  - Identified as % of Net County Cost
  - Tier 3 Target for Indigent Defense Budget \$58,417



- Currently 10 Contract Attorney's \$794,000
  - \$6,612 monthly (\$79,344 annually per attorney)
    - Three Year Agreement July 1, 2008 June 30, 2011
    - No increase in compensation for 3 year term
      - Prior agreement included a 7% increase each year
      - Increase was not included in recognition of County Budget problem
      - FY 05-06 \$5,775 & FY 06-07 \$6,179
    - Fiscal Out Clause 60 days notice



- CAO Recommendation from June 18, 2009
  - Reduce Panel Compensation 10%
  - \$5,951 Monthly (Diff of \$661/Mo)
  - Reduce Number of Panel Attorneys
    - From 10 to 8
- Projected 09-10 Savings at this point in time \$60,000



- CAO Recommendations August 24, 2009
  - Reduce Panel Compensation 10%
    - If only this option approved, FY 2009-10 Savings approx \$60,000
    - Future Full Year Year savings of \$79,320 based on 10 Attorneys
  - Reduce Number of Panel Attorneys
    - From 10 to 7 Increase of 1 from June 18, 2009 due to continuing budget shortfalls
    - Invoke the 60 Day Fiscal Out Clause
    - Cancelled Attorney's will go into Hold Over Status and be paid at \$70/hr while finishing open cases. Savings will not be recognized in FY2009-10 due to Hold Over.
    - Hold Over could continue into future fiscal year



- Next Steps
  - Letters to Conflict Attorneys By end of August
    - 10% Reduction
    - 60 Day Notice
  - Prepare Amendments for 10% Reduction
  - Distribute to Attorneys for signature
  - Discussions with Judges to identify how many attorneys to eliminate and who
  - Coordination with Courts for assigning conflict cases with reduced number of Attorneys



Discussion and Questions



- Activity Since October 2008
  - Judges have ordered in excess of \$20,000 in fees
    - Public Defender spoke with Judges in October 2008 about ordering fees
    - Confirmed through data received from Courts
  - Revenue received from ordered fees FY 2008-09
    - \$8,708 between Public Defender & Indigent Defense budget
  - Question How do we generate more revenue to offset the cost of defense?



- Revenue Recovery (RR) pilot program.
  - Effective July 1, 2009
  - Judge Bailey's court in South Lake Tahoe
    - Review defendants ability to pay
    - Making recommendation to the Judge
      - Can't pay
      - Could pay a minimal fee
      - Could pay full attorney cost
      - Can get their own representation



- Between July 1 & August 19, 2009
- 82 Interviewed
- RR Recommended:
  - 39 Can't pay
    - Determined be below the Federal Poverty Guideline level
  - 36 Could pay a minimal fee (\$100/\$300)
  - 2 Could possibly pay the full Attorney Cost
  - 5 Could get their own representation



- How was the Revenue Recovery Recommendation determined?
  - Defendant completes financial statement developed by Courts
  - RR reviews with defendant and makes determination
  - Consideration for Federal Poverty Guidelines



- Pilot Program Considerations:
  - Did the Judge take RR recommendation?
    - Follow up is required to answer the question
    - A longer period of analysis by Revenue Recovery is needed in order to get a larger sampling to determine if the pilot is effective
    - Additional Courts may need to be added
  - What fee structure should be assessed?

Misdemeanor \$100

Felony \$300

• Other? \$500



- Collections Prior to July 1, 2009
  - The \$20,000+ ordered by the Courts is also being collected thru the Courts and remitted to the County monthly.
  - Fees ordered for services such as Probation fees and Public Defender fees are low in the order of collection as defined by State Legislation
- Need to evaluate other counties charges



Discussion and Questions



- Two individual budgets
  - Public Defender
  - Conflict Attorneys separate from Public Defender



- Examples of County Models
  - County Public Defender office & Contract Attorneys
  - County Public Defender office & County Alternate Defense office
  - County Public Defender office & Alternate
    Defense office & Contract Attorneys
  - All Contracted out



- Measuring Cost for Indigent Defense
  - The previous slide suggests 4 examples of different models found in California Counties
  - When comparing what each County is doing it is difficult to always compare apples to apples
  - Question What is the more relevant comparison
     cost per case or per capita? Both have been suggested in previous discussions



- Measuring Per Capita
  - Static population is one factor in determining how many defendants may need services
  - Other population related factors may include:
    - Crime statistics
    - Transient population
    - Seasonal Employment
    - Relative wealth of population either in County or in specific geographic area within County



- Measuring Cost per Case
  - Caseload is a measure of workload
  - Relating caseload to filings recognizes system relationship of Public Defender to District Attorney
  - Types of cases can affect cost i.e. death penalty



- Public Defender Office Model
  - Cost for defense includes more than just attorneys
    & overhead (clerical, office space, supplies)
  - Other costs may include:
    - Investigation
    - Expert Witnesses
    - Drug and Alcohol Testing
    - Medical Examinations
    - Psychiatric Evaluations
    - Number of Court Locations serviced



- Conflict Panel Attorneys Model
  - Cost for defense includes more than just attorneys
  - County gives no consideration for overhead.
  - County DOES bear other costs such as:
    - Investigation
    - Expert Witnesses
    - Drug and Alcohol Testing
    - Medical Examinations
    - Psychiatric Evaluations
    - Other



- Contracting out Model
  - Contracts with law firms may not include the "Other" costs
  - Contracts may not include defense of capital cases
  - Unless contract is "all inclusive" the base cost of the contract will not tell the story.
  - Cost of defense ends up costing more once all costs are factored in



- How do we compare apples to apples?
  - The CAO's office has established the following criteria for conducting a comparison of cost among counties:
    - A reliable data source consistent among all counties
      - Auditor's Final Budget Document. Submitted to the State Controller's Office
      - Population Data CSAC Website as of January 2008
    - Static verifiable data
      - Actual, NOT budget from the Schedule 9
    - Relevant time period
      - 2007-08 First full year actuals available in Schedule 9
      - Personnel Allocations obtained from the Auditor's Final Budget Document



- Placer County Model 3 Contracts
  - Primary Contract
    - 27 Attorneys plus 2 independent contractor attorneys (total 29)
    - 8006 Cases (276 per attorney, \$516 per case)
    - Base Contract of \$4,333,650
    - Contract does not include investigation, experts or other ancillary expenses
    - Contract limited to one death penalty case
    - County bears full expense for multiple death penalty prosecutions
  - Other County Budgeted Costs Include

Investigation	\$142,000
Professional Services	\$100,000
Medical	\$150,000
Drug & Alcohol Testing	\$ 39,000
<ul><li>Total</li></ul>	\$431.000



- Placer County Model Continued:
  - #2 Contract First Tier Conflicts
    - 9 Attorneys
    - Approx. 1200 Cases
    - Base Contract of \$1,364,953 (Fixed Gets paid even if no cases come in)
    - Contract includes investigation for non-murder cases
    - Does not include experts, testing, transcription or investigation for murder trials
    - Death Penalty cases are outside of contract



- Placer County Model Continued:
  - #3 Contract Second Tier Conflicts
    - 4 Attorneys
    - Approx. 100 Cases
    - Base Contract of \$342,487
    - Contract includes investigation
    - Contract does not include experts, testing and other ancillary costs
    - Death Penalty cases are outside of contract



- Placer County Model Continued:
  - Total for Placer County
    - 42 Attorneys
    - 9306 Cases

Contracts Total \$6,041,090

Ancillary Costs Total \$ 431,000

- Total \$6,472,090

Death Penalty cases are outside of contract



- Cost in El Dorado County
  - 22 Attorneys (14 Public Defender + 10 Contract)
- 2008 Actuals
  - Approximately 7000 Cases Combines
  - Conflict Panel Total \$1,321,450
  - Public Defender Total \$3,068,000
    - Total \$4,389,450
  - Ancillary Costs Total \$ 617,588 (Included above)
  - 2 Death Penalty cases currently in Public Defenders Office
  - 1 Death Penalty done by outside counsel



- Comparator Counties
  - # of Court Locations
  - Population factored by
    - Size
    - Neighboring

- Population Source CSAC Website updated January 2008
- Court Location Source 2008 California Courts Directory

County	# of Court Locations	Population
El Dorado - PD Office El Dorado - Conflict	5	179,722
Amador - Contracted	1	37,943
Humboldt	2	132,821
Imperial	4	176,158
Kings - Contract	3	154,434
Shasta - PD Office Shasta - Conflict	1	182,236
Placer	6	333,401
Yolo- PD Office Yolo - Conflict	2	199,066
Napa - PD Office Napa - Conflict	2	136,704
Butte	3	220,407

		Public Defender / Indigent Defense								
		FY 2007-08	FY 2007-08	FY 2007-08	# PD	# PD	Total PD		Cases per	
County	Type	Approp.	Revenue	Net Budget	Attorney's	Investigators	Staffing	# Cases	Attny	Cost per Case
El Dorado - PD Office		2,953,686	303,119	2,650,567	14	2	22	6248	446	424
El Dorado - Conflict	Contracted	<u>956,499</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>956,499</u>	<u>10</u> 24					
		3,910,185	303,119	3,607,066	24					
Amador - Contracted	Contracted	655,224	2,849	652,375	4			1450	363	450
Humboldt	PD Office	1,566,270	405,874	1,160,396	9	2	17			
Trambolat	1 5 011100	1,000,270	100,07 1	1,100,000	Ü	_				
Imperial		2,065,538	723,807	1,341,731	14	3	23			
	_									
Kings - Contract	Contract	1,987,568	4,876	1,982,692						
Shasta - PD Office	PD Office	2,896,123	92,984	2,803,139	14	4	25	3597	257	779
Shasta - Conflict	Contract	<u>2,174,558</u>	<u>75,125</u>	2,099,433						
		5,070,681	168,109	4,902,572						
Placer	Contract			6,472,090	42			9306	222	695
Yolo- PD Office	PD Office	4,526,136	245,895	4,280,241	25	4	35	5,600	224	764
Yolo - Conflict	Contract	<u>1,996,611</u>	<u>235,869</u>	<u>1,760,742</u>						
		6,522,747	481,764	6,040,983						
Napa - PD Office	PD Office	3,161,638	1,077,005	2,084,633	14	3	23			
Napa - Conflict	Contract	1,083,939	<u>0</u>	1,083,939						
		4,245,577	1,077,005	3,168,572	14			3597	257	881
Butte	Contract	2,338,792	0	2,338,792	16	Contract				



Comparison based on per capita

County	Population	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	FY 2007-08 Approp.	Per Capita
El Dorado - PD Office El Dorado - Conflict	179,722	PD Office Contracted	2,953,686 <u>956,499</u> 3,910,185	21.76
Amador - Contracted	37,943	Contracted	655,224	17.27
Humboldt	132,821	PD Office	1,566,270	11.79
Imperial	176,158		2,065,538	11.73
Kings - Contract	154,434	Contract	1,987,568	12.87
Shasta - PD Office Shasta - Conflict	182,236	PD Office Contract	2,896,123 <u>2,174,558</u> 5,070,681	27.82
Placer	333,401	Contract		0.00
Yolo- PD Office Yolo - Conflict	199,066	PD Office Contract	4,526,136 <u>1,996,611</u> 6,522,747	32.77
Napa - PD Office Napa - Conflict	136,704	PD Office Contract	3,161,638 <u>1,083,939</u> 4,245,577	31.06
Butte	220,407	Contract	2,338,792	10.61



# Other Information to be Considered

- Independent Study of Neighboring Counties Prepared by District Attorney's Office
  - Per Capita analysis of Prosecution to Defense using neighboring Counties
- January 2007 Study by Santa Clara County evaluating cost of Indigent Defense & Ability to Pay



#### **Action Today**

- Board give direction to implement CAO Recommendation to:
  - Reduce Conflict Panel Compensation by 10%
  - Reduce number of Conflict Panel Attorneys
  - Continue Pilot Program for Ability to Pay



#### **Contracting Out**

- Best way to determine cost of contracting out is to issue an RFP for services
- Need to secure other counties RFPs and outline a scope of service



#### **Further Evaluation**

- Continue to evaluate data regarding the cost of Indigent Defense using caseload as the primary factor
- Better understand revenue shown in other counties Indigent Defense budgets
- Evaluate the nexus between District Attorney and Indigent Defense (PD & Conflict) using caseload to filings as another indicator of cost
- Work with Judges to determine if other opportunities exist for cost savings and efficiency between the County and Courts



# Final Report with recommendations at September Budget Hearings

- Provide estimate on costs of other models
- Provide cost comparison on per case and filings
- Include information on possible issuance of RFP
- Report on RR pilot project



### Indigent Defense

Discussion and Questions