

DRAFT

INDIANA PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION

March 24, 2023

2:00 PM

**309 W. Washington, 5th Floor, Commission Conference Room
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204**

Members in attendance:

Mark W. Rutherford, Chair (in person)
Ms. Bernice Corley (remote)
Hon. Mary Ellen Diekhoff (remote)
Hon. Kelsey B. Hanlon (remote)
Mr. David J. Hensel (in person)
Rep. Ryan Lauer (in person)
Hon. Steven P. Meyer (in person)
Sen. Gregory G. Taylor (remote)

Members absent:

Ms. Samantha DeWester
Rep. Ragen Hatcher
Sen. Eric Koch

Staff in attendance:

Derrick Mason (in person)
Andrew Cullen (in person)
Paula Diaz (in person)
Andrew Falk (remote)
Linda Hunter (in person)
Jennifer Pinkston (remote)

Audience members:

Jim Abbs, Noble County Chief Public
Defender and President, Chiefs
Association (remote)
Ray Casanova, Marion County Public
Defender Agency (in person)
Gretchen Etling, Vigo County Chief
Public Defender (remote)
Lisa Moody, Gibson County Chief Public
Defender (remote)

At 2:00 p.m., Chair Mark Rutherford called the meeting to order. Introductions were made and it was established that a quorum was present. Ms. Corley stated that she had to leave at 2:45 p.m. and requested that agenda item 7 be discussed before that time.

1. Approval of Minutes of the December 14, 2022 Meeting

There were no changes to the minutes. Judge Meyer moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Hensel seconded the motion. There were no objections, and the motion carried unanimously.

2. Approval of Amended Comprehensive Plan: Dekalb County

Mr. Mason reported that Dekalb County has updated its Comprehensive Plan. The changes were highlighted in the materials provided to Commission members. Most of the changes were technical amendments, such as updating the hourly rate to \$100 per hour, changing felony “classes” to “levels,” making changes to conflict counsel appointments, etc. The biggest change, he noted, was the creation of a deputy chief public defender position, which would be paid the same as a chief deputy prosecutor. Mr. Mason recommended approval of the amended plan.

Ms. Corley moved to approve the Dekalb County Amended Comprehensive Plan. Judge Meyer seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Judge Meyer asked if the Commission expected counties to reimburse defenders at the hourly rate of \$100 per hour for time driving plus their mileage. Mr. Mason responded that it was a good question that has come up before. The Commission only regulates the hourly rate, he said, and it is left up to the county whether to also reimburse mileage.

3. Financial Status of Public Defense Fund & Title IV-E Reimbursements

Mr. Mason provided the Commission with the financial status of the public defense fund as well as the state of Title IV-E reimbursements. He noted that most counties have only received Title IV-E reimbursements for two quarters, but the Commission was still able to send \$554,778.08 to the counties during that time. He also clarified that the Title IV-E

reimbursements are from the Federal government, and not the Commission's own Title IV reimbursement.

Mr. Mason stated that the Commission asks the counties how they use the Title IV-E funds. Many counties have not yet spent the money. Of those who have, most have spent it on public defense. One county used the money for vaping education for high school students.

Mr. Mason reported that the Public Defense Fund was sufficient to pay the reimbursement requests. The Commission also has available \$2.4 million for At-Risk Youth and Family related expenses.

Ms. Corley asked how the Commission knows whether the funds have been spent and why the Commission wants to know how Title IV-E funds are spent. Mr. Mason responded that the Commission required the counties to state how they used the funds, and all the counties have responded. The Commission asked how the funds are used so the Commission can tell the Legislature how the money is used.

4. Status of County Compliance

a. Howard & Vanderburgh County Letter Follow-up

Mr. Mason informed the Commission that after the Commission's December meeting, Commission staff sent (non-formal 90-day) letters to Howard and Vanderburgh counties regarding outstanding salary parity issues. Howard County just reported that it would be addressing its pay parity issues at the April County Council meeting, and the Howard County Chief Public Defender stated that he believed the issue would be resolved. Mr. Mason suggested that the Commission could wait and see what the County Council does, or it could take preemptive action.

Judge Meyer stated that he did not see any harm in sending a letter to the Council, reiterating what the Council needed to do, and recognizing the county's efforts to comply. After brief discussion, Judge Meyer moved to send such a letter. Ms. Corley seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and no objections. The motion carried.

Mr. Mason reported that Vanderburgh has not provided a proposal for pay parity in 2024, but the county is speaking with Commission staff. The county has asked for salaries of

comparable counties around the state. The Commission reported to the county that most public defender salaries are between \$75,000 and \$100,000 per year, with the average in the mid-\$80s. Counties that pay in that salary range have identified fewer problems with attorney recruitment and retention. Delaware County was in a situation similar to Vanderburgh County, with unfilled positions and with losses of attorneys to DCS, but it raised its salaries to \$100,000 and it believes that increase will resolve its issues. Mr. Mason recommended that anyone whose counties might be dealing with similar issues talk to Commission staff and ask about the salary comparison study. He did not recommend further Commission action, and none was taken.

To accommodate Ms. Corley's earlier request, the Chair elected to discuss the Marion County Support Staff issue next, Agenda Item number 7.

7. New Standard Request

a. Cont'd From 12/14/2022 Mtg: Marion County Support Staff Pay Parity Request

Mr. Mason reported that, as requested at the last Commission meeting, Commission staff drafted and sent a letter to the Marion County Public Defender Agency (MCPDA) for their use in attempting to increase support staff funding. Mr. Mason stated that he did not know how or whether MCPDA had used the letter.

Mr. Mason further informed the Commission that Commission staff surveyed Commission counties that have support staff. Twenty-four of the 31 surveyed counties provided responses. He provided the following summary of the responses:

Existence of a Salary Ordinance for Support Staff:

17 counties had an ordinance

7 Counties did not have an ordinance

Of the 17 Counties With an Ordinance:

- Ten (10) report that their support staff are paid the same and are neutral on a standard change
- Three (3) report that their support staff are paid less than prosecutorial staff due to the county classifying the positions differently
 - One (1) is appealing the classification of their staff to the county
 - All three (3) are neutral on a standard change
- Three (3) report that their support staff are paid more due to different classifications by the county
 - Two (2) oppose a standard that might lower compensation
 - One (1) is neutral

- One (1) reports they don't know if they are equally paid but that the county classifies the positions differently and would support a standard change

Of the Seven (7) Counties Without an Ordinance:

- Six (6) report that their support staff are paid less than prosecutorial staff
 - Three (3) report this is due to how the county classifies the positions
 - Three (3) do not say whether classification is or is not the issue
 - All support a standard change
- One (1) reports that their support staff are paid more than prosecutorial staff and opposes a standard change

Miscellaneous:

- The counties generally report that outside consultants are hired to classify positions
- Some counties report that prosecutors report all positions as “investigators” regardless of what they do which makes the public defense “secretaries” inherently classified lower
- Sometimes, even the hours worked in the positions are different (35 vs. 40) within the county
- Not all counties agree that all positions are comparable

Mr. Mason recommended to the Commission a middle-ground approach to the solution: allow counties to amend their comprehensive plans to require staff pay parity. He reasoned that such an approach would allow counties to maintain their autonomy as to whether they wished to be bound by staff pay parity standards. If the county were to so amend their comprehensive plan, the Commission would require the county to enforce it to receive reimbursement.

Ms. Corley reminded the Commission that the Public Defender Council did vote in favor of creating a solution to this problem. She reacted favorably to Mr. Mason’s proposal. The Chair recognized Mr. Casanova and allowed him to speak for MCPDA. Mr. Casanova stated that a compensation study was completed and that as a result their support staff did receive a salary increase such that their salaries are similar to the prosecutor’s office. It did not help social workers, however, since the prosecutor’s office does not employ social workers. MCPDA is now heavily focused on moving to the new Criminal Justice Center, which is taking a lot of time. He said the Agency has considered a change in the county’s comprehensive plan. He also noted the mayoral primary election in May. Mr. Casanova requested that the topic be tabled until the June Commission meeting. Mr. Abbs stated a concern that if counties begin to amend their comprehensive plans to include support staff pay parity, uniformity would be lost. He expressed skepticism that a provision in the

comprehensive plan would be sufficient to achieve the desired ends. Judge Hanlon expressed similar concerns, wondering if a county were in compliance with the Commission's standards but not in compliance with its own self-imposed requirements, would the Commission suspend reimbursement. Mr. Mason responded that when 90-day letters are sent, they are based on what counties require in their comprehensive plans. The Commission has been training county boards to manage their comprehensive plans for their county's needs, and the Commission is duty-bound to enforce what is in the county's comprehensive plan. There were no objections to tabling the issue, and the issue was tabled until the June meeting.

b. Chief PD Request: Reduction of Support Staff Requirements

Mr. Mason introduced a second staffing issue: the Chief's Public Defender Association has requested that the Commission reduce its adequately staffed requirement from .75 staff for every attorney to .5 staff for every attorney. The Chiefs are concerned due to the likelihood that many counties may need to hire additional attorneys in 2024 to meet the revised caseload standards, which under the current staffing requirements could also require staffing hires or lead to the denial of reimbursement requests.

Mr. Mason recommended that Commission staff study the issue, as he would like to further evaluate the issue. In return, Mr. Mason agreed that the Commission would not suspend any reimbursement in 2024 solely for inadequate staffing.

Mr. Abbs said he has been raising this issue since 2008. He noted that the .75 staffing requirement is the oldest standard the Commission has; it dates to 1994, before computers were commonly used and before many changes were made in how attorneys practice. He stated that the Chiefs are the experts that the Commission should be considering. He said it is fine for the Commission to study it if there will be no repercussions in 2024 but urged the Commission to study it carefully.

Mr. Mason said he would like to study this because there are differences of opinion about what types of support staff are necessary—investigators, social workers, paralegals, etc.—and how counties may individualize their staffing needs.

Sen. Taylor moved to adopt Mr. Mason's recommendation and study the issue, report back at the September meeting, and give counties grace in 2024. Mr. Hensel seconded the motion. There were no objections and the motion carried.

Having concluded the discussion of Agenda Item number 7, the Chair continued the regular order of business and resumed with Agenda Item number 4b.

4. Status of County Compliance

b. Individual and Multi-County Compliance Updates

Mr. Mason reported that the biggest caseload compliance issue is a multicounty attorney issue, noted that it may take a year to resolve, but did not recommend any Commission action. There were no other concerns and no need for any 90-day letters.

5. Requests for Reimbursement:

a. 50% Reimbursement in Death Penalty Cases

Mr. Mason stated that some of the Clinton County capital reimbursement requests are late due to the need to work through certain overpayment and double-payment issues. Despite the fact the requests were late, Mr. Mason recommended reimbursement of all requests (see table below). There were no questions or concerns. Judge Meyer moved to grant the reimbursement requests. Sen. Taylor seconded the motion. There were no objections, and the motion carried.

INDIANA PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION

Reimbursement Requests in Capital Cases

March 24, 2023

COUNTY	DEFENDANT	TOTAL
Clinton	Ferrell	\$56,302.43
Marion	Dorsey	\$6,978.00
TOTAL		\$63,280.43

LATE CLAIMS

Clinton	Ferrell	\$17,014.65
TOTAL		\$80,295.08

b. 40% Reimbursement in Non-Capital Cases

Mr. Mason reported that Pike County had no reimbursement requests for the fourth quarter of 2022. An initial investigation revealed nothing of concern. For the first time, each of the three counties in the WCIPDO submitted their requests for reimbursement collectively. The quarter was the highest ever: a total of \$9,006,575.45 (see table below). There were no questions or comments. Mr. Hensel moved to approve the reimbursement requests. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. There were no objections, and the motion carried.

INDIANA PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION

Fourth Quarter 2022 Requests for Reimbursement in Non-Capital Cases 3/24/23

County	Total Expenditure	Non-reimbursable Adjustment	% Adjusted	Eligible Expenditure	40% Reimbursed	Prior Quarter Adjustments	Total Payment
Adams	\$122,024.27	\$21,676.21	17.76%	\$100,348.06	\$40,139.23		\$40,139.23
Allen	\$1,366,651.69	\$88,992.31	6.51%	\$1,277,659.38	\$511,063.75		\$511,063.75
Benton	\$6,506.38	\$971.88	14.94%	\$5,534.50	\$2,213.80		\$2,213.80
Blackford	\$59,233.30	\$9,070.15	15.31%	\$50,163.15	\$20,065.26		\$20,065.26
Brown	\$61,110.12	\$15,095.19	24.70%	\$46,014.93	\$18,405.97		\$18,405.97
Carroll	\$67,072.57	\$6,633.74	9.89%	\$60,438.83	\$24,175.53		\$24,175.53
Cass	\$183,802.02	\$24,749.34	13.47%	\$159,052.68	\$63,621.07		\$63,621.07
Clark	\$477,991.88	\$28,397.33	5.94%	\$449,594.55	\$179,837.82		\$179,837.82
Clinton	\$110,589.35	\$35,737.79	32.32%	\$74,851.56	\$29,940.63		\$29,940.63
Crawford	\$60,349.12	\$9,385.24	15.55%	\$50,963.88	\$20,385.55		\$20,385.55
Decatur	\$109,313.17	\$21,273.10	19.46%	\$88,040.07	\$35,216.03		\$35,216.03
DeKalb	\$238,492.95	\$21,759.22	9.12%	\$216,733.73	\$86,693.49		\$86,693.49
Delaware	\$395,749.82	\$7,068.09	1.79%	\$388,681.73	\$155,472.69		\$155,472.69
Elkhart	\$904,642.23	\$121,709.49	13.45%	\$782,932.74	\$313,173.10		\$313,173.10
Fayette	\$94,624.65	\$16,974.08	17.94%	\$77,650.57	\$31,060.23		\$31,060.23
Floyd	\$289,153.26	\$14,270.94	4.94%	\$274,882.32	\$109,952.93		\$109,952.93
Fulton	\$85,418.79	\$21,474.75	25.14%	\$63,944.04	\$25,577.62		\$25,577.62
Gibson	\$188,776.26	\$31,666.34	16.77%	\$157,109.92	\$62,843.97		\$62,843.97
Grant	\$291,757.38	\$2,635.88	0.90%	\$289,121.50	\$115,648.60		\$115,648.60
Greene	\$168,131.43	\$34,247.40	20.37%	\$133,884.03	\$53,553.61		\$53,553.61
Hancock	\$259,511.68	\$37,440.70	14.43%	\$222,070.98	\$88,828.39		\$88,828.39
Harrison	\$201,384.60	\$19,817.24	9.84%	\$181,567.36	\$72,626.95		\$72,626.95
Hendricks	\$516,101.71	\$77,665.99	15.05%	\$438,435.72	\$175,374.29	\$(1,006.58)	\$174,367.71
Howard	\$464,064.84	\$35,768.26	7.71%	\$428,296.58	\$171,318.63		\$171,318.63
Jackson	\$261,581.34	\$8,873.49	3.39%	\$252,707.85	\$101,083.14		\$101,083.14
Jasper	\$151,307.41	\$38,490.12	25.44%	\$112,817.29	\$45,126.92		\$45,126.92
Jay	\$158,340.77	\$16,881.28	10.66%	\$141,459.49	\$56,583.80		\$56,583.80
Jefferson	\$198,884.97	\$25,168.18	12.65%	\$173,716.79	\$69,486.72		\$69,486.72
Jennings	\$117,270.64	\$13,071.96	11.15%	\$104,198.68	\$41,679.47		\$41,679.47
Knox	\$211,258.14	\$46,138.27	21.84%	\$165,119.87	\$66,047.95		\$66,047.95
Kosciusko	\$251,904.42	\$102,241.75	40.59%	\$149,662.67	\$59,865.07		\$59,865.07
LaGrange	\$130,558.80	\$23,133.29	17.72%	\$107,425.51	\$42,970.20		\$42,970.20
Lake	\$1,549,255.05	\$6,960.17	0.45%	\$1,542,294.88	\$616,917.95		\$616,917.95
LaPorte	\$281,135.69	\$32,098.92	11.42%	\$249,036.77	\$99,614.71		\$99,614.71
Lawrence	\$305,788.45	\$31,316.82	10.24%	\$274,471.63	\$109,788.65		\$109,788.65
Madison	\$555,596.58	\$15,342.73	2.76%	\$540,253.85	\$216,101.54		\$216,101.54
Marion	\$7,290,573.76	\$540,573.69	7.41%	\$6,750,000.07	\$2,700,000.03		\$2,700,000.03
Martin	\$87,993.59	\$19,224.85	21.85%	\$68,768.74	\$27,507.50		\$27,507.50
Miami	\$172,089.95	\$23,076.80	13.41%	\$149,013.15	\$59,605.26		\$59,605.26
Monroe	\$950,922.56	\$156,823.77	16.49%	\$794,098.79	\$317,639.52		\$317,639.52
Noble	\$300,814.20	\$61,090.48	20.31%	\$239,723.72	\$95,889.49		\$95,889.49
Ohio	\$33,756.12	\$11,957.99	35.42%	\$21,798.13	\$8,719.25		\$8,719.25
Orange	\$130,237.71	\$19,236.10	14.77%	\$111,001.61	\$44,400.64		\$44,400.64
Owen	\$111,868.24	\$14,544.61	13.00%	\$97,323.63	\$38,929.45		\$38,929.45
Perry	\$82,218.92	\$11,017.97	13.40%	\$71,200.95	\$28,480.38		\$28,480.38
Pike	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
Pulaski	\$95,688.13	\$13,663.21	14.28%	\$82,024.92	\$32,809.97		\$32,809.97
Ripley	\$63,837.31	\$17,065.79	26.73%	\$46,771.52	\$18,708.61		\$18,708.61
Rush	\$107,907.04	\$19,533.44	18.10%	\$88,373.60	\$35,349.44		\$35,349.44
Scott	\$200,109.29	\$19,993.61	9.99%	\$180,115.68	\$72,046.27		\$72,046.27
Shelby	\$214,590.58	\$27,507.27	12.82%	\$187,083.31	\$74,833.32		\$74,833.32
Spencer	\$122,251.94	\$34,228.49	28.00%	\$88,023.45	\$35,209.38		\$35,209.38
Steuben	\$131,105.27	\$38,252.88	29.18%	\$92,852.39	\$37,140.96		\$37,140.96
St. Joseph	\$627,457.91	\$65,667.86	10.47%	\$561,790.05	\$224,716.02		\$224,716.02
Sullivan	\$111,278.21	\$24,588.47	22.10%	\$86,689.74	\$34,675.90		\$34,675.90
Switzerland	\$53,352.30	\$11,884.59	22.28%	\$41,467.71	\$16,587.08		\$16,587.08
Tippecanoe	\$983,223.69	\$138,394.51	14.08%	\$844,829.18	\$337,931.67		\$337,931.67
Union	\$16,858.50	\$2,350.50	13.94%	\$14,508.00	\$5,803.20		\$5,803.20
Vanderburgh	\$946,430.83	\$61,957.27	6.55%	\$884,473.56	\$353,789.42		\$353,789.42
Vigo	\$729,076.70	\$120,513.89	16.53%	\$608,562.81	\$243,425.12		\$243,425.12
Wabash	\$137,084.49	\$21,523.89	15.70%	\$115,560.60	\$46,224.24		\$46,224.24
Warren	\$26,833.50	\$3,808.88	14.19%	\$23,024.62	\$9,209.85		\$9,209.85
Warrick	\$169,550.27	\$22,776.33	13.43%	\$146,773.94	\$58,709.58		\$58,709.58
Washington	\$168,562.07	\$25,750.19	15.28%	\$142,811.87	\$57,124.75		\$57,124.75
WCIPDO	\$184,785.51	\$34,364.15	18.60%	\$150,421.36	\$60,168.54	\$(508.07)	\$59,660.47
TOTAL					\$9,008,090.10	\$(1,514.65)	\$9,006,575.45

6. **At-Risk Youth & Family Pilot Submissions**

a. Extension of System Navigator Pilot Projects

Mr. Mason recalled that the Commission has been working with System Navigator Pilot Projects in multiple counties. In one county, the Commission's data reveals an 8% decrease in overall case length and a 30% decrease in the time children are spending outside of the home. At a second site, the preliminary data shows a 25% decrease in overall case length, but he noted there was still insufficient data on length of time children spend outside of the home. The cases need additional time to reach resolution due to the length of typical CHINS and TPR cases.

Because county budgets are due in a few months, Mr. Mason said that the Commission needed to inform the pilots whether the Commission intended to extend the grants. He reiterated that the Commission had approximately \$2.4 million in At-Risk Youth and Family dollars available to spend on programming this biennium. He recommended that the Commission extend the pilot programs for one additional year, through the end of 2024. The estimated cost to extend both pilots for an additional year (assuming some cost increases in 2024) was approximately \$575,000.

Judge Diekhoff moved to adopt Mr. Mason's recommendation. Mr. Hensel seconded the motion. There was no discussion and no objections. The motion carried.

b. Medical-Legal Partnership Pilot (Child Advocates & Riley Hospital)

Mr. Mason noted that across the country, there is a trend to use pre-petition social work and legal efforts to help families avoid DCS involvement. Although the Commission approved this type of pilot program in 2021, so far, no such programs have been realized.

Another approach of even more recent origin has been a partnership between medical legal efforts. Child Advocates, a local non-profit organization, and Riley Hospital are beginning a pilot medical-legal partnership here. The two-year pilot would initially hire a Child Advocates lawyer and social worker and a Riley social worker to provide families involved in Riley's High-Risk Neonatal Clinic with access to legal and social work support to prevent future DCS involvement. Child Advocates has also agreed to accept referrals from outside Riley Hospital as time allows. The proposal provides for a second Riley social

worker to be hired in the second year to allow growth. The two-year request is for a maximum of \$659,981.27.

Mr. Mason recommended that the Commission approve the pilot with the stated maximum budget. Commission staff will continue to finalize financial and data collection details.

Judge Meyer asked where the funds for the pilot would come from. Mr. Mason stated that they would come from the At-Risk Youth and Family fund. Mr. Hensel stated that it sounded like a great program. Judge Meyer moved to approve Mr. Mason's recommendation. Judge Hanlon seconded the motion. There were no objections, and the motion carried.

c. Child Advocates CHINS & TPR Mediation Proposal

Child Advocates is also advancing a second program, Mr. Mason stated, that would allow it to hire mediators and a paralegal to mediate CHINS and TPR cases in Hancock and Madison counties. He has some questions about the data collection process, but Commission staff would work with the organization to refine the data collection. He also stated that he did not believe two staff members needed to be hired, and he noted that the organization does not have letters of support from the counties. Nevertheless, he recommended that the Commission approve the concept of the pilot with a maximum budget of \$504,140.76 while the data, financial, and public defender support components are resolved to the Commission's satisfaction.

Judge Meyer said that he would like to see Child Advocates expand the mediation program to additional counties. Mr. Mason agreed, stating that the programs should be open to others also.

Mr. Hensel moved to adopt the staff recommendation. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. There were no objections and the motion carried.

8. Local Public Defender Board Appointments

Mr. Cullen reported that the six Commission appointments to the county public defender boards are consensus candidates. Commission staff are still working to make

appointments in two counties. Mr. Hensel moved to approve all the consensus candidates. Judge Meyer seconded the motion. There were no objections, and the motion carried.

9. Approval of Trial Substitution Course

Mr. Mason reported that an attorney has approached the Commission with a request to approve the 2019 National Defender Training Project's Trial Advocacy Program as a substitute for one of two required felony jury trials required to handle Level 1-4 felonies under Standard E. Mr. Mason recommended that the Commission approve the course to count for one of the two felony jury trials under Standard E.

Rep. Lauer moved to approve the staff recommendation. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. There were no objections, and the motion carried.

10. Legislative & Policy Updates

Mr. Cullen first provided a brief overview of the Commission's efforts to fund misdemeanor reimbursement. He noted that the idea was twice approved by House interim committees and once by a Senate interim committee and that the Governor approved it and included it in his budget. Nevertheless, despite the Commission's efforts, including speaking to every member of the House Ways and Means Committee, that committee removed the misdemeanor language and reduced the Commission's overall budget. The Chair of the Ways and Means Committee said it would not be a huge impediment if the provision were added back in during the Senate process, but it was just not one of the House's priorities. The Commission has been working hard in the Senate to restore the language.

In other legislation, Sen. Bohacek has proposed legislation (SB 26) creating a new right to counsel for unlicensed relative caregivers in CHINS/TPR actions. Commission staff believe this would have a minor fiscal impact. Sen. Jon Ford has a Bill (SB 484) that would provide counsel to juveniles fourteen years and older in CHINS/TPR cases. Commission staff is talking to Sen. Ford about running a pilot program due to the larger fiscal and policy impact of SB 484.

Judge Meyer mentioned there was a great article in the Indiana Lawyer discussing Mr. Cullen's work. Mr. Cullen noted that it was a team effort and thanked everyone for their assistance.

Mr. Cullen indicated that the Chief Public Defender Retirement Bill has passed out of the House, having fully funded it, with only one 'no' vote and is working its way through the Senate. The Indiana Prosecuting Attorneys Council, which originally opposed the legislation, now supports it. Mr. Abbs stated he is cautiously optimistic and thanked Mr. Cullen for all his efforts. The Chair stated that he appreciated the table format for the legislation.

11. Other Matters

There were no other matters and no objections to adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:20 p.m.