APPROVED MINUTES	
Committee	**UTAH INDIGENT DEFENSE COMMISSION**
Date, Time Location	**Thursday, April 18, 2024, 2 PM – 4 PM** **370 E South Temple, Suite 500, Salt Lake City, UT 84111. Also, virtually via Zoom.**
Members Present	Chair Lorene Miner Kamalu, Pam Vickrey, Richard Mauro, Michael Drechsel, Casey Hopes, Michael Zimmerman, Tom Ross, Margaret Lindsay.
Members Excused	
Staff	Matthew Barraza, executive director; Leslie Howitt, research & data analyst; Katriina Adair, grant manager; Joshua Buhay, financial analyst; Debra Nelson, Chief Appellate Officer.
Guests	
Agenda Item	**Welcome & Introductions**
	Commissioner Lindsay welcomed the attendees in place of Chair Kamalu as the Chair was running late from another meeting. Matthew asked the attendees to introduce themselves. The IDC Staff and Commissioners introduced themselves.
Agenda Item	**Funding Strategy and Messaging Discussion**
	Matthew Barraza started his presentation on IDC Funding Strategy and Messaging as Chair Kamalu was running late and the Commission did not have a quorum. Matthew Barraza started off the presentation with an overview of the current funding landscape, specifically regarding the FY25 funding granted. Matthew Barraza stated the legislature asked him what the IDC's end goal was when they were asking for funding. He detailed the comparisons with neighboring states' indigent defense programs performed in the original study that resulted in the creation of the IDC. Matthew Barraza said other approaches could be to bring indigent defense spending up to par with prosecution spending or to reach the newly published ABA standards. Commissioner Ross stated there were portions of all three of those options that would make sense to argue. He stated he did notice that legislators feel

	that the IDC had been working for a while but continued to ask for more money each year. He also stated that legislators were looking for reasons not to approve spending increases across the board due to a stricter budget. Commissioner Mauro stated that in Salt Lake County they spent a lot of time discussing what work they did. He continued to say that giving examples of cases where the IDC was able to make a difference, as well as case and time data, might help to convince more people and create a greater understanding in the work that the IDC performs and the results they achieve. Commissioner Lindsay stated she would like to see parity between staffing levels and funding levels between defense and prosecution. She also stated that her office was not notified about fiscal notes to increase prosecution staffing or compensation and so was unable to stay ahead of staffing and compensation disparity. Commissioner Mauro stated that had happened in Salt Lake County twice as well. Commissioner Zimmerman stated that the State funding prosecution and the courts but putting the load on counties when it came to defense was not reasonable or defensible. He continued that arguing that fact would likely be more effective than arguing ABA standards and that the State of Utah is putting its finger on the scale by using state taxpayer dollars for only one side of the court while the other relies on cash strapped local governments exclusively. Commissioner Ross stated there were very few ways to inform Legislators about what was really happening in courts. He continued that using neighboring states as examples would be more effective than non-neighboring states. Commissioner Vickrey said that there was a lot of talk in the legislature about what would the fiscal impact be for the Department of Corrections during discussions about the courts. She continued that when the IDC was initially established it was under the understanding that the yearly funding would need to increase drastically for the State to properly support indigent defense throughout the state. Matthew Barraza discussed the pros and cons around new one-time funding requests being based on the previous year's unfulfilled requests but stated that this strategy appeared to have run its course. He then stated it might be time to go big next year and push hard to educate and inform legislators about the current state of indigent defense in the State of Utah. Commissioner Ross stated that strategy is dependent on the budget year and stated going big would likely lose the IDC more than it would gain in a bad budget year. Commissioner Mauro stated that discussions about parity around full time defense offices has been more successful as counties have a full time managing public defender to communicate with and used Weber County Public Defenders as an example. He continued that the focus should be around bolstering full time offices in Washington and Utah county. Commissioner Zimmerman said when the IDC started, they focused on the constitutionality of defense dysfunction, especially in smaller counties. He

	continued that now the IDC has expanded there is more institutional buy-in now than 10 years ago, but that the State's expansion of courts and prosecution puts defense behind again; He stated that doing so is not maintaining the new and improved status quo the IDC was able to establish and that the best argument will likely be that of parity between these new expansions of prosecution and the funding of indigent defense across Utah. Adam Trupp stated that for smaller counties, directly asking legislators was often very effective. Chair Kamalu stated that when talking with legislators using real stories helped to bring the point home. Matthew Barraza noted that in the past, the IDC had focused on messaging around attorney caseloads and compensation, but that it might be time to change the messaging to how clients are affected by additional funding. He continued that sometimes the IDC was reluctant to spotlight cases due to the legislators not being particularly empathetic towards the plights of those accused of many types of crimes. Commissioner Mauro stated that when giving legislators data they often wanted to know about acquittals as a sign that properly funded defenders can achieve better outcomes and more dismissed cases and less pressure on Corrections. He continued that those metrics were the types of data that people wanted to hear about due to media dramatization and narratives about people falsely convicted of crimes being acquitted. Chair Kamalu wondered if it would be possible and effective to have someone give a short presentation during interim session while legislators are all in one place in a less frantic environment than the normal legislative session. Commissioner Drechsel stated that the IDC should reinforce the discussions legislators are hopefully already having instead of taking on the burden of presenting to legislators. Matthew Barraza moved on to discuss how to tailor the message of the IDC to different audiences. Chair Kamalu stated that it's important to remember why the IDC was created in the first place and that the IDC is a State agency. Commissioner Hopes noted that in Carbon County that there are more public defenders than prosecutors.
Agenda Item	**IDC Representative to Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice and Sentencing Commission**
	Matthew Barraza started discussing statutory changes in CCJJ and the sentencing commission. Previously the IDC did not have a seat on the sentencing commission and CCJJ appointed someone instead. He stated that statute had changed and that seat would now be filled by an Indigent defense attorney appointed by the IDC. Matthew Barraza thanked Commissioner Zimmerman for his presence on the board for the last year. He

	stated that the IDC staff's choice was Richard Mauro due to his years of experience and his advocacy for public defenders, which Commissioner Zimmerman seconded. The motion was passed unanimously. Commissioner Mauro thanked everyone in the Commission for their advocacy and work to support indigent defense throughout the state.
Agenda Item	**Other Business/Public Comment**
	No other business.
Adjourn	**Chair Kamalu adjourned the meeting.**
Next Meeting	May 16th, 2024.
	Meeting adjourned.