

# FISCAL NOTE 2004-047

Ordinance/Motion No. 2004-	
Title:	Ridgway Disappropriations
Affected Agency and/or Agencies:	Current Expense/Law, Safety and Justice Agencies
Note Prepared By:	Beth Goldberg
Note Reviewed By:	James Walsh

Impact of the above legislation on the fiscal affairs of King County is estimated to be:

**Revenue to:**

Fund/Agency	Fund Code	Revenue Source	Current Year 2004	1st Year 2005	3rd Year 2006
Current Expense Fund	CX	CJ Out-Year Mitigation Reserve	\$ 422,567	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 422,567</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

**Expenditures from:**

Fund/Agency	Fund Code	Dept #	Current Year 2004	1st Year 2005	3rd Year 2006
Dept of Judicial Administration	CX	0540	\$ (77,384)	\$ -	\$ -
Office of the Public Defender	CX	0950	\$ (243,712)	\$ -	\$ -
Superior Court	CX	0510	\$ (101,471)	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ (422,567)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

**Expenditures by Categories**

Dept. Name	Fund Code	Dept #	Current Year 2004	1st Year 2005	3rd Year 2006
Staffing	Jud. Admin	0010 0540	\$ (77,384)		
<b>Dept Sub Total</b>			<b>\$ (77,384)</b>		
Staffing	Public Defender	0010 0950	\$ (126,670)		
Technology	Public Defender	0010 0950	\$ (40,621)		
Experts	Public Defender	0010 0950	\$ (76,242)		
Special Master	Public Defender	0010 0950	\$ (179)		
<b>Dept Sub Total</b>			<b>\$ (243,712)</b>		
Staffing	Superior Court	0010 0500	\$ (88,034)		
Jury Costs	Superior Court	0010 0500	\$ (401)		
Equip, Supplies & Fac Mods	Superior Court	0010 0500	\$ (9,500)		
Other	Superior Court	0010 0500	\$ (3,536)		
<b>Dept Sub Total</b>			<b>\$ (101,471)</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ (422,567)</b>		

# 2004-047

## State v. Ridgway Actual Expenditure Reporting Office of Management & Budget

Summary Report  
January 22, 2004 Proviso

### Summary: Expenditures on Items Not in Base Budget

By Agency:	2002		2003		2004		2005		
	Adopted Budget	Actual Expenditures	Total Budget	Expenditure Through October	Executive Proposed Budget	Council Adopted	Revised Budget	Projected Budget	Revised Projection
Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO)	\$ 1,633,564	\$ 1,482,557	\$ 1,267,338	\$ 738,307	\$ 1,181,294	\$ 295,323	\$ 295,323	\$ 613,665	\$ -
Sheriff's Office	\$ 2,153,017	\$ 2,193,923	\$ 1,783,211	\$ 1,949,413	\$ 1,406,677	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,713,838	\$ -
Office of Public Defense (OPD)	\$ 2,694,960	\$ 1,154,028	\$ 4,152,061	\$ 1,678,832	\$ 2,874,085	\$ 318,771	\$ 75,059	\$ 330,744	\$ -
Superior Court/Judicial Admin	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 132,024	\$ 710	\$ 509,067	\$ 178,855	\$ -	\$ 2,658,247	\$ -
<b>By Budget Category:</b>									
Staffing	\$ 2,429,772	\$ 2,135,471	\$ 3,459,986	\$ 2,619,141	\$ 3,698,401	\$ 581,770	\$ 289,682	\$ 2,063,631	\$ -
Technology & Facilities	\$ 2,415,927	\$ 1,907,217	\$ 1,110,890	\$ 980,936	\$ 727,780	\$ 50,121	\$ -	\$ 555,520	\$ -
Expert Services & Trial Costs	\$ 1,412,323	\$ 580,517	\$ 2,632,508	\$ 687,168	\$ 1,420,049	\$ 157,522	\$ 80,700	\$ 720,991	\$ -
Other	\$ 223,519	\$ 207,303	\$ 131,250	\$ 80,016	\$ 124,893	\$ 3,536	\$ -	\$ 74,429	\$ -
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,481,541</b>	<b>\$ 4,830,508</b>	<b>\$ 7,334,634</b>	<b>\$ 4,367,261</b>	<b>\$ 5,971,123</b>	<b>\$ 792,949</b>	<b>\$ 370,382</b>	<b>\$ 3,414,571</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
Savings in 2002 Budget*									

### Summary: Expenditures on Absorbed Costs

By Agency:	2002		2003		2004		2005		
	Absorbed Costs	Actual Expenditures	Absorbed Costs	YTD Expenditure	Executive Proposed Budget	Council Adopted	Revised Budget	Projected Budget	Revised Projection
PAO	\$ 248,259	\$ 248,259	\$ 255,543	\$ 203,977	\$ 264,487	\$ 264,487	\$ -	\$ 138,856	\$ -
Sheriff's Office	\$ 455,967	\$ 455,967	\$ 392,278	\$ 306,564	\$ 263,204	\$ 263,204	\$ 87,018	\$ 218,459	\$ -
OPD	\$ 208,371	\$ 208,371	\$ 358,204	\$ 266,591	\$ 257,218	\$ 257,218	\$ -	\$ 104,802	\$ -
Superior Court/DJA	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 141,763	\$ 10,699	\$ 784,909	\$ 784,909	\$ 87,018	\$ 462,117	\$ -
<b>Total of Absorbed Costs</b>	<b>\$ 912,597</b>	<b>\$ 912,597</b>	<b>\$ 1,147,788</b>	<b>\$ 787,831</b>	<b>\$ 784,909</b>	<b>\$ 784,909</b>	<b>\$ 87,018</b>	<b>\$ 462,117</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

### Summary: Revenues

By Agency:	2002		2003		2004		2005		
	Revenues Budgeted	Revenues Received	Total Revenues Budgeted	Actual Revenues Through October	Executive Proposed	Council Adopted	Revised Budget	Total Revenues Budgeted	Revised Projection
Sheriff's Office <sup>c</sup>	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ 1,063,000.00		\$ 548,175			\$ 548,175	\$ -
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 500,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,063,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 548,175</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 548,175</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

\*This amount is the 2002 budget with the 2002 actuals and carryover to 2003 subtracted.

<sup>b</sup>2003 Staffing Models, including absorbed, loaned, and temporary staff are:

**PAO (10 staff):** 5 attorneys, 4 legal services staff, 1 paralegal. Investigators and administrative staff appear in the Sheriff's Office budget.

**Sheriff's Office (21 staff):** 1 captain, 2 sergeants, 12 detectives, 2 evidence specialists, 1 database manager, 3 administrative staff.

**OPD (23.5 staff):** 8 attorneys, 7.5 investigators, 2 clerks, 6 paralegals.

**Superior Court/DJA:** The judges, bailiffs, court reporters, clerks, and administrative staff involved in the case have other duties as well. Some of the time these staff are dedicating to

<sup>c</sup>The Sheriff's Office was recently notified of a \$2.7 million COPS grant award covering a three-year period. The grant application was submitted in Spring 2002 to cover costs associated with the on-going GRHI. The Sheriff's Office is currently working with the COPS grant office to determine when the three-year period for the grant begins (i.e. in 2002 or 2003).

**State v. Ridgway Actual Expenditure Reporting  
Prosecuting Attorney's Office**

# 2004-047

- 1st Quarter Report - due to Budget Office June 2, 2003
- 2nd Quarter Report - due to Budget Office July 18, 2003
- 3rd Quarter Report - due to Budget Office October 20, 2003
- January 22 Proviso
- 4th Quarter Report - due to Budget Office January 20, 2004

**Summary: Expenditures on Items Not in Base Budget**

	2002		Carryover from 2002	New Appropriation	Total Budget	2003 Proposed				YTD Proj. Expend.	2004 Original Budget	2004 Revised Budget
	Adopted Budget	Actual Expenditures				3rd Quarter YTD Expend.	Oct-03 Actual	Nov-03 Actual	Dec-03 Projected			
Staffing (see detail below)	\$ 294,291	\$ 269,000	\$ -	\$ 649,753	\$ 649,753	\$ 515,805	\$ 47,614	\$ 48,722	\$ 53,168	\$ 665,309	\$ 729,861	\$ 235,623
Technology	\$ 1,244,000	\$ 1,137,091	\$ 71,600	\$ 71,600	\$ 71,600	\$ 179,842	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 199,842	\$ -	\$ -
Experts, Exhibits, Other Trial Costs	\$ 57,773	\$ 40,562	\$ 150,144	\$ 395,841	\$ 545,985	\$ 34,194	\$ 18,642	\$ 6,961	\$ 5,000	\$ 64,797	\$ 451,433	\$ 59,700
Furniture & Equipment	\$ 37,500	\$ 35,904	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,466	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 28,466	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,633,564</b>	<b>\$ 1,482,557</b>	<b>\$ 221,744</b>	<b>\$ 1,045,594</b>	<b>\$ 1,267,338</b>	<b>\$ 738,307</b>	<b>\$ 66,256</b>	<b>\$ 55,683</b>	<b>\$ 98,168</b>	<b>\$ 958,414</b>	<b>\$ 1,181,294</b>	<b>\$ 295,323</b>
Savings in 2002 Budget <sup>a</sup>	\$ (70,737)											

**Detail: Staffing Not in Base Budget**

	2002		Carryover from 2002	New Appropriation	Total Budget	2003 Proposed				YTD Proj. Expend.	2004 Original Budget	2004 Revised Budget
	Adopted Budget	Actual Expenditures				3rd Quarter YTD Expend.	Oct-03 Actual	Nov-03 Actual	Dec-03 Projected			
<b>Attorneys Subtotal<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>\$ 163,042</b>	<b>\$ 153,970</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 256,930</b>	<b>\$ 256,930</b>	<b>\$ 194,864</b>	<b>\$ 21,406</b>	<b>\$ 22,741</b>	<b>\$ 22,074</b>	<b>\$ 261,085</b>	<b>\$ 265,923</b>	<b>\$ 41,250</b>
Sr. Deputy PA 1 - Baird	In base	See below		In base	In base	See below	See below	See below	See below	See below	See below	See below
Sr. Deputy PA 2 - Eakes	In base	See below		In base	In base	See below	See below	See below	See below	See below	See below	See below
Sr. Deputy PA 3 - McDonald	\$ 57,907	\$ 110,488	\$ -	\$ 114,563	\$ 114,563	\$ 90,016	\$ 9,888	\$ 9,738	\$ 9,813	\$ 119,455	\$ 118,573	\$ -
Deputy PA 4 - O'Donnell	\$ 57,907	\$ 29,097	\$ -	\$ 80,620	\$ 80,620	\$ 45,148	\$ 4,960	\$ 6,050	\$ 5,505	\$ 61,663	\$ 83,442	\$ 41,250
Deputy PA 5 - Goodhew <sup>c</sup>	\$ 23,614	\$ 14,384	\$ -	\$ 61,747	\$ 61,747	\$ 59,700	\$ 6,558	\$ 6,953	\$ 6,756	\$ 79,966	\$ 63,908	\$ -
Deputy PA 6 <sup>c</sup>	\$ 23,614	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Legal Services</b>	<b>\$ 39,000</b>	<b>\$ 87,142</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 256,847</b>	<b>\$ 256,847</b>	<b>\$ 188,322</b>	<b>\$ 20,989</b>	<b>\$ 20,923</b>	<b>\$ 20,956</b>	<b>\$ 251,190</b>	<b>\$ 265,836</b>	<b>\$ 109,320</b>
Computer Coordinator	\$ 24,000	\$ 8,820	\$ -	\$ 72,385	\$ 72,385	\$ 52,987	\$ 5,821	\$ 5,873	\$ 5,847	\$ 70,528	\$ 74,919	\$ 38,171
Discovery Coordinator	\$ -	\$ 5,295	\$ -	\$ 65,233	\$ 65,233	\$ 44,986	\$ 5,261	\$ 5,344	\$ 5,303	\$ 60,894	\$ 67,516	\$ 34,501
Legal Services Supervisor	\$ -	\$ 65,223	\$ -	\$ 67,788	\$ 67,788	\$ 50,490	\$ 5,546	\$ 5,462	\$ 5,504	\$ 67,002	\$ 70,160	\$ 36,648
Legal Secretary <sup>d</sup>	\$ 15,000	\$ 7,804	\$ -	\$ 51,441	\$ 51,441	\$ 39,859	\$ 4,361	\$ 4,244	\$ 4,303	\$ 52,767	\$ 53,241	\$ -
<b>Paralegals Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 92,249</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 55,976</b>	<b>\$ 55,976</b>	<b>\$ 39,768</b>	<b>\$ 5,219</b>	<b>\$ 5,058</b>	<b>\$ 5,139</b>	<b>\$ 55,183</b>	<b>\$ 118,102</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
Para 1	\$ 62,249	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55,976	\$ 55,976	\$ 39,768	\$ 5,219	\$ 5,058	\$ 5,139	\$ 55,183	\$ 57,936	\$ -
Para 2 <sup>e</sup>	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,166	\$ -
Para 3 <sup>e</sup>	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Extra Help</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 27,889</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 80,000</b>	<b>\$ 80,000</b>	<b>\$ 92,851</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 5,000</b>	<b>\$ 97,851</b>	<b>\$ 80,000</b>	<b>\$ 85,053</b>

<sup>a</sup>This amount is the 2002 budget with the 2002 actuals and carryover to 2003 subtracted.

<sup>b</sup>The 2002 budget reflects amounts for backfilling these positions with entry- and mid-level staff. The 2003 budget reflects the actual cost of the positions listed.

<sup>c</sup>The 2002 budget for these positions is for a partial year.

<sup>d</sup>See the Sheriff's Office budget for investigative, administrative, and overhead costs associated with the prosecution of the case.

**Expenditures on Absorbed Costs**

	2002		2003					2004 Original Budget	2004 Revised Budget
	Absorbed Costs	Actual Expenditures	Absorbed Costs	3rd Quarter YTD Expend.	Oct-03 Actual	Nov-03 Actual	Dec-03 Projected		
<b>Attorneys</b>									
Sr. Deputy PA 1 - Baird	\$ 130,093	\$ 130,093	\$ 132,757	\$ 106,497	\$ 11,699	\$ 11,521	\$ 11,610	\$ 141,327	\$ 137,403
Sr. Deputy PA 2 - Eakes	\$ 118,167	\$ 118,167	\$ 122,786	\$ 97,479	\$ 10,708	\$ 10,546	\$ 10,627	\$ 129,360	\$ 127,084
<b>Total of Absorbed Costs</b>	<b>\$ 248,259</b>	<b>\$ 248,259</b>	<b>\$ 255,543</b>	<b>\$ 203,976</b>	<b>\$ 22,407</b>	<b>\$ 22,067</b>	<b>\$ 22,237</b>	<b>\$ 270,687</b>	<b>\$ 264,487</b>
				\$ 88,663	\$ 77,750	\$ 120,405			

State v. Ridgway 2003 Estimated Balance and 2004 Budget  
Office of The Public Defender  
January 22, 2004

2004-047

Summary: Expenditures on Items Not in Base Budget

	2002 Adopted Budget	Actual Expenditures
Staffing (see detail below)	\$ 1,130,320	\$ 616,940
Technology	\$ 740,090	\$ 271,861
Experts	\$ 788,800	\$ 237,061
Special Master	\$ 15,750	\$ 3,107
OPD Legal Counsel	\$ 0	\$ 25,059
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,694,960</b>	<b>\$ 1,154,028</b>
Savings in 2002 Budget	\$ 1,540,932	

Detail: Staffing Not in Base Budget

	2002 Adopted Budget	Actual Expenditures
<b>Attorneys Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 504,000</b>	<b>\$ 252,764</b>
Tony Savage (retained by defendant)	NA	See below
Mark Prothro (ACA)	In base	See below
Todd Greenhagen (ACA)	In base	See below
Michelle Shaw	\$ 144,000	\$ 167,890
Eric Lindell*	\$ 90,000	\$ 21,293
Fred Leatherman*	\$ 90,000	\$ 39,791
Dave Roberson*	\$ 90,000	\$ 23,000
Atty 8 (Elliot, Giffith, Zuckerman)*	\$ 90,000	\$ 791
<b>Investigators Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 343,200</b>	<b>\$ 154,887</b>
ACA (1/2 in base budget)	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000
Lead Inv	\$ 76,800	\$ 54,641
Inv 1*	\$ 36,000	\$ 2,873
Inv 2*	\$ 36,000	\$ 57,006
Inv 3*	\$ 33,600	\$ 458
Inv 4*	\$ 33,600	\$ 245
Inv 5*	\$ 33,600	\$ 4,665
Inv 6*	\$ 33,600	\$ -
Inv 7*	\$ 33,600	\$ -
Inv 8*	\$ 25,000	\$ -
Travel	\$ 77,720	\$ 51,774
<b>Clerks Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 47,000</b>	<b>\$ 47,000</b>
ACA	\$ 47,000	\$ 47,000
Transcriptionist	\$ 30,720	\$ 4,774
<b>Subtotal Paralegal<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>\$ 225,400</b>	<b>\$ 157,514</b>
ACA	\$ 63,000	\$ 42,000
Para 1	\$ 33,600	\$ 33,511
Para 2	\$ 33,600	\$ 13,493
Para 3	\$ 33,600	\$ 21,435
Para 4	\$ 33,600	\$ 22,026
Para 5	\$ 28,000	\$ 25,050

\*The 2002 budget for these positions is for a partial year.

Expenditures on Absorbed Costs

	2002 Absorbed Costs	Actual Expenditures
<b>Attorneys</b>	<b>\$ 105,928</b>	<b>\$ 105,928</b>
Tony Savage (retained by defendant)	NA	NA
Mark Prothro (ACA)	\$ 102,443	\$ 102,443
Todd Greenhagen (ACA)		
<b>ACA ADMIN</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Investigators</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
ACA (1/2 in base budget)		
<b>Clerks</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
ACA		
<b>Paralegals</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
ACA		
<b>Total of Absorbed Costs</b>	<b>\$ 208,371</b>	<b>\$ 208,371</b>

<sup>1</sup> The Ridgway Team has more than two paralegals and for reporting purposes has used the total amount paid divided by five. Some paralegals are working full time and some are part-time. The rate of pay for paralegals varies from \$12 to \$30 per hour.  
<sup>2</sup> Absorbed costs for investigator, clerk and paralegal for the first 3 calendar quarters were directly paid under Ridgway Low Org. OPD will transfer these costs out of Low Org. 2/23/04

	2003 Budget				Estimated Total 2003 Expenditure
	Carryover from 2002	New Appropriation	Total Budget	YTD 3rd Quarter Expenditures	
\$	\$ 11,206	\$ 1,530,096	\$ 1,541,302	\$ 702,482	\$ 748,779
\$	\$ 468,229	\$ 331,280	\$ 799,509	\$ 623,733	\$ 695,185
\$	\$ 27,250	\$ 1,763,000	\$ 1,790,250	\$ 350,429	\$ 443,629
\$	\$ -	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 2,188	\$ 5,650
\$	\$ 506,685	\$ 3,645,376	\$ 4,152,061	\$ 1,678,832	\$ 1,823,234

	2003 Budget				Estimated Total 2003 Expenditure
	Carryover from 2002	New Appropriation	Total Budget	YTD 3rd Quarter Expenditures	
\$	\$ 11,206	\$ 1,530,096	\$ 1,541,302	\$ 702,482	\$ 748,779
\$	\$ -	\$ 738,000	\$ 738,000	\$ 265,401	\$ 284,365
\$	\$ -	\$ 147,600	\$ 147,600	\$ 119,511	\$ 130,739
\$	\$ -	\$ 147,600	\$ 147,600	\$ 42,657	\$ 46,543
\$	\$ -	\$ 147,600	\$ 147,600	\$ 62,077	\$ 63,952
\$	\$ -	\$ 147,600	\$ 147,600	\$ 38,243	\$ 40,118
\$	\$ -	\$ 147,600	\$ 147,600	\$ 2,914	\$ 2,914
\$	\$ 11,206	\$ 492,960	\$ 504,166	\$ 180,257	\$ 195,802
\$	\$ -	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 18,148	\$ 21,125
\$	\$ -	\$ 78,720	\$ 78,720	\$ 61,801	\$ 62,585
\$	\$ 1,637	\$ 59,040	\$ 60,667	\$ 1,627	\$ 2,127
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 42,321	\$ 42,540
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 2,518	\$ 2,518
\$	\$ 533	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,573	\$ 3,896	\$ 3,896
\$	\$ 9,046	\$ 59,040	\$ 68,086	\$ 42,095	\$ 51,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 5,112	\$ 5,112
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 1,336	\$ 1,496
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 18,641	\$ 24,792
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 15,106	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 238,183	\$ 240,355
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 47,637	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 47,637	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 47,637	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 47,637	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 47,637	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$ 236,160	\$ 236,160	\$ 960	\$ 3,535
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 48,191
\$	\$ -	\$ 59,040	\$ 59,040	\$ 192	\$ 47,829
\$	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 160	\$ 2,000
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,152	\$ 28,356
\$	\$ -	\$ 62,976	\$ 62,976	\$ 6,151.99	\$ 24,821
\$	\$ -	\$			

## State v. Ridgway Actual Expenditure Reporting Superior Court & Department of Judicial Administration

- 1st Quarter Report - due to Budget Office June 2, 2003
- 2nd Quarter Report - due to Budget Office July 18, 2003
- 3rd Quarter Report - due to Budget Office October 20, 2003
- Special Report - Expenditures thru November 2004
- 4th Quarter Report - due to Budget Office January 20, 2004

### Summary: Expenditures on Items Not in Base Budget

	2003						2004		
	Total Budget	3rd Quarter Expenditures	October Expenditures	November Expenditures	YTD Expenditure	2003 Forecast	Exec Proposed Budget	2004 Total Budget	2004 Anticipated Need
Superior Court	\$ 116,764	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,797	\$ 5,507	\$ 38,704	\$ 405,888	\$ 181,471	\$ -
Staffing	\$ 69,846	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,431	\$ 292,792	\$ 88,034	\$ -
Jury	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92,116	\$ 401	\$ -
Upgrades to Facilities & Technology	\$ 46,918	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,589	\$ 5,299	\$ 33,850	\$ 17,480	\$ 9,500	\$ -
Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 208	\$ 208	\$ 423	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,536	\$ -
<b>Department of Judicial Administration *</b>	<b>\$ 15,260</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,153</b>	<b>\$ 103,179</b>	<b>\$ 77,384</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
Staffing	\$ 15,260	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,153	\$ 100,179	\$ 77,384	\$ -
Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 132,024</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 4,797</b>	<b>\$ 5,507</b>	<b>\$ 39,857</b>	<b>\$ 509,067</b>	<b>\$ 178,855</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

Detail: Items Not in Base Budget									
	2003 Total Budget	3rd Quarter Expenditures	October Expenditures	November Expenditures	YTD Expenditure	2003 Forecast	2004 Exec Proposed Budget	2004 Total Budget	2004 Anticipated Need
Superior Court - Staffing	\$ 69,846	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,797	\$ 5,507	\$ 4,431	\$ 292,792	\$ 88,034	\$ -
Judge	In base	See below			See below	See below	In base	In base	In base
Bailiff	In base	See below			See below	See below	In base	In base	In base
Court Reporter	In base	See below			See below	See below	In base	In base	In base
Facilities Specialist	In base	See below			See below	See below	In base	In base	In base
Computer Services Staff	In base	See below			See below	See below	In base	In base	In base
Pro Tem Judges	\$ 6,708	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Bailiff Overtime	\$ 1,104	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 58,547	\$ 40,034	\$ -
Pro Tem Bailiffs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,415	\$ -	\$ -
Computer Services Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,571	\$ 34,599	\$ -	\$ -
Pro Tem Court Reporter	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Assistant / Staff Overtime	\$ 15,473	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,164	\$ 48,000	\$ 48,000	\$ -
Law Clerk/Contract Attorney	\$ 44,377	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 54,095	\$ -	\$ -
Temp / OT - Facilities Specialist & Facilities Mgmt (DCFM)	\$ 2,184	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,696	\$ 71,867	\$ -	\$ -
Temp - Jury Coordinator	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,097	\$ -	\$ 0
							\$ 14,172	\$ -	\$ 0
DJA - Staffing	\$ 15,260	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,153	\$ 100,179	\$ 77,384	\$ -
Clerk	In base	See below			See below	See below	In base	In base	In base
Supervisor & Clerk Overtime	In base	See below			See below	See below	In base	In base	In base
Pro Tem Clerk / Clerk OT	\$ 5,214	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 246	\$ 45,076	\$ 21,076	\$ -
0.50 Pro Tem Clerk	\$ 3,210	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,888	\$ 23,888	\$ -
Computer Services Staff OT	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 619	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
0.50 Pro Tem Office & Exhibit Room Support / Staff OT	\$ 6,836	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 288	\$ 31,215	\$ 32,420	\$ -
Superior Court - Jury	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92,116	\$ 401	\$ -
Jury Summons: postage & processing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ -
Jury Fees & Mileage	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 89,715	\$ 0	\$ 0
Additional phone line	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 401	\$ 401	\$ -
Superior Court - Facilities & Technology Upgrades	\$ 46,918	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,589	\$ 5,299	\$ 33,850	\$ 17,480	\$ 9,500	\$ -
Computer Upgrades: jury room, judge, staff	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 710	\$ 710	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Data lines, printer, copy machine, fax	\$ 10,918	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,980	\$ -	\$ -
Modifications to expand jury box	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,500	\$ 4,500	\$ 0
Modifications to expand courtroom security	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 0
Other courtroom modifications	\$ 1,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Wiring & monitor for press room, overflow/family room	\$ 13,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,262	\$ 3,262	\$ 13,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Equipment Rental - Audio, P/A & KCTV	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,327	\$ 1,327	\$ 20,140	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Superior Court - Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 208	\$ 208	\$ 423	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,536	\$ -
Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 153	\$ 153	\$ 368	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,536	\$ -
Travel & Subsistence	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DJA - Other	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 0
Clerk's Papers	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Exhibit Storage	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 0

The Superior Court and DJA had no supplemental expenditures in 2002 for this case.

\* Note, DJA 2004 appropriation will be reduced to \$26,096 (by 75%) when the technical corrections ordinance is implemented.

### Expenditures on Absorbed Costs

	2003						2004		
	Absorbed Costs	3rd Quarter Expenditures	October Expenditures	November Expenditures	YTD Expenditure	2003 Forecast	Total Budget	2004 Total Budget	2004 Anticipated Need
Superior Court-Staffing	\$ 30,493	\$ 1,206			\$ 5,427	\$ 25,411	\$ 60,986	\$ 60,986	\$ -
Judge	\$ 28,391	\$ 44			\$ 1,968	\$ 3,948	\$ 51,757	\$ 51,757	\$ -
Bailiff	\$ 36,330	\$ -			\$ 536	\$ 10,955	\$ 72,067	\$ 72,067	\$ -
Court Reporter	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 5,604	\$ 5,604	\$ 7,247	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Staff	\$ 16,584	\$ -			\$ -	\$ 1,292	\$ 16,916	\$ 16,916	\$ -
Facilities Specialist	\$ 726	\$ -			\$ 65	\$ 4,529	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Computer Services	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DJA-Staffing	\$ 22,683	\$ -			\$ 2,162	\$ 26,463	\$ 45,365	\$ 45,365	\$ -
Clerk	\$ 5,800	\$ -			\$ -	\$ 8,400	\$ 9,600	\$ 9,600	\$ -
Supervisor & Clerk Overtime	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Superior Court-Jury	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ 527	\$ 527	\$ -
Jury Summons	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Superior Court - Travel & Subsistence	\$ -	\$ -			\$ 540	\$ 540	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Superior Court-Upgrades	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Computer Upgrades-jury room, judge & staff	\$ 756	\$ -			\$ 756	\$ 756	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total of Absorbed Costs</b>	<b>\$ 141,763</b>	<b>\$ 1,251</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 5,604</b>	<b>\$ 17,059</b>	<b>\$ 89,541</b>	<b>\$ 257,218</b>	<b>\$ 257,218</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

Norm Maleng  
Prosecuting Attorney

W554 King County Courthouse  
516 Third Avenue  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
(206) 296-9067  
FAX (206) 296-9013

15 December 2003

Steve Call, Director  
Office of Management and Budget  
32<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Bank of America Tower  
701 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Seattle WA 98104

**Re: State v. Ridgway Plans for 2003 and 2004: Budget Proviso Compliance**

Dear Steve,

This submittal is designed to comply with the proviso in the 2004 PAO budget and provide detail on the PAO's budget needs for 2003 and 2004 with regard to the additional work necessary to finish the PAO's legal and public records act obligations on this case.

**I. The Prosecution Team and the Workplan**

The remaining work on the criminal case includes:

- 1) the sentencing hearing, set for December 18;
- 2) preparation of legal documents, including the aggravated murder report for the court;
- 3) victim-family notification and advocacy throughout the sentencing;
- 4) victim-family restitution, which has been ordered by the court to be compiled through affidavits;
- 5) completion of the scanning project for transcripts and reports not yet in the database;
- 6) organizing the prosecution's work product for storage

We anticipate that the bulk of the work on the criminal prosecution part of this case will be completed by mid-January.

We have five deputy prosecutors assigned to the case. Four of the five will be returned to an assignment within the PAO in early 2004. The fifth deputy is managing the public records act project detailed below.

There is one senior paralegal assigned to the project. The other paralegals have returned to other units of the PAO.

We have two employees who have expertise in database management. They will continue to work on the public records act project though at least the first quarter of 2004. We will be making a proposal to you that we bring their skills in document-intensive litigation management

Page 2

in-house in the PAO. We believe we could save the county hundreds of thousands of dollars annually that is now spent on private companies that provide litigation management services.

## **II. The Public Records Act Project**

Under this state's unique approach to public records, most of the documents, recordings and exhibits in this case are presumptively public and must be provided upon request by any citizen. The statute provides only the ability to recover the cost of the medium upon which the record is printed (e.g. 15 cents per page or the cost of a blank CD-ROM). We cannot charge a requesting party the actual costs of organizing the records, or the cost of removing from the records that which is prohibited by law from being disclosed, such as medical reports, non-conviction criminal information, or private data such as social security numbers.

A significant effort has already begun to comb through the hundreds of thousands of documents and hundreds of hours of recordings to identify and redact impermissible records, and prepare a complete public record copy. As you know, failure to meet our legal obligations can carry significant financial penalties under the state's Public Records Act, RCW 42.17.

As of today there are more than 43 separate requests from journalists for access to the investigative documents and recordings in this case. The law presumes that these materials are public documents, but the law also mandates that certain categories of documents (e.g. non-conviction data, medical examiners' reports, and private information such as social security numbers) be withheld. There are also open and unsolved crimes that are part of the voluminous materials that are necessary to redact for effective law enforcement.

As part of this memo, I have outlined the resources needed to fund a small team from the PAO to meet the incoming requests for production of these materials. Like everything else in this case, the size and scope of public records amassed is unprecedented. At this stage it is not possible to predict precisely how long this project will take to complete. I anticipate that the team will need to be funded through at least the first quarter of 2004. Out of an abundance of caution, assumptions have been made in the accompanying budget reports that take this project through the first two quarters of 2004. There is no one in the PAO who wants the project to last that long.

### **Inventory and Scope of Presumptively Public Records**

Below is a list of the categories of records subject to public disclosure requests:

1. Interview transcripts: 6,600 pages (approx.)
2. Recorded interviews: 248 tapes/DVDs
3. Ridgway suspect file: 26,000 pages
4. Victim files: 65,000 pages
5. "Tips" Files: 86,000 pages
6. Other suspect files: 160,000 pages
7. GRTF correspondence: 10,000 pages
8. Other archived materials: 53,000 pages
9. Misc. archived materials: 36 boxes not scanned into database

### **PAO Public Records Team**

The Public Records Project team will need these resources:

1. One deputy prosecutor;
2. Two technical staff who have experience with the electronic database for the first quarter of 2004;
3. One senior paralegal for the first quarter of 2004;
4. An extra-help budget of up to \$85,000 to hire temporary help to “code” the otherwise public documents for necessary redaction;
5. Additional costs of document processing into the database;
6. Significant time from Civil Division deputies familiar with public records act requirements (no additional costs);
7. Significant assistance from PAO IT staff (no additional costs)

### **III. Additional Work still to be performed in 2003**

The sentencing hearing on the 18<sup>th</sup> of December marks a significant milestone in this case, but does not signal the end of our work. Another critical task is the presentation of the aggravated murder report for the court’s approval. This report becomes part of the database of aggravated murder cases in Washington and will become the official record for court review.

The court has ordered restitution to be paid to the families of victims for actual costs related to funeral expenses. PAO staff is working with families to provide the court with loss statements for calculation and presentation at a time after sentencing.

There also remains a significant amount of work left to enter the transcripts of the interviews with the defendant into the database. This is necessary for the public records compliance and for the benefit of ongoing investigations. Due to security concerns, transcripts were not sent to the vendor during the six months of interviews prior to the plea on November 5<sup>th</sup> to be scanned and integrated into the Summation Database. These consist of approximately 2700 pages of “new victim” documents, 6500 pages of Ridgway Interview Transcripts, and about 500 pages of new Tip Sheets. Additionally, the detectives have yet to submit Follow-up Report Forms for the past five months – estimated (based on past volume) to be about 4000 pages. This approximate total of 13,700 pages will cost between \$15,000 and \$20,000 (depending on document complexity) to process and can probably be accomplished in time to be billed by the end of December.

We will also need to acquire additional storage capacity on the file server that hosts the database and video editing equipment to make appropriate redaction in the DVDs containing the interviews with the defendant where details of unsolved homicides were discussed.



#### **IV. 2003 Budget -- Unspent Line Items**

The 2003 budget for this case for the PAO totaled \$1,267,338, not including the PAO absorption of the costs of two full-time senior deputy prosecutors. The staffing and technology costs for 2003 have met the projections and will be fully expended.

The one area where fewer funds were expended as a result of the plea agreement is in the area of expert witness costs and trial exhibit preparation. **We estimate that we will under-spend our 2003 budget on this case by about \$310,000.**

#### **V. 2004 Budget**

For 2004 the Executive and Council had reserved \$1,174,350 for prosecution staffing and trial costs. The 2004 budget proviso set aside \$295,323 to cover PAO costs associated with closing out this case. We anticipate that this amount will more than cover the cost of the Public Records Project for 2004. We look forward to finishing our work on this case, complying with our obligations under the public records act, and re-integrating our prosecution team into the office.

The Executive and the Council have provided exemplary leadership in responding to the needs of the PAO since this case was filed in late 2001. We look forward to the conclusion of this project, and will fully participate in budget reconciliation to account for resources provided that were not utilized.

Sincerely,

Norm Maleng  
King County Prosecuting Attorney

Cc: The Honorable Ron Sims, King County Executive  
The Honorable Larry Phillips, Chair, Budget and Fiscal Management Committee  
Rebecha Cusack, Lead Analyst, Budget and Fiscal Management Committee

**2004-047**

**RIDGWAY DEFENSE STAFFING REDUCTION PLAN 2003 – 2004**

The defense has been very attentive to the issue of public costs in the Ridgway case. The primary focus has always been on providing Mr. Ridgway with the defense services which were needed to effectively address his case. An ever present secondary concern has been the cost. This dual focus has produced substantial savings during the third and fourth quarters of the 2003 budget.

The Ridgway team budget for 2004 reflects the same priorities.

The budget makes the following assumptions:

- The defense and the Office of the Public Defender (OPD) will abide by the Memorandum of Understanding, which outlines the scope of work, particularly the jurisdictional limits of the legal representation, which are King County incidents.
- There will be no new charges filed, which are alleged by the Prosecutor to be outside of the plea agreement. If new charges are filed outside of the plea agreement, those will be addressed as a separate case with a separate budget.
- There is no motion to withdraw the plea of guilty, which was entered on November 5, 2003.
- The plea agreement is carried out, with six months of work associated with continuing investigation of additional homicides in King County.

**Memorandum of Understanding and Scope of Work  
Between Associated Counsel for the Accused (ACA) and  
Office of the Public Defender (OPD), King County  
On Behalf of Gary L. Ridgway**

This memorandum of understanding is between Associated Counsel for the Accused (ACA), as counsel for Mr. Ridgway, and Office of the Public Defender (OPD), King County Washington. Nothing in this agreement binds Mr. Tony Savage, who is retained privately by Mr. Ridgway.

OPD has assigned ACA, a non-profit public defender agency, and several private attorneys to represent Gary Ridgway for all criminal cases which have been filed or may be filed in King County, Washington. Mr. Ridgway entered 48 pleas of guilty to First Degree Aggravated Murder on 11-05-03. He has agreed to continue sentencing on these matters for up to six months, to May 2004 (5/5/04). The purpose of this continuance is to allow the Green River Task Force to continue to investigate and interview witnesses, including Mr. Ridgway, regarding other unsolved homicides which have occurred in King County, Washington. As part of the plea agreement entered between Mr. Ridgway and King County, he has agreed to cooperate and tell the truth. All parties to this agreement believe that additional charges may become part of this plea.

ACA agrees to continue to represent Gary Ridgway for all criminal homicide charges which have been filed, or may be filed, by King County. This representation will continue until such time as Mr. Ridgway is sentenced and the case is finally resolved in King County, Washington. Further, ACA will continue to provide two attorneys, Mr. Mark Prothero and Mr. Todd Gruenhagen, one paralegal, Fabian Acosta, one investigator, Bettye Witherspoon, and one clerk, Jana Witt, on an actual need basis to complete the representation of Mr. Ridgway in King County, Washington. ACA has taken possession of the technology equipment and database in this matter from Certus. ACA agrees to continue to use and maintain this data until completion of these cases.

The Rules of Professional Conduct require that ACA attorneys represent Mr. Ridgway from the date of appointment and continue through every stage of the legal proceedings until the sentencing and any final motions are completed. The attorneys must do whatever is necessary to complete the representation between now and the sentencing date. ACA agrees that if another county, state, or foreign country questions Mr. Ridgway while he is in King County we must provide him with substantial legal advice concerning his constitutional rights. The purpose of this representation would be to preserve Mr. Ridgway's fundamental constitutional rights and to preserve the integrity of the plea arrangement with King County. However, as soon as the constitutional right to counsel attaches to any out of King County charge, counsel for Mr. Ridgway will seek funding from the non-King County jurisdiction or appointment of associated counsel to represent Mr. Ridgway in the non-King County jurisdiction.

King County will not incur substantial expenses on behalf of Mr. Ridgway in relation to any charge or charges which may be investigated or filed outside of King County.

ACA agrees to continue to keep OPD notified about necessary expert costs and legal services deemed necessary and reasonable to defend Mr. Ridgway in these King County charges. If at any time between now and the time of sentencing it is obvious that the size of the Ridgway defense team must be modified, ACA will promptly notify Anne Harper, OPD, and modify the number of staff as deemed appropriate by additional agreement with OPD.

Nothing in this agreement will hinder or disrupt the ACA attorneys from exercising their judgment consistent with the Rules of Professional Conduct in performance of any tasks or duties required to complete the representation of Mr. Ridgway in the King County matters. Nothing in this agreement will abridge any rights that Mr. Ridgway possesses under any applicable criminal law or as a result of the plea agreement with King County.

The contract between ACA and King County to provide general public defense services is incorporated by reference into this agreement. This is not a modification of the current general contract governing the relationship between OPD and ACA.

---

David Chapman, Director  
Associated Counsel for the Accused

---

Anne C. Harper, The Public Defender  
Office of the Public Defender

2004-047

Superior Court for the State of Washington  
for the County of King

Claudia Olney  
Deputy Chief Administrative Officer  
claudia.olney@metrokc.gov

516 Third Avenue, Room C-203  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
(206) 296-9315

**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** December 15, 2003  
**TO:** Beth Goldberg, Budget Supervisor  
**FM:** Claudia Olney  
**RE:** 2003 Ridgway Proviso

Attached is information regarding Superior Court's 2003 costs incurred as a result of State v. Ridgway. This information relates only the 48 counts in King County cause number 01-1-10270-9 to which Mr. Ridgway entered guilty pleas on November 5, 2003 and for which he'll be sentenced commencing on December 18, 2003.

The estimate assumes that no additional hearings will occur after the sentencing in this case. Should additional matters arise that require subsequent hearings, costs for those hearings will be subject to supplemental funding requests.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

cc: Judge Richard A. Jones  
Paul L. Sherfey, Chief Administrative Officer