

REPORT OF STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
August 23, 2012

The Strategic Planning Committee consists of myself, Chuck Petaja and Bill Snell. Our purpose was to renew the OPD's Strategic Plan which was instituted on April 21, 2006. Many changes have occurred within the organization since that time. There was a need to review our strategic plan in going forward.

Over the past year, the Committee has met on numerous occasions. We have had the support and input from many sources, including Chairman Gillespie and Harry Freebourn. We've been supported greatly by Cathy Doyle and OPD staff.

The following is a brief overview of areas we've addressed and recommendations our Committee is making to the Commission. The first order of business was to decide whether to (1) keep the current plan; (2) revise the current plan, or (3) develop a new plan. The Committee decided to revise the current plan as we went along. As we tweaked the existing plan, OPD staff would write up the proposed changes. So at each subsequent meeting, we would have in place the most recent revised version of the plan.

The Agency Strategic Plan in your handouts contains the proposed changes as they were developed. The Strategic Plan is designed to be an aspirational plan, in effect, a visionary look at what we hope to achieve.

The Committee spent a lot of time addressing the problems created for our system by the proliferation of civil cases, particularly DN cases. DN cases have increased significantly, creating a drain on the ability of the system to provide attorneys, together with corresponding drain on our budget. An initial proposition discussed was that OPD seek changes in the law so that we are not obligated to handle DN cases at all. It was emphasized, however, that the issues in DN cases are important to those involved who need effective assistance of counsel. Also, the practical reality was that the courts would assign OPD attorneys to handle these cases no matter what we decided.

The solution that the Committee came to was the creation of a Civil Program. By establishing such a separate program, we could separate and clearly identify costs related to these cases. We could devise strategies for dealing with the situation if the number of cases exceeded OPD's ability to effectively handle them. It would enhance our ability to provide the legislature with more accurate information about the cost of handling these cases. The civil program would not include youth criminal cases. This Program would be known as Program 4.

A great deal of discussion also was devoted to the conflicts coordinator area. The Committee ultimately decided to recommend that that function be the subject of a separate program as well, Program 3. In this way, we could effectively eliminate conflict of interest issues created by funding and direction coming from Program 1 or 2. Both the AU and ACLU

reports were critical of OPD's handling of conflicts cases. The Committee believes the creation of Program 3 would effectively deal with the conflicts area.

The Committee reviewed the regional configuration. It was decided to make no changes thereto. One problem area involving Judge Tucker's judicial district was addressed. Staff dealt with Judge Tucker on seeking resolution to his concerns. No changes were suggested that convinced the Committee to change the existing regions. We recommend they be left as they are.

The Committee addressed case load levels and continue to work on that area. We have discussed our joint desire to seek better compensation for all attorneys and staff. Goals 6, 7 and 8 will be presented at this meeting. Changes to our goals and objections are noted in the handout at item 10(b). They will be addressed at the upcoming meeting.

Respectfully,

Kenneth R. Olson, Chairman
Strategic Planning Committee