

State of Nevada
Department of Indigent Defense Services
Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, December 4, 2025

1:00 PM

Primary Meeting Location:

OFFICE	LOCATION	ROOM
Department of Indigent Defense Services	751 Basque Way Carson City, NV 89706	Conference Room
(Online attendance via Zoom link and telephone call in options)		

1. Call to Order/Roll Call:

Board Chair Kate Thomas called the meeting of the Board on Indigent Defense Services to order at 1:00 pm, on Thursday, December 4, 2025.

Casey Popovich conducted a roll call. A **quorum was established**.

Board Members Present Remotely: Kate Thomas, Joni Eastley, Chris Giunchigliani, Joe Crim (after roll-call, notified the Chair of being a few minutes late) Susan Bush, Allison Joffee (approximately ten minutes after roll-call), Lorina Dellinger, Dave Mendiola, and Dayvid Figler.

Board Members Present In-Person: Jarrod Hickman

Members not present: Abigail Frierson, Angela Cook, Justice William Maupin.

Others Present In-Person: Executive Director Peter Handy, Deputy Director Brenda Roberts, and Deputy Director Homa Sayyar.

Other Participants Present Remotely: Brian Filter (Douglas County Indigent Defense Services), Senior Deputy Attorney General Todd Weiss, Derrick Lopez, David Schieck, Prof. Eve Hanan (Davis Monitor), Massey Mayo, Patrick Mansfield, and Nevada State Public Defender Andrew Coates.

2. Public Comment:

Chair Thomas opened the line for public comment and the information relating to joining the meeting was shared. Chair Thomas referenced a three-minute limit for public comment.

Chair Thomas recognized individual commenter (Massey Mayo) with their virtual hand up.

Massey Mayo introduced herself as a partner at Mansfield Mayo, a law firm with two indigent defense contracts: one with Lyon County and one with the Nevada State Public Defender in Humboldt County and referenced the effect of reporting about representation, including “open ended negative inferences” regarding perceived concerns. Ms. Mayo spoke at length about the lengths her office goes to in ensuring quality of representation, including having staff available in person even where counsel is appearing remotely in certain matters (she referred to this as a hybrid approach). She offered that she and her office were always open to any questions or clarifications needed and emphasized zealous advocacy on behalf of clients and shared their processes/policies regarding talking to clients before appearances. She expressed concern that the activities outside the view of court observers and specified were not rounding out

observation reporting. Ms. Mayo addressed reporting/data keeping efforts (including cleanup of data from inherited cases), but cautioned against an hours focus that did not belie performance. She concluded her comments by highlighting improvement in rural Nevada in the face of absorbing the NSPD caseload after two resignations and her firm's efforts in growing rural legal practice. She suggested that the people encouraging relocation and practice of law in rural Nevada be people who are not outsiders themselves as her office had been actively recruiting, including a LASSO summer intern, and retaining legal talent.

Chair Thomas thanked Ms. Mayo for her participation and indicated there were no further commenters wishing to be recognized.

3. Introduction of New Board Member(s): (For discussion)

Chair Thomas noted that new board member Ms. Frierson was not on the call and the item could be continued to the March 2026 agenda.

4. Approval of the Minutes: (For possible action)

Chair Thomas referenced that the prior meeting had not been brief and Member Eastley noted that they were reviewed thoroughly and should be approved. Both Members Mendiola and Hickman sought to second.

Motion: Approve the Meeting Minutes of October 23, 2025.
By: Joni Eastley
Second: Dave Mendiola / Jarrod Hickman (simultaneously)
Vote: Passed Unanimously

Note: On a further agenda item (at about 1:21 pm), Member Eastley remarked about clarification as to Mr. Schieck's reporting reflected on page 13 of the October minutes where it seemed as though the Justice of the Peace was personally feeding inmates. Mr. Schieck indicated the Justice of the Peace was indicating inmates were being fed, not that she was responsible for feeding them. No motion or other clarification was sought, but these minutes now do reflect the information.

5. Oversight Update: (For discussion and possible action).

a. Reports from Outreach Advisors.

Deputy Director Sayyar began by referring to the memo she had drafted to the Board regarding her own observations in Douglas and Humboldt counties as well as other oversight activities. She indicated that attached to the referenced memo were reports/correspondence from Mr. Schieck and Mr. Lopez and she suggested that Mr. Schieck's memo regarding Nye County was a companion to the Davis Monitor's reference in her 17th Report to a December 18, 2025 visit to Nye County as well as a posting from Nye County to bring in more attorneys. She shared that Mr. Schieck had reported to her up to 20% of contract attorney time in Nye County was being spent on NRS 432B matters which were not part of the scope of reimbursement. Mr. Lopez had indicated information regarding his Lyon County visits and that was included as well. Ms. Sayyar highlighted the length of law and motion days, including a variety of attorneys in Winnemucca owing to assignment of former NSPD cases to a variety of individuals for coverage. She also referenced an attorney reportedly stating on the record in a case that they could wait for cases to be called and their claim to have 300 cases, which was of concern owing to workload standards. She relayed the technical assistance activities of the Department, including contacting the National Association for Public Defense as indicated by the 16th report of the monitor and a meeting with U.S. Digital Response regarding user experience and case management systems to address complaints/concerns regarding Legal

Server's functionality in practice. She invited Mr. Schieck to address his reporting and ongoing discussions with counsel in his assigned counties.

Member Eastley asked if she could reach out to the Deputy Director directly if she had questions and that was confirmed.

Deputy Director Sayyar noted that there were issues regarding inmate communication before yielding the floor to oversight contract attorney David Schieck.

David Schieck, contractor for the Department, suggested that his update would not include Nye County specifically until item 8 on the agenda and then discussed Lincoln, White Pine, Eureka, and Esmeralda counties. He reported Lincoln County was in full compliance on caseloads, it has a jail to house its own inmates, and that the two attorneys there were "doing a fine job." For Eureka County he reported that Kelly Brown was retiring from his position at the end of December. Eureka coverage was reported at a .3 caseload given limited cases in the area such that Jane Eberhardy, who has several contracts (White Pine County for overflow and conflict coverage for the Nevada State Public Defender's Office) would take on the caseload and decrease coverage in areas that could draw from other attorney resources. Eureka County also was having an issue with housing inmates as they house them in White Pine (incidentally, where Ms. Eberhardy has an office). A full time deputy from the Eureka Sheriff's Office was reportedly assigned to do inmate transport for court hearings and a second individual was going to be hired as well. Estimates in Eureka county were reported to include a doubling of the population in the next 2 to 3 years which would possibly force a reopening of the jail in the area. For White Pine county, the caseload coverage is through the Nevada State Public Defender's Office. Two attorneys assigned full time as well as James Hoffman providing some coverage. Ely support staff for the State Public Defender is no longer being provided and Mr. Schieck expressed concern that the office is not available/open to clients. For Esmeralda county, the caseload is low and the contract coverage (in Goldfield) is via Jason Earnest in addition to his contract with Nye county.

Member Hickman inquired about where clients are being housed in Nye county and it was confirmed that the Tonopah jail remains closed and that it presents challenges for attorney-client communication prior to hearings. Mr. Schieck indicated Jason Earnest reported to him that the court allows for breaks for him to meet clients and he endeavors to get to court early to meet with transported clients.

Derrick Lopez, contractor for the Department, indicated his assigned counties were Douglas, Elko, Humboldt, Lander, and Pershing in addition to watching some court in Lyon county upon request. He shared regarding Dayton Justice Court that there were long calendars though the attorneys appeared to be meeting with clients but overall the volume was a concern. He expressed that he observed in Fernley the hybrid dynamic Ms. Mayo offered public comment regarding where a paralegal went to a private room to have the attorney communicate remotely with the client. Mr. Lopez shared that he had seen some but not all of the Mansfield & Mayo firm attorneys and specifically said he had observed Ms. Mayo performing well in her role. He opined more generally that he did prefer attorneys to be present in court but recognized that was an older "school." For Zoom appearances it appeared to Mr. Lopez that it worked better if both client and attorney were in person or both were on Zoom. Continuances are one outcome of virtual appearances where the client has not had a chance to talk to counsel. Regarding Douglas county he observed that there are 4 experienced attorneys with contracts and a fifth contract was covering misdemeanor to low B felonies while a sixth spot was being assigned by Brian Filter to hourly counsel through DIDS. For Elko county he noted positive coverage but the recent loss of one attorney and another being out for the time being with not all staff being experienced is being felt. He referenced a previously discussed issue in Elko regarding AI generated pleadings but said it was being addressed. Attorneys come from Las Vegas and Reno to rural counties and the State Public Defender has no attorneys housed in Humboldt county where they have a contract. Mr. Lopez noted he had seen the physical office in Winnemucca and it appeared nice. For Lander and Pershing county the filling of the position vacated due to the passing of the District Court

judge was in the process of being filled while senior judges fill in. Pershing and Lander counties both have experienced public defenders doing well and there are not many conflicts for the conflict counsel on contract. Pershing county has a vacant conflict attorney position but hourly attorneys are being assigned as applicable. Lyon County is assigning Dayton Justice Court matters A through L to Ray Areshenko. M through Z is covered by Kale Brock (who has a number of attorneys assisting him but without any known subcontracts).

Chair Thomas asked Nevada State Public Defender Andrew Coates if he had any comment as she saw him join the meeting a few minutes before 1:35pm. He responded that he would wait for his agenda item.

Member Hickman thanked Ms. Mayo for her public comment about hybrid appearances and asked Mr. Lopez if he was seeing other virtual appearance dynamics and also asked about Mr. Brock's approach to support from attorneys.

Derrick Lopez referenced a case in Winnemucca where an attorney was virtual but the client (who was about 17 when the offense in question occurred) was in jail by video and it appeared he was very nervous and scared. The matter was continued and from an observer standpoint it seemed counsel should not have been remote for a substantive matter for entry of a plea pursuant to an agreement. Regarding Mr. Brock's attorney coverage, Mr. Lopez assumed it was via a handshake agreement.

Deputy Director Sayyar referenced her submitted memo indicating Mr. Brock had 823 open cases per Legal Server and at least one attorney has casually referenced that Mr. Brock pays him \$200 an hour to cover hearings for him. Upon inquiry that attorney did not have a contract for that arrangement. She also referenced the instance in Winnemucca as she had been present for the hearing and when the attorney on zoom had side-barred with her client she reported back that he was on suicide watch. It may have been possible to know that before the hearing had she been present to meet with her client. It was also noted that during the hearing the attorney appeared to be answering emails and one email was received during that time to a DIDS email address which was unrelated to the matter being appeared on. Ms. Sayyar asked about interest in examining remote appearances separate and apart from the ADKT on the subject, perhaps with a future presentation. Issues such as confidentiality, client communication, and even virtual chats which may not become part of the record could be examined.

Chair Thomas inquired of Member Bush as to her perspective regarding virtual appearances.

Member Bush referenced ADKT 0581 which has a chart regarding remote appearances used by judges in Clark County.

Executive Director Handy observed that training could help identify the options for attorneys and examine the minimum bar while also addressing procedural safeguards given criminal justice standards being higher regarding meeting clients. Further observation forms could include areas to indicate who is/isn't remote in a hearing.

Member Giunchigliani asked how remote appearances tie back with the monitor's report referencing stand-in counsel. Member Figler echoed the inquiry.

Executive Director Handy felt they were fundamentally connected with standby counsel being a factor in examining remote appearances.

Member Figler asked about the next agenda including this matter and suggested attaching standards in a message to members to see the baseline.

Deputy Director Sayyar welcomed the ongoing dialogue and the importance of practitioner input (roundtables, training, etc.).

Chair Thomas suggested a short term reminder to send out a reminder to attorneys and then have an item for a longer discussion. She moved to accept the oversight update.

Motion: Approve the Oversight Update.

By: Joni Eastley

Second: Chris Giunchigliani

Vote: Passed Unanimously

6. Davis Litigation Updates (For discussion and possible action).

a. Monitor's Report(s)

Professor Hanan indicated her availability to answer any questions. She thanked the Department for being helpful and referenced areas of concern raised in the prior meeting.

Member Joffe referenced CLE offerings since the prior meeting and thanked Deputy Director Roberts for that, especially mental health credit. She referenced prior concerns regarding experienced criminal defense attorney staffing within the Department and asked about financial options to pay counsel. Member Joffe indicated 432B matters were difficult and that she was glad they were not part of the Board's scope.

Professor Hanan responded to a question about her report referencing Nye county and whether they were turning attorney's away – she said she watched prior meetings of the county commission and observed 14 applicants but not all were taken on and that the process was not what the county plan required. She observed the issue of not having an appointed council administrator to make sure that reporting for cases was accurate as Mr. Scheick had referenced in his own reports.

Member Eastley suggested the monitor's reports be shared with the county commissions when submitted.

Chair Thomas asked if the commission had been acting with this information and Member Eastley asked Member Dellinger to chime in and she confirmed the commission's awareness in Nye county. A colloquy with **Senior Deputy Attorney General Weiss** took place regarding what action may be allowed on this agenda item, finally settling on anything Nye specific take place under agenda item 8.

Member Giunchigliani expressed concern that the commission went off the record and back on the record regarding counsel contracts, reports of high caseloads for attorneys (referencing Mr. Lopez's reporting) and the security concerns with the closed jail all in reference to the monitor's report.

Member Eastley offered that there was disagreement with the District Attorney's office about the caseloads referenced in the monitor's report versus open cases on their end and she was unsure how to reconcile the two though she did wish to see information about the numbers of open cases with the DA's office. She indicated attorneys may not be closing cases or not closing them correctly.

Executive Director Handy started with county compliance as referenced in the monitor's report (Nye county on item 8) such as Lyon county follow-up with Kale Brock regarding his contract coverage as well as the county regarding his contract to provide service for up to 5 attorneys. Numbers are improving in other areas such as Churchill County as well as others. The \$3 million from SB 4 in the special session will in part be earmarked for \$1,000 weekly travel stipends for Nevada State Public Defender Employees (addressing recruitment and retention). He continued by indicating the Department's workload being a

concern for being available to assist attorneys which may be resulting in attorney communications with Board members. Part of the special session funding could be used in a constructive way including technical assistance from the National Association of Public Defenders (approximately \$180,000 over 15-18 months). Additionally, mentorship has been raised regarding the appointed State Public Defender, Andrew Coates as to Member Joffe's concern about criminal specific experience. Robust training is another area of focus as well as learning what attorneys need from the Department to support their efforts. Creative ideas could include social workers and other measures all in addressing the monitor's report.

Professor Hanan thanked Ms. Mayo for her public comment and perspective and indicated that the oversight counsel were doing important work and hoped the third contract would be filled soon. Professor Hanan thanked Executive Director Handy for indicating the guidelines regarding remote appearances were a floor because of the need for confidential meetings with clients.

Member Giunchigliani suggested examining other rural areas and the solutions they have come up with for matters such as confidential spaces and computer access. She suggested NCSL might have information and also contemplated other disciplines recruiting, such as teachers in districts having special housing options.

b. NSPD Workload Monitoring & Reporting

Executive Director Handy spoke about reports run for the NSPD and Mr. Coates' covering of cases from Justin Clouser, who took on a Douglas county contract. An additional hire in White Pine county by Mr. Coates was referenced as well as Julie Cavanaugh-Bill covering juvenile matters and Jane Eberhardy covering a portion of cases under contract as well. In Humboldt, presented as "the bigger problem," two attorneys with the NSPD resigned and Mansfield and Mayo were picking up a large portion of the work while other cases went out to conflict counsel. Accurate data's importance ties back to closing cases which should have been previously closed. Mansfield & Mayo made huge efforts in the last 6 weeks to close a significant number of cases and 300 had been closed. Legal Server being not the easiest to work with is a challenge to expedient case closure but numbers are being monitored across reports. Suggested contractors were shared with Mr. Coates for him to contact for assistance as well.

c. Special Session SB4 and allocations of funding for compliance.

Executive Director Handy responded to questions about special session funding which would also be already available to the Department to address matters under its scope without going to the Interim Finance Committee and the funds would also forward into the next fiscal year.

Motion: Accept Davis Litigation Updates
By: Chris Giunchigliani
Second: Dayvid Figler
Vote: Passed Unanimously

7. NSPD Status and Update on Humboldt County Office (For discussion and possible action).

a. Physical Office Status

Nevada State Public Defender Andrew Coates reiterated that both attorneys in Humboldt county resigned over the same weekend but for different stated reasons. One was related to receiving better pay in Washoe County. There are two investigators in that area and there is a remote legal secretary in White Pine county. Mr. Coates then turned it over for questions.

Chair Thomas asked if anything would be covered further regarding recruitment and retention though it was somewhat covered in the physical office status.

b. Recruitment and Retention

Nevada State Public Defender Andrew Coates stated he had shared what he had to say on this agenda item.

Member Giunchigliani asked about salary being the driving factor and whether there was help the Board could offer. Mr. Coates affirmed it was about salary.

Chair Thomas clarified that Washoe County did a class and compensation study two years ago and increased salaries to the middle range and that highlights that the state's salaries are lower than a middle range.

Executive Director Handy indicated that PERS contributions are factored into posted salaries for positions which means take home is even lower than the posted amounts.

Chair Thomas noted that losing staff can put pressure on the workload of remaining staff such that it is a vicious cycle.

Executive Director Handy reiterated the technical assistance goals and need of a mentor for Mr. Coates. Member Hickman stated his support for the idea of mentorship and having conversations with possible candidates. Member Giunchigliani asked about using SB4 funds for coverage of expenses for a mentor and gathering information or doing studies to support a case for a future ask for the State Public Defender's office fiscally.

Member Hickman asked about whether the White Pine office was open and available to clients. And Mr. Coates said there is an attorney there every other week (alternating weeks from Las Vegas). Follow-up was requested from Mr. Scheick who stated that when the attorneys are in court the office is not open because there is no legal secretary in the Ely office and that it is a concern raised by judges and others. Mr. Coates alluded to not having applicants in Ely for the legal secretary position though he also represented that applicants are screened by the Division of Human Resource Management and he does not see all applications. Mr. Handy shared that there are ways to see information from HR. Mr. Coates, regarding Winnemucca, stated that he had a remote applicant interested in a legal secretary position there but he was working on approval.

Motion: Accept NSPD Status Report
By: Chris Giunchigliani
Second: David Mendiola
Vote: Passed Unanimously

8. Nye County Status Report and Analysis (For discussion and possible action).

- a. NCSC Study Identified Attorney Need.**
- b. Current Attorney Numbers.**
- c. Current Attorney Caseload Reporting.**
- d. New efforts at reducing attorney caseloads and other systemic impediments to effective representation.**
- e. Issues to Address by Corrective Action Plan and Options.**

Note: all subsections were discussed without calling out a switch to each item, instead a holistic discussion took place

Executive Director Handy summarized that a chief concern is a lack of attorneys to meet workload requirements. Additionally the use of stand in counsel was a concern which happens when attorneys must be in multiple places at a time (even within the same courthouse with competing calendars). Nye County should have 12 attorneys based on caseload data from several years ago. Reporting shows an unsustainable workload. Some high numbers are because of needing cases closed in Legal Server which Mr. Schieck is assisting with. Some high numbers are where a client already has a rapport with an attorney when they have a new case and others are because of a lack of additional contract attorneys. 8 contract attorneys out of 12 contemplated by the study have contracts with two being fairly recent additions. Some prior counsel did not have contracts renew or chose not to renew. A council administrator has been identified and contracting is underway (Robert Langford, an experienced defense attorney in Las Vegas) so that attorneys will have mentorship and further resources. The county solicited for more attorneys with a January cut off date. The *Davis* deadline in August along with Nye not reaching compliance for workload over several years is being watched in relation to the question of a corrective action plan. Mr. Scheick related back Member Eastley's ask about case data from the District Attorney's office and said that he has not been able to get that information as they have reported they do not have it. Mr. Scheick also stated that the counsel administrator would be helpful for many of the stated issues, including recruitment for new attorneys and compliance with the county plan in future recruitment (the five member committee to make recommendations to the County Commissioners. He echoed the statements regarding a need to close cases as the numbers are not correct.

Member Giunchigliani inquired about staffing assistance as to closing cases to address the need for accurate data and Mr. Handy agreed it was a good idea suggested case closure it is more of a symptom of attorneys having not enough time to do work that is needed.

Member Hickman asked about the posture of the reporting and Mr. Handy specified that it was an update to the Board because of prior reporting to the board about the county. A second question was whether 432B cases are part of the solicitation for 4 attorneys and Mr. Handy confirmed that they were still included as in prior solicitations which represents about 20% of attorney time. Mr. Handy indicated contract drafts will be obtained from Member Dellinger to review at the Department level. Finally, Mr. Hickman asked about whether reimbursement was happening for 432B cases which are not under NRS 180 indigent defense. Mr. Handy indicated reimbursement was reduced where known but it is possible Nye county was over reimbursed if the work was not being reported separately (and that the LCB audit may show that as well). Mr. Scheick estimated that 13.5 attorneys would be needed if the discretionarily appointed 432B case hours are included.

Member Dellinger shared that the goal was to have 12 contracts (4 in January and once compliance was achieved in the number of contracts, then removal of 432B work and awards of separate contracts for that work).

Member Hickman asked if the question was regarding corrective action/authority depending on the outcome of the Nye County Commission's meeting after January 6th. Member Eastley agreed and discussion happened regarding monthly meetings. Chair Thomas asked for a motion. Discussion included whether there was authority from the board for corrective action process and Mr. Handy said it was not needed, it was just for Board direction given the timeline and uncertainty overall and deep interest in Nye County in the last several months as the Board is not needed for a corrective action plan.

Motion: **Accept the Report with Direction to Find out about a Board Meeting in January to Discuss Nye Contract Status**

By: Chris Giunchigliani
Second: Allison Joffe
Vote: Passed Unanimously

9. Department of Indigent Defense Board Updates (For discussion and possible action).

a. Technical Assistance Request.

Executive Director Handy shared that technical assistance would not require an IFC ask as the funding from SB4 could be used and alluded to matters already discussed regarding the opportunity for assistance and tailoring it to Nevada.

b. LCB Programmatic Audit.

Executive Director Handy shared that the Department was told the audit would be coming in draft form soon though it would be confidential until presented to the audit committee.

c. Number of Claims Received.

Executive Director Handy referenced uploaded information about claims received and how billing is not the mission of the Department and the goal is to have staff focus on the mission and similarly have attorneys do the same such that more staff is needed to address billing. Mr. Handy showed a large stack several inches high on camera to reflect the stack of bills received weekly. In 2024 almost 3,000 bills were processed and in November when the report was run in 2025 over 3,700 bills had been processed. Part of this involves conflict counsel and shuffling of counsel due to rotation of contractors in places like Nye county. This presents 50% more work but not 50% more billing staff. The AA2 recruiting will help as well as the ASO1 recruitment though even more staff may be needed. Mr. Handy identified that staff working on billing could be doing other work beneficial to the Department.

d. Non-PD/Non-CLE Training
1. LegalServer/timekeeping.

Executive Director Handy referenced timekeeping training with NSPD staff invited with a plan to refine the training in future. The Department holds monthly meetings about LegalServer virtually as well.

2. Billing and Claims.

See item C above.

3. Rural Judges Conference

Deputy Director Roberts attended and presented at the conference and reported that there were good questions, constructive comments, and discussions to build rapport with the judiciary.

Member Eastley indicated that the presentation was great at the conference.

10. Workload Compliance Update: (For discussion and possible action).

a. Churchill County

Executive Director Handy indicated that two new attorneys had been added for a total of 4 in the office, 1 alternate, and another contract so 6 of the 7.4 under the NCSE study. He offered kudos to Jacob Summer for his efforts and making the Public Defender's office in Fallon a great, friendly place to work.

b. Douglas County

Brian Filter, Douglas County Indigent Defense Services, shared that a sixth attorney was coming on starting January 1st from Nye County. Justin Clouser will be having a jury trial that would qualify him for high B and A cases. Mr. Handy noted that the Douglas model is new and could be implementable elsewhere with an attorney overseeing the contracts.

c. Eureka County

Executive Director Handy referenced prior comments about changes of coverage and the monitoring of Jane Eberhardy's workload with multiple contracts and picking up the contract covered by Kelly Brown.

d. Lyon County

Executive Director Handy referenced prior comments about next steps in Lyon county as to actual workload coverage with a hope of more information for the Board in future.

e. Mineral County

Executive Director Handy noted that they lost a second tier contractor but will be adding Kirsty Pickering and be back to two total with a workload requirement of 2.1.

f. Nye County

Chair Thomas asked for member questions as Nye county had previously been covered.

Motion: Accept Workload Compliance Reporting
By: Chris Giunchigliani
Second: Joni Eastley
Vote: Passed Unanimously

11. Training and Pipeline Update: (For discussion and possible action).

a. Pipeline/LASSO Update.

Deputy Director Roberts shared that aside from UNLV Law, information was being shared on the McGeorge job board and a letter of interest has already come in. There is discussion of rule 49.1 and expansion of coverage which may have an update in January. The Department is planning on attendance at the Northwest Public Career Service Fair with schools drawn in from Washington, Oregon, some in California, Idaho, Montana and Arizona.

b. Annual Conference Update.

Deputy Director Roberts indicated that the conference is still scheduled for March 18th in Las Vegas at the Embassy Suites but there was an announcement delay because of the NPHF contract finalization with

the State. The conference will focus on technology and the law. Breakout sessions for skills practice as well as some recorded sessions are changes for the conference.

c. Virtual Training Update.

Deputy Director Roberts alluded to a training in December regarding Batson by David Westbrook out of the Clark County PD's office as well as a Substance Abuse CLE upcoming with a panel including Justice Cherry and Kristine Kuzemka. An ethics CLE is also in the works with the Ethics Commission. Future trainings will include ethics/billing from Professor Rappaport at the law school as well as competency training and managing experts. Jane Eberhardy has agreed to do a training on opposing juvenile certifications to be tried as adults as there have been questions about it on the NACJ listserv.

d. Externs from Boyd.

Deputy Director Roberts found out that one summer extern, Samson Whetstone, has a sponsor for supervising the MBA portion of his program and will be looking into oversight reports being turned into usable data versus a series of anecdotes.

12. Upcoming Meetings. (For discussion and possible action).

a. February 5, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.

Virtual Board Meeting via Zoom.

b. (Proposed) March 18, 2026, time TBD.

Board Meeting. In person at the DIDS Annual Conference in Las Vegas at the Embassy Suites.

c. June 11, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.

In-Person Board Meeting and Virtual. Location: TBD.

Chair Thomas invited discussion of upcoming meetings and polling for January and others. Deputy Director Roberts suggested that Board members would get to see the DIDS conference on March 18 in Las Vegas as well as network with the attorneys there. mentioned that the dates are flexible at the Board's discretion. He also stated it was up to the Chair or the Board if they should set a special meeting for the appeal issue. June 11 was referenced as the annual in person meeting and anyone interested in hosting should contact the Department.

Motion: Accept Upcoming Meetings with the Addition of a January Meeting TBD

By: Chris Giunchigliani

Second: Joni Eastley

Vote: Passed Unanimously

13. Public Comment.

Chair Thomas asked if there was anyone who would speak regarding public comment.

Patrick Mansfield noted that his law partner had already spoken at the start of the first public comment and followed up by identifying measures their firm takes to be responsible with remote appearances. He offered to speak with anyone about their approaches. Mr. Mansfield indicated that since the last meeting he had worked to close cases and it was eye opening to see cases still open from 2021 and how that skews numbers. He appreciated the suggestion for help closing cases but it is a task best suited for counsel to know what happened or how to dispose of cases. He offered an example of effective assistance of counsel coming up against workload because a push to reduce workload would not have resulted in as good an outcome for a recent client but one more case on the books meant a client was OR'd pending further action.

He closed by stating, “We care about standards and representation, and the Constitution and people's rights.”

Member Mendiola indicated it was his final meeting and that he had learned about the challenges of public defense. He stated that it had been a joy and that he had made friends and was proud of his service. Members of the board thanked him for his service and expressed appreciation of his contributions and how much he would be missed.

14. Adjournment.

Chair Thomas adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:59 p.m.

DRAFT