

August 23 2023 8:30 AM

CONSTANCE R. WHITE
COUNTY CLERK
NO: 23-2-09161-8

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

6 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF PIERCE

7 PIERCE COUNTY, ASOTIN COUNTY,
8 CLALLAM COUNTY, COWLITZ
9 COUNTY, DOUGLAS COUNTY,
10 GRANT COUNTY, GRAYS HARBOR
11 COUNTY, ISLAND COUNTY,
12 JEFFERSON COUNTY, KING
13 COUNTY, KITSAP COUNTY,
14 KLUCKITAT COUNTY, LEWIS
15 COUNTY, LINCOLN COUNTY,
16 PACIFIC COUNTY, SKAGIT COUNTY,
17 SKAMANIA COUNTY, SNOHOMISH
18 COUNTY, SPOKANE COUNTY,
19 THURSTON COUNTY, WHATCOM
20 COUNTY, YAKIMA COUNTY, AND
21 WASHINGTON STATE ASSOCIATION
22 OF COUNTIES,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT
26 OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES,
27 and JILMA MENESES, in her official
capacity as SECRETARY OF
WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT
OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES,

Defendants.

No.

COMPLAINT FOR
DECLARATORY JUDGMENT,
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, AND WRIT
OF MANDAMUS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Our constitutional system expects, and requires executive branch officials to follow statutes and court orders. The Department of Social and Health Services (“DSHS”) is failing this fundamental obligation by refusing to provide mental health services to conversion patients. By ignoring the dictates of the legislative and judicial branches, DSHS is depriving a particularly at-risk population of the opportunity for necessary mental health treatment to the detriment of both patient well-being and community safety. In the face of DSHS’s continuing contempt for both legislative and judicial authority, Washington’s counties have joined in an unprecedented coalition to enforce DSHS’s legal obligations.

2. The Washington State Association of Counties and its members, Asotin County, Clallam County, Cowlitz County, Douglas County, Grant County, Grays Harbor County, Island County, Jefferson County, King County, Pierce County, Kitsap County, Klickitat County, Lewis County, Lincoln County, Pacific County, Skagit County, Skamania County, Snohomish County, Spokane County, Thurston County, Whatcom County, Yakima County (collectively, the “Counties”), which together represent more than 6 million Washington residents, have a substantial interest in proper and effective operation of both Washington’s criminal justice system and its mental health care system.

3. When the mental competency of a criminal defendant cannot be restored, county superior courts dismiss the defendant’s charges without prejudice and must commit the former defendant to DSHS custody to evaluate the patient for potential civil commitment. Because the dismissal of criminal charges “converts” these patients from a criminal hold to a civil commitment hold, they are referred to as “civil conversion patients.”

1 4. DSHS has conceded that state law requires it to admit civil conversion patients for
2 evaluations in order to determine whether additional civil commitment is warranted.

3 5. In each case, DSHS's obligation to conduct an evaluation is ordered by the
4 Superior Court.

5 6. Nonetheless, DSHS has selectively refused admission to civil conversion patients
6 since at least December 2022 and, on information and belief, has refused to admit any civil
7 conversion patients for statutorily required civil commitment evaluations since July 13, 2023.

8 7. In addition, Washington law requires that DSHS provide written notice to specific
9 law enforcement officials, prosecutors, victims and other interested parties at least 30 days
10 before it releases certain civil conversion patients back to their communities following treatment.
11 This notice is essential to ensuring the safety and well-being of both the patients and their
12 communities.
13

14 8. However, DSHS has recently stated its intention to release these individuals
15 without complying with its statutory notice requirements.
16

17 9. DSHS's statutory violations deny conversion patients necessary mental health
18 treatment and impede public safety throughout the Counties. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek
19 declaratory and injunctive relief against DSHS or a writ of mandamus to: (1) declare DSHS'
20 refusal to admit patients for statutorily required civil conversion evaluations a violation of RCW
21 10.77.086 and direct DSHS to admit patients for the required evaluations; and (2) declare
22 DSHS's release of civilly committed conversion patients without proper notice a violation of
23 RCW 71.05.425 and direct DSHS to comply with its statutory notice obligations before releasing
24 any such patients.
25
26
27

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

II. PARTIES

10. Plaintiff Washington State Association of Counties (“WSAC”) is a voluntary, non-profit association that represents the interests of all of Washington State’s 39 counties. Established in 1906, WSAC provides a variety of services to its member counties, including advocating for their interests, conducting training and workshops, facilitating the development and sharing of best practices, and promoting and lobbying for legislation and policy that advances the interests of its members. As a representative of counties across Washington, WSAC has an interest in ensuring that DSHS meet its statutory obligation to admit conversion patients for evaluations to determine the need for further civil commitment and treatment. WSAC also has an interest in ensuring that counties are not wrongfully burdened with civil conversion evaluation costs and responsibility, when they do not have the authority and means necessary to furnish such services.

11. Plaintiff Asotin County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and has a population of approximately 22,362 residents. Asotin County operates the Asotin County Superior Court.

12. Plaintiff Clallam County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and has a population of approximately 77,805 residents. Clallam County operates the Clallam County Superior Court.

13. Plaintiff Cowlitz County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and has a population of approximately 111,524 residents. Cowlitz County operates the Cowlitz County Superior Court.

1 14. Plaintiff Douglas County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
2 has a population of approximately 43,696 residents. Douglas County operates the Douglas
3 County Superior Court.

4 15. Plaintiff Grant County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
5 has a population of approximately 100,297 residents. Grant County operates the Grant County
6 Superior Court.

7 16. Plaintiff Grays Harbor County is a political subdivision of the State of
8 Washington and has a population of approximately 76,841 residents. Grays Harbor County
9 operates the Grays Harbor County Superior Court.

10 17. Plaintiff Island County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
11 has a population of approximately 87,432 residents. Island County operates the Island County
12 Superior Court.

13 18. Plaintiff Jefferson County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington
14 and has a population of approximately 33,605 residents. Jefferson County operates the Jefferson
15 County Superior Court.

16 19. Plaintiff King County is a home rule charter county organized under the
17 provisions of the Washington Constitution and has a population of approximately 2.2 million
18 residents. Like all Washington counties listed herein, it provides substantial funding to the
19 criminal justice system, which includes the superior courts, the prosecuting attorney, public
20 defenders, the sheriff, and the county jail. Like all counties listed herein, King County operates
21 and/or funds the civil commitment process under Washington's Involuntary Treatment Act,
22 including Designated Crisis Responders ("DCRs").
23
24
25
26
27

1 20. Plaintiff Kitsap County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
2 has a population of approximately 274,314 residents. Kitsap County operates the Kitsap County
3 Superior Court.

4 21. Plaintiff Klickitat County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
5 has a population of approximately 23,271 residents. Klickitat County operates the Klickitat
6 County Superior Court.

7 22. Plaintiff Lewis County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
8 has a population of approximately 84,398 residents. Lewis County operates the Lewis County
9 Superior Court.

10 23. Plaintiff Lincoln County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
11 has a population of approximately 10,570 residents. Lincoln County operates the Lincoln County
12 Superior Court.

13 24. Plaintiff Pacific County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
14 has a population of approximately 23,948 residents. Pacific County operates the Pacific County
15 Superior Court.

16 25. Plaintiff Pierce County is a home rule charter county organized under the
17 provisions of the Washington Constitution and has a population of approximately 925,700
18 residents.

19 26. Plaintiff Skagit County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
20 has a population of approximately 131,179 residents. Skagit County operates the Skagit County
21 Superior Court.

1 27. Plaintiff Skamania County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington
2 and has a population of approximately 12,170 residents. Skamania County operates the
3 Skamania County Superior Court.

4 28. Plaintiff Snohomish County is a home rule charter county organized under the
5 provisions of the Washington Constitution and has a population of approximately 833,500
6 residents.

7 29. Plaintiff Spokane County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
8 has a population of approximately 549,690 residents. Lewis County operates the Lewis County
9 Superior Court.

10 30. Plaintiff Thurston County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
11 has a population of approximately 297,977 residents. Thurston County operates the Thurston
12 County Superior Court.

13 31. Plaintiff Whatcom County is a home rule charter county organized under the
14 provisions of the Washington Constitution and has a population of approximately 228,831
15 residents. Whatcom County operates the Whatcom County Superior Court.

16 32. Plaintiff Yakima County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington and
17 has a population of approximately 256,035 residents. Yakima County operates the Yakima
18 County Superior Court.

19 33. Defendant Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (“DSHS”)
20 is a governmental agency of the State of Washington. DSHS’ Behavioral Health Administration
21 is responsible for the management of Washington’s civil commitment and adult forensic mental
22 health care system. It is responsible for providing competency evaluation and restoration
23 services, as well as evaluations for civil conversion commitment.
24
25
26
27

1 34. Defendant Gilma Meneses is a resident of Washington, and the Secretary of
2 DSHS.

3 **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 35. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to chapter 2.08 RCW,
5 chapter 7.16 RCW, chapter 7.24 RCW, and chapter 7.40 RCW.

6 36. Venue is proper in this Court under RCW 4.92.010.

7 **IV. STANDING**

8 37. The Counties have standing to challenge DSHS's failure to comply with its
9 statutory obligations to evaluate civil conversion patients for potential civil commitment and
10 provide adequate notice before releasing civilly committed patients back to their communities.

11 38. WSAC has standing to bring suit on behalf of its member counties because its
12 members would otherwise have standing to sue in their own right, the interests WSAC seeks to
13 protect are germane to its purpose of protecting and advancing the interests of all of Washington
14 State's 39 counties, and neither the claim asserted nor the relief requested requires participation
15 of individual counties in the lawsuit.

16 39. The Counties have each suffered an injury in fact due to the DSHS's failure to
17 comply with its statutory obligations.

18 40. This Court's grant of declaratory and injunctive relief or a writ of mandamus will
19 redress directly the harms caused to Plaintiffs by DSHS's violations of RCW 10.77.086 and
20 RCW 71.05.425.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

V. STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. The Civil Conversion Process

41. Under RCW 10.77.086(5), whenever a superior court dismisses felony criminal charges because a defendant's competency cannot be restored, the court is required to order that the former defendant be referred to DSHS for a mental health evaluation.

42. DSHS is mandated by law and court order to accept these civil conversion patients for periods of up to 120-hours of evaluation. During these evaluations, DSHS must determine based on a thorough review of the patient's history and observation of the patient, whether to pursue an additional civil conversion commitment for treatment. By petition and affidavit, DSHS may seek additional 180-day periods of inpatient treatment followed by conditional release to a supportive less restrictive environment.

43. DSHS's mental health treatment of conversion patients and its supportive release of those patients following treatment is effective in reducing recidivism.

44. From at least September 2022 through March 2023, DSHS removed beds from and closed wards at Western State Hospital, long before replacement bed space was available, resulting in a decrease in capacity to perform its statutory obligations, including its obligation to evaluate civil conversion patients.

45. On December 14, 2022, DSHS Assistant Secretary Bovenkamp issued a policy memorandum titled "Hospital Admission Triaging," ("Memorandum") informing counties and others that it would no longer comply with RCW 10.77.086(5) or superior court orders to admit conversion patients for evaluation commitments. Instead, DSHS asserted its alleged authority to "triage" which conversion patients it would accept, and stated it would provide "timely notice" when rejecting a conversion patient for admission.

1 46. The Counties did not receive notice of this policy change prior to its
2 implementation, nor were they consulted by the DSHS.

3 47. Immediately after issuing the Memorandum, DSHS began refusing to admit some
4 civil conversion patients for evaluation, and instead recommended that counties reach out to
5 local county-funded DCRs in order to assess the patients for possible civil detention at a local
6 facility.

7 48. For example, on December 7, 2022, the King County Superior Court ordered
8 DSHS in Case No. 22-1-04244-0 SEA to admit Michael Charles Holland for a 120 hour civil
9 conversion evaluation.¹ The court’s order was issued on a standard form used statewide for the
10 purpose of dismissing felony charges and directing a conversion commitment evaluation.

11 49. Despite the Superior Court order, on December 14, 2022, DSHS refused to admit
12 Mr. Holland for a conversion commitment evaluation. With DSHS represented and present in the
13 courtroom, the Superior Court entered an order clarifying that its prior order “mandates and
14 directs” DSHS to admit the patient for a 120-hour evaluation. *State v. Holland*, No. 22-1-04244-
15 0 SEA (December 16, 2022). It ordered DSHS to admit Mr. Holland by no later than December
16 21, 2022. *Id.* DSHS again ignored and violated the court’s order by refusing to admit Holland for
17 an evaluation.

18 50. The Counties have received numerous letters from DSHS denying admission to
19 civil conversion patients under this “triage” policy. These letters were sent by DSHS from
20 Western State Hospital, which is located in Pierce County, Washington.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27

¹ Mr. Holland’s criminal charges were dismissed because DSHS has failed in its statutory and constitutional obligation to offer timely competency restoration services.

1 51. In a letter dated January 12, 2023, the Washington Superior Court Judges’
2 Association (“SCJA”) expressed to DSHS that the agency’s policy change “may worsen
3 Washington State’s public safety crisis” and “contributes substantially to a scenario in which
4 individuals requiring clinical treatment are released with no accountability for criminal, often
5 violent, behavior.” “The SCJA urge[d] the Department to rescind the memorandum released on
6 December 14, 2022 and meet its obligations” under Chapter 10.77 RCW. DSHS did not revise its
7 triage policy to comply with statute and court order.
8

9 52. On July 7, 2023, in *A.B. by & through Trueblood v. Washington State Dep’t of*
10 *Soc. & Health Servs.*, Case No. 2:14-cv-1178 (U.S.D.C. WD WA), the U.S. District Court for the
11 Western District of Washington issued an order (the “*Trueblood Order*”) ruling that DSHS
12 breached its duty owed a class of pre-trial detainees by failing to provide timely competency and
13 restoration services in violation of the detainees’ Fourth Amendment Rights, and in violation of a
14 settlement agreement DSHS had previously entered with the plaintiff class.
15

16 53. As part of its relief, the federal court ordered that DSHS “shall immediately cease
17 admitting Civil Conversion patients to the state hospitals for ordered civil commitment
18 treatment.” Although the *Trueblood Order* was limited to long-term treatment admissions, did
19 not impact short-term evaluation admissions, and had no applicability to other DSHS operated or
20 contracted facilities, DSHS immediately began citing the *Trueblood Order* as a basis to decline
21 providing mental health evaluations to *all* civil conversion patients.
22

23 54. On or about July 13, 2023, DSHS sent a letter informing King County that it
24 could not conduct evaluations of former criminal defendants, purportedly due to the *Trueblood*
25 *Order*. Since then, it has issued similar notifications to other counties. This letter was, again, sent
26 by DSHS from Western State Hospital, which is located in Pierce County, Washington. On
27

1 information and belief, DSHS has not admitted any civil conversion patients for evaluation since
2 that date.

3 55. DSHS's refusal to perform its legal duty to evaluate civil conversion patients
4 deprives these patients of care they are statutorily entitled to, precludes any evaluation of
5 whether the patients are likely to recommit potentially serious and violent offenses as a result of
6 a mental health disorder, and risks returning these individuals to communities where they may
7 pose a risk to themselves and others.
8

9 56. DSHS has also improperly sought to shift the burden and expense of its own
10 statutory obligations to the Counties, which would require the diversion of critical resources
11 from other essential needs. Because the conversion commitment statutes are available only to
12 DSHS, conversion commitment patients are denied necessary mental health treatment and public
13 safety is negatively impacted.
14

15 **B. DSHS's Notice Requirements**

16 57. When DSHS intends to release, transfer or grant authorized leave to patients who
17 have been civilly committed following dismissal of sex, violent, or felony harassment charges
18 ("Committed Patients"), DSHS must "at the earliest possible date, and in no event later than
19 thirty days before [the release, leave or transfer] . . . send written notice of [the release, leave, or
20 transfer] to the following: (i) The chief of police of the city, if any, in which the person will
21 reside; (ii) The sheriff of the county in which the person will reside; and (iii) The prosecuting
22 attorney of the county in which the criminal charges against the committed person were
23 dismissed." RCW 71.05.425(1)(a).
24

25 58. In addition, on request, DSHS must also provide notice to: "(i) The victim of the
26 sex, violent, or felony harassment offense that was dismissed . . . or the victim's next of kin if the
27

1 crime was a homicide; (ii) Any witnesses who testified against the person in any court
2 proceedings; (iii) Any person specified in writing by the prosecuting attorney. . . ; and (iv) The
3 chief of police of the city, if any, and the sheriff of the county, if any, which had jurisdiction of
4 the person on the date of the applicable offense.” RCW 71.05.425(1)(b).

5
6 59. On or around August 2, 2023, DSHS began sending letters without any specific
7 address or recipients, and directed only to “Prosecutor, Washington Association of Sheriffs and
8 Police Chiefs (WASPC), and county law enforcement agencies” stating that it would be releasing
9 certain Committed Patients “by September 7, 2023.”

10 60. DSHS’s letters did not comply with the notice requirements of RCW 71.05.425—
11 a fact DSHS’s letters concede by stating that DSHS “expect[s] to return to routine notification
12 process after these discharges are completed in September.”

13
14 **VI. CAUSES OF ACTION**

15 **A. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT**

16 61. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each of the foregoing allegations as though fully set
17 forth herein.

18 62. For reasons including but not limited to those stated in this Complaint, an actual
19 dispute exists between Plaintiffs and DSHS, which parties have genuine and opposing interests,
20 which interests are direct and substantial, and of which dispute a judicial determination would be
21 final and conclusive.

22
23 63. This matter raises important questions about the State’s duty to civil conversion
24 patients and their communities, and a judicial opinion will benefit the public, other branches of
25 government, and counties across Washington.

1 64. Plaintiffs will suffer immediate damage and harm if DSHS's existing refusal to
2 accept and conduct civil conversion evaluations is not declared a violation Chapter 10.77 RCW.

3 65. Plaintiffs will further suffer immediate damage and harm if DSHS's failure to
4 comply with the statutory notice requirements for the release Committed Patients is not declared
5 a violation of RCW 71.05.425.

6 66. Plaintiffs are, therefore, entitled to a declaratory judgment that state law and
7 related court-orders require DSHS to: (1) accept civil conversion patients for civil commitment
8 evaluations; and (2) comply with RCW 71.05.425's notice requirements prior to releasing,
9 transferring, or granting leave to Committed Patients, as well as such other and further relief as
10 may follow from the entry of such a declaratory judgment.

11
12 **B. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

13 67. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each of the foregoing allegations as though fully
14 set forth herein.

15 68. Plaintiffs have clear legal rights to ensure that DSHS fully meets its statutory
16 obligation to evaluate civil conversion patients and provide notice prior to the release, transfer, or
17 grant of leave to Committed Patients. Plaintiffs have a well-grounded fear of immediate invasion
18 of those rights by the State, which invasion will result in actual and continuing injury. No
19 adequate remedy at law exists to remedy this invasion of Plaintiffs' rights.

20 69. Plaintiffs are, therefore, entitled to an injunction requiring DSHS to: (1) accept
21 civil conversion patients for civil commitment evaluations; and (2) comply with RCW
22 71.05.425's notice requirements prior to releasing, transferring, or granting leave to Committed
23 Patients.
24
25
26
27

1 **C. THIRD ALTERNATIVE CAUSE OF ACTION: PETITION FOR WRIT OF**
2 **MANDAMUS**

3 70. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each of the foregoing allegations as though fully set
4 forth herein.

5 71. A Writ of Mandamus is available “to compel the performance of an act which the
6 law especially enjoins as a duty,” when there is no “plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the
7 ordinary course of law.” RCW 7.16.160, .170.

8 72. DSHS has a statutory duty, enforced by court order, to evaluate civil conversion
9 patients.

10 73. DSHS has a statutory duty to provide notice to specific law enforcement officials,
11 prosecutors, and community members prior to releasing, transferring, or granting leave to
12 Committed Patients.

13 74. Plaintiffs are beneficially interested in DSHS’s performance of these obligations.

14 75. If the Court finds it may not issue an injunction, Plaintiffs are in the alternative
15 entitled to a writ of mandamus compelling DSHS to perform evaluations of civil conversion
16 patients and comply with its notice obligations.

17 76. Plaintiffs are, therefore, entitled to writ of mandamus requiring DSHS to: (1)
18 accept civil conversion patients for civil commitment evaluations; and (2) comply with RCW
19 71.05.425’s notice requirements prior to releasing, transferring, or granting leave to Committed
20 Patients.
21
22

23 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

24 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request the following relief:

25 A. That the Court enter an order declaring that:
26
27

- 1 a. DSHS’s refusal to accept and conduct civil conversion evaluations violates
2 RCW 10.77.086 and enforcing court orders; and
3
4 b. DSHS’s failure to provide adequate notice prior to releasing, transferring, or
5 granting leave to Committed Patients violates RCW 71.05.425;
6
7 B. That the Court enter an injunction requiring DSHS to:
8 a. accept civil conversion patients for civil commitment evaluations; and
9 b. comply with RCW 71.05.425’s notice requirements prior to releasing,
10 transferring, or granting leave to Committed Patients.
11
12 C. That the Court in the alternative to entering an injunction, issue a writ of
13 mandamus compelling DSHS to:
14 a. accept civil conversion patients for civil commitment evaluations; and
15 b. comply with RCW 71.05.425’s notice requirements prior to releasing,
16 transferring, or granting leave to Committed Patients.
17
18 D. An award of reasonable attorney fees, expenses and costs, to the fullest extent
19 allowed by law and equity;
20
21 E. For leave to amend pleadings as justice may require; and
22
23 F. Any further relief as this Court may deem necessary and proper.

24 DATED this 22nd day of August, 2023.

25 PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP

26 /s/ Paul Lawrence

27 Paul J. Lawrence, WSBA #13557

Ian D. Rogers, WSBA #46584

Shweta Jayawardhan, WSBA #58490

1191 2nd Avenue, Suite 2000

Seattle, WA 98101

MARY ROBNETT

Pierce County Prosecuting Attorney

/s/ Michelle Luna

Michelle Luna, WSBA #27088

Assistant Chief, Civil Division

955 Tacoma Avenue South, Suite 301

Tacoma, WA 98402

1 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Washington State*
2 *Association of Counties*

3 CURT LIEDKIE
4 Interim Asotin County Prosecuting Attorney

5 */s/ Curt Liedkie*

6 Curt Liedkie, WSBA #30371
7 Prosecutor
8 P.O. Box 220
9 Asotin, WA 99402

JONATHAN MEYER
Lewis County Prosecuting Attorney

10 */s/ Davie E. Bailey*

11 David E. Bailey, WSBA #26070
12 Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
13 345 West Main Street, 2nd Floor
14 Chehalis, WA, 98532

15 RYAN JURVAKAINEN
16 Cowlitz County Prosecuting Attorney

17 */s/ David J. Berger*

18 David J. Berger, WSBA #48480
19 Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
20 312 SW 1st Ave.
21 Kelso, WA 98626

ADAM WALSER
Lincoln County Prosecuting Attorney

22 */s/ Adam Walser*

23 Adam Walser, WSBA #50566
24 Prosecutor
25 450 Logan Street
26 Davenport, WA 99122

27 GORDON EDGAR
Douglas County Prosecuting Attorney

/s/ James T. Mitchell

James T. Mitchell, WSBA #31031
Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
P.O. Box 360
Waterville, WA 98858

MICHAEL ROTHMAN
Pacific County Prosecuting Attorney

/s/ Katrina A. King

Katrina A. King, WSBA #51717
Chief Civil Deputy Prosecutor
300 Memorial Drive
South Bend, WA 98586

KEVIN MCCRAE
Grant County Prosecuting Attorney

/s/ Rebekah M. Kaylor

Rebekah M. Kaylor, WSBA #53257
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
35 C Street NW
Ephrata, WA 98823

RICH WEYRICH
Skagit County Prosecuting Attorney

/s/ Erik Pedersen

Erik Pedersen, WSBA #20015
Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
605 South Third Street
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

NORMA TILLOTSON
Grays Harbor County Prosecuting Attorney

ADAM KICK
Skamania County Prosecuting Attorney

1
2 /s/ Bryan Lane
3 Bryan Lane, WSBA #18246
4 Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
102 West Broadway, Room 102
Montesano, WA 98563

5
6 GREGORY M. BANKS
Island County Prosecuting Attorney

7 /s/ Gregory M. Banks
8 Gregory M. Banks, WSBA #22926
9 Prosecutor
1 NE 7th Street
10 Coupeville, WA 98239

11 JAMES KENNEDY
12 Jefferson County Prosecuting Attorney

13 /s/ Philip C. Hunsucker
14 Philip C. Hunsucker, WSBA #48692
15 Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
1820 Jefferson St
16 Port Townsend, WA 98368

17 LEESA MANION
18 King County Prosecuting Attorney

19 /s/ Andrea Vitalich
20 Andrea Vitalich, WSBA #25535
21 Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
701 5th Avenue, Suite 600
Seattle, WA 98104

22
23 CHAD M. ENRIGHT
24 Kitsap County Prosecuting Attorney

25 /s/ Katherine A. Cummings
26 Katherine A. Cummings, WSBA #51646
27 Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
614 Division Street, MS-35A
Port Orchard, WA 98366

/s/ Adam Kick
Adam Kick, WSBA #27525
Prosecutor
240 NW Vancouver Ave.
Stevenson, WA 98648

JASON CUMMINGS
Snohomish County Prosecuting Attorney

/s/ Bridget E. Casey
Bridget E. Casey, WSBA #30459
Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 504
Everett, WA 98201

LARRY H. HASKELL
Spokane County Prosecuting Attorney

/s/ Christopher Anderson
Christopher Anderson, WSBA #45361
Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
100 W Mallon Ave
Spokane, WA 99260

JON TUNHEIM
Thurston County Prosecuting Attorney

/s/ Elizabeth Petrich
Elizabeth Petrich, WSBA #18713
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
2000 Lakeridge Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98502

ERIC J. RICHEY
Whatcom County Prosecuting Attorney

/s/ Karen Frakes
Karen Frakes, WSBA #13600
Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
311 Grand Ave., Suite 201
Bellingham, WA 98225

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

DAVID R. QUESNEL
Klickitat County Prosecuting Attorney

JOSEPH A. BRUSIC
Yakima County Prosecuting Attorney

/s/ David R. Quesnel
David R. Quesnel, WSBA #38579
Prosecutor
205 S. Columbus Ave, Room 106
Goldendale, WA 98620

/s/ Don L. Anderson
Don L. Anderson, WSBA # 12445
Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
128 North 2nd Street, Room 211
Yakima, WA 98901