# *Part I – Agency Profile*

**Agency Overview**

The Office of the State Appellate Public Defender (SAPD) provides appellate representation in the Idaho Supreme Court and Idaho Court of Appeals to indigent adults and juveniles who have been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor. The SAPD also provides appellate representation to petitioners in state post-conviction and habeas corpus cases. In capital cases, where a defendant has been sentenced to death, the SAPD provides district court representation for post-conviction cases, as well as representation on appeal in both the direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and the appeal from the denial of the post-conviction petition.

On November 22, 2016, Governor Otter appointed Eric D. Fredericksen to the position of State Appellate Public Defender. Mr. Fredericksen was reappointed to the position of State Appellate Public Defender on August 1, 2018. The office has 25 full-time employees, including the agency head. The Capital Litigation Unit includes three attorneys, a mitigation specialist, an investigator, and one administrative assistant. The Appellate Unit has thirteen staff attorneys and three legal assistants. There is also an office administrator and receptionist. The office is located at 322 East Front Street, Suite 570, Boise, Idaho.

The SAPD must provide effective assistance of counsel to its clients and timely process appeals, as mandated by both the United States and Idaho Constitutions, as well as by Idaho statutes and court rules. Ethically, in its casework the SAPD must serve, first and foremost, the best interests of its clients. The SAPD is also mindful of relevant constituent groups and the legislative goal of reducing the financial burden on Idaho counties previously caused by the extraordinary cost of legal representation of indigent defendants on appeal. The SAPD is additionally committed to strengthening Idaho’s criminal justice system to ensure it is both efficient and effective for SAPD clients.

The SAPD’s Mission: Defending zealously, advancing fairness, and advocating with integrity.

The SAPD’s Vision: A better Idaho where the legal system treats each person with fairness and dignity.

**Core Functions/Idaho Code**

The right of a defendant to representation by an attorney in a felony criminal case is a core value in Idaho, dating back to the days of the Idaho Territory. The Revised Statutes of Idaho, dated 1884, stated that if a defendant “desires and is unable to employ counsel, the court must assign counsel to defend him.” Years later, the United States Supreme Court recognized, in *Alabama v. Powell*, 287 U.S. 45, 68-69 (1932), that the basic fairness required by the United States Constitution meant that indigent defendants facing capital charges had the right to assistance of counsel. More than thirty years later, in *Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963), the Supreme Court ruled that states have a constitutional obligation under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution to provide trial counsel to non-capital indigent defendants facing a loss of liberty. Finally, in *Douglas v. California*, 372 U.S. 353 (1963), the Court found that an indigent defendant is entitled to the assistance of counsel in a first appeal granted as a matter of right from a criminal conviction.

Even absent the constitutional requirements for counsel, Idaho continues to adhere to the core value of ensuring that criminal defendants facing a loss of liberty are represented by counsel “to the same extent as a person having his own counsel is so entitled.” I.C. § 19-852. Similarly, in accordance with Idaho Criminal Rule 44.2, immediately after the imposition of the death penalty, the court must appoint at least one lawyer to represent the defendant for purposes of seeking post-conviction relief pursuant to Idaho Code §19-2719.

The legislature recognized that the cost of providing appellate representation was an extraordinary burden on the counties of Idaho. “In order to reduce this burden, provide competent counsel but avoid paying high hourly rates to independent counsel to represent indigent defendants in appellate proceedings,” the legislature created the SAPD. *See* I.C. § 19-868. The duties of the SAPD are enumerated in I.C. §19-868 through §19-872.

**Revenue and Expenditures**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Revenue** | **FY 2020** | **FY 2021** | **FY 2022** | **FY 2023** |
| General Fund | $3,099,100 | $3,091,200 | $3,312,00 |  |
| Dedicated | $0 | $0 | $0 |  |
| **Total** | **$3,099,100** | $3,091,200 | $3,312,000 |  |
| **Expenditures** | **FY 2020** | **FY 2021** | **FY 2022** | **FY 2023** |
| Personnel Costs | $2,368,800 | $2,409,400 | $2,580,600 |  |
| Operating Expenditures | $407,500 | $488,400 | $432,400 |  |
| Capital Outlay | $19,400 | $71,300 | $3,700 |  |
| Trustee/Benefit Payments | $0 | $0 | $0 |  |
| **Total** | **$2,795,700** | **$2,969,100** | **$3,016,700** |  |

**Profile of Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided** | **FY 2020** | **FY 2021** | **FY 2022** | **FY 2023** |
| Capital Cases Managed | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| Non-Capital Cases Opened | 618 | 435 | 568 |  |

**FY 2023 Performance Highlights**

The SAPD had a number of significant legal victories over the past fiscal year, including the following notable developments in Idaho jurisprudence. In *State v. Randall*, 169 Idaho 358 (2021) and *State v. Howard*, 169 Idaho 379 (2021), the Idaho Supreme Court overturned an Idaho Court of Appeals opinion from 2015, finding that decision to be inconsistent with United States Supreme Court precedent. In *Randall* and *Howard*, the Court held that when a drug-sniffing canine trespasses into the interior of a vehicle it is a “search” within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment. In *State v. Paulson*, the Idaho Supreme Court overturned a vehicular manslaughter conviction finding that the jury was incorrectly instructed. The *Paulson* Court clarified that in order to render a guilty verdict for vehicular manslaughter under an impairment theory, the jury has to be instructed and find that the defendant must have caused the collision *because of* his impairment. Finally, in *State v. Diaz*, 170 Idaho 79 (2022), the Idaho Supreme Court held that expert testimony may be admitted to try to show the defendant’s mental condition prevented him from forming the requisite *mens rea* for the charged offense.

***Part II – Performance Measures***

| **Performance Measure** | | **FY 2020** | **FY 2021** | **FY 2022** | **FY 2023** | **FY 2024** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal 1**  *Provide Competent, Constitutionally Sufficient Representation to All SAPD Clients* | | | | | | |
| 1. No affirmed reprimands from the Office of Bar Counsel or the Idaho Supreme Court. | actual | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| *target* | *No Affirmed Reprimands* | *No Affirmed Reprimands* | *No Affirmed Reprimands* | *No Affirmed Reprimands* |  |
| 1. No affirmed findings of ineffective assistance of counsel against an SAPD attorney. | actual | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| *target* | *No Affirmed Findings* | *No Affirmed Findings* | *No Affirmed Findings* | *No Affirmed Findings* |  |
| 1. Continuing legal education credits for renewal of licenses to practice law. | actual | 100% | 100% | 100% |  |  |
| *target* | *100% License Renewal* | *100% License Renewal* | *100% License Renewal* | *100% License Renewal* |  |
| **Goal 2**  *Provide Services In An Efficient Manner* | | | | | | |
| 1. New contract cases assigned by fiscal year. | actual | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| *target* | *0 Cases* | *0 Cases* | *0 Cases* | *0 Cases* |  |
| 1. All cases assigned within 21 days of receipt of the transcript and record such that objections to the record can be filed in the district court. | actual | 100% | 100% | 100% |  |  |
| *target* | *100%* | *100%* | *100%* | *100%* |  |
| 1. Reduce the number of initial appellant’s briefs filed on more than two extensions as identified each fiscal year. | actual | 559/110 | 476/103 | 425/84 |  |  |
| *target* | *10% Reduction of Briefs Filed on >2 Ext. from previous FY* | *No more than 10% of Initial Appellant’s Briefs Filed on > 2 Ext.* | *No more than 10% of Initial Appellant’s Briefs Filed on > 2 Ext.* | *No more than 10% of Initial Appellant’s Briefs Filed on > 2 Ext.* |  |
| 1. Reduce the average Appellant Unit attorneys’ caseloads to an appropriate level of no more than 35 units per year. | actual | 58.08 units | 43.30 units | 36.56 units |  |  |
| *target* | *35.00 Unit Average* | *35.00 Unit Average* | *35.00 Unit Average* | *35.00 Unit Average* |  |
| **Goal 3**  *Collaborate With Other Entities To Improve Idaho’s Criminal Justice System* | | | | | | |
| 1. Clarify or modify the jurisdiction of the SAPD to handle identified indigent defense representation needs each fiscal year. | actual | 100%\*\* | 100% | 100% |  |  |
| *target* | *Amend Idaho Code § 19-840 to expand jurisdiction of the SAPD to handle juvenile and misdemeanor appeals from the district court\*\** | *Amend Idaho Code § 19-840 to expand jurisdiction of the SAPD to handle juvenile and misdemeanor appeals from the district court* | *Amend Idaho Code § 19-840 to expand jurisdiction of the SAPD to handle juvenile and misdemeanor appeals from the district court* | *Assess SAPD jurisdiction under Idaho Code § 19-5905 to determine whether the SAPD should be appointed to additional appellate cases.* |  |
| 1. Collaborate with other entities to improve Idaho’s criminal justice system. | actual | 100% | 100% | 100% |  |  |
| *target* | *Participation in the ICJC, IPDC, the Grant Council, the Technology Committee, the Appellate Rules Committee, and the NAPD* | *Participation in the ICJC, IPDC, the Grant Council, the Technology Committee, the Appellate Rules Committee, and the NAPD* | *Participation in the ICJC, IPDC, the Grant Council, the Technology Committee, the Appellate Rules Committee, and the NAPD* | *Participation in the ICJC, IPDC, the Grant Council, the Technology Committee, the Appellate Rules Committee, and the NAPD* |  |

\* This Performance measure was completed in FY2017 and has been replaced with a new performance measure for FY2020.

\*\*New Performance measure for FY 2020.

**Performance Measure Explanatory Notes**

In FY2022, the SAPD was appointed to 568 criminal appeals from the district court, which is a significant case increase from FY2021 (435), but more on target with caseloads from previous years. The SAPD’s numbers are consistent with the number of felony criminal appeals filed in the Idaho Supreme Court. The average deputy’s workload this past year was 36.56 units, which marks a second year of an average workload decrease. The decrease is largely attributed to the Corona Virus pandemic which significantly slowed the litigating of cases in the district court over the past two years. The SAPD anticipates the workload will increase as district courts process through the backlog of cases created by the pandemic. While 36.56 units slightly exceeds the SAPD’s goal to average 35 workload units per attorney, it is certainly a manageable workload. Additionally, SAPD attorneys are given a weekly opportunity to refuse new cases if they believe their current workload is too high. SAPD attorneys will routinely refuse to accept new cases until they believe they are able to meet their constitutional obligations to their individual clients. Additionally, attorneys are permitted to obtain additional extensions from the Idaho Supreme Court in filing the briefs on appeal.

|  |
| --- |
| **For More Information Contact**  Eric D. Fredericksen  State Appellate Public Defender  322 East Front Street, Suite 570  Boise, ID 83702  Phone: (208) 334-2712  E-mail: [efredericksen@sapd.state.id.us](mailto:efredericksen@sapd.state.id.us) |