

# WSBA Juvenile Law Section Newsletter

*Executive Committee:*

September 2009

**Stephen Hassett and Jana Heyd, Co-Chairs**

**Kim Ambrose, Past Chair**

**Jeannie Nist, Secretary-Treasurer**

**Karen Pinnell, Member at Large**

**Chori Folkman, Member at Large**

**Paul Alig, Co-Director, Civil Legal Needs Committee**

**Erin Lovell and Cheryl Wolfe, Co-Directors, Dependency/Child Welfare Committee**

**Katie Hurley and Wyman Yip, Co-Directors, Juvenile Offender Committee**

## Letter from the Co-Chairs

Contact Co-Chairs: Steve Hassett (stephenh@atg.wa.gov) and Jana Heyd (jana.heyd@scraplaw.org)

Dear Section Members,

We would like to take this opportunity to update you on upcoming activities of the Section, welcome our new Section members and express our appreciation for the participation and commitment of our ongoing members.

The WSBA Juvenile Law Section's annual meeting and CLE is scheduled for October 7, 2009 from noon to 4 pm at the WSBA offices. We will be celebrating our 3<sup>rd</sup> year as a section, and will be planning events and trainings for the upcoming year. The annual meeting will begin at noon with a business meeting, which will include the election of officers, revision of bylaws and a review of the section's activities for 2008-2009. Each of the subcommittees will report. Our current subcommittees include Civil Legal Needs, Dependency/ Child Welfare and Juvenile Offender. Each subcommittee is responsible for hosting a quarterly mini-CLE, and each reviews legislation and policy that is significant to that practice area.

Following the business meeting on October 7, there will be a CLE that will look at how youth initiatives support and possibly impact youth at risk in the education system. A panel of individuals who work with youth and whose work is impacted by these initiatives will discuss the benefits and potential consequences for youth in Washington. We hope you will join us for this event.

Thank you for your ongoing diligent advocacy for youth in Washington. We hope you will join us for the annual meeting, the CLE and that you will continue your participation with the Section and its activities.

Sincerely,

Jana Heyd                      Steve Hassett

Co-Chairs of the Juvenile Law Section

### Inside this issue:

JLS Civil Legal Needs Committee	2
JLS Dependency and Child Welfare Committee	2
JLS Legislative Update	3
JLS Juvenile Offender Committee	9
JLS Upcoming Events	10

*This is a publication of a section of the Washington State Bar Association. All opinions and comments in this publication represent the views of the authors and do not necessarily have the endorsement of the Association nor its officers or agents.*

## JLS Civil Legal Needs Committee

Contact Co-Directors: Paul Alig ([paul.alig@teamchild.org](mailto:paul.alig@teamchild.org)) & Chori Folkman ([cfolkman@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov](mailto:cfolkman@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov))

The Civil Legal Needs Committee is composed of members of the Section who provide or hope to provide civil legal services for youth, or those who want to work on policy or legislative issues relating to the civil legal needs of youth. There are three subcommittees within the Civil Legal Needs Committee: Education, Outreach, and Status Offender.

The Civil Legal Needs Committee met on August 27<sup>th</sup> at TeamChild in Seattle. Participants discussed ideas for upcoming CLE opportunities within the Juvenile Law Section and in collaboration with other youth advocacy organizations. The Committee agreed to pursue an ethics CLE focusing on issues that arise in the practice of civil cases while representing youth. The Committee discussed outreach to law students and the private bar to increase membership and involvement in the section.

**Education:** Paul Alig, chair of the Education Subcommittee discussed how members will try to develop CLEs on the school to prison pipeline and col-

laboration with the private sector on the representation of children in special education due process hearings.

**Outreach:** Chori Folkman, co-chair of the Outreach Subcommittee, discussed the subcommittee's goals to enhance the communication and collaborative partnerships between the public and private sectors working in the areas of youth law. Ideas of creating a regular Juvenile Law Section newsletter as first project or creating a regular yearly meeting were discussed.

**Status Offender:** Rosey Thurman, co-chair of the Status Offender Subcommittee ([rosey.thurman@teamchild.org](mailto:rosey.thurman@teamchild.org)), identified the need for statewide brown-bag CLEs on issues related to truancy, ARY, and CHINS cases. Individuals involved in these areas of law provided updates on changes and progress in their practice in the last few months.

## JLS Dependency and Child Welfare Committee

Contact Co-Directors: Erin Lovell ([erin.lovell@defender.org](mailto:erin.lovell@defender.org)) and Cheryl Wolfe ([cherylw@atg.wa.gov](mailto:cherylw@atg.wa.gov))

The Child Welfare Committee has three projects pending.

A small group has been working on a review of the Superior Court Juvenile Court Rules for civil proceedings to identify necessary amendments. Proposed amendments were identified prior to the last legislative changes. A second review in light of new legislation is planned for the near future to identify additional changes.

The Counsel for Kids Subcommittee brings practitioners from a variety of fields and organizations together to work on a statewide plan to promote and advocate for the appointment of counsel for children involved in dependency proceedings in Washington state. Subcommittee members keep each other apprised of various advocacy efforts statewide, and work to educate Juvenile Law Section

members on the issue and ways to help this advocacy movement. Most recently, the subcommittee worked with the Juvenile Law Section's Executive Committee to request the Board of Governors to co-sponsor the American Bar Association's Model Rules on the Representation of Children involved in Abuse, Neglect and Dependency Proceedings. Anyone interested in joining the subcommittee should contact the organizer, Chori Folkman, at [cfolkman@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov](mailto:cfolkman@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov).

Finally, the committee plans to co-sponsor a CLE in October regarding youth aging out of the system and the new Lawyers Fostering Independence project.

## A Summary of Dependency and Child Welfare Bills From the 2009 Session

By Stephen Hassett

***Special 2009  
Legislative  
Summary  
Section***

While the 2009 legislative session was a long session, it was dominated by budget issues. With one notable exception, bills on child welfare issues tended to have a fairly narrow focus. However, a number of bills were passed in 2009 that make substantive changes to the dependency process or otherwise affect child welfare related statutes. All statutes enacted or amended in 2009 became effective on July 26, 2009, unless otherwise specified. The most significant and far reaching bill passed in 2009 session was 2SHB 2106, which starts a process of shifting provision of child welfare services from DSHS to private supervising agencies. Initially this will be done by the creation of a child welfare transformation design committee which will select two demonstration sites. While the bill does amend a number of sections in chapters 13.34 and 74.13 RCW to add the phrase “supervising agency,” it will be a few years before it has a direct impact on the local level.

### ESSB 5811

This bill is entitled “an act relating to foster child placements” but it covers a number of issues. Sections 1 through 5 amend existing sections of chapter 13.34 RCW on dependency proceedings to put increased emphasis on placement of a child with relatives and “other suitable persons.”

Section 1 amends RCW 13.34.065 to add “other suitable person” wherever the statute refers to relative placement. Section 2 makes similar changes to RCW 13.34.130 on relative placement when a disposition order is entered. Section 5 also amends RCW 13.34.260 to provide that the department shall follow the wishes of the parents (“absent good cause”) regarding placement of their child “with a relative or other suitable person...” In 2007, the legislature added other suitable person as a placement option in dependencies. While the definition of other suitable person is unchanged, this year’s amendments effectively elevate other suitable persons to the same status as a child’s relative for placement considerations. Section 1 also amends RCW 13.34.065 to add a requirement in shelter care hearings that the court “shall ask the parents whether the department discussed with them the placement of the child with a relative or other suitable person...” With this information the court “shall determine what efforts have been made toward such a placement.” This is the first time the legislature has mandated that the court in a dependency-related hearing directly ask the parents for information on any specific issue.

However, other amendments in this bill make it clear that the primary considerations of the court in placement decisions continue to be the best interests and needs of the child. In a shelter care hearing, the court “must also determine whether placement with the relative or other suitable person is in the child’s best interests.” While this is consistent with long-standing case law, it has not previously been so clearly stated in statute. Also, at disposition, the court “shall consider the child’s existing relationships and attachment when determining placement.” A similar change is made by Section 3 to RCW 13.34.138 on review hearings where a best-interests requirement is added when the court makes a finding on whether preference has been given to relative placement.

Section 4 amends RCW 13.34.145 on permanency planning hearings to also add a new finding for the court. If the department is recommending placement of a child with someone other than the current foster parent, relative or other suitable person, the court must “enter a finding as to the reasons for the recommendation for a change in placement.” This does not change either the placement and care authority of DSHS over children in its custody or its ability to move a child in an emergency situation, but if DSHS is recommending a change of placement as part of a permanency plan for a child, the court must make a finding on the reasons for that recommendation.

Sections 7 and 8 require DSHS to inform children in dependency proceedings of the statutory duties and responsibilities of the department to them by posting on the Internet a document listing such duties and responsibilities, which include reasonable efforts towards reunification, sibling and parent-child visits, preference towards relative or other suitable person placement, etc., and directly providing the document to dependent youth 12 or older.

Other sections address adoption support program issues and the authority of the Office of Children's and Family Ombudsman, but they will have little direct bearing on dependency proceedings.

### SHB 1769

This bill requires DSHS to provide housing assistance to families in dependency cases in which homelessness or lack of suitable housing is a "significant factor." Its four sections amend RCW 13.34.030, 13.34.065, 13.34.130 and 13.34.138 respectively. However, while the provision of housing assistance may go to reasonable efforts, it is not a remedial service for purposes of reunification and the court's authority to order housing assistance is conditioned on the availability of funding and resources and by eligibility on the part of the family.

Section 1 adds a definition of "housing assistance" to RCW 13.34.030. It includes "appropriate referrals," help with forms and applications, and possible financial assistance, but it specifically states that "housing assistance" is not a remedial service as described in RCW 13.34.025(2).

Section 2 amends the shelter care hearing statute, RCW 13.34.065, to require that the court inquire "as to whether housing assistance was provided to the family to prevent or eliminate the need for removal of the child or children." This inquiry does not need to be made in every case, but only when the court has information before it, from the dependency petition or other sources, that "homelessness or the lack of suitable housing was a significant factor contributing to the removal of the child..."

RCW 13.34.130 currently allows the court at a disposition hearing to order housing assistance in an in-home dependency. This is amended by section 3 to clarify that it be for the purpose of assisting the parents "in maintaining the child in the home" and that it be "appropriate."

Section 4 is the main section of the bill and amends RCW 13.34.138 to require the court to make a written finding as to whether a parent's "homelessness or lack of suitable housing is a significant factor delaying permanency for the child by preventing the return of the child to home of the child's parent and whether housing assistance should be provided by the department or supervising agency." But even if the court makes such a finding, its authority to order housing assistance is limited to the availability of funds "appropriated for this specific purpose." In addition, the court should not order DSHS to provide housing assistance if it is not available or the family is not eligible for such assistance.

### ESHB 1782

In its final form, this bill has a dual focus: to promote early engagement of parents and to encourage placement stability of children by considering their best interests and attachments to their current care providers. It also adds a presumption of current unfitness to the termination statute which allows the court to consider a parent's failure to remain in touch with his or her child in considering if there is little likelihood of reunification.

Section 2 amends RCW 13.34.062 to require that the written notice provided to parents prior to or at the shelter care hearing be augmented by a fairly lengthy provision regarding the need to participate in the dependency proceeding. DSHS currently provides this notice and will be responsible for adding the new provisions and no action is required by other participants in dependency cases.

Section 3 is one of four separate amendments to RCW 13.34.065, all of which now need to be read together. It adds a requirement that the court in making a placement decision at a shelter care hearing “shall weigh the child’s length of stay and attachment to the current provider” in determining the child’s best interest. Although the intent of this is to allow courts to consider a child’s attachments to the child’s care provider independent of the provider’s legal or biological relationship with the child, it is not likely to be consideration in most shelter care hearings.

RCW 13.34.145 is amended by section 4 to add a similar consideration in some permanency planning hearings. RCW 13.34.145(1)(b) currently provides that when a child is removed from a long term placement and placed in out of home care, a permanency planning hearing must be set within 12 months. The amendment adds the requirement that “every effort shall be made to provide stability in long term placement, and avoid disruption of placement, unless the child is being returned home or it is in the best interest of the child.” From its context in the statute, this amendment arguably only applies to cases where a permanent plan has disrupted, such as a failed guardianship, and not to cases where a child is in relative, other suitable person, or licensed foster care under the supervision of DSHS or a supervising agency.

Section 5 amends RCW 13.34.180 to add a new rebuttable presumption to the statutory requirement in a termination proceeding that there is little likelihood that a parent can remedy his or her deficiencies to the point where a child can be returned to the parent in the near future. To substance abuse and mental illness or psychological incapacity, the legislature now adds the “failure of the parent to have contact with the child for an extended period of time after the filing of the dependency petition,” provided the parents was provided the opportunity to have such a relationship by the department or supervising agency and received “documented notice of the potential consequence of this failure.”

This is likely to have its greatest impact on non-custodial parents who fail to engage with the department or court in a dependency case as to their child. It may not have much practical effect as even occasional or sporadic visitation may be enough to rebut the presumption in a given case. While “extended period of time” is not defined, it should be read in context with the time frame that gives rise to the rebuttable presumption in the first place: “twelve months following entry of the dispositional order.”

Actual inability to visit is also a defense. One mitigating circumstances that may exist in a number of cases is the parent’s incarceration, which “does not in and of itself constitute failure to have contact with the child.” But this is not inconsistent with long standing case law that holds that criminal activity or incarceration of a parent do not constitute abandonment in and of themselves, but that a pattern of criminal activity or repeated or long-term incarceration may constitute constructive abandonment of a child. See for example *In RE Adoption of Dobbs*, 12 Wn. App. 676 (1975).

### SHB 1239

This bill amends RCW 13.34.155 to give juvenile court similar authority to enter parenting plans in dependency proceedings as it currently has to enter third party custody orders: “when doing so will implement a permanent plan of care for the child and result in the dismissal of the dependency.” All parents active in the case must agree to the entry or modification of the parenting plan and the court must find that it is in the child’s best interests. While the amendment does not require that the department or supervising agency explicitly agree as well, there are not likely to be many cases where these factors apply in the absence of agreement by all parties. If parents do not agree, a party can move for the parenting plan issues to be transferred to family court, but the court can only grant the motion if it makes a written finding that it is in the best interests of the child. The court also has authority to appoint a GAL or attorney for the child on the parenting plan issues and to interview the child in chambers to ascertain the child’s wishes. Property and support issues should not be addressed by juvenile court but should be transferred to family court. Filing fees are waived for indigent parties. Section 1 also amends RCW 13.04.030 to provide that juvenile court have concurrent jurisdiction with family court for parenting plans or residential schedules as provided in RCW 13.34.155.

### SSB 5431

In the event a dependent child is returned home for a trial home visit or eventual reunification and has to be placed in out-of-home care a second (or subsequent) time, a new section is added to chapter 13.34 RCW providing that if the department cannot locate an appropriate relative or other suitable person placement, the preferred placement for the child is a foster home where the child was previously placed. This is conditioned on whether the foster home is available and willing to care for the child, is appropriate and able to meet the child's needs, and such placement is in the best interests of the child. RCW 74.13.290 is amended to say essentially the same thing, but a provision is also added to that statute saying that when a placement determination is made at the initial removal of the child or at disposition, "placement of the child with a relative or other suitable person is the preferred option."

### 2SHB 1938

Whenever the permanent plan for a child is adoption and that child has siblings, this bill encourages providing and facilitating post-adoption contact between the siblings by means of an open adoption agreement. It was introduced after legislators heard from youth in foster care and recent alumni of the foster care system that they had been denied contact with their siblings after they were separated in foster care and the siblings were adopted. But while the bill encourages such post adoption contact, it cannot mandate it.

The key section for dependency purposes is Section 5 which amends RCW 13.34.136 on permanent plans of care. When the plan is adoption, courts "shall encourage" the prospective adoptive parents or other care providers to "seriously consider the long-term benefits to the child adoptee and his or her siblings of providing for or facilitating postadoption contact between the siblings." The court shall make a similar inquiry of the child's GAL or attorney, if any, and there is a presumption that contact should be at the same level as existed prior to the adoption whenever feasible and in the best interests of the child.

This statute imposes some responsibility on the court but it does not require that it make a finding or order on this issue. The court can only inquire about and encourage postadoption sibling contact. Prospective adoptive parents are not parties to the dependency (which raises the practical issue of how courts will "encourage" them) and the court will have no jurisdiction over the child, adoptive parents or department once the adoption is finalized. The amendment further provides that it does not require the department to agree to any specific provisions in an open adoption agreement and does not create an obligation for it to provide "supervision or transportation for visits between siblings separated by adoption from foster care."

### SSB 5510

Like Section 2 of ESHB 1782, this bill requires the department to provide additional notice to parents to encourage them to engage in services and maintain contact with their child or risk possible termination of parental rights. It adds a new section to chapter 13.34 RCW requiring the department to attach the written notice on contrasting paper to the ISSP when it is provided to the parent prior to a dependency review hearing.

### E2SHB 1961

This bill was enacted to implement two provisions of a lengthy federal law that was passed in late 2008, The Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-351). While the majority of the Act's requirements are already law in Washington State or are practices that can be implemented without legislative changes, 2SHB 1961 is intended to implement two programs that are optional for states: (1) extending foster care, adoption support and relative guardianship payments to youth ages 18 to 21 in certain circumstances and (2) implementing a relative guardianship subsidy program.

Sections 2 and 4 both amend RCW 74.13.031 on the duty of the department to provide child welfare services. Section 4 is intended to continue current law on educational opportunities for youth aging out of foster care, part of which expired at the end of 2008. It provides that the department has authority, within amounts appropriated for this specific purpose, to provide continued foster care to youths who are participating in a postsecondary academic or vocational program. Continued eligibility is subject to department rules. The amendment deletes a requirement that youth enrolled in a postsecondary educational program must maintain a 2.0 grade point average.

Section 2 expands the program consistent with the new federal option to give the department authority to provide continued foster care or group care benefits and to continue adoption support benefits or subsidized relative guardianship to youth up to age 21 under certain specified conditions. The amendments to RCW 74.13.031 under section 2 do not become effective until October 1, 2010, at which time they will supersede the amendments made by Section 4.

Sections 5 and 6 address subsidies for dependency guardianships. Section 5 adds a new section to chapter 13.34 RCW that first states that the legislature intends to make subsidized relative guardianships, as permitted under federal law, available to Washington families through the dependency guardianship statute and through a guardianship program. It then provides that relative guardianships "shall be a permissible permanency plan" for a dependent child who is Title IV-E eligible "and for whom the prospective relative guardian has been the licensed foster care provider for at least six months prior to the guardianship being established."

Section 6 amends RCW 13.34.234 to specify that to be eligible for a guardianship subsidy, the dependency guardian must be a licensed foster parent at the time the guardianship is established and have been the child's foster parent for a minimum of six consecutive months prior to the entry of the guardianship order. But unlike section 5, it does not use the term "relative guardianship."

The effect of Sections 5 and 6 is to limit the federal guardianship subsidy but it remains to be seen what impact this bill will have on non-subsided dependency guardianships. For example, it appears that an unlicensed suitable other person who is the care provider for a child could become a dependency guardian but would not be eligible for the federal subsidy. Federal guidelines have not yet been issued on the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act. After such guidelines are issued, the department can establish rules setting eligibility and program standards. This process has begun and additional clarification may be available within a few months.

### SSB 5285

Section 2 of SSB 5285 amends RCW 13.34.100 to require that courts "shall attempt" to match children with special needs with a guardian ad litem or CASA with specific training or education related to the child's needs. GAL programs will also be required to maintain and provide information on each GAL's/CASA's "specific training related to issues potentially faced by children in the dependency system" and "specific training or education related to child disability or developmental issues." Background check requirements for GAL/CASAs are also strengthened, although the results of the background check cannot be provided to parties or their attorneys, only to the court.

Section 1 amends RCW 26.44.030 to make GALs and CASAs appointed under Titles 11, 13 or 26 RCW mandated reporters for child abuse and neglect when acting in the course of their representation of children.

### **SHB 2346**

The first four sections of this bill amend existing statutes in chapters 13.32A and 74.13 RCW to provide that youth may be held in some secure or semi-secure crisis residential centers (CRCs) for as long as fifteen days, up from the current five-day maximum. This is intended to increase the opportunity for the CRC to provide intervention, stabilization and reconciliation services to the youth or the youth's family. But SHB 2346 authorizes a stay of up to 15 days only in those secure CRCs that are not co-located in a juvenile detention center, in effect creating two different types of secure CRCs. In no event may a child stay in a secure CRC co-located in a juvenile detention center for more than 5 days. Currently there are stand-alone secure CRCs in Spokane, Yakima, Seattle and Vancouver.

Section 5 adds a new section to Chapter 13.32A RCW, which authorizes DSHS to "take a runaway youth to a secure facility after attempting to notify the parent of the child's whereabouts." However, DSHS may not do this if it "has reasonable cause to believe that the reason for the child's runaway status is the result of abuse or neglect." Further, there is nothing in Chapter 13.32A RCW that specifically gives the department the authority to take a runaway youth into custody for placement purposes. Only law enforcement officers have this authority per RCW 13.32A.050 and .060. The effect of this amendment will be to allow DSHS to transport a youth to a secure CRC if the youth has been taken into custody by law enforcement as a runaway or if the youth voluntarily agrees to go to the secure CRC.

Full copies of the bills listed above, along with legislative bill reports, can be accessed at the legislature's website at <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo/>. Just key in the bill number and press the search button.

*Steve Hassett is the Co-Chair of the WSBA's Juvenile Law Section. He is Lead Counsel for the Children's Administration at the Office of the Attorney General in Olympia.*

## JLS Juvenile Offender Committee

Contact Co-Directors: Katie Hurley (Katie.hurley@defender.org) and Wyman Yip (wyman.yip@kingcounty.gov)

The Juvenile Law Section Offender Committee is open to attorneys and non-lawyer professionals who work with juveniles or on juvenile issues. The Offender Committee is mainly composed of public defenders, prosecutors, and social workers who work in the juvenile justice system.

This year our Committee has principally focused on responding to our membership's stated goal of learning more about the Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative and other issues involving at-risk youth in our communities. The Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative, in particular, is one of the most public and far-reaching steps that any government entity in the State of Washington has taken to directly target at risk youth in the community and school environments. To learn more about the Initiative, this year's Quarterly meetings have featured presentations by Jeron Gates and Royal Ali Barnes about the role of the Garfield Teen Life Center and Seattle Parks and Recreation Department in the Youth

Violence Prevention Initiative. Our section has also heard from Jamila Taylor, who works at the Urban League and supervises their Community Outreach Workers.

At our meeting on September 18, 2009 at the King County Youth Service Center, the Director of the Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative, Mariko Lockhart, teamed up with Jamila Taylor to discuss the Initiative and its projects and goals for

*Our Offender Committee is actively seeking additional volunteers to present to local schools and other community groups and we would love additional members!*

the upcoming school year.

In April, the Offender Committee organized a mini-CLE which featured a presentation by Dr. Marcia Davenport Kent, a child, adolescent, adult, and forensic psychiatrist, on "How Mental Health Issues Impact Youth on

Probation in the Juvenile Justice System." Specifically, Dr. Kent provided an overview of the following diagnoses/issues: ADHD, conduct disorder, bipolar disorder, substance use, depression and then went on to analyze how each diagnosis can impact a youth's thinking and ability to conform to court expectations, and address what interventions can best help youth fully comply with court requirements and expectations.

The Juvenile Law Section Offender Committee is actively committed to other public outreach and education projects and has begun that effort by speaking to the Girls-First program as part of a Street Law training panel. Our Offender Committee is actively seeking additional volunteers to present to local schools and other community groups, and we would love additional members!

**Don't forget you need to re-join the section every year! Annual dues are \$30 and can be paid online. Thanks for your continued support!**

**Find us on the web at:  
[www.wsba.org/  
 lawyers/groups/  
 juvenile + law + section  
 .htm](http://www.wsba.org/lawyers/groups/juvenile+law+section.htm)**

## **What Is the Juvenile Law Section?**

The Juvenile Law Section is a forum for members of the Washington State Bar Association that encompasses the many different areas of practice involving children and youth. The Section's intent is to be inclusive of defenders, prosecutors, private attorneys, judges, and service providers to allow for cross-system training and collaboration, which can lead to improved outcomes for young people and the community.

Areas of legal practice the Section will address include:

- Child Welfare
- Juvenile Justice
- Status offenses (truancy, at-risk youth and child in need of services)
- Civil legal needs of youth

## **JLS Upcoming Events**

**October 7, 2009**

**Juvenile Law Section Annual Meeting & Mini-CLE at noon at the WSBA**

**October 9, 2009**

**Juvenile Law Section Child Welfare Committee & Washington Defender Association Webinar on services for youth aging out of foster care at noon. For more info, visit <http://www.defensenet.org/education-and-training>**

**October 15, 2009**

**JLS Civil Legal Needs Committee panel discussion: "Keeping Kids in School: Tackling the School to Prison Pipeline in Washington State" as part of Seattle University School of Law's Social Justice Week Poverty Law CLE**