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I received my PH.D. in Economics from the University of California Berkeley in 1973. In that year I accepted a faculty position at Duke University in public policy and economics. I was promoted through the ranks from assistant professor to full professor with tenure, and ultimately awarded a distinguished professorship in 1996.

I am the former Senior Associate Dean for Faculty at the Sanford School of Public Policy. I served as director of the School’s predecessor, the Sanford Institute of Public Policy, for a total of seven (7) years. I have held visiting positions at Harvard University, the University of Maryland, the Russell Sage Foundation, and the Collegio Carlo Alberto, among others.
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I have also published a number of death penalty-related studies in law reviews and peer-reviewed academic journals. Many of these articles relate to race- and gender-based disparities in the application of the death penalty. I am the co-author of another book, Suspect Citizens: What 20 Million Traffic Stops Tell Us about Policing and Race (Cambridge University Press, 2018; winner of the C. Herman Pritchett Best Book Award from the Law and Courts Section of the American Political Science Association in 2019). This book, and numerous related articles published in peer review journals, also delves deeply into the analysis of race- and gender-based disparities in criminal justice outcomes.
II. Introduction.

Analysis of studies across the nation on the cost of the death penalty are clear: administration of the death penalty is more costly than not. Additional costs are incurred at every stage of litigation, from investigation to post-conviction.

This is also true in Kansas. The modern death penalty was re-instituted in Kansas in 1994 but has been rarely used. Since its adoption, there have been over 3,500 criminal homicides in Kansas, but no executions. There are currently nine (9) people imprisoned in Kansas with a death sentence, the most recent of whom was sentenced in 2016. Two (2) other individuals who were sentenced to death since 1994 died of natural causes while incarcerated, and four (4) individuals have been resentenced to life without the possibility of parole (“LWOP”). But, despite the fact that death sentences are rare, the cost of maintaining the death penalty in Kansas amounts to millions of dollars each year.

This report explains why the death penalty is costly and seeks to quantify the cost by reviewing literature on the cost of the death penalty, discussing available estimates from two previous cost studies performed in Kansas, and building off the previous Kansas studies with an examination of additional data gathered in the years since the conclusion of the last study.

In 2003, the state of Kansas released the Legislative Post Audit report (“2003 Report”) which compared costs in 22 cases, some death penalty and some first-degree murder cases. In 2014, the Judicial Council Death Penalty Advisory Committee reviewed additional costs incurred in the death penalty cases analyzed by the 2003 Report as well as in all capital-eligible cases filed between fiscal years 2004 and 2011 (“2014 Report”). The new analysis in our report builds off of the State’s 2003 and 2014 studies and focuses on the five-year period between 2014, the year that Mr. McNeal was charged, and 2018. During that time the State incurred costs associated with ongoing appeals of previous death sentences, as well as active capital cases defined as those

---

that were ongoing, charged, or in a retrial posture during this time period. The Counties that had one or more active capital cases between 2014 and 2018 include: Barton, Chautauqua, Franklin, Geary, Harvey, Johnson, Labette, Pratt, Riley, Saline, Sedgwick, Shawnee, and Wyandotte. Within these counties, all investigation, prosecution, and adjudication costs were requested for all active capital and non-capital first degree homicide cases.⁶

Cost data were requested from the following entities: 1) county attorney offices; 2) county clerk offices; 3) county accounting departments; 4) district courts; 5) police departments; 6) sheriff departments; 7) the Kansas Department of Corrections; 8) the Kansas State Board of Indigents’ Defense Services (BIDS); 9) the Kansas Supreme Court; 10) the Attorney General’s office; 11) the Kansas Bureau of Investigation; and 12) the Kansas Court of Appeals. These requests sought to capture costs from the initial investigation into a capital or non-capital homicide case, through any trial, incarceration, and appeals. The general responsiveness and level of detail provided differed greatly among these entities. The results of these requests are briefly summarized in the attorney declaration attached as Appendix C.

This data collection spanned more entities than the previous studies, but faced similar challenges, including non-centralized databases, inconsistent record keeping, and a failure to track costs by case. The results of the previous studies and this supplemental study make clear one thing: no one can provide a comprehensive accounting of the full cost of the death penalty to the State of Kansas. However, the data available demonstrate that maintaining the death penalty in Kansas is significantly more costly than pursuing other forms of punishment and costs the State and its taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

III. Analysis

1. Conclusions of Cost Studies Across the Country

In the following section, we first explain how we identified the studies used and then review their estimates of overall cost, breaking down these estimates where possible to show which parts of the process seem to be generating most of the cost or savings. This section is based on a chapter in Professor Baumgartner’s 2018 book, Deadly Justice: A Statistical Portrait of the Death Penalty, and is co-written with Justin Cole, currently a student at Yale Law School and co-author of the original book chapter, which this section updates.

In order to find studies on the cost of the death penalty, we first referred to a page on the Death Penalty Information Center (“DPIC”) website that focuses specifically on cost.⁷ We started with all the articles listed in the main sections on this page: “State Studies on Monetary Costs,” “State Studies on Time Costs,” “DPIC Reports on Costs,” and “DPIC Testimony and Presentations on Costs.” We then conducted Google Scholar searches for relevant terms such as “death penalty

---

⁶ Additional costs were sought both in the two years leading up to 2014 and through January 1, 2020, in order to identify any other costs that were not otherwise captured in the period of 2014 to 2018.

⁷ See Costs, DEATH PENALTY INFO. CTR., deathpenaltyinfo.org/policy-issues/costs (last visited Feb. 11, 2022).
costs,” “cost of capital punishment,” and “price of capital punishment.” Because the DPIC site is relatively complete, these searches yielded few additional hits. We identified 25 published studies, most of which focus on a single state. The vast majority of the studies were published in academic journals or law reviews, but a few were published in highly professional and systematic journalistic or legislative reviews. We did not include any studies that focused on individual cases or that were of relatively small empirical scope. All the studies reviewed focus on comparisons of the cost of capital cases with non-capital murder trials. Some provide overall cost estimates, and many of them break down the source of the costs by the different phases of the trial or postconviction appeals. In the following sections, we provide a tabular summary of the studies, their time and geographical scopes, the number of cases reviewed, and their cost estimates.


Of the 25 studies we reviewed, 15 provide some estimate of the overall cost of a death sentence, an execution, or the entire death penalty system as compared with a first-degree murder trial or a system where capital punishment is not considered or available as an option. All of the studies are in states where the death penalty is legally available, so the comparison is across cases where the State seeks the death penalty to otherwise similar cases where the death penalty is not sought. The studies use slightly different definitions of cost, as we describe below. Table 1 summarizes these results. Where it is possible to give a precise dollar amount, we do so. Where there is only an indication of “more” spending in the capital case, we indicate this with a plus sign (+). We use a minus sign (−) in the rare cases where there are savings.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Year</th>
<th>Geographic Scope</th>
<th>Time Period Examined</th>
<th>Cases Sampled</th>
<th>Death Penalty Trials as Compared to Non-Death Penalty Trials</th>
<th>Death Sentence as Compared to a Sentence of Life without Parole</th>
<th>Death Penalty as Compared to a Scenario Where the Maximum Punishment Is Life without Parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Commission on the Fair Administration of Justice (2008)</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>1978–2007</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+$125,500,000 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarcón and Mitchell (2011)</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>1978–2010</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>+$1,000,000 per case</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+$4,000,000,000 over 31 years (+$129,000,000 per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau and Whitson (2013)</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1999–2010</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>+123.5 days per case</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Post Capital Bureau (2000)</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1979–1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+$51,000,000 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Division of Post Audit (2003)</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1994–2003</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+$316,000 per case</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Council (2014)</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1994–2011</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>+17.1 days per case</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen et al. (2019)</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2007–2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+$750,000–$4,000,000 per case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>Cost per Case / Sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1978–1999</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>+$640,000 per case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieter (2009)</td>
<td>National Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+$851,000 per death sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goss, Strain, and Blalock (2016)</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1973–2014</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>+$1,491,000 per case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau (2014)</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2000–2012</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+$375,000–$389,000 per case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–$5,000 per death sentence to +$86,000 per death sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$375,000–$475,000 per case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsberg (2005)</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1982–2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>+$253,300,000 over 24 years (+$11,000,000 per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook (2009)</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2005–2006</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>+$11,000,000 per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2004–2010</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>+$110,000 per case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan (2013)</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1984–2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>+$5,000 per death sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieter (2010)</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1976–2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>+$1,000,000 per case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: [+] means an item is more expensive; [-] means an item is less expensive; [=] means the expenses are equivalent; blank means there was no relevant information on the category in the study.
The first column of the table lists the author or authors of the study, as well as the date that the study was published. All but one of these studies were published in the twenty-first century, indicating that the cost of the death penalty has only begun to attract attention in recent years. The second column notes the geographical scope of each cost study. Most of the studies (23 of 25) limit their analysis to one state. The third column contains the time period that was examined by each study. There are two important points to highlight here. First, most of the studies focus on a time period of a decade or more, but a fair number limit their analysis to a period of only a few years. Second, the vast majority of the studies examine the death penalty prior to 2012, and the data reported does not always take inflation into account. We have not made adjustments for inflation in the table, but report the dollar values listed in the articles we review. For these reasons, it would be fair to consider the cost estimates as low or conservative ones. Real costs are undoubtedly higher.

The fourth column lists the total number of cases examined in each study. The number listed is the total number of homicide cases. For the first entry in the table, the study reviewed 1,644 homicide cases in California between 1978 and 2007. Only a fraction of these cases were prosecuted capitally, and then only a fraction of those led to a death penalty. The N reported in the table is the total number of homicide cases the study reviewed, not the number of death sentences. The fifth column compares the cost of a death penalty trial to the cost of a first-degree murder trial where the death penalty was not sought. Of course, not every death penalty trial ends in a death sentence, and trials that end in death sentences are more expensive than those that do not. To account for this, a weighted average of trial costs in these two categories was compiled and then compared to the costs of first-degree murder trials where the death penalty was not sought to get this figure. Some studies examined both trials and pleas. When pleas were included, they were incorporated through a weighted average into both the costs of death penalty trials and the costs of first-degree murder trials where the death penalty was not sought.

The sixth column compares the cost of a capital trial that ends without a death sentence with a capital trial that ends with a death sentence. The costs encompassed by this category are appellate costs garnered in direct appeals, state postconviction proceedings, and federal postconviction proceedings as well as incarceration costs. This category is especially interesting because most people who receive death sentences do not actually end up being executed; thus, the death penalty is effectively an expensive form of LWOP, at least in those cases. The seventh column looks at both the trial and the postconviction phases of a death penalty case and compares the overall cost of a death sentence, an execution, or the entire death penalty system with a first-degree murder trial where capital punishment is not considered. The entries indicate whether the cost estimate is for the entire system, indicating the additional costs of maintaining a death penalty system over a system where there is no capital punishment, or if the estimate is per case. Per-case estimates refer to the additional costs of seeking death over seeking a punishment of life without parole.

---

9 The study by Gould and Greenman (2010) focuses solely on federal death penalty cases and the one by Dieter (2009) is a national survey of police chiefs.
Overall costs of the entire system are perhaps the most important indicators: what does it cost a state to maintain a capital punishment system, per year? Reading down the last column and looking at those estimates, we see approximately $125-129 million per year in California; $51 million in Florida; $15 million in Nebraska; $11 million in New Jersey; and $11 million in North Carolina. The per-case estimates are also high, $750,000 to $4 million in Louisiana; $1.5 million in Maryland; $375,000 to $475,000 in Nevada; and $110,000 in Oklahoma. No estimates are negative; the death penalty is always more expensive. How much higher ranges depending on the state. Unsurprisingly, the states with more active death penalty systems show higher costs, as California faces costs over $100 million per year, Florida sees over $50 million, and New Jersey is lower at $11 million. New Jersey, however, maintained these costs over a quarter century and carried out just one execution; that single execution came at a cumulative estimated cost of a quarter-billion dollars. The similar estimates for California, over a longer time period, include a global estimate of more than $4 billion. As the state has carried out just 13 executions in the period since 1976, this amounts to a price tag of over $300 million per execution, similar to the New Jersey figure. And once again, these numbers do not take inflation into account. Kansas, of course, has not carried out a single execution in the modern era, so the costs associated with the maintenance of a death penalty are related to no executions at all.

b. Trial Phase Cost Estimates.

The 25 studies listed in Table 1 also break down the costs associated with the different phases of the trial process. Table 2 summarizes these results.
Table 2. Costs Associated with Each Phase of the Death Penalty Trial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Year</th>
<th>Geographic Scope</th>
<th>Time Period Examined</th>
<th>Cases Sampled</th>
<th>Death Penalty Trials as Compared to Non-Death Penalty Trials</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Experts</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Jury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alarcón and Mitchell (2011)</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>1978–2010</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>+$1,000,000 per case</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marceau and Whitson (2013)</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1999–2010</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>+123.5 days per case</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Source</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Average Cost/Time per Case</th>
<th>Cost/Time Range</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Division of Post Audit (2003)</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1994–2003</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+$316,000 per case</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Council (2014)</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1994–2011</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>+17.1 days per case</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1978–1999</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>+$640,000 per case</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieter (2009)</td>
<td>National Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miethe (2012)</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>+1,166 hours per case</td>
<td>+ $116,600–$145,750 per case</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau (2014)</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2000–2012</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+$375,000–$389,000 per case</td>
<td>+$176,891–$225,834 per case</td>
<td>+$7,212–$10,699 per case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsberg (2005)</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1982–2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+$2,300,000 per year</td>
<td>+$4,600,000–$7,800,000 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook (2009)</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2005–2006</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+$13,180,385 over 2 years</td>
<td>+26,680 hours over 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2004–2010</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>+$32,700 per case</td>
<td>+$17,684 per case</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Year Range</td>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>Change 1</td>
<td>Change 2</td>
<td>Change 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins et al. (2015)</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1997–2014</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>+ $493,500 per case</td>
<td>+ $55,900 per case</td>
<td>+ $80,000 per case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: [+ means an item is more expensive; [-] means an item is less expensive; [=] means the expenses are equivalent; blank means there was no relevant information on the category in the study.
Just as in Table 1, the first four (4) columns of Table 2 provide the basic characteristics of each of the studies. The fifth column is also contained within Table 1. The remaining columns, however, deal specifically with various phases of a death penalty trial as compared with a first-degree murder trial where capital punishment is not considered.

Eight (8) studies provide some specific numerical estimate of the costs associated with the defense, and six (6) studies provide some estimate of the costs associated with the prosecution. Each of these shows that attorney costs are substantially higher for capital trials than for first-degree murder trials where capital punishment is not considered. Unsurprisingly, among those studies that provide a precise cost estimate for the defense, costs range from an additional $32,700 per case in Oklahoma to an additional $493,500 per case in Washington. For those that provide information on the prosecution, costs range from an additional $7,212 per case in Nevada to an additional $217,000 per case in Washington.

Three (3) studies provide some specific numerical estimates explicitly associated with expert testimony, and three (3) studies provide some estimate of court costs, either direct monetary costs or costs in terms of time. Each of these shows that both expert and court costs are substantially higher during capital trials than during first-degree murder trials where capital punishment is not considered. Even studies that do not provide specific numerical data provide some indication that these components are more expensive in capital trials. As science has improved, the defense has increasingly relied on experts who specialize in everything from mental health to hair follicle analysis to bite marks to eyewitness testimony in an attempt to avoid the death penalty for their client. As a result, the prosecution has naturally countered with its own array of experts. Court costs are also higher in capital trials. More capital trials change venues, which is costly. More importantly, capital trials last much longer, which means not only that daily costs of writing transcripts or providing security increase but also that opportunity costs arise. The more time a capital trial takes, the less time there is for other trials in that same courtroom or by that judge. This does not appear as a direct cost in a state budget, but it is nonetheless important, particularly as many states are experiencing significant delays in their criminal justice system associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. With this in mind, additional expert costs range from $49,000 to $77,754 per case, and additional court costs range from $46,640 to $80,000 per case.\textsuperscript{10}

Two (2) studies provide some specific numerical estimate of the costs associated with voir dire, or jury selection. Marceau and Whitson (2013) compared six (6) capital prosecutions with 148 noncapital cases in Colorado and found that jury selection took 24.5 days longer in the capital trials. Many more potential jurors are required; individuals who are categorically opposed to the death penalty and would refuse to consider a death sentence are excused, as are many others due to financial hardship, a problem that is far more severe because of the greater length of capital trials. Missing work or childcare responsibilities for a longer time is also more onerous. Once the trial begins, jurors are paid for every day they work, which added up to $224,640 over two years in North Carolina.

\textsuperscript{10} “Additional court costs” are those associated with longer trials: court reporters, court staff, courtroom security, and so on.
It is clear that costs are high and that they stem not from a single easily controlled source but from virtually every element of the trial and investigation. Contrary to popular belief, the costs of the death penalty are not limited to the appeals that come after a conviction; rather, the costs accumulate from the very instant that a case becomes capital.


We found 19 studies that break down the costs associated with the different phases of the postconviction process; these are a subset of those listed in the previous table. Table 3 summarizes these results.
Table 3. Costs Associated with Each Phase of the Death Penalty Postconviction Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Year</th>
<th>Geographic Scope</th>
<th>Time Period Examined</th>
<th>Cases Sampled</th>
<th>Direct Appeal</th>
<th>Postconviction at the State Level</th>
<th>Postconviction at the Federal Level</th>
<th>Incarceration</th>
<th>New Death Row Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Commission on the Fair Administration of Justice (2008)</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>1978–2007</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+$90,000 per inmate per year</td>
<td>+$402.6 million overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minsker (2008)</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>1996–2006</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+$90,000 per inmate per year</td>
<td>+$356 million overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarcón and Mitchell (2011)</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>1978–2010</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+$200,000–$300,000 per death sentence</td>
<td>$1.11 million per death sentence</td>
<td>+$90,000 per inmate per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Legislature Office of Performance Evaluations (2014)</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1998–2013</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>+1.2 years per death sentence</td>
<td>+1.4 years per death sentence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Division of Post Audit (2003)</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1994–2003</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+$24,690 per inmate per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Council (2014)</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1994–2011</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+$50,880 per inmate per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Data Points</td>
<td>Life Cost of One Death</td>
<td>Life Cost of One Inmate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1978–1999</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>+$851,000 per death sentence</td>
<td>+$340,000 per death sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$43,000 per death sentence</td>
<td>+$96,000 per death sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieter (2009)</td>
<td>National Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goss, Strain, and Blalock (2016)</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1973–2014</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>+$619,000 per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: [+] means an item is more expensive; [-] means an item is less expensive; [=] means the expenses are equivalent; blank means there was no relevant information on the category in the study.
Just as in Table 1, the first four columns of Table 3 describe the basic characteristics of all the studies. The fifth column is also contained within Table 1. The remaining columns, however, deal specifically with various phases of the postconviction process when a death sentence was handed down as compared with the postconviction process when a sentence of LWOP was issued.

Four (4) studies provide some specific numerical estimate of the costs associated with direct appeals, three (3) provide some estimate of the costs associated with postconviction proceedings at the state level, and two (2) provide some estimate of the costs associated with postconviction proceedings in federal courts. Each of these shows that the various appeals are expensive. For direct appeals, costs range from an additional $13,561 to $340,000 per death sentence; for postconviction appeals at the state level, an additional $43,000 to $300,000 per death sentence; and for postconviction appeals at the federal level, from $96,000 to $1.1 million per death sentence.\(^{11}\)

Ten studies provide some specific numerical estimate of the costs associated with incarceration. Eight (8) of these indicate that incarceration is more expensive for those who are given the death penalty. Of course, in states such as California, like Pennsylvania, and many other jurisdictions, which rarely executes those they condemn, it is clear that costs accumulate but there are few or no offsetting savings. Virginia\(^{12}\) and Texas, which historically have executed a higher proportion of their death row inmates, may not have the same high costs associated with incarceration rates of prisoners sentenced to death. However, just two (2) studies out of 19 found what many would assume to be true logically: that incarcerating prisoners who had received LWOP was more expensive because death row prisoners are executed prior to their natural death. While, theoretically, one might expect to see lower incarceration costs for those sentenced to death as opposed to LWOP, several factors make this less likely: few of those condemned are executed; death rows are expensive to operate; and many inmates spend decades on death row before being executed (or seeing their sentence reversed).

### 2. Why the Kansas Death Penalty is Costly

As in other states, and consistent with the United States Supreme Court’s ruling that “death is different,” capital cases in Kansas are more complex and involve more procedural safeguards than otherwise similar murder cases. As a result, litigating capital cases is more costly to state and local governments than if defendants had been prosecuted for murder without the possibility of a death sentence.

---


\(^{12}\) In March 2021, the state of Virginia repealed the death penalty statute and converted all existing death sentences to life without parole.
What cases are capital eligible?

Kansas law, as enacted in 1994, states that the death penalty is reserved for “intentional and premeditated killing” in one (1) of seven (7) circumstances. In addition, it is required that there be one or more aggravating circumstances, and that the defendant is an adult. Prosecutors are not required to seek the death penalty in cases that are capital eligible, and must indicate their intention to seek the death penalty no later than seven days after the time of arraignment.\textsuperscript{13}

How are capital cases sentenced?

A bifurcated trial is required for cases where the prosecutor seeks the death penalty. The jurors must be death-penalty “qualified” during the jury-selection process, meaning potential jurors may be excluded if they would be unable to recommend the death penalty.\textsuperscript{14} If the jury decides the defendant is guilty of capital murder during the first phase, then that same jury is seated for a sentencing trial.\textsuperscript{15} During the sentencing trial, the jury is presented with evidence on both aggravating and mitigating circumstances to determine whether the defendant should be put to death or be sentenced to life without parole.\textsuperscript{16} A sentence of death requires a unanimous finding that one or more aggravating circumstances exist and that the aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances, beyond a reasonable doubt.\textsuperscript{17} The trial judge may only impose the death penalty if the jury so recommends.\textsuperscript{18}

In what specific ways are capital-trial proceedings more costly than if the prosecutor had decided to proceed non-capitally?

As the Kansas’s Judicial Council Death Penalty Advisory Committee summarized in a 2009 Report, “[t]he capital case requires more lawyers on both the prosecution and defense teams, more experts on both sides, more pre-trial motions, longer jury selection time, and a longer trial.”\textsuperscript{19} The 2009 Report further describes the post-conviction process as “litigated for years . . . difficult, and time consuming.”\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{20} Id.
A non-exhaustive list of the ways in which capital-trial proceedings differ includes the following:

- **Representation.** Because capital trials tend to be complex and require specialized expertise, two (2) attorneys are typically appointed for the defense through BIDS. BIDS provides these attorneys either through the existing public defender offices or by appointing private counsel. Public defense in capital cases is conducted at the trial-level by the capital defender office, on direct appeal by one (1) of two (2) capital appellate offices, and in post-conviction by the state habeas office. Appointed counsel consists of either contract counsel who contract with BIDS to accept cases at rates reduced from market value when the public defender has a conflict or is unable to otherwise take on the case, or of non-contract assigned counsel who are private attorneys who meet established regulatory criteria and who voluntarily serve on appointments panels in each judicial district. Contract counsel typically cost more per case than do public defenders. Only in rare cases does the defendant retain private counsel for all or part of the proceedings. The trial defense team generally also include—at minimum—a fact investigator and a mitigation specialist. On the opposing side, the State is also typically represented by two (2) or more prosecutors.

- **Motion practice.** In every stage of a capital case, defense counsel have a duty to consider all legal claims potentially available and, if counsel decides to raise an issue, they must “present the claim as forcefully as possible.” This involves litigating all possible legal and factual bases related to the issue, making supplemental presentations, and ensuring a complete record of the claim has been made. “Because of the possibility that the client will be sentenced to death, counsel must be significantly more vigilant about litigating all potential issues at all levels in a capital case than in any other case.” As a member of the Death Penalty Advisory Committee put it in the 2004 Report, “[s]ince the law regulating the imposition of death is much more expansive it requires several dozen motions in, each case… More motion hearings are required and the hearings take longer.

---

22 Id. at 9.
24 BIDS Report, at 10.
25 Id. at 23.
27 ABA Guidelines 10.8(B)(1).
28 ABA Guidelines 10.8 commentary.
than in a non-death case." As another committee member and trial judge noted “it is certainly not unusual for over 100 motions to be filed in a typical capital case.” Based on our analysis of data from the 2014 Report, trials in which the death penalty is sought were preceded by 15 days of motions, compared with five (5) days for trials in which the death penalty was not sought.

- **Jury selection.** Pools of potential jurors are usually larger in capital cases. Indeed, the 2003 Report found that capital cases averaged 230 jurors at the start of jury selection, compared to 89 jurors at the same point in other first-degree-murder cases. The larger pool is in part because voir dire of potential capital jurors typically includes questioning by the prosecution on willingness to impose a death sentence, which often results in the exclusion of jurors who would otherwise be qualified to serve. Jury selection in capital cases in Kansas hence may take longer than it takes to pick a jury in a non-death case.

- **Trial.** Capital trials typically last longer, with more expert witnesses. The 2003 Report estimated that death penalty cases were an average length of 28 days, compared to nine (9) days in non-death cases (from the start of jury selection to the end of trial). The 2014 Report provided details for jury trials, showing 16 days for trials in which the death penalty was sought, and seven (7) days for murder cases in which the death penalty was not sought.

- **Sentencing phase.** If the jury finds a defendant guilty of capital murder, then it continues to serve for a second phase of the trial to determine a sentencing recommendation of death or life without parole. The 2003 Report found that a separate sentencing proceeding added an average of six (6) days to trials. Further, during the penalty phase a capital defense team is required both to put forward a mitigation presentation and to rebut the prosecution’s case on aggravation. This testimony may require witnesses familiar with evidence relating to a client’s life and development as well as expert and lay witnesses who can provide medical, psychological, or sociological insights relevant to the client’s mental health, life history, and culpability, or otherwise support a sentence less than death or rebut aggravating evidence. A member of the Death Penalty Advisory Committee summarized this issue by stating that in “a homicide in which death is not being sought as a punishment, I do not necessarily need to know my client’s life history. In ‘death’ cases it is essential that the defense team know all aspects of the accused’s

---

30 *Id.* at 13
31 2014 Report, Appendix D.
33 2004 Report at 11
34 2003 Report, at 15.
35 2014 Report, Appendix D.
37 ABA Guidelines 10.11.
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family history…school records …work history[
]

This same committee member also noted that death penalty cases typically require more experts, who are not always local.\(^{40}\)

- **Direct appeal to the Kansas Supreme Court.** A conviction for capital murder resulting in a death sentence entitles a defendant to automatic review by and appeal to the Kansas Supreme Court.\(^{41}\) The Kansas Supreme Court is required to consider both the sentence and any errors asserted, and is further “authorized to notice unassigned errors appearing of record if the ends of justice would be served thereby.”\(^{42}\) In the 2014 Report, the Kansas Supreme Court estimated that justices spend five (5) times more hours on capital cases than non-capital cases, and that a justice writing the opinion in a capital case spends 20 times the number of hours than in a non-capital case.\(^{43}\) As retired Kansas Supreme Court Justice Six put it “[t]he gargantuan dimensions of a death case, the voluminous trial court record, the great number of issues, and the length of the briefs, not only take over your professional life but also occupy ‘personal family time’ during resolution of the issues on appeal.”\(^{44}\) On the defense side, these appeals are handled by the BIDS’ Capital Appeals Office, the Capital Appeals and Conflicts Office, or appointed counsel. On the state side, these appeals are typically handled by the Attorney General’s Office.

- **Post-conviction proceedings.** If the Kansas Supreme Court affirms the death sentence, other challenges to the verdict or sentence may be brought through both state and federal courts. On the defense side, state appeals are handled either by the Kansas Capital Habeas Office or appointed counsel and on the government side, state appeals are typically handled by the Attorney General’s Office. It should be noted that the Kansas Supreme Court did not affirm any death sentence since the death penalty was reinstituted in 1994 until 2015 (Robinson).

- **Re-trial and re-sentencing.** Since the death penalty was reinstituted in 1994, appeals of death sentenced cases have been more successful than appeals of murder convictions that resulted in a sentence of life imprisonment. In this respect the experience in Kansas mirrors that of other states. Indeed, a 2000 study found that there is a nationwide reversal rate of over two (2) out of every three (3) capital judgments due to serious error.\(^{45}\) Sometimes the result is to return the case to the state district court for re-trial or re-sentencing, which may be as costly, or even exceed the costs of the original trial.

A flow chart outlining the appeals process following a death sentence is attached as Appendix D.\(^{46}\)

---

40 *Id.* at 11.
42 *Id.*
Are there additional corrections costs associated with the death penalty?

In the past, Kansas has incarcerated death-sentenced defendants in a maximum-security prison with other prisoners who are being held in administrative segregation. That requirement has now been eased, so that administrative segregation is no longer a requirement. However, as of the writing of this report, the Kansas Department of Corrections website still lists the nine (9) prisoners serving death sentences as remaining in “special management,” or segregated custody. In 2009, the Judicial Council Death Penalty Committee estimated that housing a prisoner in administrative segregation costs roughly $1000 more per a year than housing a prisoner with the general population.

Kansas has not executed anyone since 1965, so there has been no attrition of the number of people serving death sentences due to execution. It appears, then, that if the death penalty had been abolished in, say, 2014, there would have been some subsequent savings associated with moving death-sentenced prisoners out of administrative segregation. Now if administrative segregation is no longer used for death-sentenced prisoners, that potential savings would no longer apply in the future.

Is there any way in which the death penalty may reduce the cost of litigating murder cases?

There is no persuasive empirical evidence supporting the conclusion that the death penalty reduces the cost of litigating murder cases.

First, some suggest that some number of defendants in capital murder cases may be more likely to plead guilty as part of a bargain to avoid the death penalty, which one would think would save the state the cost of a trial. However, this potential savings has not been demonstrated.

Moreover, the costs incurred by a case that is charged capitally begin to incur immediately, given the more substantial pre-trial motion practice, investigation, and attorney team size; it is quite possible that a case that is prosecuted capitally and ultimately settled through a guilty plea would end up being more costly to the state than if it had been prosecuted non-capitally and went to trial.

Second, some have argued that the threat of the death penalty has some deterrent value, and in particular reduces the number of (premeditated) murders. If so, in addition to the obvious benefit to public safety, the resulting reduction in the number of murders would result in savings that should be netted out against the extra costs described above. But persuasive evidence for this deterrent effect is lacking, and there are plausible mechanisms by which abolition of the death penalty would result in savings that should be netted out against the extra costs described above.

---

penalty may actually reduce the murder rate. For example, if the death penalty were abolished, then criminal-justice-system resources currently devoted to capital cases would become available to prosecute other cases more intensively with the potential of preventing violent crime.\textsuperscript{51} In any event, the evidence on the net effect of the death penalty on the murder rate is so weak as to be irrelevant to reaching a conclusion on this matter.\textsuperscript{52}

\textit{Summing up.}

In Kansas, as in other states, capital cases are more costly to adjudicate than they would have been if the death penalty had not been an option. These extra “super due process” costs have been documented in several earlier studies.\textsuperscript{53}

3. \textbf{Analysis of Costs in Kansas}

a. The definition of “cost”

We are interested in estimating the “cost” of the death penalty, but that term requires careful definition to be meaningful. The definition that is used here follows an earlier study of the costs of the death penalty in North Carolina,\textsuperscript{54} and is similar to the definition used in the 2014 Report.

- \textbf{State and local.} “Cost” is the expenditures by state and local agencies in Kansas. Excluded from the accounting are private expenditures (by the defendant and his family, for example) or voluntary contributions by private citizens. Also excluded are any costs to the federal judicial system.

- \textbf{Cash accounting.} The accounting method utilized here to assess new costs is “cash accounting,” as opposed to “accrual accounting.”\textsuperscript{55} The difference is largely a matter of timing. Cash accounting records a cost at the time of payment. Accrual accounting records a cost at the time it is obligated, even if payment is in the future. In the case of the death penalty, accrual accounting is speculative. When a death sentence is imposed, it is likely to initiate a costly process in the state and possibly federal courts that may continue for decades. The trajectory of the case following sentencing is highly uncertain, and may depend in part on future US Supreme Court rulings and new state laws. Documenting actual expenditures for some period of time (cash accounting) entails fewer assumptions and is as relevant to understanding the cost burden of the death penalty as accrual accounting.

\textsuperscript{52} Id.
\textsuperscript{53} Id.
\textsuperscript{55} Jae K. Shim Ph.D., Joel G. Siegel Ph.D. CPA, et al., \textit{Barron's Accounting Handbook} (Nov 1, 2014).
• Counterfactual. We seek to estimate the extra cost of processing capital murder cases that resulted from the procedural requirements associated with the death penalty. We focus on the 5-year period 2014 to 2018. One way to understand this accounting is as a comparison between actual costs and the costs that would have been incurred if the state had abolished the death penalty at the beginning of that period. In this hypothetical scenario, it is necessary to specify the alternative regime in some detail. In particular, we assume that the death sentence is no longer an option for cases that are capital eligible under current law. Conviction for capital murder would then result in LWOP. For the nine (9) individuals currently on death row, the death sentence would be replaced with LWOP.

b. Review of previous cost estimates for Kansas

Several reports on death penalty costs in Kansas have been issued by state agencies. The most notable studies have been the 2003 Report and the 2014 Report. Some additional information was provided by the Kansas Legislative Research Department in the 2021 Report. Each of these reports provides relevant information.

2003 Performance Audit Report. The 2003 Report estimates some costs for 22 murder cases that were tried and resulted in convictions between 1994 and 2003. During this period, there were 79 cases that met the statutory criteria for capital murder, of which 53 were capitally charged, which is to say that the prosecutor filed notice of the intent to seek the death penalty. The sample for this study included all 14 capitally charged cases that went to trial. Seven (7) of those resulted in the death penalty and seven (7) in conviction but a sentence other than death. In addition, the sample included eight (8) murder cases that were tried non-capitally, convicted, and given a long sentence. Cases that were settled by guilty plea rather than trial were not included in this analysis.

Cost information was solicited from state and local agencies involved in all phases of the investigation and processing of murder cases, including local law enforcement officials, local courts and prosecutors, state courts, the Kansas Attorney General’s Office, the Kansas Bureau of Investigation, BIDS, Legal Services for Prisoners, and the Department of Corrections. For the most part, these agencies did not keep records of resources expended on specific cases, and instead provided rough estimates of costs incurred.

The report uses the accrual accounting perspective and attempts to project the costs of cases following conviction. At the time of the report, none of the death penalty cases had completed the entire appeals process and only two (2) had completed the first appeal. Although the Report

\[\text{56} \] 2003 Report, at 4, 22.
\[\text{57} \] Id. at 4.
\[\text{58} \] Id. at 32.
\[\text{59} \] Id. at 1.
\[\text{60} \] As the 2003 Report notes, no agency tracks court costs or prosecutorial costs related to death penalty cases. Id. at 30.
\[\text{61} \] 2003 Report at 2.
concluded that actual cost figures for death penalty and non-death penalty cases in Kansas are impossible to obtain due to limitations such as a failure to keep case-specific time records, difficulty predicting future appeals, and a failure of the Kansas Supreme Court to estimate time spent on capital cases, it did estimate that the median death penalty case cost the state $1.2 million through execution, about 70 percent more than the estimated cost of a median non-death penalty case. 62

Here is a summary of the actual costs estimated for investigation and trial:

**Table 4: Investigation and Trial costs to state and local government** (all figures in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capital trial</th>
<th>Capital trial</th>
<th>Capital trial</th>
<th>Non-capital trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>Conviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death sentence</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>Other sentence</td>
<td>All cases</td>
<td>Long prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,205</td>
<td>$2,034</td>
<td>$7,239</td>
<td>$878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$744</td>
<td>$291</td>
<td>$517</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$657</td>
<td>$276</td>
<td>$363</td>
<td>$86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2003 Report, at 38.*

The report notes that the samples are necessarily small, and that the costs of investigation and trial differ widely depending on the complexity of the case. 63 It appears that among the 14 capital trials, those that ultimately resulted in a death sentence were systematically more complex than the others since they were more costly. Ideally, there would be some way to adjust for the complexity of the case before making comparisons, but that was not attempted in the report. In the third column of Table 4 above, the 14 cases are combined. The combined category represents all capital trials in Kansas between 1994, when the death penalty was reinstated, and 2003. These 14 cases can be compared to the eight (8) cases that were utilized in this study to represent capital-eligible cases that were prosecuted non-capitally and resulted in a conviction at trial. Note that the average cost through conviction of the capitally prosecuted cases was nearly five (5) times as high as for the cases that were not prosecuted capitally ($517,000 compared to $110,000). This large difference in average costs is at least in part due to the “super due process” requirements that are unique to capital cases, discussed above. We are seeking to understand how much those 14 capital trial cases would have cost the state if the death penalty had not been an option, but all else were the same. The sample of eight (8) non-capital murder cases serves as a valid basis for estimating the counterfactual if it is similar to the group of capitally prosecuted cases with respect to average complexity. We note that the

---
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eight (8) cases were capital eligible, at least at the time they were prosecuted, but detailed information about these cases is lacking. If we assume that they are similar to the 14 capital cases, then it is possible to compute the extra cost borne by the State as a result of proceeding capitally in the 14 capital cases. The 14 capital cases cost on average $407,000 more than the average case that was not prosecuted capitally. The total extra cost for the period in question, 1994 – 2003, is then $5,698,000, or about $570,000 per year statewide. Thus, without the death penalty, processing these 14 murder cases through trial and conviction would arguably have been much less costly.

Finally, during that same 10-year period the death penalty imposed additional costs. The 2003 Report does not consider the additional costs of capital processing for eligible cases that resulted in a plea deal. In addition, the cost of the direct appeals to the Kansas Supreme Court for the seven (7) death-sentenced cases should be included and netted against the average cost of appeal for the murder cases that resulted in a lesser sentence. Those appeals were underway in 2003 but only completed for two (2) of these cases.

2014 Report by the Judicial Council Death Penalty Advisory Committee. The 2014 Report adopts a cash accounting framework for fiscal years 2004-2011 and, unlike the 2003 Report, includes all capital-eligible cases filed between 2004-2011.64 During that eight-year period, the State incurred costs associated with 41 capital-eligible cases initiated during this period, and costs associated with appeals of death sentences and the consequences of those appeals. The 2014 Report also includes an accounting of the number of days that capital cases were in the trial court for any reason, including pre-trial motions, trial, and initial sentencing. These “court days” tabulations include both the cases included in the 2003 Report, and the “new” cases initiated during fiscal years 2004-2011.

The Committee sent surveys regarding 63 total cases (41 new capital eligible cases and 22 originally reviewed in the 2003 Report) to the Kansas Supreme Court, Attorney General’s Office, BIDS, Kansas Bureau of Investigation, district courts, local prosecutors’ offices, county clerks’ offices, and local sheriff and police departments.65 A number of entities, including local prosecutors, police departments, and the Attorney General’s Office, either did not respond or could not provide the requested information as no case-specific records were kept.66 The Committee was able to tabulate data on the number of days each case was in the trial court using docket sheets.67

The following tabulations are based on the data presented in the 2014 Report and its detailed appendixes.

64 2014 Report, at 1; 5.
65 Id. at 3.
66 Id. at 3-4.
67 Id. at 12.
Budgetary cost of defense and district trial court work through initial trial phase.

For the fiscal years 2004-2011, 41 cases that were deemed capital-eligible were initiated in Kansas courts. Of these, five (5) were eventually dismissed, and two (2) involved underage defendants, leaving the 34 cases that were the focus of the 2014 Report.\textsuperscript{68} Prosecutors sought the death penalty in 19 of these cases, including 10 that went to trial.\textsuperscript{69} We designate these cases as “capitally prosecuted” or just “capital.” As discussed above, a capital case requires a more extensive defense regardless of whether the case ultimately goes to trial. For the remaining 15 cases, six (6) went to trial.

The Committee grouped the 34 cases according to whether the prosecutor had sought the death penalty (“capital cases”) or not (“non-capital cases”). There were four (4) cases that were classified as “non-capital cases” in the 2014 Report even though the prosecutor had initially sought the death penalty. In our judgment those cases should be classified as “capital,” since they did generate extra costs for the early phase of the prosecution. We re-computed the relevant statistics accordingly. In practice, the statistical impact of this reclassification is small.

The Committee canvassed a number of state and local agencies to obtain cost estimates for these cases. The most comprehensive response was from BIDS. BIDS provided defense-cost estimates for 32 of the 34 cases, only lacking data on two (2) of the non-capital prosecutions.\textsuperscript{70} Table 5, below, reports averages, for these cases, grouped as in Table 4. The average defense cost for capital cases was $257,000 and for non-capital cases was $59,000 implying a difference of $198,000. Since there were 19 capital cases initiated during the period 2004-2011, the implication is that the overall “extra” defense cost was $3,762,000, or $470,000 per year.

Table 5. Average BIDS Costs at trial phase for capital-eligible cases initiated FY 2004-2011 (all figures in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capital cases</th>
<th>Non-Capital Cases</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>$367 (n=10)</td>
<td>$97 (n=5)</td>
<td>$271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plea</td>
<td>$135 (n=9)</td>
<td>$35 (n=8)</td>
<td>$99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>$257 (n=19)</td>
<td>$59 (n=13)</td>
<td>$198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from data in 2014 Report, Appendix A

Note: No data are available for 2 of the non-capital cases.

Table 6, below, shows similar cost data based on responses received from the district courts. District courts reported the operating costs associated with court days, including salary.

\textsuperscript{68} Id. at 5.
\textsuperscript{69} Id. at Appendix A.
\textsuperscript{70} Id. at 1, 7, Appendix A.
information. Extra costs to the district courts are associated with the extra days in court required for a capital prosecution. By the same computation as before, “extra” district court costs averaged $38,000 per capital case. Since there were 19 capital cases, the total was added up to $722,000, or about $90,000 per year.

**Table 6. Average District-Court Costs at trial phase for capital-eligible cases initiated FY 2004-2011** (all figures in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capital cases</th>
<th>Non-capital cases</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trial</strong></td>
<td>$69 (n=10)</td>
<td>$17 (n=4)</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plea</strong></td>
<td>$16 (n=7)</td>
<td>$3 (n=6)</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>$47 (n=17)</td>
<td>$9 (n=10)</td>
<td>$38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Computed from data in 2014 Report, Appendix A*

*Note: No data are available for 2 of the capital cases and 5 of the non-capital cases.*

Combining defense costs and district court costs implies a combined average “extra” cost of $560,000 per year incurred by the state during the 8-year period under consideration.

These estimates do not include the extra burden on prosecutors when representing the state for capital cases. The prosecutorial time devoted to a case during pre-trial and trial is in part indicated by the number of days in court (see below), as well as the time and effort devoted by the defense.

The 2014 Report also provided updated data on the costs of the 22 cases analyzed in the 2003 Report. BIDS reported that the costs of appeals for the seven (7) death-sentenced cases amounted to $1,057,000, compared with just $56,000 for the seven (7) cases that were initially capitaly prosecuted but did not result in a death sentence, and therefore proceeded as a non-capital case on appeal. Even smaller were the costs associated with the cases that were tried non-captally, with a total of $1,000 in representation costs on appeal.

All seven (7) of the death-sentenced cases incurred new costs in trial court following their direct appeals. In some cases the death penalty was vacated and the case returned for re-sentencing. The total cost to BIDS of trial-court representation was $817,000, including resentencing. There were zero costs associated with trial-court proceedings for cases that did not receive the death penalty.

---

71 2014 Report, at 5.  
72 Id. at 9-10.  
73 Id. at Appendix C.  
74 Id.
Total defense representation costs for the seven (7) cases sentenced to death prior to 2004 was $1,874,000. There were essentially no costs for the murder cases that were convicted following a non-capital trial. The death-penalty-related cost averages to about $234,000 per year for the period 2004-2011.

*Days in court.*

The Committee tabulated data on district-court appearances from court dockets for the 34 cases that formed the focus of the 2014 Report and the 21 cases that formed the focus of the 2003 Report (removing 1 juvenile case) for a total sample of 55 cases. Recall that the 2003 Report’s sample of cases is not comprehensive. It included all capital cases that went to trial but excluded those that were settled by plea. For that reason, the estimate of “extra” court days understates the true total. The case list used in the 2014 Report is comprehensive.

For each case, the number of days in which there were district court proceedings were tabulated. This count included court days for motions, trial, and sentencing. In Table 7, cases are grouped according to whether or not the prosecutor ever sought the death penalty (denoted “capital case”), and whether the case went to trial or was settled by a guilty plea. While the Committee classified four (4) cases in which the death penalty was initially sought but eventually withdrawn as non-capital, we classified these cases as capital. Our rationale is that those cases were capitally prosecuted for a while, which would have generated extra costs.

**Table 7. Average number of court days for capital-eligible murder cases initiated between 1994 - 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capital cases</th>
<th>Non-Capital cases</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trial</strong></td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[N=24]</td>
<td>[N=13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plea</strong></td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[N = 9]</td>
<td>[N=9]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[N = 33]</td>
<td>[N=22]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Computed from data in 2014 Report, Appendix D*

Averages are much higher for cases that were prosecuted capitally both for those that went to trial and those that were settled by a guilty plea. In particular, the capitally prosecuted cases that went to trial utilized between 17 and 90 days in court with an average of 39.5, whereas the range for non-capital trials was from nine (9) to 30 with an average of 16.2 days.\textsuperscript{75} Processing a capital case through trial takes on average over 23 additional days in district court than processing a

\textsuperscript{75} *Id.* at Appendix D.
non-capital case through trial.\textsuperscript{76} (That estimate presumes that the sample of capitally prosecuted cases is a reliable basis for estimating the number of court days that would have been required if they had been prosecuted non-capitally.) All together, capital prosecutions required 561.6 “extra” days in district court, or an average of over 31 additional days per year.

For cases that were settled by plea agreement, the capital cases required 9.7 more court days on average than the non-capital cases, adding substantially to the burden on court usage.

During that period, the trial courts also had proceedings in cases in which a death sentence was vacated on appeal, but no data is available on the number of court days for those proceedings.

\textit{Budgetary costs for appeals.}

The 2014 Report also tabulates defense representation costs for appeals following convictions for cases initiated during fiscal years 2004-2011. Five (5) defendants were sentenced to death, and they generated almost all of the costs of representation on appeal: a total of $844,000.\textsuperscript{77} An additional five (5) cases were prosecuted capitally but did not result in a death penalty; representing them on appeal cost BIDS $72,000, less than 10% of total cost of the death-sentenced cases.\textsuperscript{78} The 15 cases that were not prosecuted capitally cost $54,000 in BIDS cost of representation on appeal.

It is clear that for capital-eligible murder cases, the great bulk of representation costs on appeal are due to cases that are actually sentenced to death. If the death penalty had not been available, the savings to the state for extra representation costs associated with appeals and subsequent trial-court proceedings would have been about $2,718,000, or $340,000 per year during the period 2004-2011, as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item $1,057,000 – BIDS appellate representation of seven (7) sentenced to death before 2003
  \item $817,000 – BIDS representation of those seven (7) defendants in subsequent trial-court proceedings
  \item $844,000 – BIDS appellate representation of five (5) sentenced to death, 2003-2011
  \item $2,718,000 – total, representation of all death-sentenced defendants, 2003-2011
\end{itemize}

The 2014 Report does not include estimates of the cost of representing the State during appeals and subsequent proceedings in trial court, although that cost is clearly substantial. It does offer some information on the Kansas Supreme Court’s burden associated with reviewing appeals. In response to a query, the Court estimated that over the previous three (3) years, the staff had devoted 13,600 hours to appeals of death-penalty cases.\textsuperscript{79} Generally speaking, the Court devotes 20 times as much time to death-penalty appeals than other murder cases.

\textsuperscript{76} 2014 Report, at 13.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Id.} at A-1.
\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Id.} at A-1.
\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Id.} at 11.
Summary estimate for the period 2004-2011.

The 2014 Report provides data to estimate several of the cost elements for the period 2004-2011. Gathering the estimates detailed above indicates a total of $7,202,000 for this 8-year period, or $900,000 per year:

- $3,762,000 – Extra costs of defense at trial, capital cases filed 2004-2011
- $722,000 – Extra district court costs for capital cases filed, 2004-2011
- $2,718,000 – Representation of all death-sentenced defendants following sentencing
- $7,202,000 – Total, defense representation and district court costs

We note again that these costs reflect actual expenditures by state and local government agencies during the period in question. The total omits several important costs for which no information was provided in the 2014 Report, including the extra costs of prosecution in capital cases, state representation during appeal of death sentences, and the cost to the Kansas Supreme Court of appellate review of death penalty cases. If data on these items were available, the annual figure would be well over $1 million during that period.

c. New Kansas Cost Study on Costs During 2014-2018

Since the 2014 Report, the death penalty has continued to generate extra costs to state and local government, both from murder cases in which the prosecutor chose to seek the death penalty, and from appeals and other litigation involving defendants who were previously sentenced to death. In this section, we focus on the 5-year period 2014-2018, and seek to estimate the extra death-penalty-related cost of processing murder cases. As explained above, we use a cash-accounting framework for this period and pose the question of how much money the State would have saved on processing murder cases if the death penalty had been abolished before 2014.


During these five (5) years, 22 capital-eligible murder cases were filed in Kansas district courts. In nine (9) of these cases the prosecutor filed notice of seeking the death penalty. One of the defendants was sentenced to death (Cross) and three ended in a plea agreement. Eleven (11) of the 22 filed cases were not resolved during the 5-year window, and in fact five (5) of the capitaly prosecuted cases are still pending as of 2022.

Ten other capital-eligible cases were filed before 2014 but were concluded in district court during the 5-year window of interest and hence generated costs during that period. One of these cases (Flack) was filed in 2013 and the defendant was convicted and sentenced to death in 2016.

In sum, there were a total of 17 capital murder cases that were resolved or filed during the period 2014-2018. Only two (2) of these cases were both filed and resolved during that period.
As of January 1, 2014, there were eight (8) death-sentenced prisoners in Kansas whose cases were under appeal before the Kansas Supreme Court or otherwise litigated during the 2014-2018 window. 80

Extra Costs of Defense.

To review, the extra cost generated by the death penalty to the State includes, but is not limited to, the following items:

1. The extra cost of defense during the trial phase in capital cases, and representation of death-sentenced defendants during direct appeal and subsequent litigation;
2. The extra cost of prosecution during the trial phase in capital cases, and representation of the State during direct appeal and subsequent litigation involving death-sentenced defendants; and
3. The extra cost to the district courts resulting from the greater number of days in court (associated with motion practice and longer trials) and Kansas Supreme Court (due to death penalty appeals), as well as the likelihood that death-sentenced cases return to district court following a successful appeal.

Unfortunately, there is scant data available for quantifying these costs. The best available information is on the costs of indigent defense, which is provided by BIDS. The annual BIDS budgets break out the budget for “Capital Defense.”

“Capital Defense represents individuals charged with capital cases, administers a system by which courts may appoint qualified attorneys to represent indigents charged with capital offenses, serves as a resource for attorneys assigned to capital cases, develops training programs and materials for persons involved in capital cases, maintains statistical records about the use of capital punishment, and provides expert and investigative services to trial counsel in capital cases.

“Expenditures for the unit include costs of in-house defense, contracts with private attorneys in conflict cases or because of staff overload, and costs associated with capital cases on appeal.” 81

The actual budget for Capital Defense doubled between FY2014 and FY2018 and was still larger in FY2019, reaching nearly $3 million in that year. This increase is associated with the increasing costs of death-penalty appeals and other litigation from cases that had first been sentenced years before.

80 Kleypas, Robinson, J. Carr, R. Carr, Gleason, Cheever, Thurber, Kahler.
Fiscal Year | Budget (all figures in thousands)
---|---
2014 | 1,185.4\(^{82}\)
2015 | 1,523.5\(^{83}\)
2016 | 1,662.2\(^{84}\)
2017 | 1,943.3\(^{85}\)
2018 | 2,430.6\(^{86}\)
2019 | 2,966.7\(^{87}\)

The Kansas fiscal year begins July 1, while our 5-year window follows the calendar year. An estimate of total BIDS expenditures on capital defense for the five (5) calendar years (2014-2018) is $9,635,600, which includes half of the FY2014 budget and half of the FY2019 budget. Thus the expenditure for indigent defense during this period averaged $1,927,800 annually, or close to $2 million.

The BIDS summary budget does not distinguish between defense expenditures during the trial phase, and defense expenditures for death-sentenced defendants. During the trial phase, the counterfactual (no death sentence, so no “super due process” requirements) would apply to cases in which the prosecutor was seeking the death sentence. Defense representation would have been costly even if the death sentence were not available. Based on the data from the 2014 Report, we estimate that the cost of defense of capital-eligible murder cases in which the prosecutor did not seek the death penalty averaged $59,000. An adjustment for general inflation implies an increase to over $69,000 (based on Consumer Price Index, which increased 17.6% from 2007 to 2016). That estimate can be applied to the two (2) capital cases that were filed and resolved during the window, and a share of these expenses to the 15 cases that were either resolved during the window (but filed earlier), or filed during the window (but not resolved). We assume that half the total expense of defense was incurred for those cases. The 15 partial cases are then the equivalent of 7.5 complete cases, for a total of 9.5. The implied cost (9.5 x $69,000)


\(^{83}\) FY2017, at 233.


is $655,500, the cost of defending these cases without possibility of the death penalty. No such deduction is needed for the cost of death-penalty appeals and other litigation following sentencing, since the cost of representing LWOP-sentenced defendants on appeal has generally been negligible in practice.

Much of the BIDS Capital Defense budgets support representation of death-sentenced defendants on appeal. It is informative in this respect to read some of the notes in the BIDS budget justification:

- In the FY2018 budget request, BIDS requested $380,000 as a supplement in FY2017 “in order to provide counsel for state capital habeas proceedings in two capital punishment cases: the John E. Robinson case ($200,000) and the Scott Cheever case ($180,000).”

- The 2017 Legislature added $1.1M for FY2018 and $1.4M for FY2019 for state capital habeas proceedings, estimated by case as: Robinson ($350,000 in each FY2018 and FY2019), Cheever ($200,000 in each FY2018 and FY2019), Gleason ($250,000 in FY2018 and FY2019), the Carr brothers ($250,000 in each FY2018 and FY2019), and Kleypas ($300,000 in FY2019).

Additionally, from FY2017 to FY2019, the capital defense unit increased in staff size from 18 positions to 27 in-house capital defense positions. As noted before the increase, “two capital habeas unit attorneys oversee seven cases and four death penalty unit attorneys oversee ten cases.” The capital defense program has been a growing fraction of the overall BIDS budget and number of full time employees.

In sum, the BIDS capital defense budget for the 5-year window was $9,635,600. From this amount we deduct an estimate of the cost of defending the capital cases under the counterfactual assumption that they had been prosecuted non-capitally, $655,500. The net amount is then $8,980,100.

Extra cost of prosecution and representation of the State.

The Attorney General’s Office is responsible for representing the State of Kansas in appeals before state and federal appellate courts, and for providing legal advice, support, and aid to Kansas counties and district attorneys. (The 2003 Report found that the bulk of prosecution costs in capital cases was incurred by the State as opposed to local jurisdictions.) Unfortunately the Attorney General’s Office has not provided budget information or other information relevant to

---

88 FY2018, at 946.
89 FY2018, at 949, 953; FY2019, at 237
90 FY2019, at 250;
91 FY2019, at 243; FY2021, at 1089.
Local jurisdictions also failed to provide any data on the costs of prosecution. In the absence of any directly relevant data, we can only estimate the extra cost of prosecuting capital cases to the State during appeals and post-conviction proceedings for death-sentenced defendants. Some guidance is provided by the 2003 Report, which found that defense expenditures were 5.3 times as high as prosecution expenses in capital cases. That was for the trial phase, and does not necessarily apply to litigation following a death sentence. Assuming the ratio applies to both, and that it is a reasonable approximation during the period under consideration, we can estimate the cost of prosecution and representation of the state to have been $1,818,000 during 2014-2018. From that must be deducted the counterfactual cost of prosecuting the capital cases non-capitally. Assuming the cost for a non-capital prosecution is similar to the cost of defense in such cases, we use the same deduction of $655,500. As a result, we estimate the extra costs of prosecution due to the death penalty for 2014-18 was $1,162,500.

Extra cost in District Courts.

We can follow a similar strategy to estimate the costs in the District Courts from 2014-2018. Based on our analysis of the 2014 Report, we estimated that the extra costs of capital cases to the District Courts amounted to $38,000 per case. Multiplying this by the 9.5 cases during our 5-year period, and taking inflation into account, results in a total estimate of $425,000.


We estimate that Kansas state and local agencies incurred the following extra costs between 2014-2018:

- $8,980,100 – Defense in capital cases and subsequent representation of death-sentenced defendants;
- $1,162,500 – Prosecution in capital cases and representation of the State for appeal of death sentences;
- $425,000 – District courts; and
- $10,567,600 – Total sum of defense, prosecution, and district court costs.

Our conclusion is that these extra costs amounted to approximately $2.1 million per year to state and local agencies.

---

93 See Appendix C.
94 2003 Report, at 12, Appendix D (showing the prosecution cost for the 14 capital cases totaled $750,000, and the defense totaled $3,962,000).
95 2014 Report, Appendix A.
This estimate understates the true total of public costs, since it omits the costs to the Kansas Supreme Court of processing death-penalty appeals, and the extra costs of holding death-sentenced prisoners in administrative segregation, which was required from 2014-2018.

We deliberately excluded any extra costs to private citizens, including defendants and their families. We also excluded the costs to federal courts; for example, the Supreme Court of the United States heard several appeals of rulings by the Kansas Supreme Court concerning the constitutionality of the death penalty during the period under consideration.

The bottom line is that the death penalty cost government agencies in Kansas over $2 million per year during the period 2014-2018. If the death penalty had been abolished before 2014, that amount could have been returned to taxpayers or reallocated to serving other public purposes.

Philip J. Cook

Frank R. Baumgartner
REFERENCES


APPENDIX A
December 8, 2021

PHILIP JACKSON COOK

Terry Sanford Professor Emeritus of Public Policy  Telephone: 919 613-7360
Professor Emeritus of Economics and Sociology  FAX: 919 681-8288
Sanford School of Public Policy
Box 90545
Duke University  E-mail: pcook@duke.edu
Durham, NC 27708

Education:

B.A. (with high distinction) University of Michigan, 1968
Ph.D. (Economics) University of California, Berkeley, 1973

Positions held:

2017-   Terry Sanford Professor Emeritus of Public Policy, Professor Emeritus of Economics
2018-2019 Visiting scholar, Collegio Carlo Alberto, Turin, Italy (4 months total)
2014-15   Fellow, Russell Sage Foundation, New York
2009-2013 Senior Associate Dean for Faculty, Sanford School of Public Policy
2008-9    Schelling Visiting Professor of Public Policy, University of Maryland
2003     Residency, Bellagio Study and Conference Center (September-October)
2000     Visiting Scholar, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
1997-99   Director, Sanford Institute of Public Policy; Chair, Department of Public Policy Studies
1994-2017 ITT/Terry Sanford Professor of Public Policy
1992-2017 Professor of Public Policy Studies, Economics, & Sociology, Duke University
1989-90   Visiting Professor, Fuqua School of Business, Duke University
1985-89   Director, Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University and Chairman, Department of Public Policy Studies
1984-2017  Professor of Public Policy and Economics, Duke University

1979-84  Associate Professor; 1973-79  Assistant Professor, Duke University

1982  Expert (part time) Office of Policy and Management Analysis, Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice

Fall 1980  Visiting Scholar, Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Fellowships and Academic Honors:
Stockholm Prize in Criminology, 2020
Fellow of the Academy of Experimental Criminology, 2012-
Raymond Vernon Memorial Prize for best paper in JPAM, 2008
Richard A. Stubble Teacher Mentor Award, 2008
Member, National Academy of Medicine (formerly Institute of Medicine), 2001-
Who’s Who in America 2001 and subsequent issues
Fellow of the American Society of Criminology, 2000-
Vernon Prize for best paper in Journal of Policy Analysis & Management (v. 16), 1997
Research Associate, National Bureau of Economic Research 1996-
Kenneth J. Arrow Award (for best paper published in health economics), 1994
National Science Foundation Fellowship, 1968-1970
Special Career Fellowship (Ford Foundation), 1968-1972
National Merit Scholar, 1964-1968
Sims Award, Economics Department, University of Michigan, 1967
Phi Beta Kappa
Publications

A. Health and Safety Regulation

1. Books and Edited Volumes


   PJ Cook and A Scharff, Recommendations Concerning Administration and Rate Structure for Excise Taxation in Romania Distributed by Tax Advisory Program, US Treasury Department, August 1994.
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Washington Post, November 12, 1995
Washington Monthly, December 1995
Chronicle of Higher Education, January 5, 1996

F. Education and Other topics
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Public safety through private action, University of Oregon Department of Economics, March 05, 2011.
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Cost of the Death Penalty in North Carolina, University of Maryland September 27, 2012

The Virtuous Tax, Cornell University, Department of Policy Analysis and Management October 10, 2012
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Member, N.C. Governor's Task Force on Drunken Driving, 1982.
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Testified on the use of alcohol taxation as a public-health measure before the U.S. Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, September 27, 1988.

Member, Workshop on Health Economics, National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, September 1988.

Member, National Research Council's Panel on the Understanding and Control of Violent Behavior, 1988-91.

Member, Advisory Board to the Injury Prevention Research Center, University of North Carolina, 1990-.


Invited participant, CDC's Forum on Youth Violence in Minority Communities, Atlanta, December 10-12, 1990.

Member, President’s Advisory Board of the H. John Heinz III School of Public Policy and Management, Carnegie Mellon University, 1992-96 and subsequently (including 2007).


Member, Center for Gun Policy Research, Johns Hopkins University, 1995-.


Invited speaker, U.S. Senate Democratic Policy Council, Wilmington, DE, April 26, 1996.
Member, National Academy of Sciences (IOM) Committee on Injury Prevention and Control, 1997-8.

Member, Advisory Committee to the Harvard Injury Control Research Center, 1998-.


Member, National Academy of Sciences (NRC) Committee on School Violence, 2001-2002.

Member, Division Committee for the Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, 2001-2004.

Member, "Committee to Develop a Strategy to Prevent and Reduce Underage Drinking", Institute of Medicine 2002-3.


Member, Crime and Justice editorial board, 2007-2010.

Member, National Research Council Workshop on Understanding Crime Trends, 2007-8 Co-Director, NBER Economics of Crime Working Group, 2007-

Vice Chair, National Research Council Committee on Law and Justice, 2006-2010.

Vice President, Association of Public Policy and Management, 2008-2009 (two years).


Member, International Scientific Advisory Board, Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NSCR), 2010-.

Member, National Research Council Committee on Deterrence and the Death Penalty, August 2010 – November 2011.

Member, National Research Council Committee on The Illicit Tobacco Market: Collection and Analysis of The International Experience, 2013-15.

Member, National Research Council Committee on Proactive Policing, 2015-2017.
Refereeing


Editorial consultant, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 1982-.


Associate Editor, *Criminology*, 1987-91.

Editorial board, *Criminology & Public Policy*  2010-

Editorial board, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*  2015-
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FRANK R. BAUMGARTNER
Richard J. Richardson Distinguished Professor of Political Science
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
313 Hamilton Hall • Chapel Hill, NC 27599–3265
Phone 919 962 3041 • Fax 919 962 0432
Frankb@unc.edu • http://fbaum.unc.edu/

EDUCATION
Ph.D., 1986, The University of Michigan. (Fields: Comparative, American, methods.)


Languages: American (native); French (fluent).

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

**Full-Time Academic Appointments**

2009– Richard J. Richardson Distinguished Professor of Political Science, UNC Chapel Hill (also Adjunct Professor of Public Policy, 2019–)


1998–99 California Institute of Technology, Visiting Professor

1987–98 Texas A&M University (Assistant Professor 1987–92; Associate Professor 1992–97; Professor 1997–98)

1986–87 The University of Iowa, Visiting Assistant Professor

**Temporary and other Appointments**

2019 Visiting Professor, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland, May–June

2016 Fellow, Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities, University of Edinburg, May–June


2000–10 Professor (honorary appointment), University of Aberdeen

2007 Fellow, The Camargo Foundation, Cassis, France, January–May

2005 Visiting Professor, Cevipof / Sciences Po, Paris, March–August

2004–05 Visiting Fellow, European University Institute, Department of Political and Social Sciences, Florence, September–February

1997 Visiting Scholar, The University of Washington, Seattle, Summer
1996, 90, 87 Visiting Scholar, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Summers
1988 Visiting Scholar, Institut de Management Public, Paris, Summer
1981–86 Teaching Assistant, then Instructor, then Lecturer, The University of Michigan
1981–86 Research Assistant, then Research Associate, The University of Michigan.
Institute for Public Policy Studies; National Election Studies; Center for Political Studies; Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research
1981 Summer intern and interpreter, Conseil Régional du Nord – Pas-de-Calais, France, M. Pierre Mauroy, President of the Region and Prime Minister of France

**Teaching and Research Fields**
Public policy, policy process, punctuated equilibrium, agenda-setting, framing, interest groups, lobbying, social movements, budgeting, capital punishment, American politics, comparative politics, race and ethnic politics, racial disparities in criminal justice, traffic stops, and policing.

**CURRENT RESEARCH**
Comparative Agendas Project (see [http://www.comparativeagendas.net](http://www.comparativeagendas.net)). Bryan Jones and I started the US Policy Agendas Project in 1994, making available data on the activities of the US government since 1947. It has now expanded internationally to become the Comparative Agendas Project (CAP), with affiliated projects in over 25 countries and political systems.

Capital Punishment Research (see [http://fbaum.unc.edu/Innocence/Innocence.htm](http://fbaum.unc.edu/Innocence/Innocence.htm) and [http://fbaum.unc.edu/books/DeadlyJustice/index.html](http://fbaum.unc.edu/books/DeadlyJustice/index.html)). Following on the research I conducted for books published in 2008 and 2018, I continue to be involved in analyses of the death penalty in the US and in North Carolina.

Traffic Stops and “Driving While Black” (see [http://fbaum.unc.edu/traffic.htm](http://fbaum.unc.edu/traffic.htm) and [http://fbaum.unc.edu/books/SuspectCitizens/index.html](http://fbaum.unc.edu/books/SuspectCitizens/index.html)). After publishing a comprehensive analysis of over 20 million traffic stops in North Carolina since 2000, I have remained active in studying the “driving while black” phenomenon in a series of articles.

Racial Disparities in Criminal Justice Outcomes. With a team of graduate students and other collaborators, I am involved in various studies of jury formation, patterns of arrest, and differences in judicial outcomes for different racial and gender groups in the North Carolina criminal justice system, based on large administrative databases.

Research Under Review or Near Completion:
- Being revised for submission
  *Criminal Justice Contact and Outcomes in North Carolina: Race, Poverty, and Inequality.* A book-length analysis of arrest records, using comprehensive data from the North Carolina courts with millions of observations from 2013 through 2019. (Frank R. Baumgartner, Christian Caron, Marty A. Davidson, and Kaneesha R. Johnson)
The Importance of Faculty Diversity for Political Science. Target for submission: Spring 2022. (with Chris Clark and Ray Block, Jr.)

Geography or Personal Choice: Prosecutor Decisions about the Death Penalty in the 30 Most Active Death Penalty Counties in the US. Target for submission: Summer 2022 (Sally Stanley and Frank R. Baumgartner)


Physical Characteristics and Severity of Punishments in Prison. Target for submission: Summer 2022 (Kaneesha Johnson and Frank R. Baumgartner)


- Under review


**PUBLICATIONS**

**Authored Books**


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.


• Winner of the Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010.

• Simplified Chinese translation, Nanjing University Press, forthcoming.
Other Editorial Work

*Theoretical Models of the Policy Process*, virtual special issue of *Journal of European Public Policy*, 2014. Frank R. Baumgartner and Petya Alexandrova, guest editors. (This is our selection of 11 influential articles from previous issues of *JEPP*, with a short introduction.) [http://explore.tandfonline.com/page/pgas/rjpp-policy-process](http://explore.tandfonline.com/page/pgas/rjpp-policy-process)

**Articles in Peer-Reviewed Journals**


- Included in the *PSJ* Virtual Special Issue on Racial Justice, ed. Jamila Michener, July 15, 2020


Budgetary Change in Authoritarian and Democratic Regimes. *Journal of European Public Policy* 24, 6 (2017): 792–808. (Frank R. Baumgartner, Marcello Carammia, Derek A. Epp, Ben Noble, Beatriz Rey, and Tevfik Murat Yildirim)


- Included in the *PSJ* Virtual Special Issue on COVID-19 Crisis, ed. Michael D. Jones, May 26, 2020


- Included in the #BlackLivesMatter *PGI* Micro-Syllabus


- Included in the #BlackLivesMatter *PGI* Micro-Syllabus


- Included in the *PSJ* Virtual Special Issue on COVID-19 Crisis, ed. Michael D. Jones, May 26, 2020


– Selected for inclusion in special issue reprinting the most outstanding articles for the 20th anniversary issue of *JPART*, 2010.


This article led to a rebuttal and response as follows:


**Articles Published in Law Reviews**


**Book Chapters**


– The Origins, Organization, Maintenance, and Mortality of Interest Groups (with Beth L. Leech), pp. 95–111.
– Criminal Justice Interest Groups (with Michael C. MacLeod), pp. 248–49.
– Education Interest Groups (with Michael C. MacLeod), pp. 221–23.

The following chapters in Frank R. Baumgartner and Bryan D. Jones, eds., *Policy Dynamics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002:
– Introduction: Positive and Negative Feedback in Politics (Frank R. Baumgartner and Bryan D. Jones)
– Studying Policy Dynamics (Frank R. Baumgartner, Bryan D. Jones, and John Wilkerson)
– The Changing Agendas of Congress and the Supreme Court (Frank R. Baumgartner and Jamie Gold)
– Conclusion (Frank R. Baumgartner and Bryan D. Jones)

Organized Interests and Issue Definition in Policy Debates. In Allan J. Cigler and Burdett A.


**Invited Essays and Other Publications**


Part of a symposium recognizing the 30th anniversary of the publication of Jack L. Walker Jr.’s book of that title. Other contributors include Andrew S. McFarland, Kathleen Marchetti, and Jesse M. Crosson, Alexander, C. Furnas, and Geoffrey M. Lorenz.

Forward: Political Actors and the Media. In Peter Van Aelst and Stefaan Walgrave, eds. *How


Studying Interest Groups Using Lobby Disclosure Reports. *VOX POP* (Newsletter of the Political Organizations and Parties Section of the APSA) Vol. 18, No. 1 (Fall 1999), pp. 1–3. (with Beth L. Leech)


Lessons from the Trenches: Ensuring Quality, Reliability, and Usability in the Creation of a New Data Source. *The Political Methodologist* (Newsletter of the Political Methodology Section of the APSA) Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring 1998), pp. 1–10. (Frank R. Baumgartner, Bryan D. Jones, and Michael C. MacLeod)


**Legal / Criminal Justice / Legislative Testimony / Reports**


Affidavit in support of Mr. Bruce Johnson regarding jury selection in Johnston County, NC, November 9, 2021.

Affidavit in support of Mr. Nathan Holden regarding capital jury selection in Wake County, NC, June 10, 2021.

Affidavit in support of Mr. Kendrick Gregory regarding capital jury selection in Wake County, NC, June 10, 2021.


Oral presentation to the Nevada Legislature regarding AB 379, a bill to remove expiration date stickers from NV automobile license plates as a means to reduce racial disparities, April 1, 2021.


Declining Use of the Death Penalty for Offenders 18, 19 and 20 Years of Age. Submitted, August 1, 2019 as part of the capital appeal of State v. Guzek, Marion County OR, No. 17CV08248. Court testimony in Salem OR, October 10, 2019.


Amicus brief to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Eastern District regarding racial bias in the application of the state’s death penalty system. Related case is Cox v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and Marinelli v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 102 EM 2018; brief filed February 2019. (co-signed with Catherine M. Grosso and Jules Epstein as lead signatories and 21 other social scientists)

Amicus brief to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington regarding racial bias in application of the state’s death penalty system. Related case is State v. Gregory (no. 88086-7); brief filed January 22, 2018. (co-signed with Catherine Grosso and Jeffrey Fagan as lead signatories and nine other social scientists). In October, 2018, the Supreme Court of Washington ruled the death penalty unconstitutional based on racial and geographic bias, consistent with our brief.

Analyzing Racial Disparities in Traffic Stops Statistics from the Texas Department of Public Safety. Report to the Texas House of Representatives, Committee on County Affairs, September 20, 2016. (Frank R. Baumgartner, Leah Christiani, and Kevin Roach)

Amicus brief to the US Supreme Court regarding constitutional defects in the application of the death penalty. Related case is Tucker v. Louisiana (15-946); brief filed February 29, 2016. (lead author, with 20 signatories)

The Impact of Race, Gender, and Geography on Florida Executions. 2016.
The Impact of Race, Gender, and Geography on Ohio Executions. 2016.
The Impact of Race, Gender, and Geography on Missouri Executions. 2015.


Affidavit in support of litigants seeking relief under the NC Racial Justice Act to be tried in Forsyth County, NC August 8, 2012.

Amicus brief to the US Supreme Court regarding mandatory life without parole sentences for juveniles, January 17, 2012; related Supreme Court Decision is Miller v. Alabama No. 10–9646, Decided June 25, 2012. (co-signed with Jefferey Fagan lead author and 44 others)

Member, Task Force on Racial and Ethnic Bias in the Criminal Justice System, North Carolina Advocates for Justice, 2010-2012. Our report (see below) led the Attorney General to create The North Carolina Commission on Racial Disparities in the Criminal Justice
System in September 2012. I am not a member of this commission but have consulted with it.

North Carolina Traffic Stop Statistics Analysis. Report to the North Carolina Advocates for Justice, 1 February 2012. (with Derek A. Epp) These technical reports were based on official statistics provided by the NC Department of Justice and relate to possible racial bias associated with each traffic stop in the state from January 1, 2000 through June 2011. The report was submitted to the Governor, Attorney General, and leaders of both parties in both chambers of the NC legislature in April 2012. In June 2012, it was leaked to the press.

**Opinion Pieces / Op Eds**


If Biden abolishes the federal death penalty, he’ll have more support than you think. *WashingtonPost.com* Monkey Cage, August 3, 2021.

Why traffic stops can be deadly for people of color. *Los Angeles Times*. April 16, 2021. (Frank R. Baumgartner, Derek Epp and Kelsey Shoub)

Virginia may abolish the death penalty. There’s a racist history behind why a few jurisdictions use it most. *WashingtonPost.com* Monkey Cage, February 4, 2021. (Frank R. Baumgartner and Christian Caron)

Ten Years of Study and the Protesters are Right. What traffic stops tell us about racial bias in policing. *Medium.com/3streams*, June 25, 2020 (Frank R. Baumgartner, Leah Christiani, Derek A. Epp, Kelsey Shoub, and Kevin Roach)

The fears of Driving While Black in NC are true. The data prove it. *Raleigh News and Observer*, July 27, 2018 (Frank R. Baumgartner, Derek A. Epp and Kelsey Shoub)

What 20 Million Traffic Stops Reveal about Policing and Race in America. *SSN Key Findings*, June 2018 (Frank R. Baumgartner and Derek A. Epp)


America’s Failed Efforts to Reform the Death Penalty. *SSN Key Findings*, February 2018. (Frank R. Baumgartner, Marty Davidson, Kaneesha Johnson, Arvind Krishnamurthy, and Colin Wilson)

A few counties are responsible for the vast majority of executions. This explains why. *WashingtonPost.com* Monkey Cage, February 1, 2018 (Frank R. Baumgartner, Janet M. Box-Steppensmeier, and Benjamin W. Campbell)

There’s been a big change in how the news media covers sexual assault. *WashingtonPost.com* Monkey Cage, May 11, 2017. (Frank R. Baumgartner and Sarah McAdon)

Arkansas plans to execute 7 men in 11 days. They’re likely to botch one. *WashingtonPost.com* Monkey Cage, April 14, 2017 (Frank R. Baumgartner and Kaneesha Johnson)

Does the death penalty target people who are mentally ill? We checked. *WashingtonPost.com* Monkey Cage, April 3, 2017 (Frank R. Baumgartner and Betsy Neill)

Is Congress working as it should? Depends on who you are, by Frank R. Baumgartner and Lee Drutman, *Vox.com*, September 15, 2016.


Study shows racial bias in death penalties in Florida, *The Florida Times Union* (Jacksonville), February 5, 2016


Americans are turning against the death penalty. Are politicians far behind? *WashingtonPost.com* Monkey Cage December 7, 2015 (Frank R. Baumgartner, Emily Williams and Kaneesha Johnson)


Missouri should abandon death penalty, *St. Louis American*, July 22, 2015


The Death Penalty: A Symbol of Which Lives Matter, and Which Lives Don’t, April 24, 2015. *90MillionStrong.org*


A Half Century after the March on Washington, Little Attention to the Struggles of the Poor. SSN Key Findings, October 2013. (Frank R. Baumgartner and Max Rose)

Governor must veto RJA repeal, *Winston Salem Journal*, December 8, 2011


In N.C., only 20 percent of condemned are executed. *Charlotte Observer*, March 5, 2010.


**Book Reviews**


*Sociation Today* (North Carolina Sociological Association), 11, 1 (Spring/Summer 2013).


**REVIEWS OF MY BOOKS**

*Comparative Policy Agendas: Theory, Tools, Data.*


*Suspect Citizens: What 20 Million Traffic Stops Tell Us about Policing and Race*

- *Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Politics* 6, 1 (March 2021): 258–261, by Michael Leo Owens
- *Perspectives on Politics* 17, 3 (2019): 892–893, by Doris Marie Provine
- *Choice*, 56, 5 (January 2019), by D.R. Kavish

*Deadly Justice: A Statistical Portrait of the Death Penalty*

- The Champion (National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers), August 2018, p. 54, by Robert Sanger
- *Choice* 55, 9 (May 2018), by J. S. Taylor

Agenda Dynamics in Spain

- *European Political Science* (2016), by Tevfik Murat Yildirim (Joint review of *Politics of Information and Agenda Dynamics in Spain*)

**The Politics of Information**
- *European Political Science* (2016), by Tevfik Murat Yildirim (Joint review of *Politics of Information and Agenda Dynamics in Spain*)
- *Congress & the Presidency* (2016), by Gisela Sin
- Low-Information Lawmakers: Why today’s Congress can no longer cope with complex problems. *Washington Monthly* by Lee Drutman, June/July/August 2015
- *Choice* 52, 12 (August 2015), by L. T. Grover

**Lobbying and Policy Change**
- *Perspectives on Politics* 9, 1 (2011): 178-80, by McGee Young
- *Political Science Quarterly* 125, 1 (2010), by Susan Webb Yackee
- *Regulation* (Fall 2010), pp. 48-49, by John Samples
- *APSA Legislative Studies Section Newsletter* Jan 2010, by Caitlyn O’Grady
- *Choice* (March 2010), by S. L. Harrison

**The Decline of the Death Penalty and the Discovery of Innocence**
- Review Symposium in *Perspectives on Politics* 7, 4 (2009): 921-30. Reviews by James A. Morone; Robert Y. Shapiro; Marie Gottschalk; and Austin Sarat
• *Law and Politics Book Review* 17, 8 (2008), by Priscilla H. M. Zotti
• *Choice* (August 2008), by M. A. Foley.
• *Research Penn State*, 2008, by Vicki Fong
• *Contemporary Sociology* 37, 5 (2008): 495, Take Note short reviews.

**Politics of Attention**
• *ThinkProgress.org*, February 28, 2011, by Matthew Yglesias
• *Political Communication* 25 (2008) 330-331, by Kathleen Knight
• *Perspectives on Politics* 4, 3 (2006): 598-9, by Paul E. Johnson
• *Political Science Quarterly* 121, 3 (2006) 515-516, by Scott E. Robinson
• *Social Forces* 85, 3 (2006) 1042-43, by John C. Scott
• *Choice* (March 2006), by M. C. Price
• *Significance* 37 (2006): 139, by Ya-Hui Kuo

**Basic Interests**
• *Journal of Politics* 61, 3 (1999): 844–848, by Anthony Nownes
• *Political Science Quarterly* 114, 1 (1999): 177–178, by Ken Kollman
• *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 63, 1 (1999): 151-154, by John R. Wright
• *Choice*, October 1998, by M. E. Ethridge

**Agendas and Instability**
• *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 72, 1 (Spring 1995): 233, by Donald L. Shaw
• *Choice*, September 1993, by D. R. Imig

**Conflict and Rhetoric in French Policymaking**
SUPREME COURT DECISIONS REFERRING TO MY RESEARCH

Oregon Supreme Court, 365 Or 695 (S066119) State v. Arreola-Botello, November 15, 2019, stating that a police officer may not conduct a search following a traffic stop if that search is unrelated to the purpose of the original stop. The Court noted our research on the racial disparities in such searches.


United States Supreme Court, 14-7153 and 17-7245, June 28, 2018, Justice Breyer in his dissents to the denial of cert in Jordan v. Mississippi and Evans v. Mississippi, on three separate issues: increasing delays on death row before execution, high proportions of homicides that are death-eligible, and the increasing geographic concentration of executions in just a few counties.

Iowa Supreme Court, No. 16-0735, June 28, 2018, Iowa v. Ingram, on the use of traffic stops as an “unregulated tool in crime control”.

United States Supreme Court, 14-7955, June 29, 2015, Justice Breyer in his dissent in Glossip v. Gross, on the rate at which death sentences are overturned.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Driving while Black (and Male, and Young, and...): Evidence of Disparities at the Margin and the Intersection. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA, August 30–September 2, 2018. (Frank R. Baumgartner, Leah Christiani, Derek Epp, Santiago Olivella, Kevin Roach, and Kelsey Shoub)


Budgeting in Authoritarian and Democratic Regimes. Paper presented at the Political Budgeting across Europe conference, Texas A&M University, December 2015 (Frank R. Baumgartner, Marcello Carammia, Derek A. Epp, Ben Noble, Beatriz Rey, and Tevfik Murat Yildirim)


Budgeting in Authoritarian and Democratic Regimes. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Comparative Agendas Project, Lisbon, June 2015. (Frank R. Baumgartner, Petra Bishtawi, Marcello Carammia, Derek A. Epp, Ben Noble, Beatriz Rey, and Tevfik Murat Yildirim)

Punctuated Equilibrium in Public Budgeting in Authoritarian and Democratic Brazil. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL, April 16–19, 2015. (Beatriz Rey, Derek A. Epp, and Frank R. Baumgartner)


How Robust are Distributional Findings of Punctuated Equilibrium in Public Budgets? Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago IL, April 2–6, 2014. (Derek A. Epp and Frank R. Baumgartner)
The Diversity of Internet Media: Utopia or Dystopia? Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago IL, April 2–6, 2014. (Bryan J. Dworak, John Lovett, and Frank R. Baumgartner)


Explaining the Surprising Decline of Capital Punishment in North Carolina. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the National Conference of Black Political Scientists, March 18, 2011, Raleigh, NC. (Frank R. Baumgartner and Isaac Unah)

Retrospective on 20 years after the publication of Jack L. Walker, Jr.’s *Mobilizing Interest Groups in America*, annual meetings of the Southern Political Science Association, New Orleans, LA, January 8–11, 2011.


Measuring the Size and Scope of the EU Interest Group Population. Paper prepared for the 5th ECPR General Conference, Potsdam, Germany, September 10–12, 2009. (Arndt Wonka, Frank R. Baumgartner, Christine Mahoney, Joost Berkhout)


Author meets critics panel on *The Decline of the Death Penalty*, annual meetings of the Academy for Criminal Justice Sciences, Boston, March 13, 2009.


The Structure of Washington Lobbying Networks: Mapping the Ties that Bind. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago IL, April 3–6, 2008. (With Timothy M. La Pira and Herschel F. Thomas III)
Patterns of Public Budgeting in the French Fifth Republic: From Hierarchical Control to Multi-Level Governance. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association, Chicago IL, August 30–September 2, 2007. (with Martial Foucault and Abel François)
Washington: The Real No-Spin Zone. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association, Chicago IL, August 30–September 2, 2007. (with Jeff Berry, Marie Hojnacki, Beth Leech, and David Kimball)
The Structure of Policy Conflict. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 20–23, 2006. (with Jeff Berry, Marie Hojnacki, Beth Leech, and David Kimball)
A Model of Choice for Public Policy. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 7–10, 2005. (with Bryan D. Jones)
The Determinants and Effects of Interest-Group Coalitions. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September 2–5, 2004. (with Christine Mahoney)


the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, GA, September 2–5, 1999. (with Bryan D. Jones)


Lobbying with Governmental Allies. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 10–12, 1997. (with Beth L. Leech)


Normative Perspectives on Interest Groups and Lobbying. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, GA, November 6–8, 1996. (with Nicole Canzoneri)


Tractability and Triviality in Interest-Group Studies. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 18–20, 1996. (with Beth L. Leech)


The Legislative Importance of Non-Legislative Hearings. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 14–16, 1994 (with Bryan D. Jones and Jeffery C. Talbert)


Congressional Committees and Jurisdictional Dynamics. Paper presented at the annual meetings
of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 8–11, 1992. (with Bryan D. Jones and Jeffery C. Talbert)


A New Question on Group Affiliations in the 1986 NES Pilot Study. Report to the Board of
Overseers of the National Election Study, May 20, 1986. (with Jack L. Walker)


EXTERNAL GRANTS AND AWARDS

Grants Submitted / Pending

Proposal for Study of Jury Pool Formation and Jury Selection. Submitted to the Governor's Task Force on Racial Equity in the Criminal Justice System, January 2021. (Frank R. Baumgartner, Marty Davidson, and Emily Coward)

Grants Funded / Awarded

National Science Foundation, Developing Policy-Specific Measures of Public Opinion, award number SES 1024291. $157,989 for the period of July 1, 2010 to August 31, 2013. Jim Stimson, PI; Frank R. Baumgartner, Co-PI.

National Science Foundation, Framing Policy Debates in the European Union, proposal 1102978. $300,000 awarded for the period of August 15, 2011 to July 31, 2013. Christine Mahoney (University of Virginia), PI; Frank R. Baumgartner, Co-PI; Heike Kluever, consultant.

Visiting International Scholar, Catalonia Ministry of Education and Research, funding for eight month visit to the University of Barcelona, December 2011–July 2012 (with Laura Chaqués Bonafont, University of Barcelona)

Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (CASBS), Stanford University. Expenses for a dozen scholars from the social sciences, computer science, government, and industry to travel to Stanford and attend a one-week workshop: Tracking, Transcribing, and Tagging Government: Building Digital Records for Computational Social Science, June 21–25, 2010. Frank R. Baumgartner and James T. Hamilton (Duke University), PIs

European Science Foundation (European Union), “The Politics of Attention: West European Politics in Times of Change.” Proposal with subprojects in Denmark, Netherlands, United Kingdom, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, and Spain, with Christoffer Green-Pedersen and others. Submitted April 2007. Projects have been funded starting in 2008 for Denmark, Spain, United Kingdom, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Belgium.


National Science Foundation, “Nanotechnology and Science Federalism.” Grant # NER 0608986, $85,000, August 1, 2006 to July 31, 2007. Co-PI. Paul Hallacher (Penn State) is PI. Additional Co-PI’s are Roger Geiger, Henry Foley, and Creso Sa.


National Science Foundation, REU supplemental award for award 0111611, $15,000, awarded October 12, 2005.


National Science Foundation, “Collaborative Research on Lobbying.” Grant # SBR 9905195, $80,569, August 1, 1999 to December 31, 2000. Principal Investigator. Co-Investigators are: Jeff Berry, Marie Hojnacki, Beth Leech, and David Kimball.

Norwegian Science Foundation (Norges forskningsråd), “Agenda Setting and Public Policy” to support teaching a graduate seminar at the University of Bergen, in fall 1998. (69,300 Norwegian Krone, with Richard L. Matland.) Awarded December 1997.


National Science Foundation, Research Opportunities for Undergraduates, supplements to the Policy Agendas grant, $12,500 per year, 1994, 1995. (with Bryan D. Jones)
French Government Travel Grant ($1,000), 1988.

**Awards**

C. Herman Pritchett Best Book Award from the Law and Courts Section of the American Political Science Association, 2019 *(for Suspect Citizens)*
Lijphart / Przeworski / Verba Dataset Award, APSA Section on Comparative Politics, 2019 *(for the Comparative Agendas Project)*
Best reviewer award, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 2018
Member, American Academy of Arts & Sciences, inducted 2017
Louis Brownlow Book Award, National Academy of Public Administration, 2016 *(for The Politics of Information)*
Samuel J. Eldersveld Career Achievement Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2011.
Hometown Hero Award, News Talk 1360 WCHL Chapel Hill NC, concerning career achievement award listed above, July 2011.
Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award, APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties, 2010 *(for Lobbying and Policy Change)*.
Article selected for inclusion in special issue reprinting the most outstanding articles for the 20th anniversary issue of *JPART*, 2010, for “A Model of Choice for Public Policy.”
Gladys M. Kammerer Award, American Political Science Association, for the best publication in the field of US national policy, 2008 *(for The Decline of the Death Penalty)*.
Best Instructional Political Science Web Site, for [www.policyagendas.org](http://www.policyagendas.org), from the Information Technology and Politics Section of the American Political Science Association, 2007.
Mentoring Award from the Public Policy Section of the American Political Science Association, 2005. For mentoring younger members of the profession.
Winner, vote by the members of the Public Policy Section of the American Political Science Association for *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*; top vote-getter in an election where members of the section were asked to identify the top five policy-related books or articles written in the past ten years. See *Policy Currents* 11 (2), Summer 2001, p. 14.
Aaron Wildavsky Award from the Public Policy Section of the American Political Science Association, 2001, *(for Agendas and Instability in American Politics)*. The Wildavsky Award recognizes work of lasting impact on the field of public policy.
Phi Beta Kappa, The University of Michigan, 1980.

**INTERNAL GRANTS, AWARDS, AND SCHOLARSHIPS**

Senior Faculty Research and Scholarly Leave, UNC-CH, 2020–21.
Faculty Fellowship, Institute of African American Research, UNC-CH, Fall 2015.
Charles Robson Award for Excellence in Graduate Instruction, UNC-CH, Department of Political Science, 2013.
Welch Alumni Relations Award, Pennsylvania State University, College of the Liberal Arts,
2008.
Best Graduate Student Advisor, Pennsylvania State University, Department of Political Science, Spring 2005. Based on a vote by current graduate students.
Faculty Scholar Medal in Social Sciences, Pennsylvania State University, 2005.
Distinction in the Social Sciences Award, Pennsylvania State University, College of the Liberal Arts, 2003.
“Legislative Lobbying,” $5,000 grant from the Program in American Politics, Texas A&M University (with Beth L. Leech), 1998.
“Lobbying Congress,” $7,500 grant from the Texas A&M Office of Associate Provost for Research, Program to Enhance Scholarly and Creative Activities (with Beth L. Leech), 1997.
“Interest Groups and Lobbying in American Politics,” $3,000 grant from the Program in American Politics, Texas A&M University (with Beth L. Leech), 1996.
Jordan Faculty Fellow, Center for Presidential Studies, Texas A&M University, 1994, 1995.
International Curriculum Development Grant ($1,100, with Richard Golsan), 1993.
Honors Program Curriculum Development Grant ($6,000, with Bryan D. Jones, Nehemia Geva, and Alex Mintz), 1993.
Center for Presidential Studies Grant ($1,000, with Bryan D. Jones), 1993.
Center for Energy and Mineral Resources Grant, Texas A&M University ($12,500, with Bryan D. Jones) 1989.
College of Liberal Arts Summer Research Award ($7,000), 1988.
International Enhancement Grant, Texas A&M University ($1,200), 1988.
Center for Energy and Mineral Resources Grant, Texas A&M University ($3,000) 1988.
Rackham Pre-Doctoral Fellowship, The University of Michigan, 1985–86.
Rackham First Year Fellowship, The University of Michigan, 1980–81.

DOCTORAL STUDENTS ADVISED AND ACADEMIC / POLICY PLACEMENTS

Kelly Tzoumis** (Texas A&M, 1992; DePaul University, tenured)
Jeffery C. Talbert** (Texas A&M, 1994; University of Kentucky School of Medicine, tenured)
Shalini Vallabhan* (Texas A&M, 1995; VP for Government Relations, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network)
Rachel Gibson** (Texas A&M, 1995; University of Manchester, England, tenured)
Billy Ray Hall** (Texas A&M, 1995; Baylor, now an attorney in private practice)
Beth L. Leech* (Texas A&M, 1998; Rutgers, tenured)
Michael C. MacLeod* (Texas A&M, 1998; Hewitt Associates)
James L. True* (Texas A&M, 1998; Lamar, tenured, retired)
Doris McGonagle* (Texas A&M, 1998; Blinn College, tenured)
Glen Krutz*** (Texas A&M, 1999; Oklahoma State University, Dean of Arts and Sciences)
Nicole Canzoneri** (Texas A&M, 1999; Alexandria, VA schools)
Xingsheng Liu** (Texas A&M, 1999; Texas A&M)
Valery Hunt*** (University of Washington, 2002)
Jens Feeley*** (University of Washington, 2002; NASA)
Matthieu Dalle** (Penn State, French, 2002; University of Louisville)
Suzanne Robbins** (SUNY, Stony Brook, 2003; George Mason University)
Chad Lavin** (Penn State, 2003; SUNY Buffalo (English), tenured)
Andrew Martin** (Penn State, Sociology, 2004; Ohio State University, tenured)
Maria Inclan** (Penn State, 2005; CIDE, Mexico City, tenured)
Christine Mahoney*** (Penn State, 2006; University of Virginia, tenured)
Amber Boydstun* (Penn State, 2008; University of California, Davis, tenured)
Tim LaPira** (Rutgers University, 2008; James Madison University, tenured)
Manuele Citi** (European University Institute, Florence, 2009; Copenhagen Business School)
Sam Workman** (University of Washington, Seattle, 2009; University of Oklahoma, tenured)
Caelesta Poppelaars** (Leiden University, Netherlands, 2009; Leiden)
Erika Martin** (Yale, 2009; SUNY Albany, Public Health)
Paul Rutledge** (West Virginia University, 2009; University of West Georgia, tenured)
Julianna Sandel Pacheco** (Penn State 2010; University of Iowa, tenured)
Stéphanie Yates** (Université de Laval, Quebec City, Canada, 2010; University of Ottawa)
Joost Berkhout** (Leiden University, Netherlands, 2010; University of Amsterdam)
Chris Faricy ** (UNC 2010; Syracuse University, tenured)
Shaun Bevan* (Penn State, 2011; University Edinburg, tenured)
Jiso Yoon* (Penn State, 2011; University of Kansas, tenured)
Isabelle Guinaudeau** (Sciences Po Bordeaux, 2011; CNRS / Sciences Po Bordeaux)
Cecilia Cannon** (Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva, 2012)
Jon Moody* (Penn State 2013; Pew Charitable Trusts)
Mary Layton Atkinson* (UNC 2013; UNC-Charlotte, tenured)
C. Elizabeth Coggins** (UNC 2013; Colorado College, tenured)
Roy Gava** (PhD 2014, University of Geneva; University of St. Gallen)
Petya Alexandrova** (PhD 2014, Leiden University; EU Asylum Support Office, Malta)
Tinette Schnatterer** (PhD 2014, Sciences Po Bordeaux; CNRS Sciences Po Bordeaux)
Trey Thomas** (PhD 2015, University of Texas at Austin; University of West Virginia)
Tyler Hughes** (PhD 2015, University of Oklahoma; Cal State Northridge)
Derek Epp* (PhD 2015, UNC; University of Texas at Austin)
Nick Howard** (PhD 2015, UNC; Auburn University at Montgomery)
Greg Wolf** (PhD 2015, UNC; Drake University)
Stephen Weir ** (PhD 2015, Trinity University, Dublin)
John Lovett* (PhD 2016, UNC; Wake Forest)
Ehud Segal** (PhD 2017, Hebrew University, Israel; Haifa University, post-doc)
Carmen Huerta* (PhD 2017, UNC Sociology; UNC Office of Student Affairs)
John Wachen** (PhD 2018, UNC Education Policy; Chicago Ill. education consultant)
Zoila Ponce de Leon** (PhD 2018, UNC; Washington and Lee)
Annelise Russell** (PhD 2018, University of Texas; University of Kentucky)
Andrew Tyner** (PhD 2018, UNC; Center for Open Science)
Emily Carty** (PhD 2018 UNC; University of Salamanca, Spain)
Kelsey Shoub* (PhD 2018, UNC; University of South Carolina)
Milad Minooie** (PhD 2018, UNC Mass Communications)
Mike Fliss** (PhD 2019 UNC Epidemiology; post-doc, UNC-Chapel Hill Public Health)
Amy Sentementes** (PhD 2019 UNC; Penn State)
Serge Severenchuk** (PhD 2019 UNC; post-doc, Dartmouth)
Leah Christiani* (PhD 2020 UNC; University of Tennessee)
Emily Wager* (PhD 2020 UNC; Washington DC polling firm)
Marc Faulkner** (PhD 2020, Université de Montréal; Quebec provincial government)
Thomas Kristensen** (PhD 2020, Aarhus University, Denmark; City of Aarhus)
Stefany Ramos* (PhD 2020, UNC Public Policy; RTI International)
Austin Bussing** (PhD 2021, UNC; Sam Houston State University)
Beatriz Rey** (PhD 2021, Syracuse University; post-doc, Johns Hopkins and APSA Congressional Fellow)
Kevin Roach* (PhD 2021, UNC)
Christian Caron* (PhD expected 2022, UNC, current student)
Bettina Stauffer**(University of Bern, Switzerland, current student)
Kaneesha Johnson** (Harvard, current student)
Arvind Krishnamurthy** (Duke, current student)
Marty Davidson** (Michigan, current student)
Philip Warncke** (UNC, current student)
Jonathan Schlosser** (UNC, School of Journalism, current student)
Colin Case** (UNC, current student)
Alex Love** (UNC, current student)

* indicates committee chair or co-chair
** indicates committee member
*** indicates another student from the Policy Agendas Project or the Advocacy and Public Policy Project with whom I have worked closely

SENIOR HONORS THESES ADVISED AT UNC

Jasmine Orsini, in progress for 2022
Alessandra Quattrochi, in progress for 2022
Rebecca Weisberger, in progress for 2022
Lucas Cain, in progress for 2022
Emily Payne, Race, Age, Gender, Attorney Type, and Income on Violent and Non-Violent Felonies in North Carolina, 2021
Tate Rosenblatt, Sentenced to Die? A Comparison of Factors Leading to Death Sentences and Executions, 2021
Sally Stanley, on the effect of District Attorneys on capital punishment, 2020
Sydney Johnson, on the cost implications of LWOP prison sentences, 2020
Sarah McAdon, on the outcomes of traffic tickets in North Carolina, 2019
Olivia O’Malley, on the legal treatment of sex trafficking crimes in North Carolina, 2019
Luke Beyer, on the outcomes of high-level felonies in North Carolina, 2019
Libby Doyle, on the geographical distribution of racial inequities in North Carolina, 2019
Betsy Neill, on mental illness and the death penalty, 2017*
Wallace Gram, on the geographic distribution of executions in the US, 2015
Anna W. Dietrich, on the conditional probability of execution given a death sentence, 2014*
BJ Dworak, comparing traditional news media with social media, 2013*
Alex Loyal, on trends in state legislation concerning the death penalty, 2013
Lindsey Stephens, on the impact of the creation of a statewide Indigent Defense Services office on the use of capital punishment in North Carolina, 2012
Max Rose, on changing media frames associated with poverty, 2012
Alissa Ellis, on North Carolina’s use of the death penalty with inmates suffering from mental illness, 2011
(* = Winner of the departmental award for the best senior thesis that year)

COAUTHOR RELATIONSHIPS

- **Faculty mentors:** Jack L. Walker, Jr., Edie N. Goldenberg, Michael W. Traugott, Joel D. Aberbach, John Creighton Campbell
- **Graduate student colleagues:** Mark A. Baskin, Nina P. Halpern
- **Non-academics:** Kenneth J. Rose, Jennifer E. Thompson, Tim Lyman, Lyle May
INVITED ACADEMIC TALKS AND CONFERENCES

Manchester University (UK), November 10, 2021*
John Jay College, Center on Media, Crime, and Justice, November 3, 2021*
UNC-Charlotte, November 2, 2021*
UNC Chapel Hill, 27th Annual MURAP Academic Conference, July 23, 2021*
Kings College (London), Ken Young Annual Lecture in Public Policy, May 18, 2021*
University of Georgia, George S. Parthemos Lectures, April 5–7, 2021*
MIT Media Lab, Poetic Justic Group, March 30, 2021*
Georgetown Law / Howard University / The Lab@DC workshop on Reimagining Police Stops, October 16, 2020*
Dartmouth University, October 7, 2020*
University of Michigan, ICPSR Summer Program, Blalock Lecture, July 9, 2020*
Arizona State University, Pi Sigma Alpha lecture, February 22, 2020
Notre Dame University, November 8, 2019
University of Tennessee, book workshop, September 20, 2019
University of Texas at Austin, September 13, 2019
International Conference on Public Policy, Montreal, Keynote Speaker, June 27, 2019
University of Stuttgart (Germany), June 3, 2019
University of Konstanz (Germany), May 27, 2019
University of St Gallen (Switzerland), May 21, 2019
UNC-Chapel Hill, Odum Institute 95th Anniversary Speakers Series, April 22, 2019
UNC-Greensboro, February 7, 2019
Reed College, book workshop, December 12, 2018
Johns Hopkins University, conference on policing and race, May 17–18, 2018
Wayne State University School of Law, conference on congressional oversight, March 23, 2018
New America Foundation, conference on congressional capacity, Washington DC, March 1–2, 2018
University of Michigan, January 19, 2018
Harvard University, November 6, 2017
Wake Forest University School of Law, November 3, 2017
University of Arizona, October 26, 2017
Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, September 27, 2017
Leiden University, The Hague Campus, Netherlands, September 21, 2017
Aarhus University, Denmark, September 19, 2017
University of Antwerp, Belgium, September 14, 2017
ESADE Business School, Madrid, Spain, January 12, 2017
National Academy of Public Administration, Washington DC, November 17, 2016
NC State University, Raleigh, graduate seminar on public policy, October 10, 2016
Columbia University, “Politics at Work” book workshop, August 15, 2016
University of Edinburgh, Scotland, May 19, May 26, June 16, 2016
Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE), Mexico City, May 4, 2016
Distinguished Lecturer in the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, National Science Foundation, October 14, 2015
UNC-Chapel Hill School of Journalism, September 11, 2015
UNC-Chapel Hill Institute of African-American Research, September 9, 2015
University of Glasgow, Scotland, June 12, 2015
Duke University, Ralph Bunche Summer Institute, June 4, 2015
University of Michigan, May 8, 2015
University of Texas, May 6, 2015
University of Oklahoma, April 30, 2015
University of Houston, February 6, 2015
Princeton University, November 10, 2014
University of Minnesota, November 6, 2014
Center for the Study of the American South, UNC-CH, October 28, 2014
University of California, Irvine, January 30, 2014
University of Geneva, January 27, 2014
University of Michigan, September 13, 2013
University of Malta, May 21, 2013
University of Pennysylvania, March 21, 2013
SUNY at Buffalo, March 8-9, 2013
University of South Carolina, March 1, 2013
University Institute of Lisbon, Portugal, February 6, 2013
University of Maryland, November 30, 2012
Appalachian State University, November 6, 2012
UNC-Chapel Hill Conference on Policy Change in Complex Urban Systems, Keynote, March 31, 2012
Georgetown University, March 26, 2012
Oxford University, All Souls College, March 8, 2012
Aarhus University, Denmark, January 26, 2012
Sciences Po Bordeaux, December 1, 2011
UNC-Charlotte, November 10, 2011
Santa Fe Institute, August 2011
University of Florida, July 14, 2011
SUNY Albany, April 24, 2011
University of Michigan, 100th anniversary of the political science department, April 7, 2011
UCLA, February 27, 2011
Washington State University, February 25, 2011
Suffolk University School of Law, Symposium on Peter Hall, February 11, 2011
Trinity College, Dublin, December 13, 2010
Johns Hopkins University, November 4, 2010
Hewlett Foundation, San Francisco, symposium on public advocacy, July 2, 2010
Stanford University, CASBS workshop on digital government records, June 21–25, 2010
Sciences Po, Paris, May 19, 2010
University of Milan, Italy, May 12, 2010
Institut National de l’Audiovisuel, Paris France, May 3, 2010
University of Laval, Quebec, April 16, 2010
Northwestern University conference on “Text as Data,” March 11–12, 2010
Kalamazoo College workshop on complexity in the social sciences, March 5, 2010
University of North Carolina, Charlotte, February 18, 2010
Witness to Innocence (Death penalty advocacy group), Philadelphia, PA, October 23–24, 2009
University of North Carolina, Department of Public Policy, October 2, 2009
University of Leiden, Den Haag campus, June 16, 2009
University of Mannheim, Germany, MZES, June 8, 2009
University of Lausanne, Switzerland, May 18, 2009
University of Geneva, Switzerland, May 18, 2009
University of Manchester, England, May 15, 2009
University of Leiden, Netherlands, May 8, 2009
Northwestern University, NICO (complexity series), April 1, 2009
University of Michigan, RWJ Health Policy Scholars Program, March 3, 2009
University of Southern California, February 18, 2009
National Coalition to Abolish the Death Penalty, Harrisburg PA, January 23–24, 2009
Sciences Po, Paris, Social Movement Effects on Public Policy, January 5, 2009
Hebrew University of Jerusalem and IDC, Herzliya, Israel, December 14–21, 2008
SPIRIT / Sciences Po, Bordeaux, France, November 28, 2008
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, November 7, 2008
University of Antwerp, October 29, 2008
Wageningen University, NL, keynote speaker, Agriculture in Transition, October 28, 2008
University of Antwerp, workshop on US-EU lobbying, October 23–24, 2008
University of Washington, Seattle, American Politics series, October 10, 2008
Cevipof / Sciences Po, Paris, France, Groupe Argent et Politique, June 23, 2008
SPIRIT / Sciences Po, Bordeaux, France, June 9, 2008
Syracuse University workshop on US-EU lobbying studies, April 24–25, 2008
Yale University, April 15, 2008
Wayne State University, Detroit, March 20, 2008
CONNEX workshop on lobbying, University of Mannheim, Germany, March 6–8, 2008
University of North Carolina, February 15, 2008
University of Washington, Seattle, November 2, 2007
Harvard University, Graduate School of Education, Askwith Education Forum, October 4, 2007
University of Antwerp, September 20–21, 2007
University of Aberdeen, July 1, 2007
University of Barcelona, June 14, 2007
University of Aarhus, Denmark, June 8, 2007
University of Geneva, May 7, 2007
Oxford University, March 6, 2007
World Congress Against the Death Penalty, Paris France, February 1–3, 2007
University of Newcastle, January 25–26, 2007
Université de Montréal, November 18, 2006
Public Policy Institute of California, San Francisco, October 27, 2006
University of Newcastle, England, May 3–4, 2006
UCLA Law School, Conference on Capital Punishment, April 8, 2006
University of Manchester, England, March 17, 2006
Mount St. Mary’s University, Maryland, February 23, 2006
University of Wisconsin, Madison, February 10, 2006
Indiana University, January 27, 2006
University College, London, England, School of Public Policy, Distinguished Visiting Speaker, January 16–20, 2006
National Coalition to Abolish the Death Penalty, Austin Texas, October 28, 2005
Yale University, Aspen Conference on Climate Change, October 6–8, 2005
University of Aarhus, Denmark, Workshop on Comparative Agenda-Setting, July 1–2, 2005
University of Aberdeen, Scotland, June 15, 2005
University of Manchester, England, June 14, 2005
Centre de Sociologie des Organisations (CSO–CNRS), Paris, France, June 10, 2005
University of Leiden, Netherlands, Workshop on Reform Miracles, May 27–28, 2005
University of Exeter, England, May 18, 2005
University of Leiden, Netherlands, Workshop on Interest Groups in the EU, April 14–16, 2005
University of Utrecht, School of Governance, Netherlands, March 17, 2005
University of Antwerp, Belgium, March 15, 2005
University of Mannheim, Germany, Center for European Social Research, January 24, 2005
University of Aarhus, Denmark, January 21, 2005
University of Trento, Italy, January 19, 2005
European University Institute, Florence, Italy, November 22, 2004
University of Aberdeen, Scotland, November 19, 2004
University of Leiden, Netherlands, June 10–12, 2004
University of Aberdeen, Scotland, May 24–June 4, 2004
University of North Carolina, American Politics Research Group, April 2, 2004
Harvard University, Conference on The Transformation of American Politics: Policies, Institutions, and Participation, March 5–6, 2004
University of Kentucky, Martin School of Public Policy, January 23, 2004
University of Aberdeen, Scotland, December 15–19, 2003
Rutgers University, November 21, 2003
University of Arizona, Conference on Research Policy as an Agent of Change, October 10–11, 2003
Pennsylvania State University, College of Communications, September 26, 2003
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, August 18–19, 2003
Yale University, School of Forestry, Conference on Punctuated Equilibrium Models of Environmental Policymaking, June 30, 2003
University of Michigan, Robert Wood Johnson Health Policy Fellows Program, April 10, 2003
Pennsylvania State University, Hazleton Campus, November 7, 2002
University of Michigan, Conference on Social Movements and Organizations, May 10–11, 2002
West Virginia University, April 19, 2002
Nuffield College, Oxford University, England, Conference on Budgetary Policy Change:
Measures and Models, March 8–9, 2002
University of California, Irvine, Conference on Social Movements, Public Policy, and Democracy, January 11–13, 2002
University of Chicago, May 21, 2001
University of Kentucky, April 13, 2001
Temple University, March 14, 2001
Columbia University, January 26, 2001
Harvard University, November 3, 2000
Princeton University, Conference on Political Participation: Building a Research Agenda, October 13–14, 2000
University of Aberdeen, Scotland, May 15–19, 2000
University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Mellon University, April 10, 2000
Pennsylvania State University, Department of French, February 28, 2000
Western Michigan University, Sam Clark Lecturer, March 15–16, 1999
University of California, Santa Barbara, February 12, 1999
University of Aberdeen, Scotland, October 1998
University of Bergen, Norway, October 1998
University of Texas School of Public Health, October 2, 1997
Harvard University Conference on Civic Engagement, September 26–28, 1997
University of Michigan, 5th Annual Jack L. Walker Memorial Conference of Political Affairs: The Politics (or Un-Politics) of the Underclass and Unemployed, March 20, 1992
UCLA Workshop on Comparative Political Economy of Science, January 1990
Feltrinelli Foundation Conference on Organized Interests and Democracy, Cortona, Italy, 1990

LEGAL EDUCATION TRAININGS PRESENTED
National Law Enforcement Liaison Program, panel discussion on traffic safety enforcement, sponsored by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the Governors Highway Safety Association, August 12, 2021*
Guilford County, NC Judicial Conference (Judges, DA’s, Court Administrators, Public Defenders), October 30, 2020*
North Carolina Conference of District Court Judges, October 7, 2020*
North Carolina Conference of Superior Court Judges, August 14, 2020*
Fair and Just Prosecution, DA workshop on capital punishment, Durham NC, December 6, 2019
National Police Accountability Project, Durham NC, October 17, 2019
NC NAACP, Raleigh NC, December 7, 2018
American Bar Association, Chicago, IL, August 3, 2018
NC Committee on Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the Criminal Justice System (NC-CRED), Wake Forest University School of Law, November 3, 2017
NC Association of District Court Judges, Asheville NC, October 5, 2016
UNC School of Government, training for judges, April 6, 2016
UNC School of Government, Racial Equity Network (public defenders), July 24, 2015

COMMUNITY PRESENTATIONS ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE
Panelist, Scholars and Local Policymakers: An Essential Collaboration for Change. Scholars Strategy Network, Chapel Hill NC, November 16, 2021*
Panelist, Race and the Death Penalty virtual seminar, Quaker Southeast Yearly Meeting, Tampa FL, September 10, 2021*
Hillsborough NC, City Council, Mayor, Police Chief, March 11, 2021*
Arlington County VA, Policing Oversight Group, November 16, 2020*
UNC / Chapel Hill Community Dialogue on Race, November 10, 2020*
Suffolk County, NY, Policing Oversight Group, November 3, 2020*
Chapel Hill Rotary Club, October 30, 2020*
UNC Honors Carolina, Structures of Inequality speakers series, September 23, 2020*
UNC Highway Safety Research Center, September 2, 2020*
Lexis-Nexis, Raleigh NC, July 16, 2020*
City of Berkeley (CA) Fair and Impartial Policing Working Group, July 1, 2020*
NC-CRED, Policing and Racial Justice seminar, June 29, 2020*
UNC General Alumni Association, roundtable on racial justice June 18, 2020*
Greensboro Bound (Greensboro NC), panel discussion on the death penalty, June 11, 2020*
North Carolina Commission on Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the Criminal Justice System (NC-CRED), Raleigh, NC, August 24, 2018
Chapel Hill, NC, Public Library, August 13, 2018
UNC-Chapel Hill THINKposium, August 17, 2016

*Presentation made by remote video technology

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AND MEMBERSHIP**

*University / College / Department service at UNC-Chapel Hill:*

**University**
- Faculty Co-Chair, Campus Safety Commission, 2019–21
- Faculty Council (elected position), 2012–19
- Carolina Summer Reading Program Selection Committee, 2013–14; Chair, 2014–15
- Member, review team, Institute for African American Research, Spring 2016
- Faculty Affiliate, Institute of African American Research, 2014–
- Office of Undergraduate Research, Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship (SURF) selection committee, 2018

**College of Arts and Science**
- Chair, Search Committee for Distinguished Professor and Director of the Center for the Study of the American South (CSAS), 2021–22
- Member, Advisory Board, Center for the Study of the American South (CSAS), 2016–
- Member, Advisory Committee, Department of Public Policy, 2019–2022
- Adjunct Professor of Public Policy, 2019–
- Member, Dean’s Faculty Diversity Advisory Group, 2016–2021
- Chair, Student Learning Outcomes for General Education Courses Committee, 2017–18
- Co-Chair, Diversity Task Force, 2015–16
- Member, Interdisciplinary Grants Awards Committee, 2013
- Member, Dean’s Task Force on Faculty Diversity, 2010–11

**Department of Political Science**
- Director of PhD Placement, 2014–17, 2018–; interim Placement Director, Fall 2012
- Member, post-tenure review committees, 2010–13, 2014–17; Chair 2012–13, 2019–20
- Member, Committee on Faculty Mentoring (2016–18)
Diversity Liaison, 2011–17
Chair, Diversity Affairs and Recruitment, 2010–17 (Member, 2009–10)
Chair, American Politics Talent Search Committee, 2015–16
Chair, Dawson Chair Search Committee, 2016–17
Member, Strategic Planning (SWOT) Committee, 2016–17
Director of Graduate Admissions, 2013–14
Member, Salary Review Committee, 2011–12, 2014–15
Member or chair, ad hoc faculty recruitment committees, 2009–15, 2016–17, 2021–22
Member, internal evaluation (promotion) committees, 2013–14, 2016–17
Member, best MA thesis committee, 2013, 2020; best graduate student publication award committee, 2015

Editorial boards

Policy Studies Journal, 2003 –
Journal of European Public Policy, 2004 –
Public Administration, 2008 –
Journal of Public Policy, 2010 –
Gouvernement et Action Publique, 2010 –
Interest Groups and Advocacy, 2011–
Governance, 2012 –
French Politics, Society, and Culture, 2013 –
West European Politics, 2015–
Politics, Groups, and Identities, 2017–
Interdisciplinary Political Studies, 2017–
International Review of Public Policy, 2018–
Political Research Quarterly, 2006–14
American Journal of Political Science, 2006–09
Journal of Information Technology and Politics, 2006–10

Series editor, Palgrave Macmillan series on Comparative Studies of Political Agendas, with Laura Chaqués Bonafont, Christoffer Green Pedersen, Frédéric Varone, and Arco Timmermans. Publications began in 2012, as listed below:

– Isabelle Engeli, Christoffer Green-Pedersen and Lars Thorup Larsen, eds. 2012. Morality
Politics in Western Europe: Parties, Agendas and Policy Choices.

Book review board, French Politics, Society, and Culture (formerly French Politics and Society), 1997 – 2012

Tenure and promotion reviews for the following colleges and universities: Aberdeen (Scotland), Alabama-Birmingham, Arizona, Arizona State, Australian National, Barcelona (Spain), Brandeis, British Columbia (Canada), California at Berkeley, California at Los Angeles, California at Riverside, California at San Diego, Chicago, Colorado at Denver, Colorado at Boulder, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Denver, Duke, East Carolina, Edinburg (Scotland), Georgia, Georgia State, Georgetown, Harvard, Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Israel), Johns Hopkins, Indiana, Iowa State, Kansas, Kentucky, Lamar, London School of Economics (UK), Malta (Malta), Marquette, Maryland, Massachusetts, Memphis, Miami, Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana State, New School for Social Research, Ohio, Ohio State, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Potsdam (Germany), Pittsburgh, Princeton, Purdue, Reed, Roosevelt, Rutgers, SciencesPo Paris (France), Southampton (UK), SUNY-Albany, SUNY-Buffalo, St. John Fisher College, Syracuse, Tel Aviv (Israel), Temple, Texas at Austin, Texas at Dallas, Villanova, Virginia, Washington, Wellesley, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Yale
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APPENDIX C
I, Olivia Ensign, declare and state the following:

1. I made this declaration based upon my personal knowledge, as a former Staff Attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union’s Capital Punishment Project.

2. On December 3, 2019, Board of Indigent Defense Services Death Penalty Defense Unit (DPDU) attorney Peter Conley sent a KORA request to the Sedgwick County District Attorney’s office requesting homicide data. The Sedgwick County District Attorney’s Office provided a response on February 21, 2020. On April 2, 2020, Mr. Conley sent an additional request to the Sedgwick County District Attorney requesting data related to decisions to seek the death penalty, training materials for prosecutors, and costs associated with prosecuting capital cases.

3. On February 5, 2020, Mr. Conley sent KORA requests to the other 104 counties in Kansas. These requests went out to County and District Attorney offices. These requests asked for data on capital and non-capital homicide prosecutions between July 1, 1994 to the present. The requested data included charging materials, training materials, and cost and staffing data.

4. Mr. Conley also filed a KORA request with the Kansas Department of Corrections for the data related to the added cost of housing death row prisoners on August 26, 2020, and received data on September 3, 2020.

5. On April 2, 2020, counsel filed a KORA request with the Kansas Judicial Counsel for the data collected during the January 29, 2004, December 4, 2009, and February 13, 2014 reports by the Death Penalty Advisory Committee. On August 13, 2020 counsel was granted access to these files.

6. Also on April 2, 2020, counsel filed a KORA request to the Kansas Legislative Division of Post Audit for the December 2003 Performance Audit Report on Costs Incurred for Death Penalty Cases. On that day, the Kansas Legislative Division of Post Audit responded that they had destroyed all records.

7. On June 22, 2020, at the request of counsel, Mr. Conley provided the Kansas State Board of Indigent Defense (BIDS) budgets by fiscal year for the years 2014-2021. On February 16, 2021, counsel sent an additional request to BIDS for trial expenses, direct appeal expenses and habeas expenses for the Counties that had a capital trial prosecution between 2012 and 2019 to ensure the years with an active capital case, 2014 to 2018 were covered. BIDS provided costs for the homicides the agency handled since 2012, pulling from vouchers, for attorney costs, expert costs, and transcript costs in June 2021.

8. On October 20, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Kansas Supreme Court. This request was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration and denied in part on October 21, 2021. On November 1, 2021, November 4, 2021, and November 5, 2021, the Office provided documents regarding judicial salary information and annual budgets from 2012-present.

9. On August 30, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Kansas Attorney General’s Office. On September 9, 2021, counsel received a response stating the Office had received the request. On September 27, 2021, October 6, 2021, November 2, 2021, and November 8, 2021, counsel
attempted follow up communications via phone and email but received no reply. On December 13, 2021, counsel sent the Office a courtesy copy of a complaint set to be filed in Kansas district court due to this lack of response. On December 15, 2021, counsel conferred with the Attorney General’s Office via a phone conference. Following this conference, on December 30, 2021, counsel received a letter denying the request in part and noting that the Attorney General’s Office would continue to collect certain documents. On February 8, 2022, the Office provided a list of criminal homicide cases handled by the Office from 2012-2020 and noting that the Office would continue to collect certain documents. On February 22, 2022, the Office sent a request for clarification which counsel responded to on February 23, 2022.

10. On August 26, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI). On September 1, 2021, counsel received a list of questions regarding the request from KBI and responded on September 14, 2021. On September 24, 2021, counsel received a letter from KBI stating that the KBI website contained a register of all KBI’s publicly available digital information. On October 15, 2021, KBI sent a letter stating the request did not contain sufficient information for the relevant documents to be located. On October 27, 2021, and November 1, 2021, counsel sent emails intended to clarify the request for KBI. On November 1, 2021, KBI again stated the request did not contain sufficient information for the relevant documents to be located. On November 15, 2021, counsel again provided an updated request with a focus on documents from a single county. On November 18, 2021, KBI again stated the request did not contain sufficient information for the relevant documents to be located. On January 3, 2022, counsel again provided an updated request. On January 6, 2022, KBI again stated the request did not contain sufficient information for the relevant documents to be located. On January 19, 2022, counsel again provided an updated request. On January 25, 2022, KBI replied stating that they would need until February 21, 2022, to provide an update. On February 21, 2022, KBI sent a letter describing the data available for one investigation and requesting additional clarification. Counsel responded to this letter on February 24, 2022.

11. On January 12, 2022, counsel sent a KORA request to the Kansas Court of Appeals. On January 14, 2022, this request was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration. It was denied on January 20, 2022.

12. Beginning in January 2021 extensive follow up efforts were initiated to gather all outstanding data from county officials in counties that had one of more active death penalty cases between 2014 and 2018. These included Barton, Chautauqua, Franklin, Geary, Harvey, Johnson, Labette, Pratt, Riley, Saline, Sedgwick, Shawnee, and Wyandotte counties.

13. Barton: In February 2020, the Barton County attorney issued its initial response to counsel’s February 2020 request. On February 24, 2020, they issued a partial response to the KORA request sending itemized budgets from 1998 to 2020, detailing wages, travel, and witness fees, but not providing a breakdown by case. On January 12, 2021, counsel reached out to confirm that, when public health guidelines allowed, that a team member would be able to review physical files for charging documents and individual costs in files. On January 14, 2022 counsel reached out to confirm a time to review and, in the alternative, requested a “filings by statute report” search. On January 20, 2022, the county attorney’s office provided a list of capital and first-degree homicide cases from 2012-2020.
14. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Barton County Sheriff’s Department. On September 29, 2021, the Barton County Sheriff’s Department provided relevant budget documents and reported that they handled no relevant cases between January 1, 2012, to January 1, 2020 and therefore had no relevant cost documents.

15. On August 27, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Clerk of the Barton County District Court. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration. On January 5, 2022, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Barton County District Court for all complaint(s); the notice of intent to seek the death penalty; the journal entry of judgement; the notice of intent to seek a separate sentencing proceeding; the withdrawal of notice of intent to seek the death penalty; all financial affidavits; all orders appointing counsel; the notice of filing of charge(s), amended charge(s), or additional charge(s); and any documents that appear to be related to expenses/costs for all capital and non-capital homicide cases handled by the court between January 1, 2012 to January 1, 2020 (hereinafter, the “documents requested from the District Courts”). On January 6, 2022, the District Court provided some of these documents.

16. **Chautauqua:** On March 19, 2020, the Chautauqua County Attorney issued a partial response to counsel’s February 2020 request. The only information the County Attorney could provide was an estimation of approximately $300 in witness fees for homicide cases prosecuted since January 2017. The County Attorney also confirmed that she did not maintain time-keeping records. She also referred counsel to the Clerk of District Court for any lists of capital and non-capital homicide prosecutions, the County Clerk of the Court for any annual budgets, and the Office of the Attorney General for any documentation of capital prosecutions originating from the County. A renewed KORA request was sent to the Chautauqua County Attorney’s Office in January 2021, but no additional information was provided.

17. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Chautauqua County Sheriff’s Office. On October 8, 2021, the Chautauqua County Sheriff’s Office provided relevant budget documents, documentation for personnel who would have assisted or investigated non-capital homicides between January 1, 2012, to January 1, 2020, and reported that they handled no relevant capital homicide cases between January 1, 2012, to January 1, 2020 and therefore had no relevant cost documents for capital homicide cases.

18. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Clerk of the Chautauqua County District Court. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration. On January 6, 2022, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Chautauqua County District Court for the documents requested from the District Courts. On January 7, 2022, the District Court provided some of these documents.

19. On August 27, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Chautauqua County Clerk’s Office. On September 27, 2021, the Chautauqua County Clerk’s Office provided relevant budget documents and accounts payable, including transcript and jury fees.

20. **Franklin:** In February 2020, the Franklin County Attorney provided a partial response to counsel’s February 2020 request with a list of capital and non-capital homicide cases prosecuted since 1994 and associated charging documents as well as non-itemized annual budgets. In January 2021, counsel submitted a renewed KORA request to the County Attorney and did not
receive any additional information. In their response to this renewed KORA request, the County Attorney noted that prior to his taking over the office in November 2018, the record keeping “was not good” and that no additional responsive information was available.

21. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Franklin County Sheriff’s Office. On October 15, 2021, the Franklin County Sheriff’s Office provided relevant budget documents.

22. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Clerk of the Franklin County District Court. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration. On December 13, 2021, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Franklin County District Court for the documents requested from the District Courts. On December 13, 2021, the District Court provided some of these documents.

23. On August 26, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Franklin County Accounting Department. The County Treasurer forwarded this request to the County Clerk who, on August 30, 2021, provided the relevant budget documents for the Franklin County Attorney from January 1, 2012 to January 1, 2020. Additionally, the Franklin County Clerk provided trial funds from 2013-2017 that contain expenses for the only capital homicide as well as county staff hours and salary for time attributed to that case.

24. Geary: On February 10, 2020, the Geary County Attorney requested additional time to respond to counsel’s February 5, 2020, KORA request. In January 2021, counsel submitted a renewed KORA request. In February 2021, the County Attorney responded to this renewed request and advised that it would take “no less than six months” to produce responsive records. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Geary County Accounting Department and on August 27, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Geary County Clerk’s Office. The County Treasurer and the County Clerk forwarded this request to the Geary County Attorney’s Office who on September 14, 2021 provided the relevant budget documents for the Geary County Attorney for the years 2014, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020; attorney salaries for 2021; and a list of capital and non-capital homicides from 2012-2020. On September 21, 2021, the County Attorney’s Office provided relevant budget documents for the remaining years of 2012, 2013, and 2015. On October 5, 2021, the County Attorney’s Office provided vouchers associated with the list of capital and non-capital homicide cases.

25. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Geary County Sheriff’s Office. On August 30, 2021, the Geary County Sheriff’s Office provided relevant budget documents. On September 21, 2021, the Geary County Sheriff’s Office provided caseloads and salaries for employees involved in a case that would classify as capital murder.

26. On August 27, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Clerk of the Geary County District Court. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration. On December 16, 2021, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Geary County District Court for the documents requested from the District Courts. On December 22, 2021, the District Court provided a portion of these documents. On February 16, 2022, counsel received complete paper documents.
27. **Harvey:** Counsel submitted a KORA request to the Harvey County Attorney on February 5, 2020 and a renewed request on January 27, 2021 to the newly elected Harvey County Attorney. Counsel did not receive a response to either request. As a result, on February 16, 2021, counsel notified Harvey County Attorney Jason Lane that they would be pursuing enforcement actions in the District Court and attached a draft courtesy copy of the related complaint. Lane responded the next day, citing system issues and transition as the reason behind the lack of response. Lane requested additional time to process the request and renewed this request in March 2021. On April 6, 2021, Lane provided lists, but not charging documents, for capital and non-capital homicide cases in the requested time period and lists of decision makers. Lane referred counsel to the Harvey County Office of Administration for annual budgetary information and noted that the “Harvey County Attorney’s Office does not segregate costs and time-keeping specific to the prosecution of capital homicide cases from general prosecution.”

28. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Harvey County Sheriff’s Office and the Harvey County Accounting Department. The County Treasurer and Sheriff forwarded this request to the County Counselor who provided the relevant budget documents for the Harvey County Attorney’s Office and the Harvey County Sheriff’s Office for the years 2013, 2016, and 2017 on October 11, 2021. On October 22, 2021, the County Counselor provided relevant budget documents for both offices for the years 2012, 2014, 2015, 2018, 2019, and 2020.

29. On August 27, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Clerk of the Harvey County District Court and the Harvey County Clerk’s Office. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration who provided suggestions. On December 16, 2021, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Harvey County District Court for the documents requested from the District Courts. On December 17, 2021, the District Court provided some of these documents.

30. **Johnson:** On July 31, 2020, the Johnson County District Attorney acknowledged receipt of the July 31, 2020, KORA request. In December 2020, the District Attorney stated that review was still in progress. In March 2021, the District Attorney provided an update that the review would be finalized soon. In May 2021 the District Attorney’s office responded, directing counsel to the Johnson County Budget and Financial Planning Department for any historical budget data and employee salary information, and noting that there were no responsive cost documents because the “Johnson County District Attorney’s Office does not track billable hours or keep timesheets related to specific cases.”

31. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Johnson County Sheriff’s Office. On October 14, 2021, the Johnson County Sheriff’s Office provided relevant documents.

32. On August 27, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Clerk of the Johnson County District Court. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration. On December 20, 2021, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Johnson County District Court for the documents requested from the District Courts. On February 8, 2022, the District Court provided some of these documents.

33. **Labette:** On February 13, 2020, the Labette County Attorney acknowledged receipt of the February 5, 2020 request. Later that month, the County Attorney’s office requested additional
time to process the request. On January 27, 2021, counsel submitted a renewed KORA request. On March 2, 2021 the Labette County Attorney supplied only budget information for 2013 to 2021. On March 8, 2021 counsel replied, requesting cost estimates for searching individual files for cost information. This estimate was not forthcoming despite follow up by counsel in July and August. On August 25, 2021 the County Attorney requested a phone call, which took place on August 26, 2021. The next day the County Attorney provided in writing a confirmation of the information provided on the call including that the Labette County Attorney’s Office did not keep time keeping records and that there were no expert costs expended by the office on homicide cases between 2012 and 2019. The County Attorney also referred counsel to the Attorney General’s Office for information about the capital case charged in that period.

34. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Labette County Sheriff’s Office and the Labette County Clerk’s Office. On September 10, 2021, the Labette County Clerk’s Office provided relevant budget documents for the Labette County Sheriff’s Office.

35. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Clerk of the Labette County District Court. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration who provided suggestions. On January 5, 2022, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Labette County District Court for the documents requested from the District Courts. On January 6, 2022, the District Court provided some of these documents.

36. Pratt: On February 5, 2020, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Pratt County Attorney. On February 17, 2020, the Pratt County Attorney provided a list of charged homicide cases, all of which were referred to and prosecuted by the State Attorney General’s Office. On costs, the County Attorney provided its annual budget and expert witness consulting costs for a single case.

37. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Pratt County Sheriff’s Office. On September 7, 2021, the Pratt County Sherriff’s Office provided relevant budget documents and reported that they handled no relevant cases between January 1, 2012, to January 1, 2020 and therefore had no relevant cost documents.

38. On August 27, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Pratt Police Department. On August 31, 2021, the Pratt Police Department directed the inquiry to the Pratt Finance Director. On September 17, 2021, the Pratt Finance Director provided annual certified budget sheets from 2012-2020 and budgets for 2012-2020.

39. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Clerk of the Pratt County District Court. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration. On December 17, 2021, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Pratt County District Court for documents requested from the District Courts. On December 17, 2021, the District Court provided some of these documents.

40. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Pratt County Freedom of Information Officer. On August 27, 2021, this request was forwarded to the Pratt County District Court Clerk and the Pratt County Attorney. On September 17, 2021, and October 13, 2021, the Pratt County Attorney provided relevant cost-related documents for two homicide cases.
prosecuted in the county between January 1, 2012, and January 1, 2020, as well as county budget documents.

41. **Riley:** On February 10, 2020, the Riley County Attorney responded to counsel’s February 5, 2020, KORA request. They produced cost information included budgets going back to 2018, but referred counsel to the Riley County Clerk’s Office for historical budget information prior to that date. The County Attorney also provided a cost estimate for additional research into cost information. On May 20, 2021 counsel flagged outstanding documents to the County Attorney. On September 9, 2021 the County Attorney’s Office provided additional information on costs, however noting that the office did not track hours spent on each case or the “number of hours spent preparing and or responding to motions and preparing for trial.” The County Attorney did provide “documented fees” by case, totaling $34,308.26.

42. On January 12, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Riley County Clerk. The County Clerk forwarded this request to the Deputy Riley County Counselor who provided the budget information for the Riley County Attorney from January 1, 2012 to January 1, 2020.

43. On August 26, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Riley County Police Department. On November 22, 2021, the Riley County Police Department provided budget information from 2012-2020 and the number of hours spent and costs associated with investigating 22 non-capital homicides from 2012-2020.

44. On August 27, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Riley County District Court. Following discussions with the Office of Judicial Administration, counsel sent an updated request on December 13, 2021, to the Clerk of the Riley County District Court for documents requested from the District Courts. The Riley County District Court provided some of these documents on December 22, 2021 and January 28, 2022.

45. **Saline:** On February 5, 2020, counsel sent a KORA request to the Saline County Attorney. On February 11, 2020, the County Attorney responded by email and provided the annual budget for the County Attorney from 2001 to 2020. The County Attorney also responded that “no such documents exist” relating to prosecuting capital cases and non-capital homicide cases, but did provide an “unofficial...tab of expenses for homicide cases” by year, that did not include time keeping records and included “mostly costs of photographs, exhibits, witness expenses.” Counsel submitted an updated KORA request January 12, 2021, identifying a capital case charged in 2017 and requesting associated costs as well as requesting the underlying documentation for the unofficial tab provided in February 2020. An additional request was made by counsel March 17, 2021, identifying another capital case charged in the requested time period. No additional information was provided by the County Attorney who replied “I don’t know the numbers for costs or hours handling capital cases” and referred counsel to the Saline County Administrator’s Office and the Clerk of the Court.

46. On August 26, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Salina City Police Department. On November 17, 2021, and November 19, 2021, the Police Department provided 2012-2020 budgets, overtime hours submitted by police officers and some civilian support staff, salaries, and benefits of identified officers and support staff broken down by homicide.
47. On August 26, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Saline County Sheriff’s Office. The Office provided budget information on August 30, 2021.

48. On August 26, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Saline County District Court. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration. On December 12, 2021, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Saline County District Court for the documents requested from the District Courts. The Saline County District Court provided some of these documents on January 3, 2022, January 7, 2022, January 26, 2022, and January 27, 2022.

49. On August 26, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Saline County Clerk. On August 27, 2021, this request was forwarded to the Saline County Attorney who responded that none of the requested documents were available on October 6, 2021.

50. On August 26, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Saline Accounting Department. On September 9, 2021, the Department provided payroll information for all employees in the County Attorney’s Office.

51. **Sedgwick:** On April 2, 2020, counsel sent a request to the Sedgwick District Attorney requesting data related to decisions to seek the death penalty, training materials for prosecutors, and costs associated with prosecuting capital cases. On June 5, 2020 the Office of the District Attorney provided a response to the KORA request and on June 19, 2020, the Office of the District Attorney provided cost estimates for providing annual budgets and expenses related to criminal cases. The District Attorney also stated that they did not maintain records regarding staff time spent working on homicide cases and did not have compensation data to determine the salaries of staff during the time they worked on specific cases. For the latter they referred counsel to the Sedgwick County Division of Finance. On March 30, 2021, the District Attorney provided counsel with their budget for years 1994 through 2002 as well as case related payments for 813 cases where one or more deaths occurred between the dates of July 1, 1994 and August 2, 2020.

52. On August 30, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Wichita Police Department. On October 13, 2021, the Department provided annual budget information.

53. On August 30, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Sedgwick Sheriff’s Office. On September 10, 2021, and October 28, 2021, the Sheriff’s Office provided the following information: annual budgets from 2007-2021; annual benefit rates from 2012-2020; excel spreadsheet representing all officers who worked on a homicide case from 2012-2020; and excel spreadsheet including a list of names and dates corresponding to each officer who worked on homicide cases from 2012-2020.

54. On August 30, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Wichita State University Police Department. On December 10, 2021, Wichita State University General Counsel’s Office provided records of the Department’s involvement in one investigation and annual budget information.

55. On August 30, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Sedgwick County District Court. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration. On January 25, 2022, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Sedgwick County District Court for the documents requested from the District Courts. The Sedgwick County District Court provided some of these

56. Shawnee: On February 5, 2020, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Shawnee District Attorney. On January 13, 2021, counsel submitted a renewed KORA request to the District Attorney requesting all documents on the costs of investigating, charging, or prosecuting of capital and non-capital homicides between January 1, 2012 and January 1, 2020. On January 15, 2021, the District Attorney responded noting that they were unable to provide expert fees or time keeping records and referring counsel to the Clerk of the District Court for witness fees. On January 26, 2021, the District Attorney submitted an additional response noting that it was not possible to determine staff time on a particular case, but offered to provide information on the special fund created by the County Commission authorized by the District Attorney’s Office for any special costs related to prosecuting capital cases. Upon submission of payment, the Shawnee District Attorney’s Office provided cost documentation including information on budget line items and totals for the Special Account for Capital Murder, fiscal year 2014-15, trial expenses for fiscal year 2015-18, and information on employee salaries and benefits.

57. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Topeka Police Department. On September 1, 2021, the Department provided annual budget information for fiscal years 2012-2020.

58. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Shawnee County Sheriff’s Office. On September 9, 2021, and November 18, 2021, the Office provided the following information: budgets from 2012-2020; a table of case numbers and types; and a table of hours worked during each pay period by the officers assigned to the case while the case was active, along with their wages at the time of the respective case and any overtime.

59. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Shawnee County District Court. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration. On December 13, 2021, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Shawnee County District Court for the documents requested from the District Courts. The Shawnee County District Court provided some of these documents on January 11-14, 2022, and February 4, 2022.

60. On January 13, 2021, counsel submitted a KORA to the Shawnee County Clerk requesting the annual budget of the District Attorney’s Office and costs related to the adjudication of capital and non-capital homicide costs. The Shawnee County clerk referred this request to the Deputy District Attorney who on January 20, 2021, provided the annual budgets for their office for 2012-2019. On August 26, 2021, counsel submitted another KORA request to the Shawnee County Clerk’s Office and Accounting Department. On August 27, 2021, this request was forwarded to the Shawnee County District Attorney’s Office. On September 17, 2021, the District Attorney reported that they had provided all information in their possession.

61. Wyandotte: On February 5, 2020, counsel submitted a KORA request to the Wyandotte County District Attorney. On February 7, 2020, counsel received an email response requiring that a request be made through a specific portal; the request was resubmitted through this platform on July 31, 2020. On July 31, 2020, Wyandotte County acknowledged receipt of the Request and assigned it reference number 20-1541. Wyandotte County did not respond again to Mr. Conley’s
request until September 25, 2020. On this date Wyandotte County’s Public Records division sent Mr. Conley an unsigned email stating they had reviewed the request and determined none of these records exist in their office. The email stated that “[t]he District Court may have records.” On January 22, 2021, counsel sent the District Attorney’s office a draft courtesy copy of a complaint seeking additional information. On January 25, 2021, the District Attorney’s Office responded referring counsel to the District Court for criminal case records and Unified Government Accounting for records regarding costs. On this same date the District Attorney’s Office provided three case names. On February 3, 2021, counsel submitted KORA requests to the District Attorney’s Office and Accounting Department. On February 26, 2021, the Accounting Department provided amended and actual budgets of the District Attorney between 2011 and 2020 as well as expenditures, not broken down by case, but including, among other items, witness fees and travel costs. On May 12, 2021 the District Attorney’s Office provided a list of homicide cases between 2012 and 2020.

62. On August 26, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Kansas City Police Department. On September 27, 2021, the Department provided their annual budgets from 2012-2020.

63. On August 26, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Wyandotte County Sheriff’s Office. On September 21, 2021, the Office provided their annual budget documents.

64. On August 26, 2021, counsel sent a KORA request to the Wyandotte County District Court. This was forwarded to the Office of Judicial Administration. On December 16, 2021, counsel submitted an updated request to the Clerk of the Shawnee County District Court for the documents requested from the District Courts. The Wyandotte County District Court provided certain of these documents on February 11, 2022. On February 16, 2022, counsel followed up for additional documents. The Wyandotte County District Court provided certain of these documents on February 17, 2022.

I declare under the penalty of perjury of perjury under the laws of North Carolina that the foregoing is true and correct and was executed this 4th day of March in Durham, North Carolina.

_________________________
Olivia Ensign
Death Penalty Cases Have Several Levels of Review

U.S. Supreme Court rulings have given defendants in death penalty cases access to various levels of review, as shown below.

**Initial Trial and Appeal**

- Initial trial in State district court for determination of guilt and sentence

  - Case may be sent back for re-trial or re-sentencing

**State Post-Conviction Processes**

- State habeas motions filed in State district court (also called post-conviction motions) to raise issues such as ineffective assistance of counsel or other issues not viewed as errors made during the trial

  - Case may be sent back for re-trial or re-sentencing

- Appeal to the Kansas Supreme Court to review the decision of the district court regarding the issues raised in the habeas motions

**Federal Processes**

- Federal habeas motions filed in U.S. District Court to raise federal constitutional issues, such as challenging the constitutionality of the death penalty

  - Appeal U.S. District Court decision to U.S. Court of Appeals

**Petition for the U.S. Supreme Court**

- . . . to review decision of the Kansas Supreme Court
- . . . to review decision of the Kansas Supreme Court
- . . . to review decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals

If sent back for re-trial or re-sentencing as a result of any of the 3 appeals, the re-trial or resentencing is handled by the district court.

As a general rule, the levels of appeal are sequential; the defendant must appeal to the Kansas Supreme Court and the U.S. Supreme Court before filing post-conviction motions in district court, and State appeals must be exhausted before filing any appeals with the U.S. District Court.