

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

July 31, 2020

Date	Time	Location	Preparer of Minutes
7/31/2020	8am - Noon	ZOOM	Carrie Hennen

Attendance

Committee Members	TST Staff	Others
<p>Present</p> <p>Glenn Dunam Chanita Jackson Bob Jones Marilyn Roberts Skip Steffen Wendy Tanner Priscilla Terry Steven Thomson Gina Thompson</p>	<p>Absent</p> <p>None</p> <p>Carrie Hennen</p>	<p>Todd Thoma Jim Downing Stephanie Klein Jennifer Creighton Staci Coleman Pam Hartman-Beyer Sabrina Craig Katie Alderson Laura Vogel Georgia Christian Patrick O'Connor Jose Vargas</p>

Agenda Item	Notes
Welcome, Introductions, and Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carrie provided an overview of the meeting, reminding the group that about half of offices & departments receiving TST funding had presented a preview of their budget requests to the committee on July 24, 2020 and the remainder would be presenting during the morning session.

Budget Presentations from County Offices & Departments (see accompanying slides)

County offices and departments presented slides addressing current TST-funded programming, requests for TST budget changes for existing or new programs, ways in which programs seek to advance equity, and COVID-19 implications of current and possible new programming. Slides are available accompanying these minutes and their content is not repeated below—instead, Committee discussion and questions are summarized.

Thurston County Corrections	<p>Stephanie Klein, Jim Downing, and Todd Thoma presented information and budget requests related to the many TST-funded programs operated in the Thurston County Correctional Facility. Discussion and questions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Chemical Dependency Program</i>- clarification regarding how participants enter the program (usually Court orders, including Drug Court participants), questions regarding policies supporting equity, racial makeup of CDP counselors/ staff and efforts to hire for diversity (Corrections indicated that equity is part of the canon of
-----------------------------	---

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item	Notes
	<p>ethics and is at the core of Corrections’ work, that some CDP staff identify as people of color, and that Corrections does not hire the contracted staff directly), questions regarding Moral Reconation Therapy and whether other treatment modalities had been considered (generally no, Corrections leadership indicated they would need technical assistance to consider a different clinical approach but would be open to discussion and change)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Preparing for Reentry Employment</i>- questions regarding entry to the program (mostly CDP participants with others served when space is available), questions regarding challenges of getting ID cards (especially challenging due to COVID shutdowns and for individuals from out of state) - <i>Pretrial Release and Reentry Assistance</i>- clarification regarding whether providing substance use disorder assessments through this program would add new costs (no, current staff are credentialed to do this work, supervisor would need additional license but this is achievable), questions regarding the type of education provided as part of reentry services (education on resources available in community), discussion of changes in jail population since COVID (decreased from 380 in January to about 250 in January, now approximately 265) - <i>Transitions and Medication Management</i>- discussion of COVID impacts (significant, as this program is connected to Work Release, which has been suspended) - <i>Psych ARNP</i>- questions regarding transition of existing prescriptions from community-based prescribers to jail (in many cases, this can be done by medical staff without involvement of psych ARNP), discussion of telehealth (transition to telemedicine occurred before COVID for this program) - <i>New funding request-- Psychiatric Medications</i>- discussion of which services are billed to inmates and how this could be changed (current proposal would fund only medications related to competency restoration process, Corrections leadership is open to broader discussion but this would require additional stakeholders possibly including medical team, fiscal team, and legal; agreement that there should be follow up discussion) - <i>TST Corrections Coordinator</i>- question regarding big systemic changes over time, especially related to COVID and equity discussions (population decrease over time, leaving population with more risk factors and more intense behavioral health needs)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item	Notes
District Court	<p>Jennifer Creighton and Staci Coleman presented information and budget requests related to Mental Health & Veterans Court and the Intensive Supervision Probation Counselor and related requests for expansion. Discussion and questions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Mental Health/ Veterans Court</i>- questions about capacity and waiting list (caseload dropped from 60 to 45 people during COVID, several people are now ready to enter), questions about overall budget (this program is nearly entirely TST funded, with only a very small amount of funding from a private funder), questions about staffing model (1 program manager, 2 care coordinators, a 0.75 program assistant, and judicial time), questions about whether the Court is considering developing an “in house” treatment relationship (considering it, but challenging given the many different types of needs faced by participants) - <i>New funding request—Mental Health/ Veterans Court Low Risk/ Low Need Care Coordinator</i>—questions about legal benefits for the population to be served (successful participation would mean individuals would not be convicted), questions about evidence base for serving low risk/ low needs individuals in this way rather than a precharge diversion program (legal benefits to individual are significant, precharge diversion not currently available in District Court although it could theoretically be offered if there were resources to do so; current deferred prosecution model takes 2 years and is expensive for participants), questions regarding why this service would be tied to Mental Health/ Veterans Court (program manager would be qualified to manage this, conduct needed assessments, etc), questions re: serving medium and low risk participants together (these groups would not co-mingle), questions regarding length of service and how many individuals could be served (likely about 6 months, number to be determined) - <i>Intensive Supervision Probation Counselor and new funding request to add 2nd position</i>- discussion of COVID impacts, discussion of differences between regular probation and intensive probation (caseload size, frequency of contact), discussion of spending TST funds on clinical treatment as opposed to coordination and Court supervision - <i>Further discussion of diversity and equity</i>- not specific to a particular program, Jennifer Creighton provided examples of District Court’s efforts on these issues, including partnering with the Center for Court Innovation on a ‘secret shopper’ project to evaluate implicit bias, trainings and staff meeting discussion of equity issues (e.g. book group discussions, discussions of TED talks, etc), and a research project with the WA Center for Court Research on whether there is evidence of disparity in how judicial orders are imposed (data will be available in 2021)
Superior Court	<p>Pam Hartman-Beyer, Sabrina Craig, Katie Alderson, and Laura Vogel presented information and budget requests related to the numerous TST-funded programs administered by Superior Court</p>

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item	Notes
	<p>and related new requests for funding. Discussion and questions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>DUI/ Drug Court</i>- questions about current participation levels (currently 58 participants, down from nearly 80 pre-COVID, discussion of where people go if they don't graduate (usually jail or prison, but there is national research suggesting that even some participation in Drug Courts, even if not reaching successful graduation, is beneficial) - <i>Family Recovery Court</i>- discussion of "In the Rooms" online recovery platform, discussion of request for additional funding for participation in HeartStrides equine support (including whether additional recovery support programming had been considered; staff indicated that many other services are already in place; discussion that participation would be voluntary but there was great interest in an earlier pilot), discussion of where participants come from (they are child-welfare involved and have a substance use disorder) - <i>New funding request- Safe Babies Court Team</i>- clarification that the funding request would be to continue services after a one-year grant ends, the Court will know by September 15, 2020 if they receive the grant, clarification of how this program would connect to Family Recovery Court (different model, focus on children 0-3, but likely would share a coordinator) - <i>Domestic Violence Case Coordinator</i>- discussion of the ongoing challenge of the cost of DV treatment as a barrier for participants (legal has clarified that this treatment can only be paid by TST in the context of a treatment court)
Public Defense	<p>Patrick O'Connor and Jose Vargas presented information and budget requests related to the TST-funded work at Public Defense and related new requests for funding. Discussion and questions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Treatment Court Support</i>- few questions - <i>Mitigation Services</i>- discussion of cost of this service (about \$50k per year is charged to TST) - <i>New funding request—Social Worker</i>- discussion of other public defense offices with this function (endorsed by state supreme court standards, King and Pierce Counties have this function within their public defense departments), discussion of the relationship between this position and the mitigation services contract, discussion of whether these functions could be integrated in one position to reduce the overall cost (not ideal, but the department is open to the idea) - <i>Discussion of overall changes in criminal justice system</i> due to COVID and current discussions regarding equity and Black Lives Matter movement
Wrap Up	<p>The Committee expressed appreciation for the presentations and discussion and indicated that they had gained valuable information and context about the programs.</p>



ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item	Notes
	<p>They noted that the conversation had answered some questions and raised new questions. The group agreed to convene an additional meeting in one week to identify themes and next steps.</p>

Next Meeting: Friday, August 7, 9-10am
VIA ZOOM