

# ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## Meeting Minutes

July 23, 2021

Date	Time	Location	Preparer of Minutes
7/23/2021	8am-Noon	ZOOM	Carrie Hennen

Attendance		
Committee Members	TST Staff	Others
<p><b>Present</b></p> <p>Robert Almada Chanita Jackson Bob Jones Sfirah Madrone Marilyn Roberts Wendy Tanner Gina Thompson Priscilla Terry</p>	<p><b>Absent</b></p> <p>Steven Thomson</p> <p>Carrie Hennen Kelsey Paolini</p>	<p>Lt. Stephanie Klein Chief Todd Thoma Captain Andre Muldrew Marianne Clear Nicole Carbone Matthew Herrera Grace Burkhart Patrick O'Connor Jose Vargas Maria Gallo Jon Tunheim Christy Peters Frankie Peters Keith Meyer Raul Salazar Pam Hartman-Beyer Sabrina Craig Katie Alderson Kalea Christiansen</p>

Agenda Item	Notes
Welcome & Introductions	<p>Advisory Committee Members introduced themselves.</p> <p>Carrie provided an overview of the meeting, reminding the group that about half of offices &amp; departments requesting TST funding would present a preview of their budget requests to the committee at today's meeting and the remainder will present on July 30, 2021.</p>

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 diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI), and COVID-19 implications of current and possible new programming. **Slides are available accompanying these minutes** and their content is not repeated below. Discussion and questions are summarized.

Thurston County Sheriff's Office-	Stephanie Klein and Todd Thoma presented information and budget requests related to TST-funded services in the Thurston County jail. Discussion and questions included:
-----------------------------------	---

# ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item	Notes
Corrections Bureau	<p><b>DEI</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Committee members asked for clarification as to whether there have been any adjustments or changes in jail programming to support DEI; Jail leadership indicated that there have not been specific changes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Chemical Dependency Program</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Committee members asked for information on the impacts of Blake decision; Jail leadership indicated that Blake hasn't impacted programming, many people in CDP are on other charges other than just possession charges (ID theft, etc.). When Blake decision came out, there was only 1 individual in custody who needed to be released.</li> <li>- A committee member asked whether there have been any complaints related to CDP not addressing the needs of diverse populations; jail leadership indicated that there have not been such complaints.</li> <li>- A committee member asked about the total jail population, Lt Klein indicated the current population is 245, representing about a 33% reduction in population since prior to COVID.</li> <li>- A committee member asked whether the forthcoming RFP for CDP services would change the Moral Reconciliation Therapy model and asked how many providers had responded to the last RFP; Jail leadership indicated there was no plan to change the model and that only 1 provider responded to the last RFP.</li> </ul> <p><b>Inmate Mental Health Services</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Committee members asked for further information on psych meds for inmates. Jail leadership noted that the TST allocation for medication for individuals involved in competency restoration is fairly new; in Q1 only 1 inmate's medication was funded through this allocation; that number has now increased to 12.</li> <li>- Jail leadership clarified that there would not be a request to expand TST funding for psych meds at this time because legal counsel had expressed concern about funding only some inmates or certain medications. The jail would like to continue this discussion and explore options in the future.</li> <li>- It was clarified that services in this program are provided by HealthCare Delivery Systems, the jail's medical provider.</li> </ul> <p><b>Preparing for Reentry Employment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was clarified that Pac Mountain, who provides PREP services, is looking to bring community providers and employers virtually to classes so they can let the participants know what sort of employees they're looking for.</li> </ul>

# ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Committee members were encouraged by the success of this program and noted that employment can have a big impact on participants' lives.</li> <li>- One committee member suggested that there is a need for supervised job coaching for individuals with serious mental illness.</li> </ul> <p><b>Corrections Coordinator</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No questions</li> </ul>
Pretrial Services	<p>Marianne Clear and Nicole Carbone presented information and budget requests related to Pretrial Services. Discussion and questions included:</p> <p><b>DEI</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data presented by Pretrial Services on participation and referrals was discussed and clarification was provided.</li> <li>- It was suggested that demographic data on successful exits should also be tracked and reviewed.</li> <li>- A committee member asked whether there have been any complaints related to Pretrial Services not addressing the needs of diverse populations; Pretrial Services leadership indicated that there have not been such complaints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Diversion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarification regarding the relationship between diversion and treatment courts was provided. It was noted that diversion is a shorter and less intensive program, while treatment courts are more appropriate for individuals with more significant needs who may need more support.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resource Hub</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was noted that this proposal is a partnership among Pretrial Services, Public Defense and the Prosecuting Attorney's Office.</li> <li>- There was additional discussion of the space available for the resource hub; the group noted that a small area in Building 4 at the main Courthouse campus has been set aside and the County will begin building this space out in the fall. Depending on decisions regarding the County's overall space plan, additional space may be available.</li> </ul>
Prosecuting Attorney's Office	<p>Christy Peters presented information and budget requests related to the Prosecuting Attorney's Office work in treatment courts and diversion.</p> <p>There were no questions.</p>
Public Defense	<p>Patrick O'Connor presented information and budget requests related</p>

# ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item	Notes
	<p>to Public Defense’s TST-funded activities. Discussion and questions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Committee members asked whether the department had a “wish list” for additional programming to serve individuals with behavioral health needs. Patrick indicated that a second social services position would be wonderful to have, but he noted that the program is still being developed and refined and it might be premature to request an expansion at this time.</li> </ul>
District Court	<p>Frankie Peters, Keith Meyer, and Raul Salazar presented information and budget requests related to Mental Health &amp; Veterans Court and Intensive Supervision Probation. Discussion and questions included:</p> <p><b>Mental Health/Veterans Court</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff asked whether the Court could meet the goal of expanding to serve 85 individuals at a time with the additional care coordinator requested in 2023. In the past, the Court had indicated that Court calendar time, judicial officer time, and space presented barriers to expansion. Court leadership indicated that there had been changes in dockets that should facilitate this change and noted that additional logistical issues would be analyzed and addressed between now and 2023.</li> <li>- A committee member asked for the breakdown between Mental Health Court vs. Veterans Court participants; staff replied that there are not fixed numbers for each court but that Mental Health Court has historically served more people.</li> <li>- A committee member asked about gender diversity among staff in these programs, noting that some participants may feel uncomfortable being served by staff of a particular gender. It was clarified that there is 1 male and 1 female care coordinator in Mental Health/ Veterans Court. In probation, currently the 3 officers are female, but the male supervisor can step in to support when needed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Intensive Supervision Probation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Committee members asked what happens to individuals who might benefit from intensive supervision, but end up in general population due to full caseloads. Is there impact on recidivism, length of supervision, cost? Court leadership indicated that this is difficult to track, especially given that this program is post-disposition. However, they indicated that research from other jurisdictions showed an impact on recidivism for more intensive contact and support.</li> </ul>
Superior Court	<p>Pam Hartman-Beyer, Sabrina Craig, Kalea Christiansen and Katie Alderson presented information and budget requests related to Superior Court’s TST-funded programs. Discussion and questions included:</p>

# ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item	Notes
	<p><b>Safe Babies Court</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was clarified that the Court will not know about a possible grant extension until about 6 months before the grant is scheduled to end; a decision about whether to set aside TST funds would need to be made before then.</li> <li>- Court leadership noted that this program is focused on the whole family and seeks to prevent children from being removed from their parents.</li> </ul> <p><b>DUI/Drug Court</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No questions</li> </ul> <p><b>Family Recovery Court</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was clarified that FRC participants are not also participants in other treatment courts at the same time.</li> <li>- Staff clarified that the actual participant in the program is a parent involved in a dependency case.</li> </ul> <p><b>Domestic Violence Case Coordinator</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarification was provided regarding the external fund source that can pay for DV treatment in certain situations; this fund source is Criminal Justice Treatment Account and is available when individuals have a substance use disorder and criminal charges.</li> <li>- Committee members asked about wait times for DV treatment; Court staff indicated that wait times are improving and getting back toward normal</li> <li>- The group discussed dual diagnosis. Staff noted that all local providers screen for MH/SUD issues and work to connect individuals with needed treatment. Behavioral health treatment and stabilization can be necessary to support success in DV treatment.</li> </ul>
<p>Wrap Up and Next Steps</p>	<p><i>The next meeting (July 30) will include presentations from the remaining offices and departments requesting TST funding through the County budget process.</i></p>

**Next Meeting:** Friday, July 30, 2021, 8am- Noon  
VIA ZOOM