

Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Legal & Justice Systems Subcommittee
Meeting Summary for May 16, 2016

1. Call To Order

Committee Chair Alfred Heydrich called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

Members Present: Angela Anderson, Jill Bernstein, Bill Elfo, Deborra Garrett, Stephen Gockley, Daniel Hammill, Fred Heydrich, Dave McEachran, Moonwater, Irene Morgan,

Also Present: Matt Huffman (for Michael Knapp) and Peter Ruffatto (for Darlene Peterson)

Members Absent: Michael Knapp and Darlene Peterson

Review April 11, 2016 Meeting Summary

Gockley moved to approve the April 11, 2016 meeting summary as presented. The motion was seconded.

The motion carried unanimously.

2. Committee Mission Statement, Statement of Work, and Phase Two Framework

The committee discussed the draft Statement of Work as proposed by Judge Garrett:

- Amend packet page four, the third bullet under the goals, and delete the reference to developing alternatives, “Identify and ~~develop~~ **recommend** alternatives....”
- Goals and tasks should be more clearly organized, mapped, and tracked.
- Programs should be organized according to pre-arrest, post-arrest and pre-trial, and post-conviction.
- Define discharge planning procedures and whether they encompass reentry efforts.

Elfo moved to approve the Statement of Work proposed by Judge Garrett with the amendment to recommend alternatives and the correct subcommittee title. The motion was seconded.

The motion carried 10-0-2, with Moonwater and Morgan abstaining.

Bernstein presented and the committee discussed the proposed Justice Committee – Framework for Phase Two, beginning on packet page 11:

- Goals, programs, and services should be divided into pre-arrest, pre-trial, and post-conviction sequences.
- Rename the goals to objectives.

Moonwater stated model the framework from the Yakima County framework to create a program and service map that has information regarding:

Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Legal & Justice Systems Subcommittee
Meeting Summary for May 16, 2016

- An executive summary
- Existing goals
- What they've learned so far
- Areas of focus
- Gaps in programs and services
- The problem that each program or service would solve

Bernstein stated she will draft a grid as Moonwater suggests. She asked Committee members to send her information on what is missing from the framework narrative. The committee discussed the components that should be included on the map for each program or service, including:

- Program definition
- Identified overlap with other subcommittees
- Cost-benefit analysis, which should be done at the end of the process
- Whether additional staff are needed
- Overhead and administrative costs
- National best practices
- How the program works within the context of Washington State laws

Heydrich stated he prefers to begin looking at individual programs and services in sequential order of pre-arrest, pre-trial, and post-conviction. He will pursue information on the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD) program and the pre-trial release risk assessment tool similar to what is in the Yakima Smart Pre-Trial Implementation Plan and a similar program in Spokane.

Hammill stated he is also interested in a program similar to LEAD and the Behavioral Health Officer (BHO) Program in Portland.

Anderson stated it's important that presentations on programs and services be followed by a committee discussion and concluded with a decision from the committee. At the beginning of each meeting, discuss and decide on what was presented at the previous meeting.

The committee discussed whether committee members need more information on presentations the committee has already received. The following presentations need discussion and/or conclusion (*see attached Addendum: Whiteboard Notes*):

- Good Time incentives for reduced sentence
- Changes to the Probation Department
- The City of Bellingham pre-trial jail alternative programs
- Post-conviction jail alternatives
- Drug Court and Fast Track
- LEAD
- Portability Court and Community Court

Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Legal & Justice Systems Subcommittee
Meeting Summary for May 16, 2016

There are many other ideas such as pre-trial release and bail reform that they haven't begun to discuss.

3. Driving While License Suspended (DWLS) Project Update

Bernstein presented on a proposal to begin a relicensing court for the DWLS-3 population.

- DWLS-3 results in a lot of failures to appear (FTAs)
- Law Advocates would advise people at no cost and help people request participation in the program
- Local judges and court clerks have been receptive to the idea
- No extra money from the County is required
- The courts would remove fines from collections and allow someone to have an affordable payment schedule
- These people may or may not need high-risk insurance
- District Court may allow people to pay off their fines through community service work at a set rate

5. Drug Court / Fast Track Update

McEachran described the differences between the people who choose the Drug Court option and those who choose the Fast Track option, how long it takes to begin a new Drug Court class. If the goal is to lower the jail population, then get people out of jail as fast as possible. If the goal is to get everyone in treatment, they should not make an easier offer of Fast Track. They are trying to balance all the programs. Most people don't want to go to treatment. He identifies which people may be eligible for Drug Court before their first appearance. Participation is voluntary. Generally, older folks want to change their lives and are more successful in treatment.

David Graham, Prosecutor's Office, described the assessment process.

- McEachran conducts a preliminary assessment to see if a person is eligible for programs
- Graham conducts a more in-depth assessment, and the Prosecutor's Office will suggest to those who seem eligible that they apply
- A person who is pre-approved can volunteer to apply for acceptance into the program

Graham stated that not all who apply will be accepted, and not all who are deemed pre-approved will apply. Most people who are pre-approved are also offered the Fast Track program or the Drop Down Program, and most choose the Fast Track program.

In the Drop Down Program, one could receive a gross misdemeanor instead of a felony and get out at the same time, have a year of probation, and do the drug/alcohol evaluation and compliance. No one is doing the program because they don't want to do probation. They choose the Fast Track program instead.

Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Legal & Justice Systems Subcommittee
Meeting Summary for May 16, 2016

Anderson stated the Prosecutor's Office will wait to gather several Drug Court participants before starting the program. It should be started sooner, even if they have fewer cases. The Committee could recommend that the Prosecutor's Office begin Drug Court within the 30 day timeframe.

4. Yakima Smart Pretrial Implementation Plan Review

Heydrich stated he plans to meet with the Harold Delia in Yakima who has developed and oversees the program and submitted the grant application for Yakima.

The committee discussed the benefits and disadvantages of the Plan and pre-trial release options:

- The Yakima Smart Pretrial Implementation Plan is only in the research and analysis phase to determine effectiveness
- The Whatcom County Prosecutor's Office has historically operated according to several recommendations in the plan
 - Attorneys attend first appearances
 - Criminal history is available at first appearances
 - A courtroom is in the jail
- The need to review the Prosecutor's Office current programs and benchmark those programs against national best practices
- Educate the municipal courts and Lummi court on those recommended operations
- Find a risk assessment tool that is specific to pre-trial release in terms of:
 - Risk to the community
 - The odds for failure to appear
 - Defining the services that could incentivize the person to appear
- Monitoring of those released pre-trial through ankle monitors with specific restrictions
- Having a 24/7 response process in place if an ankle monitor sends an alarm that the offender is out of compliance with his or her court order
- Finding a matrix that compares the efficacy of various assessment and pre-trial tools
- A pre-trial ankle monitoring system versus bail with no monitoring in terms of public safety

6. Next Steps: Ideas & Further Information

See Summary Addendum: Whiteboard Notes regarding Committee Mission Statement, Statement of Work, and the Phase Two Framework.

7. Public Comment

Ray Baribeau stated an analysis of recommended solutions should consider the necessary changes to allow solutions to be implemented, including changing State law, local law, or local policies

***Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Legal & Justice Systems Subcommittee
Meeting Summary for May 16, 2016***

and procedures. The City of Bellingham has changed its policies and procedures to lower the jail population.

Mark Gardner, City of Bellingham, stated he is available to help with research and structuring information.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

DRAFT

**Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Legal & Justice Systems Subcommittee
Meeting Summary for May 16, 2016**

Addendum: Whiteboard Notes from Legal & Justice System Subcommittee on May 16, 2016

Topic	Needs More Information	Group Has Enough Information	Date/Assignment
Post-Conviction Jail Alternatives		x	Angela will prepare proposed language for a recommendation in advance of the June 13th meeting
Drug Court	We want to know about implementation of recommendations from 2012 report		Judge Garrett will get this information for us in advance of the June 13th meeting
Fast Track		x	Angela will prepare proposed language for a recommendation in advance of the June 13 meeting
LEAD	x		Heydrich and Hammill will confer and organize future presentation
Pre-Trial Jail Alternatives Program	x		Group would like a presentation from Friendship Diversion and the City about the uses and limits of their program. Group to consider the pre-trial wraparound services in the Yakima Report. Heydrich to meet with Yakima to further discuss their program and their progress
Probation	x		Bruce Van Glubt to answer remaining questions at the meeting on June 13 and Group to discuss and make recommendations at the July meeting
Other Therapeutic Courts: (community court and...)	x		Further information to be presented (Perhaps Hammill to organize)



AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

W A S H I N G T O N , D C

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
JUSTICE PROGRAMS OFFICE

Bureau of Justice Assistance Drug Court Technical Assistance Project

Assignment No. DCTAP-2012-88

**REVIEW OF THE WHATCOM COUNTY
(BELLINGHAM), WASHINGTON DRUG
TREATMENT COURT**

CONSULTANTS:

**Hartwell Dowling
Michael Schrunk**

November 2012

This report was prepared under the auspices of the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) Drug Courts Technical Assistance Project at American University, Washington, D.C. This project was supported by Grant No. 2010-DC-BX-K087 awarded to American University by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

DRUG COURT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

A PROGRAM OF THE BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

4400 MASSACHUSETTES AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20016-8159 202-885-2875 FAX: 202-885-2885
www.american.edu/justice

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Study Background	1
B. Whatcom County Drug Court: Overview	2
II. OBSERVATIONS AND DESCRIPTION OF THE WHATCOM COUNTY DRUG COURT PROGRAM.....	4
A. Overview	4
B. Overall Program Design and Operations	4
1. Eligibility Determination and Referral Process	4
2. Program Capacity	5
3. Phases, Drug Court Hearings, and Pre-Hearing Staffings	5
a. Phases.....	5
b. Pre-Hearing Staffing and Drug Court Hearing	7
4. Drug Testing	7
5. Requirements to Complete the Program.....	8
6. Participant Fees.....	8
7. Program Documentation/Manuals	8
8. Management Information	9
9. Program Evaluation	9
10. Relationship with Community	10
11. Sanctions/Incentives	10
C. Treatment and Related Services.....	10
1. Overview.....	10
2. Substance Abuse Screening and Assessment	11
3. Treatment Services Provided	12
4. Ancillary Services.....	12
5. Aftercare/Alumni Services	12
D. Program Funding.....	13
E. Other Observations	13
1. Observations of the Drug Court Judge and Team	13
2. Observations of the Sheriff and Jail Administrator	13

III.	RECOMMENDATIONS	15
A.	Summary	15
B.	Discussion	15
IV.	ACHIEVEMENT OF TEN KEY COMPONENTS: OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	21
V.	ATTACHMENTS.....	25
	A. Technical Assistance Site Visit Agenda, August 23-24th, 2012	
	B. <i>Buffalo Drug Court Management Information System</i> Flyer	
	C. <i>Maine Drug Treatment Court Management Information System (DTxC 2.0) User Manual</i> (sent under separate cover)	
	D. <i>Good Beginnings: Developing a Drug Court Alumni Group</i> (sent under separate cover)	
	E. <i>How to Develop and Sustain a Drug Court Alumni Group</i> (sent under separate cover)	

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

Recommendation One: Conduct a Needs Assessment to Determine the Appropriate Capacity of the Program in Light of the Existing and Potential Need for Drug Court Supervised Substance Abuse Treatment Services for Offenders in Whatcom County

Recommendation Two: Reduce the Time from Arrest to Program Entry

Recommendation Three: Provide On-Going Role Specific, Interdisciplinary, and Team Training for Drug Court Team Members, Including Orientation for New Ones

Recommendation Four: Clarify Program Functions Required and Team Roles

Recommendation Five: Increase Involvement of Treatment Providers and Law Enforcement in Drug Court Hearings and Pre-Hearing Staffing Meetings

Recommendation Six: Develop Mechanisms to Provide Orientation to Local Providers Regarding the Drug Court Program Requirements, Policies and Procedures

Recommendation Seven: Addressing Issues Regarding Drug Testing

Recommendation Eight: Compile Adequate Operational Information on the Program for Ongoing Program Monitoring, Management, Evaluation and Information Dissemination

Recommendation Nine: Use of a Standard Curriculum for Treatment Services

Recommendation Ten: Disseminating Program Information in the Community

Recommendation Eleven: Develop a Program Advisory Board/Community Steering Committee

Recommendation Twelve: Continuing Development of an Alumni Group and Aftercare Component

B. Discussion

Recommendation One: *Conduct a Needs Assessment to Determine the Appropriate Capacity of the Program in Light of the Existing and Potential Need for Drug Court Supervised Substance Abuse Treatment Services for Offenders in Whatcom County*

Since the program is currently operating at below the targeted capacity, an analysis should be conducted promptly to ascertain the reason(s) for this situation as well as a needs assessment of

the potential services the program can/should be providing to substance abusing offenders in Whatcom County.

Regarding the first component of this analysis; the program as currently designed. It appears that the program has already compiled useful data to contribute to the first component of this analysis, which should include: (1) the drug court eligible defendants among the arrestee population; (2) the degree to which these drug court eligible defendants are screened for the program (e.g., criminal justice and substance abuse screening) and the outcomes; (3) the dispositions of the cases involving defendants screened as eligible (e.g., how many enter, how many reject and reasons for rejection); (4) the progress (or lack of) of defendants who enter the program and reasons for termination. Relevant issues that have already been raised such as the effect of delays in the application review process should be addressed. In addition, the incentives offered for program participation should be reviewed in light of changing prosecutorial policies for these offenses.

The second component of this analysis should focus on populations the program is not currently serving but could potentially. These might include, for example, probation violators. Consideration should also be given to revisions in the current eligibility criteria to increase the program's outreach without compromising its essential design.

In conducting this analysis, consideration should also be given to determining whether multiple tracks, with different supervision requirements, and service provisions, might be useful to serve an expanded program population. For example, there may be individuals who warrant the more intensive supervision the drug court can provide, including drug testing, but may not all require the intensity of services the program makes available. Reference should also be made to data available regarding drug use in the County as an additional measure of potential need.

Recommendation Two: *Reduce the Time from Arrest to Program Entry*

The process for identifying eligible participants for the program should also be reviewed and revised to ensure that they are identified as soon as possible following arrest. "Immediacy" in getting offenders into treatment is a critical element of the drug court program model and one of the major elements that distinguishes the drug court from traditional probation programs. Among the reasons why "immediacy" is so critical is to capitalize on the trauma of arrest to motivate an offender to get treatment and to halt the escalating effects of the offender's continued drug use as well as the potential additional crime that he/she may likely be committing.

Recommendation Three: *Provide On-Going Role Specific, Interdisciplinary, and Team Training for Drug Court Team Members, Including Orientation for New Ones*

It will be beneficial to conduct training for all team members that would include the specific roles and responsibilities of each team member as well as specific issues relating to addiction, its effect on cognitive functions, and evidence based treatment models. With the staff turnover the program has experienced, it is important that all involved in the program, including new members to the team, have training on the drug court model and the therapeutic orientation that it promotes, particularly in contrast to that of traditional probation supervision programs. BJA's

Drug Court Planning Initiative (DCPI) training curriculum is available, free of charge, on the NDCI website (www.ndci.org). The lack of training of even a few team members can affect all aspects of the program, including team functioning, understanding of the use of therapeutic approaches to address participant conduct, interpretation of drug test results, the use of sanctions and incentives in the program, to name a few.

There are also numerous webinars being offered, free of charge, addressing a wide range of issues relevant to the program's operations and services. Announcements for these webinars are frequent and, in many cases, the webinars are archived for subsequent retrieval at our website (www.american.edu/justice). Additional training can be provided through guest speakers on relevant topics from the local community at brown bag lunches.

Recommendation Four: *Clarify Program Functions Required and Team Roles*

As an alternative or in conjunction with the above mentioned team training, a facilitated session regarding team member roles and responsibilities would be beneficial to the functioning of the program. While the drug court team appeared to communicate effectively, their roles and relationships were not totally clear. It may be useful to develop specific job descriptions for each drug court team member to clarify team roles and the responsibilities, including information compilation and dissemination, that each team member is expected to perform. These job descriptions should be specific to the Drug Court, apart from the individual's other non-drug court responsibilities.

Recommendation Five: *Increase Involvement of Treatment Providers and Law Enforcement in Drug Court Hearings and Pre-Hearing Staffing Meetings*

Efforts should be made to strengthen the involvement of treatment providers and law enforcement representatives with the program. Program officials should follow up on issues raised by the sheriff and the jail administrator during the site visit regarding use of jail resources for sanctions, and mechanisms should be developed to more closely involve treatment providers in the program's operations. Representatives of both law enforcement and treatment should participate in staffing meetings and court hearings.

Recommendation Six: *Develop Mechanisms to Provide Orientation to Local Providers Regarding the Drug Court Program Requirements, Policies and Procedures*

Mechanisms should be developed to provide ongoing orientation and coordination with the local treatment providers regarding the drug court program requirements, how they interface with the treatment services being provided, information that would be useful to the Court to receive from treatment providers and ways the court and the treatment providers can better communicate regarding the participants being served.

Recommendation Seven: *Addressing Issues Regarding Drug Testing*

- (i) Reconsider the Policy of Reducing the Frequency of Drug Testing in Phase IV

It was noted during the site visit that the current policy of the drug court is to reduce the frequency of urinalysis in Phase IV, prior to graduation. The drug court team should re-access this policy given the vulnerability associated with that time. Similarly, continued participation in self-help groups should be encouraged as well.

(ii) Challenging Positive Drug Tests

Reportedly, there is no specific procedure in place for challenging positive drug tests. In the situation of a positive drug test a team member will call a toxicologist at Redwood Toxicology Laboratory with any questions or, if appropriate, authorize a new test. The drug court's handbook does not indicate what steps, if any, participants can take to challenge a test. The team should discuss and decide what policy makes the most sense for Whatcom County and revise the handbook to accurately inform participants of drug court policies.

Recommendation Eight: *Compile Adequate Operational Information on the Program for Ongoing Program Monitoring, Management, Evaluation and Information Dissemination*

(i) Develop an Automated Management Information System (MIS) to Compile, Report, and Analyze Programmatic and Participant Information

At the time of the site visit, the drug court was using a fairly detailed and locally created computerized data collection instrument. It captured basic demographic information and generated demographic reports readily. The effectiveness of this instrument may be hampered by a limited ability to integrate information from other disparate systems, and the lack of online capabilities. As noted in the report, there are more comprehensive MIS software programs available free of charge or readily accessible to customization in offices with competent information technology departments. One such program is the Microsoft Access based MIS software developed by the Buffalo Drug Court which would provide an adequate software program that could be adapted to the needs of the Whatcom County program. Enclosed is a description of the Buffalo MIS. The State of Maine has also developed DTxC, a non-proprietary drug court management information system. Enclosed is a copy of the DTxC User Manual, should this option prove more useful.

(ii) Develop an Evaluation Plan

We understand that the program was evaluated in August 2010 by a student and professor at Western Washington University which produced a fairly comprehensive demographic and cost benefit analysis although also raised methodological questions referenced earlier. Program officials should meet to develop a plan for a formal evaluation of the program that identifies the information that needs to be maintained on an ongoing basis to ensure that the program is operating as intended, addressing unanticipated developments as they occur, and addresses relevant policy issues, measures of participant performance that will be useful to collect, source(s) of information to be used, as well as the outcomes the program wants/needs to report to the Advisory Board and the community. In addition to recidivism related information, we suggest that the program also compile and report information describing the needs of the participants the program is serving – their prior criminal justice system contacts; nature and

length of prior drug use; their demographics (education level, employment status, family status – how many minor children and whether they are living with the participant, etc.) to convey the range of needs they present and the services that have been/are being provided.

Recommendation Nine: *Use of a Standard Curriculum for Treatment Services*

The treatment providers should be encouraged to use a standard evidence based curriculum to promote both consistency and compliance with evidence based practices.

Recommendation Ten: *Disseminating Program Information in the Community*

As a supplement to any evaluation activity the program conducts, the program should disseminate information to other justice agencies as well as the community generally on a regular basis highlighting the program’s activities and services, as well as the range of participant needs being addressed and services being provided. In this regard, presenting a “before and after” picture of each participant’s situation will be helpful in documenting their prior drug/alcohol use, contacts with the justice system, medical and other demographic information describing their situation at the time of program entry and developments in addressing these needs as they progress through the program. There are examples of this type of summary information on our website (www.american.edu/justice) and further technical assistance is available if requested. This type of information may be useful in addressing anecdotal reports made during the site visit that some in the community believe that participants remain in the court for an excessive time period.

Recommendation Eleven: *Develop a Program Advisory Board/Community Steering Committee*

It is clear that the Whatcom County Drug Court has developed strong and solid relationships with the criminal justice community – the Public Defender’s Office, Prosecuting Attorney’s Office, and the Sheriff’s Office in particular. The program could benefit, however, from the development of an Advisory Board or Steering Committee. Such a policy/advisory committee – composed of stakeholder agencies as well as representatives from the educational, medical, labor, faith, and other community sectors – can be helpful in providing guidance to the program regarding community needs as well as in conveying the program’s accomplishments – and needs – to the larger community and developing necessary community support and resources. The formation of such a group can also promote community understanding of addiction and support for the program and its services to the community.

Recommendation Twelve: *Continuing Development of an Alumni Group and Aftercare Component*

At the time of the site visit, the Whatcom County Drug Court did not have an aftercare component. The development of such a component, including requiring participants to develop an aftercare plan prior to completion of the program, is integral to the continued success of alumni. Aftercare resources, in conjunction with an active alumni group would provide important assistance to participants transitioning out of the drug court program and the structure it provides.

We understand that while alumni of the program attend holiday parties and special occasions and participate in extracurricular drug court activities; their interaction with current participants is limited. A more developed alumni group will provide a useful addition to the program in the form of peer support for participants exiting the program – both for aftercare resources as well as mentoring for participants while enrolled in the program. Attached are several resources regarding drug court alumni group development which may be of interest.

From: [Angela Anderson](#)
To: [Jill Nixon](#); [Alfred Heydrich](#); [Bill Elfo](#); [Daniel Hammill \(dchamill@cob.org\)](#); [Darlene Peterson](#); [David McEachran](#); [Deborah Bouressa](#); [Deborra Garrett](#); [Forrest Longman](#); [Irene Morgan \(impeace2@comcast.net\)](#); [Jeff Parks](#); [Jill Bernstein \(jbernstein020@gmail.com\)](#); [Joy Gilfilen](#); [Julie Finkbonner](#); [Kathy Walker](#); [Matt Huffman](#); [Mike Knapp](#); [Moonwater](#); [Nickolaus D. Lewis](#); [Peter Ruffatto](#); [Stephen Gockley](#)
Subject: RE: IPR Task Force Legal/Justice Subcomm: America University Study on Drug Court
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 11:52:51 AM

Again, hello everyone!

Judge Garrett was going to report back to us on Judge Snyder's feelings about the study. I reviewed the 12 points and wanted to throw in the public defender's (or at least my) feelings about the study and changes since then. This is nothing formal- just my reflections and thoughts.

Thanks

Angela

REFERRING TO PAGE 15's RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) A drug court needs assessment has not been done. The study suggests that running at capacity may not be beneficial. I agree with that assessment. When we were at our highest capacity, drug court felt hurried and less effective. I would like more than the current number but 80 would be too large. I also worry, as the defense attorney, of creating different "tracks." We are very lucky and pretty exclusive to have a pre plea drug court. Nationally that is very rare. I am afraid if we create post plea or probationary tracks that less (or no) clients end up on the pre plea track.
- 2) I have vented my frustration many times and cannot, again in my opinion, find an acceptable reason why David Graham and David McEachran cannot meet more frequently and do approvals faster. There has been push back to this since I started in drug court in 2010 and I have yet to hear a reason by other than their schedules are busy. If they met more frequently and for shorter periods of time, perhaps that would be easier on their schedules. I can appreciate the frustration that we demand quick approvals after a client shows no interest for months, but if the purpose of the exercise is getting these particular clients help then we need to be ready when they are.
- 3) As far as training, I do not think Maia Vanyo from the PDs office has yet to attend a National Training and Dave Graham has not since he took over in approx. 2011. National training is expensive and perhaps we can recommend more money provided in the budget for training.
- 4)
- 5) We decided as a team that we did not want law enforcement involved though we did discuss it at length. One main issue was cost- having a law enforcement officer dedicate 4 hours or more per week is difficult with their current schedules/budget.
- 6) I believe now drug court is including a treatment provider in Staffings.
- 7)
- 8) I believe we are using a new software program
- 9) We are not doing this
- 10) I believe we try to do this.
- 11) We do not have this.
- 12) We did develop an Alumni group and have seen some beneficial effects. It's still relatively new and is working out the kinks. My clients seem to enjoy working with a mentor and also being a mentor.

From: [Angela Anderson](#)
Subject: Legal/Justice Subcomm: Summaries for FAST TRACK and JAIL ALTS
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 11:47:56 AM

Good Friday everyone:

So, I created the summaries for our committee on Fast Track and Jail Alts. Since I'm the first to do this, I'm not 100% positive what to say. I tried to take my public defender slant out of these but I am certainly hoping these are used more as a starting point for the rest of us to discuss versus a final product. For example: what I took away from the jail alts presentation may not be the same as you! To some extent, we did this already for the phase 1 report- so I feel I may be repeating our previous statements- but... here goes-

Thanks
Angela

FAST TRACK:

The Committee finds that Fast Track has been an effective tool for resolving criminal cases efficiently as well as reducing the jail population. The Committee encourages Fast Track to consider even more cases and would further suggest continued expansion of the "misdemeanor probation option" for more crimes than just Possession of Controlled Substance. This option allows for a defendant to seek treatment as part of his/her sentence in exchange for a reduced charge. Further, the Committee recommends Fast Track work with Drug Court on a faster approval rate as more defendants may be inclined to accept drug court instead of a short jail sentence if the wait time could be reduced.

JAIL ALTERNATIVES:

The Committee has heard from representatives of the Whatcom County Sheriff's Office and Jail Alternatives. Jail Alternatives provides defendants with opportunities to avoid some of the difficulties associated with serving in custody jail time will still providing a punishment and offering community safety. At the request of Jail Alternatives, the Courts should explore ways to resolve cases more quickly so to allow alternatives to be used for those with shorter sentences. Many defendants resolve their cases after serving the entirety of their sentence. Conversely, Jail Alternatives should consider allow defendant the opportunity to serve their time on alternatives pretrial should they qualify on low level crimes.

Additionally, the Committee would recommend that Jail Alternatives expand its use of fee waiver options so that more low income individuals can participate in Jail Alternatives. Further, the Sheriff's Office should consider upgrading its Electronic Home Monitoring equipment to a more modern system. Though there is a cost with improving these devices, it may allow more flexibility for the participants as well as improve public safety with more effective monitoring. The Committee would recommend an increase in Staff for Jail Alternatives if that would be needed to provide more alternatives.

From: [Bill Elfo](#)
Subject: RE: Legal/Justice Subcomm: Summaries for FAST TRACK and JAIL ALTS
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 12:45:33 PM

Angela – if that is the recommendation that we adopt, I would recommend that a language change to reflect that the “Council authorize the Sheriff’s Office to waive or reduce fees for electronic home detention; assess the viability and effectiveness of new technologies in rural areas; and provide the funding needed to adopt this change.” As for pre-trial, what specific jail alternative programs are you referring to (work crews, electronic home detention)? Thanks!

Sheriff Bill Elfo
Whatcom County Sheriff's Office
311 Grand Avenue
Bellingham, Washington 98225
(360) 778-6600 (office) 360-778-6605 (direct line)

"Dedicated to making Whatcom County the safest in the State through excellence in public safety."



From: Angela Anderson
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2016 11:48 AM
To: Jill Nixon; Alfred Heydrich; Bill Elfo; Daniel Hammill (dchammill@cob.org); Darlene Peterson; David McEachran; Deborah Bouressa; Deborra Garrett; Forrest Longman; Irene Morgan (impeace2@comcast.net); Jeff Parks; Jill Bernstein (jbernstein020@gmail.com); Joy Gilfilen; Julie Finkbonner; Kathy Walker; Matt Huffman; Mike Knapp; Moonwater; Nickolaus D. Lewis; Peter Ruffatto; Stephen Gockley
Subject: Legal/Justice Subcomm: Summaries for FAST TRACK and JAIL ALTS

Good Friday everyone:

So, I created the summaries for our committee on Fast Track and Jail Alts. Since I’m the first to do this, I’m not 100% positive what to say. I tried to take my public defender slant out of these but I am certainly hoping these are used more as a starting point for the rest of us to discuss versus a final product. For example: what I took away from the jail alts presentation may not be the same as you! To some extent, we did this already for the phase 1 report- so I feel I may be repeating our previous statements- but... here goes-

Thanks
Angela

FAST TRACK: