

MIDD Advisory Committee / Steering Committee Modification Review Form

Proposed Change:

- Fiscal Change to Existing MIDD 2 Initiative(s): TX-CCPL Community Court Planning and Pilot**
 - Net Total Dollar Amount Change in Funding Level: \$420,881 requested by King County District Court; \$201,701 included in proposed supplemental budget
 - Net Percent Change in Funding Level: full-scale expansion 45% increase; proposed supplemental budget 21% increase
- Programmatic Change(s):**
 - Population Served or Impacted¹ : Expansion of Community Court to Auburn and Bellevue if fully funded as proposed by District Court; proposed supplemental budget supports expansion to Auburn
 - Outcomes or Results
 - Intervention
 - Performance Measures
 - Currently tracking the following for MIDD:
 - # of clients engaged in services
 - % linked to publicly funded behavioral health treatment
 - % linked to referred to needed other social services
 - % positively engaged in treatment or met treatment goals
 - % diverted from adult jail
 - % reduced jail use
 - Target number of people to be served will be established after a baseline year.
- One-Time Use of MIDD Funds**
 - Temporary Reallocation of Funds from Initiatives
 - Initiative(s) whose funds are proposed to be reallocated:
 - Undesignated or Underspent Funds
 - Net Total Dollar Amount: _____%
- Proposed New Ongoing Initiative(s)**
- Other (describe):**

Revision Details:

- a. **High-level summary² of affected MIDD 2 initiative(s) prior to the change, if any**

Background on MIDD Funding for Community Court through Initiative TX-CCPL

MIDD’s adopted implementation plan funded planning only for the TX-CCPL Community Court initiative (\$100,000 in 2017 only), as detailed in the [TX-CCPL initiative description](#). In MIDD’s implementation plan, the new court was “envisioned to serve individuals with low-level, misdemeanor offenses who have frequent contact with the criminal justice system.”

At the request of District Court (KCDC), \$102,000 was added from MIDD in 2018 to support initial

¹ “Populations served or impacted” should include geographic regions and/or cultural communities where applicable.

² One-paragraph summary adapted from the MIDD 2 Implementation Plan initiative description that also reflects any revisions that may have been made to the initiative prior to this proposed change.

implementation of a pilot. Again at KCDC's request, MIDD's 2019-20 allocation for TX-CCPL was increased to \$942,643 to support implementation in 2-3 locations.

Current community courts have operated in Redmond since April 2018 and Burien since February 2019. The model is coming soon to Shoreline in December 2019. The full amount of this request would further increase the 2019-20 amount to support expansion to Auburn and Bellevue; the lower amount in the proposed supplemental budget would support expansion to Auburn.

The Community Court Model

A Community Court is an alternative problem-solving court. It differs from traditional court in that it seeks to identify and address the underlying challenges of court participants that may contribute to further criminal activity. Its goal is to build stronger and safer neighborhoods and reduce recidivism.

Community courts provide support services and accountability for those who are eligible and choose to participate. While eligibility differs slightly from community to community, the courts work with those who are charged with "quality of life" crimes. An assessment is conducted for all community court participants to identify their challenges and strengths. The assessment provides information to help determine what follow-up steps an individual community court participant will be required to take. The most consistent needs that are identified through this assessment are around mental health issues and substance use. Among other actions, participants often are required to perform community service.

A Community Resource Center is an integral component of Community Court. The Resource Center at each Community Court is available to all members of the public in addition to the Community Court participants and includes on-site community partners who provide a wide array of services, such as healthcare/insurance enrollment, education support, job training opportunities, access to behavioral health and substance-use disorder services and more. Convening representatives from the social and human services agencies in one location helps facilitate court participants' and community members' immediate access to a comprehensive set of resources, and supports service agency partners' collaboration to address the unique needs of court participants and the local community at large.

While multiple court responses exist and are supported with MIDD funding, Community Court differ from other therapeutic courts (*e.g.*, Regional Mental Health Court, Regional Veterans Court, Adult Drug Diversion Court) in a few key ways:

1. Community courts are located within the community where the crime was committed. They're created locally based on the needs and desires of the communities where they're located. Other therapeutic courts are held in limited locations, in either Seattle or Kent. Providing court and resource centers and related services in the communities where people live encourages local collaboration and is more convenient for those in court and those utilizing the resource centers.
2. The community court model works to move people in and out of the criminal justice system quickly. On average, cases are in community court a few months, unlike other therapeutic courts where cases remain for 1-2 years.
3. The community court model KCDC has adopted is lower barrier than most traditional therapeutic courts. Traditional therapeutic courts utilize probation and have higher expectations of their participants. In Community Court our expectation is that participants engage in services and start on a path towards healing and recovery
4. Funding for traditional therapeutic courts is limited to those who enter into those courts. Funding for Community Courts, because of the co-located resource centers, benefits the entire

public who can access the services at the centers, as well as those who come through the alternative court.

5. While traditional therapeutic courts collaborate with local service providers, community court creates countless collaborative efforts with local municipalities, the site hosts of the courts/resource centers, schools and technical colleges, behavioral health agencies, many other service providers and many residents who serve as volunteers.

Implementation in King County to Date

Starting in January of 2018, the State Prosecuting Attorney's Office started filing cases into the Redmond Community Court. The State is also in the process of starting to file low-level out-of-custody felony drug cases (expedited cases), filed as misdemeanors into both Redmond and Burien Community Courts.

In Burien, Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD) staff is sited at the Community Resource Center weekly and uses it as a gathering place to connect with LEAD participants. LEAD leadership and court leadership have met multiple times to collaborate and determine which interventions (i.e., LEAD, Community Court, other intervention, or some combination of interventions) will best support and address the needs of the individuals committing low-level quality of life crimes as these individuals have different needs and require different levels of support. Community Court will continue to evolve in partnership with LEAD as law enforcement assisted diversion expands and based on the needs of the community. LEAD is limited to a select list of diversion-eligible charges while Community Court is more broadly available across criminal charges. LEAD has committed to accepting social referrals from Community Court but are at capacity currently with law enforcement referrals. Prosecution can choose to file LEAD cases into community court after repeated unsuccessful attempts of engagement, which allows for continued attempts to engage in services and an opportunity to dismiss charges upon successful completion. LEAD is well-suited for individuals with very high needs who can benefit from wrap-around services with no time limit. Community Court is designed to be a briefer intervention, getting participants in and out of the criminal justice system while planting seeds around growth, recovery, and connection back to the community.

Allowing law enforcement the choice of directly filing into Community Court is discussed in the planning stages of each court. With this option, law enforcement has the additional option of utilizing the resource center as a potential diversionary option and not issuing a citation or making an arrest after a crime has occurred. As the law enforcement in the community is also providing security at the courthouse, they've been highly involved in the success of the courts and resource centers.

The implementation of a new court/resource center in Shoreline is anticipated to occur in December 2019.

b. Details of the proposed change, including:

i. Origination of the change³

KCDC desires to bring Community Courts and Resource Centers to as many King County residents as possible. A full-scale increase would support expansion to Auburn and Bellevue, while the amount in the supplemental budget would support expansion to Auburn only. Not all cases will get or be appropriate

³ How did the proposed change come to the County's attention as a needed action?

for diversion and it is critical to have options to help individuals who are not eligible to access resources and reduce collateral consequences of the criminal justice involvement. Community court is one of these options.

Community Court in Auburn would serve those who have committed low-level quality of life misdemeanor crimes within the City of Auburn. The Community Resource Center, which is a critical component of the Community Court, would serve any resident living in Auburn and nearby areas, who is interested in obtaining information about and access to an array of local behavioral health and social services. The population in Auburn is growing exponentially and almost 15% of the population is in poverty and could benefit from having a resource center to assist with financial, education, employment and other needs. The City of Auburn files more criminal cases than any other partner city that District Court serves and many of these cases could benefit from this model.

Community Court in Bellevue would serve those who have committed low-level quality of life misdemeanor crimes within the City of Bellevue. The Community Resource Center, which is a critical component of the Community Court, would serve any resident living in Bellevue and nearby areas, who is interested in obtaining information about and access to an array of local behavioral health and social services. The city of Bellevue. In 2015, about 36% of the community earned less than \$35,000/year and about 7% of the city lives in poverty.

Proposed additional funds will support either 1 or 2 coordinators to assist with Community Court and Resource Center management, and related supplies.

ii. Reason/basis⁴

After the successful collaborations in Redmond and Burien, multiple jurisdictions have asked to partner with KCDC on implementation of Community Courts as an option for addressing the needs of individuals who are committing low-level misdemeanor crimes in their communities. As we currently provide court services in Auburn and Bellevue, these are natural locations for us to implement additional Community Court and Resource Centers.

iii. Timing⁵

If approved, Community Courts in Auburn and/or Bellevue will be operational by end of 2020.

c. How the proposed change addresses the Advisory Committee's guiding principles for MIDD

The proposed change continues to address the Advisory Committee's guiding principles for MIDD and expands services to additional communities in East and South King County.

d. How the proposed revision impacts the original intent of affected initiative(s)

No impact other than serving additional King County residents

⁴ To the degree feasible, address under "reason/basis" the benefits of making the change, risks of not changing, and any tradeoffs or strategic questions. If the change represents partial funding of a larger request or concept, reference this.

⁵ Address whether expedited review and action is needed, and if so, explain why.

e. Funding impacts, if any

A full-scale expansion investment of \$420,881 would support expansion to both Auburn and Bellevue, while the \$201,701 investment in the proposed supplemental budget would support expansion to Auburn. King County District Court is also interested in exploring possible opportunities to pursue Veterans, Seniors, and Human Services Levy funding to support this program.

f. Evaluation impacts, if any

g. Next steps

Committee review and discussion will occur in September. Advisory Committee consensus action on this proposal is anticipated at the committee's next meeting in October.

h. Include staff analysis, if available

Steering Committee Review:

Reviewed: 9/16/19

Full MIDD Advisory Committee Review:

Review: scheduled for 9/26/19

Action: anticipated 10/24/19