

4th District Local Treatment Board Meeting
August 19th, 2014 – Denver, CO

Statewide Correctional Treatment Board Members in Attendance: Sheriff Dave Walcher, Jim Bullock (District Attorney), Brian Connors (Public Defender), Marc Condojani (Office of Behavioral Health), Jeanne Smith (Division of Criminal Justice).

Local Treatment Board Members in Attendance: Erin Walker (PSC), Carrie Thompson (Public Defender), Ellen Walker (Probation), Judge Prince, Bridget Collins (Courts), Shannon Gerhart (District Attorney)

General Notes

1. There is difficulty connecting with AspenPointe, the mental health center. Oftentimes it is confusing what number to call and in getting timely service or getting the requested services. The relationship with AspenPointe often depends on the program and the people involved.
2. More expansive mental health evaluations are desired – beyond the standard \$200 evaluation.
3. RDDT services only exist for men and the service is highly used.
4. STIRRT is used frequently in probation and is working well.
5. A new contract for IRT services as a condition of probation is currently being negotiated. Statutory language limits these beds to clients with drug offenses only.
6. Only 12 IRT beds exist in the district and many programs experience a waitlist.
7. There is a need for medication-assisted therapy. AspenPointe underutilized its funding for medication, so conversations can be had on this front.
8. The programs have a very solid relationship with the Veteran's Administration, which helps greatly in the vet court.

Issues Facing the District:

1. Residential Treatment Services. RDDT and IRT capacity were two services that were mentioned. The RDDT for women closed and the closest service is in the Denver metro area. The local board can begin determining actual need for RDDT and IRT and connect with other regional local boards regarding their need. If there is enough regional need, perhaps RDDT for women and IRT expansion can be discussed with providers.
2. Connection with AspenPointe. It is important for the local board to meet to discuss the issues with AspenPointe and develop a productive list of issues. This could include access to staff, education on criminal justice programs, quality and scope of mental health evaluations, medication needs and more. If the local board can establish unified communication with AspenPointe, perhaps the connection with this provider/entity can improve. Marc Condojani will be available for any meeting with AspenPointe and the local board. It is also possible that other local boards who also utilize AspenPointe's services could join in on a meeting.
3. The district is looking for a screening/assessment instrument to help identify clients for its problem-solving courts. Glenn Tapia mentioned a standardized mental health screening

instrument that has been developed that might work. The local board should connect with Glenn to learn about this instrument and see how it can be used within problem-solving courts and possibly other programs.

4. The local board indicated it had a good relationship with the jail for certain programs. However, it knew nothing about the official Jail-Based Behavioral Services program that exists inside the jail. The local board should continue to reach out to the jail and learn about the programs and services it has and how they can partner together for improved treatment and continuity of care.
5. The local board indicated it wanted funding for cross-system MRT training for 10 staff. The statewide board would like more information as to how many of the clients being served by the MRT groups have a substance use/co-occurring disorder as that is the statutorily-authorized population that can be served with correctional treatment funds.
6. It appeared as if there were very separate processes and relationships with providers for each individual problem-solving court program. Perhaps the local board can help standardize some expectations from providers, regardless of the court asking for or paying for the service.

Local Board Issues to Discuss/Work On

- Continue to meet as a local treatment board and develop a unified voice for the district regarding cross-system treatment needs/desired programs.
- Create communication channels with the mental health center about client needs and numbers and see what sort of services can be supported.
- Determine what data exists across the system to support conversations with treatment providers regarding client numbers and assessed needs.
- Continue to work on jail connections not only for cross-system education and a strong unified voice with providers, but also to help with continuity of care for clients leaving the jail.
- Identify regional partners – neighboring local boards – who have similar issues and/or work with the same mental health center.
- Meet with comcor and parole representation to update on the August conversation and get those programmatic inputs and needs.
- Meet to discuss the quality of out-patient providers and what, if any issues exist.
- Meet to discuss the issues of housing, detox, sober living and other recovery-support services that exist or that are needed.

Issues for the Statewide Correctional Treatment Board

- Follow-up regarding a meeting with AspenPointe
- Follow-up regarding the mental health screening instrument