

MEETING MINUTES



Committee	UTAH SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND ANTI-VIOLENCE COORDINATING COUNCIL
Date	Tuesday, April 14, 2009
Time	12:00 noon – 2:00 p.m.
Location	Utah State Capitol Complex – Senate Building – Copper Room
Members Present	Dr. Gary Jorgensen, Harold Morrill, Gaby Anderson, Susan Burke (for Dan Becker), Craig Burr, Colonel Merrill Carter, Lisa-Michele Church, Santiago Cortez, Commissioner Bill Cox, Forrest Cuch, Commissioner Lance Davenport, Ron Gordon, Fotu Katoa, Judge Michael Kwan, Verne Larsen, Mark Payne, Craig PoVey, Terry Russo (also for Jeff Smart), Ned Searle (for Judy Kasten Bell), Kirk Torgensen, Anna Kay Waddoups
Members Excused	Heather Borski, Dr. Karen Buchi, Senator Chris Buttars, Louis Callister, Scott Reed, Mayor JoAnn Seghini, Chief Paul Tittensor, Karen and Sherm Watkins
Guests	Brock Alder, Brent Butcher, Kevin Eastman, David Felt, Casey Hill, Stephen Jardine, Michelle Jenson, Brent Kelsey, Denise Leavitt, Richard Nance, Roland Parent, Tom Patterson (via conference call), Nicole Sherwood, Jacey Skinner, Gary Syphus, Adam Trupp, Robyn Williams
Staff	Mary Lou Emerson
Agenda Item	Call to Order
Notes	Chairman Gary Jorgensen called the meeting to order.
Agenda Item	Approval of Meeting Minutes
Notes	<p>Motion: Colonel Merrill Carter made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 18, 2008 USAAV Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bill Cox and passed unanimously.</p> <p>Motion: Commissioner Bill Cox made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 24, 2009 Joint Meeting of the USAAV Council and the DORA Oversight Committee. The motion was seconded by Colonel Merrill Carter and passed unanimously.</p>
Agenda Item	Discussion and Selection of SFY 2010 DORA Implementation Sites
Notes	<p><u>Presentation of New Proposal(s)</u> Lisa-Michele Church said she and the Department of Human Services have always been supportive of DORA. The fact that DORA was on the Department's budget cut list was reflective of the \$44 million in cuts they had to make, not an indication that they do not support DORA and appreciate what has been accomplished. She explained her thinking in approaching the negotiations about where DORA will be implemented in SFY 2010 involved four considerations: 1) the proposal should have accountability for both the funding and the outcomes; 2) the proposal should fit the statutory guidelines in the amended statute; 3) the proposal must work within each department's budget guidelines (how to do justice to DORA and yet live within the limited resources left after the significant budget cuts made by the Legislature); and 4) support the counties and respect their interest in having a statewide distribution of the limited resources.</p> <p>Lisa-Michele reviewed the DORA SFY 2010 Proposal in the meeting packets and indicated it is strongly supported by the Department of Human Services, Department of Corrections, and the Utah Association of Counties Behavioral Health Committee. The proposal was to fully implement DORA in Weber, Davis, Salt Lake and Utah Counties, including DORA-funded treatment and DORA-specific AP&P agents. In addition, DORA-funded treatment will be</p>

provided in Bear River (Cache County) and in Southwest Utah (Iron and Washington Counties), but there will be no DORA-specific AP&P agents in these areas, and only “typical” supervision will be provided to DORA treatment clients. Lisa-Michele emphasized if we really want to see DORA succeed, we need to give it a chance to succeed in various forms and, as a result, we may learn that the DORA model needs to be different in different areas of the state (e.g., urban vs. rural). In those areas without DORA-specific supervision, we would not call it “DORA”, and the contracts would be separate from the DORA contracts. The proposal will provide treatment for a lot of offenders, there will be accountability, outcome measures, and statewide distribution of the resources.

Discussion and Selection of Sites

Tom Patterson, participating in the meeting via conference call, expressed his full support for everything Lisa-Michele said. The Department of Corrections wants to see DORA succeed.

Ron Gordon said he agreed with much of what had been said, but expressed concern that the supervision component would be different in some areas of the state than others, and suggested the proposal seems to shift away from the offenders’ supervision needs toward distribution to more areas in the state. He said as long as supervision is included in the definition of DORA, we need to be concerned with the supervision needs of the participating offenders. Kirk Torgensen said he shared Ron’s concern and noted that DORA is modeled somewhat after the Drug Court model, which provides for intensive focus on the individual offender. This intensive supervision is integral to the success of DORA, and AP&P agents in the outlying areas may have much larger caseloads, which could affect outcomes. Lisa-Michele noted that treatment and other resources are already very different in the rural areas compared to the Wasatch Front. Roland Parent, from the Bear River Health Department, said there would still be good collaboration between the treatment provider and the AP&P agent. Commissioner Cox asked if DORA could be patterned more after Drug Court and be successful.

Brent Kelsey said we need to be very cautious about how DORA funding will be allocated to the rural areas, ensuring we are following the Implementation Guidelines and the statute. The Guidelines talk about integrated supervision, so a plan will be required of the rural areas that shows the integration of traditional supervision with treatment. Changes to the Implementation Guidelines may be needed. We will need to think about two different programs – DORA as we have known it in the urban areas, and something different in the rural areas – and identify principles and implementation criteria for both the urban and rural programs, then move forward from there. Santiago Cortez suggested the Guidelines may need to be modified to ensure the clients in the rural areas are appropriate for the levels of treatment and supervision that can be provided, in order to ensure success. Robyn Williams said offenders in the rural areas will still be supervised according to their supervision needs.

Lisa-Michele emphasized the DORA contracts with the Local Substance Abuse Authorities will be very specific with regard to the scope of work. This will provide an opportunity to explore different models for DORA, which will be helpful in determining DORA’s future and the resources needed. Kirk Torgensen said we need to ensure DORA is structured so we can demonstrate its effectiveness and the funding saved. Lisa-Michele said the rural areas will be required to provide a plan that USAAV will have the opportunity to review.

Susan Burke cautioned the Council about talking about “two different programs,” and suggested we talk about one model. She also wondered if the supervision would really be that different in the urban areas and in the rural areas. We should promote the DORA model; how we implement it in the urban areas and the rural areas may differ because of differing resources.

	<p>Tom Patterson suggested it may be helpful to discuss the differences in supervision. Robyn Williams explained they have defined what they label as the “DORA Standard of Supervision”, which includes numbers of contacts with the treatment provider, home visits, field visits, etc. It basically takes regular supervision and heightens it. In DORA, weekly contacts are required, whereas regular supervision may only require monthly contacts. In regular supervision, the intensity of supervision decreases over time as the offender is successful in meeting requirements.</p> <p>The DORA Oversight Committee will need to determine what supervision requirements need to be met with regard to the rural areas. Harold Morrill said the different supervision models will provide an opportunity to determine what works best and what is most cost-effective.</p> <p>Lisa-Michele said if USAAV accepts the plan, we will need to go to Legislative Leadership to see if they would be supportive of this approach. Colonel Carter noted the Legislature created the situation with the budget cuts, and we are not able to implement a model that in reality requires full funding, so we’re doing the best we can. Anna Kay Waddoups said the Legislature is aware of the challenge we are facing in implementing DORA with limited resources, and that if we can demonstrate the collaborative effort behind the proposal and that we’re doing the best we can, their response should be favorable.</p> <p>Brent Kelsey emphasized the need to integrate treatment need with supervision need. As we review the Implementation Guidelines, we need to ensure the resources are meeting the needs of the populations to be served. Brock Alder, from the Bear River Health Department, said they could continue to hold weekly staffing meetings on the DORA clients, and are confident they can make things work.</p> <p>Motion: Harold Morrill said there has been a lot of cooperation and made a motion that the USAAV Council adopt the proposal and move ahead, including meeting with Legislative Leadership to ensure their support. Colonel Merrill Carter seconded the motion. The motion passed with 20 voting in favor, two opposed, and one abstaining.</p> <p><u>Next Steps</u> A meeting will be scheduled with the Governor, the Senate President, and the House Speaker. The meeting group will consist of: Tom Patterson, Lisa-Michele Church, Richard Schwermer, Richard Nance and Brock Alder. Lisa-Michele will convene the group.</p> <p>Brent Kelsey suggested we first hammer out the Implementation Guidelines so we can share exactly what we are proposing with the Governor and Legislative Leadership. Gary Jorgensen suggested in the meantime we give them at least a heads up about what direction we’re going.</p> <p>Gary Jorgensen congratulated the group for their work in formulating the proposal.</p>
Agenda Item	Review of 2009 Legislative Session
Notes	Mary Lou Emerson referenced a summary of the bills passed in the 2009 Legislative General Session in the meeting packets and briefly reviewed the USAAV priority bills.
Agenda Item	Finalize USAAV Council 2009 Meeting Schedule
	<p>Mary Lou Emerson explained two meeting schedule options for the remainder of USAAV Council meetings during calendar year 2009.</p> <p>Motion: Mark Payne made a motion to adopt proposal #2. Colonel Merrill Carter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The December meeting will be held on December 15th.</p>

Agenda Item	Other Business
Notes	Kirk Torgensen announced there would be a "Pharmaceutical Drug Crime Training" the next day in Salt Lake City. We will include this issue for discussion on a future USAAV agenda.
Next Meeting	Tuesday, June 23, 2009 – 12:00 noon-1:30 p.m. – University of Utah Olpin Student Union Building

Note: Copies of meeting materials are available upon request by contacting Mary Lou Emerson, USAAV Council Director, at (801) 538-1921 or memerson@utah.gov.