

# **Washington State's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative**

***Revised***

**Plan/Application to the  
Annie E. Casey Foundation  
and the Coalition for Juvenile Justice  
to be a JDAI replication site**

**December 15, 2003**

# Washington's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Plan/Application

## Mission Statement

The Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (GJJAC) and its **five** county partners are dedicated to enhancing the safety, dignity and well being of juveniles in the juvenile system and protecting communities. We seek to use research-based, best practices for admitting and holding juveniles in county juvenile detention centers, both in the pre-adjudication phase and after adjudication. We seek to provide alternatives to detention, when appropriate, to keep communities safe and to improve outcomes for juveniles. We seek to reduce disproportionate minority confinement and to keep status offenders, and non-offenders out of locked detention.

## Goal Statement

Our goal is to provide the right service to the right juvenile at the right time, and to hold only those juveniles that must be held in locked detention to ensure their appearance at a hearing while protecting the community.

## Introduction

The GJJAC and its **five** county partners propose to lead Washington's juvenile detention centers in an effort to increase alternatives to secure detention, which are consistent with public safety and juvenile accountability.

This initiative will be known as Washington's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative. Although Washington's GJJAC became aware of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative through its own work on reducing disproportionate minority confinement, the GJJAC and five counties realize that JDAI is broader than DMC, but that a reduction in disproportionate minority confinement will be an outcome.

**Five** counties, representing over half of the juvenile population in the state, are ready to proceed. Other counties will need more information from the Multnomah County faculty team, and may wish to participate, or not, within the next year or later. The **five** counties currently are:

### **Five Counties Wanting to be Involved in Washington's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative**

<b>County</b>	<b>Percentage of Youth in Washington</b>
King	26%
Pierce	13%
Spokane	7%
Yakima	5%
Whatcom	3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>54%</b>

These **five** counties also represent a geographical distribution of counties, from the heavily populated I-5 corridor, to the far northwest corner, to central and eastern Washington. They will serve as examples to counties in their areas.

## **Background**

In April 2003, The GJJAC, together with the Superior Court Judges Association, and 14 other state agencies and organizations, sponsored a conference on the most promising practices for reducing disproportionate minority confinement of juveniles. The conference featured the Multnomah County “faculty team,” who described the Annie E. Casey sponsored **Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI)** in Portland, Oregon, and James Bell, who described the **Building Blocks** (in King County and eight other sites).

Bart Lubow, representing the Annie E. Casey Foundation, spoke about reducing disproportionate minority confinement, and the role of the Foundation in developing, implementing, and evaluating the effectiveness of detention alternatives. The Multnomah County faculty team (prosecutor, law enforcement, court staff) described how their experience with Casey’s JDAI contributed to reducing inappropriate and unnecessary confinement in general, and reducing disproportionate minority confinement, in specific.

Conference attendees found a GJJAC Request for Proposals in their packets, and were encouraged to apply, as county teams, for GJJAC funds to replicate the JDAI (Multnomah County experience) and/or Building Blocks Model.

The GJJAC had previously voted to award a \$20,000 technical assistance grant to Pierce County (for the period of May 1, 2003, through August 31, 2003), in order for Pierce County to plan to replicate JDAI.

On July 1, 2003, Pierce County held its first Steering Committee meeting, with three juvenile court judges representing the county’s superior court judges’ agreement to participate, elected officials from Pierce County and the City of Tacoma, and many other community professionals.

On July 1, 2003, the GJJAC began its limited funding to three projects -- King, Yakima, and Skagit County. The funding is for the period of July 1, 2003 through December 31, 2003. (Skagit is the fiscal agent for a consortium of five counties – Skagit, Snohomish, Whatcom, Island, and San Juan). Due to limited funding, the GJJAC was not able to fund a fourth proposal, but was very impressed by the proposal from Spokane County. Because of Spokane County’s commitment to seeking alternatives to detention and to reducing disproportionate minority confinement, the county will be included in all Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative planning and meetings.

On July 2, 2003, representatives from the five counties came together to discuss how they would share their experience of reducing disproportionate minority confinement with each other, and how they could work collaboratively with the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Coalition for Juvenile Justice, and the Multnomah County faculty team.

At that meeting Bart Lubow discussed, and the five county representatives understood, that although their goal was to reduce disproportionate minority confinement, other issues and outcomes were involved. At that meeting, the county representatives agreed to call their joint

planning effort, “detention reform.” *Note: This term has since been changed to Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative, to avoid any negative connotations.* Bart Lubow also requested a state plan/application so that the Multnomah County faculty team could work more efficiently, rather than try to address each county, individually, in a scattergun approach.

***On November 19-20<sup>th</sup>, 2003, Skagit, Snohomish, Whatcom, Island and San Juan Counties hosted a two-day workshop on JDAI. Also attending the workshop were representatives from Yakima, Spokane, and Chelan Counties. At the end of the workshop, Bart Lubow instructed Carol Webster, GJJAC staff, to confer with the Juvenile Court Administrators to see which counties still wanted to participate.***

***Five counties confirmed with GJJAC staff that they were eager to proceed. These counties are: King, Pierce, Spokane, Yakima, and Whatcom indicated that they were anxious to proceed. Snohomish and Skagit Counties believed that they were already implementing several of the activities of JDAI, would continue to conduct data analysis on detention admissions, detention population, and detention releases, but would not be active partners.***

***On December 9, 2003, Bart Lubow sent a letter to Carol Webster, Staff to the GJJAC, with questions about Washington’s plan/application.***

***After the Mt. Vernon workshop, Phil Jans, President of the Juvenile Court Administrators Association agreed that there will be a 30 minute presentation about JDAI at the February JCA Association meeting.***

***This revised plan is the result of the discussions with Juvenile Court Administrators after November 20<sup>th</sup>, and in response to the letter from Bart Lubow.***

### **GJJAC’s Priorities of Status Offenders and JDAI**

Each year the GJJAC submits an application to the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for federal JJDP Act Title II (Formula Grant) funding, on behalf of Washington State.

GJJAC must report on its compliance with the four core requirements of the Act. GJJAC is currently out of compliance regarding holding status offenders in locked detention (DSO), and must award the funding it receives under Title II (Formula Grant) funding on coming back into full compliance, and maintaining full compliance, with *all* core requirements of the JJDP Act.

GJJAC members have voted to focus on, and fund two issues in the next two legislative sessions:

1. Status Offenders
2. Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative.

On December 12, 2003, the GJJAC Executive Committee voted to award approximately \$175,000 *each*, to Snohomish County and to Kitsap County (on behalf of Kitsap and Pierce Counties) to reduce the number of violations of DSO in the Snohomish and Kitsap County

Secure Crisis Residential Centers (S-CRCs) that are located within their county detention facilities. GJJAC will seek evidenced-based, viable detention alternatives, “expeditors,” improved processes and procedures, and more immediate services to juveniles and their families, so that the status and non-offenders are quickly moved out of the S-CRCs.

By working collaboratively with the **five** county partners on this Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, GJJAC will advance its goals of research-based, effective programs, as well as implementing the JJDP Act mandates of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) and Deinstitutionalizing Status Offenders (DSO). GJJAC will award funding and continue to seek collaborative ways to work with its county colleagues to help Washington State come into full compliance with the JJDP Act.

By working collaboratively with the GJJAC on this Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, the five counties believe they will enter into a dialog with all sectors of their juvenile justice system to seriously examine their philosophy of detention, find alternatives that will be more effective for juveniles, and establish more cost-effective alternatives for their county taxpayers.

### **Current Status of GJJAC’s Grants to Counties**

**Pierce:** Pierce County used a \$20,000 technical assistance grant from the GJJAC (for the period of May 1, 2003, to August 31, 2003) for local planning, and for bringing together a Steering Committee of Pierce County and City of Tacoma elected officials and juvenile justice professionals.

Pierce County has recently been named by Annie E. Casey Foundation as a replication site for the Multnomah County JDAI.

Pierce County juvenile justice professionals (judges, juvenile court administrator, prosecutors, county council, city council) will serve as a local model, working with their peers in other counties to disseminate what they have learned in becoming a JDAI replication site.

*GJJAC grants the following counties will end on December 31, 2003, and are being used to:*

**King:** Finalize the final statistical modeling of an objective risk assessment for admission to detention, and to build upon the work of the Building Blocks in King County for three years and the philosophy of the King County Master Plan.

Status: The draft of the risk assessment tool was shared at the GJJAC-hosted meeting on July 2, 2003, and the final copy will be shared with all counties in the state. Chris Murray, a consultant to King County, has conducted the research for the tool and is doing some final statistical modeling. It will be completed by December 31, 2003.

*The GJJAC grant to King County was for \$19,925.*

**Yakima:** Create an alternative to detention (a day reporting center), to be located in the lower part of Yakima Valley, which has a large proportion of Hispanic youth.

Status: Yakima County representatives have visited Multnomah County, and attending the Coalition for Juvenile Justice training conference in San Francisco about JDAI. Yakima has contracted with Sherry Rials, who worked with the King County Steering Committee on Building Blocks, and will also work with Chris Murray to collect and analyze research data on detention, and. Yakima is also working with Ron Hanna, on loan from Pierce County. Meetings with judges and juvenile justice professionals are taking place.

*The GJJAC grant to Yakima County was for \$10,075.*

**Skagit et al:** Convene an interactive training workshop, so that a much larger group of juvenile justice professionals from the five counties might interact with the Multnomah County faculty team (Rick Jensen, Jim Stegmiller, Stephanie Vetter, Amy Holmes-Hehn, Bob Kauffman, etc.). Several professionals from the five counties were able to attend the GJJAC April 3rd conference, but not enough juvenile justice professionals (e.g., judges, prosecutors, law enforcement, etc.) were able to hear the Multnomah County faculty team in order to know *exactly how* to replicate JDAI in their own counties. The five counties represent a spectrum of needs and specific objectives.

Status: Skagit County hosted the two-day workshop on November 19 and 20, 2003, worked with Chris Murray to collect research data and to make it available to judges and juvenile justice professionals at the two-day workshop, and invited other counties to participate. After the conclusion of the workshop, juvenile court administrators made decisions about which counties would want to continue active participation in the JDAI plan/application. Whatcom County is eager to proceed, Skagit and Snohomish will continue with the data analysis portion of JDAI, and Island and San Juan Counties are too small to participate.

*The GJJAC grant to Skagit County (consortium) was for \$20,000.*

**Spokane:** Continue to reduce disproportionate minority confinement. Although the GJJAC did not have enough funds to award a grant to Spokane, GJJAC always intends to have Spokane County be an active partner in any training workshop or discussion about juvenile detention alternatives.

Status: After the November 19-20, 2003 workshop in Skagit County, Spokane representatives continued their discussions in Spokane, and gave serious thought to their detention philosophies and procedures. Spokane wants to participate in JDAI.

Spokane County has a community-based Secure Crisis Residential Center, and received a GJJAC grant to help bring the juvenile justice community together to quickly provide services for the youth and their families, while keeping runaway youth out of detention. Spokane County also needs more technical assistance from the Multnomah faculty team to replicate the Multnomah County experience with JDAI.

## **Steering Committee for the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative**

- Ann Carey, Chair, GJJAC
- Janice O'Mahony, Chair, GJJAC's Issues and Public Education Subcommittee
- Judge Paula Casey, Thurston County, Chair of the Family and Juvenile Committee, Superior Court Judges Association
- Judge Tom Larkin, Pierce County
- Judge Patricia Clark, King County
- Bruce Knutson, JCA, King County (plus Michael Gideon)
- Dan Erker, JCA, Pierce County (plus Dan Bissonnette and Ron Hanna)
- Harold Delia, JCA, Yakima County
- Steve Paus, JCA, Whatcom County
- Rand Young, JCA, Spokane County (Marie Studebaker)
- Phil Jans, Chelan, President, Juvenile Court Administrators Association
- Ida Leggett, Director, Sentencing Guidelines Commission
- Tom McBride, Director, Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys
- Pat Cooper, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Pierce County
- Greg Hubbard, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Kitsap County
- Christie Hedman, Director, Washington Defender Association
- Pleas Green, Director, Community Programs, JRA, Department of Social and Health Services
- Ross Dawson, Deputy Director, Children's Administration, Department of Social and Health Services
- Rep. Mary Lou Dickerson, Chair, Juvenile Justice Committee, House of Representatives (*invited, not yet confirmed*)

*Current Staff: Carol Webster, GJJAC staff (retiring as of January 1, 2004)*

To date, the Steering Committee has provided a forum for lively discussion and input via e-mail.

In this revised application, Representative Mary Lou Dickerson has been added, and the names of the juvenile court administrators who will not fully participate in JDAI have been removed.

## **GJJAC and the Five Counties' Revised Plan**

Washington's JDAI will be a partnership of the GJJAC, five juvenile courts, other juvenile justice professionals, and community partners.

Washington's JDAI will have these **guiding principles**:

1. *Detention should be viewed as a legal status, with varying levels of custody supervision, rather than as a building.*
2. *Agreement is needed on the purpose of secure detention and of alternatives for alternatives to detention to be effective*
3. *Detention alternatives should be planned, implemented, managed, and monitored using accurate data and analysis.*
4. *A detention system should include a continuum of detention alternatives, with various programs and degrees of supervision matched to the risks of detained youth. This may result in expanded programming.*
5. *Detention alternatives should be culturally competent, relevant, and accessible to the youth they serve.*
6. *Detention alternatives should be designed and operated on the principle of using the least restrictive alternative possible.*
7. *Detention alternatives should reduce pre-adjudication and post-adjudication secure detention, and avoid widening the net unnecessarily.*
8. *Detention should be a safe, humane, secure, and enriching environment for those juveniles who must be detained.*

The **five** counties that participate in Washington's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative will be based on these **core strategies**:

- Washington's JDAI will build upon the experience of Multnomah County, and that of Pierce and King Counties, which have:
  - Established countywide steering committees, with support of their judges.
  - Sought alternatives (reception centers, day reporting centers, assessment centers, etc.).
  - Worked with the Annie E. Casey Foundation *and/or* the Building Blocks program, and follow their strategies.
  - Conducted research, and proposed an objective admission screening instrument.
  - Examined case processing to reduce length of stay.
  - Examined new policies and practices for probation violations, warrants, and "awaiting placement" cases.
- Washington's JDAI will immediately have two cohorts, and *may* have another cohort, over the next three years:

- A. Cohort One: **Pierce** County is now a JDAI replication site, so it can assist the other counties by sharing its experience in becoming a replication site.

**King** County was a Building Blocks County, has created the King County Juvenile Justice Master Plan, is using detention alternatives, and will have created a data-based detention admission criteria (based on the data analysis of Chris Murray), by December 31, 2003.

**Pierce** and **King** County will complete their tasks to implement their juvenile detention alternatives plans, and share with other counties how they informed their judges and policy makers, created effective steering committees to drive their initiatives, adopted a data-based admission risk assessment, created new detention policies, and either created, or attempted to create, alternatives to detention.

Both counties will need continued technical assistance from the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Multnomah County faculty team, but are far ahead of the other counties in their knowledge of JDAI, by already having created steering committees, and by having support of their judges, elected officials, prosecutor and law enforcement.

Pierce County is already a JDAI replication site, and will have technical assistance and funding available. King County is not yet a replication site and will need continued technical assistance and funding.

- B. Cohort Two: **Spokane, Yakima, and Whatcom** are prepared and committed to begin their serious participation.

Representatives of their counties attended the workshop, featuring the Multnomah County faculty team, and Annie E. Casey Foundation consultants in Mt. Vernon, in November. They understand what is at stake and what is required of their counties.

These three counties will need continued technical assistance, because there will need to be steering committees in each county, and each county may proceed at a slightly different pace.

Other counties, observing the work of these five counties, may wish to join JDAI and they would become Cohort Three.

### **GJJAC's Role and Funding Available**

GJJAC has adopted, for the next two years, two legislative issues: status offenders and Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiatives. GJJAC will award JDP Act Title II (Formula Grant) funding for technical assistance to bring Washington State back into compliance on DSO. Sufficient JJDP Act Title II (Formula Grant) funds are not available to carry out JDAI as fully as the GJJAC desires, because the funds are already committed for DSO. The technical assistance funds will be the question of who is being held in detention and why, and therefore is related to JDAI.

GJJAC will not longer receive an automatic JJDP Act Title V (Community Delinquency) block grant to Washington. As of October 1, 2003, Title V funding is a discretionary grant to states that must compete for it. OJJDP has not yet announced when the discretionary funding will be available, nor when the request for state proposals will be released. Washington State will apply for Title V funds, but it is possible that Washington State may not receive the discretionary funds.

GJJAC does not yet know when the new JJDP Block Grant, established in the reauthorized JJDP Act, will be available to Washington.

Despite the uncertainty about federal funding, GJJAC members support this Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, want to move forward now, and will encourage judges, juvenile court administrators, law enforcement, prosecutors, defenders, the legislature, and the Governor to join in implementing the Initiative.

GJJAC understands that each county may have a different approach, given the guiding principles and the situation in their own county. The GJJAC will play a planning and administrative role, as well as a strong advocacy role, because the Initiative is tied to two core requirements of the federal JJDP Act, as well as research-based models, which the GJJAC endorses as a philosophy.

### **Role of State Government**

Juvenile detention is a county function in Washington State, but that is not to say that state has no role in detention. Washington is the only state with a Sentencing Guidelines Commission that has laid out a sentencing grid, and conducts research on sentencing, to ensure that juvenile sentencing is equitable and fair statewide. If a judge goes outside the grid, the judge must explain why there would be a Manifest Injustice (MI) is going higher or lower than the grid allows.

The state's Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration, within the Department of Social and Health Services, manages the state institutions for juvenile felons; however, JRA and the counties agree that some state funds will be appropriated to the juvenile courts, through contracts, under the County Juvenile Accountability program. JRA is represented on the Steering Committee.

The Governor's Office (via Executive Policy Staff in the Office of Financial Management) is supportive of this JDAI, and has been kept apprised in every step. Dick Van Wagenen has said he is comfortable with the representative of JRA sitting on the Steering Committee, and that he does not need to be a member.

Representative Mary Lou Dickerson, Chair of the Juvenile Justice Committee, is being asked to join the Steering Committee.

***Because GJJAC does not have sufficient funding to fully support the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, and because county budgets are not sufficient, GJJAC and the five juvenile court administrators request both funding and technical assistance from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and the Coalition for Juvenile Justice, to implement Washington's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative.***

## **Funding Needed**

Washington needs funding for GJJAC to take on this additional planning, organizational, and administrative staff duties required of the Initiative, as well as sending JDAI counties to trainings both in Washington and inter-site conferences, out of Washington. Current GJJAC staffing and funding is simply not sufficient.

Washington needs funding to provide travel for the juvenile justice professionals in the counties to attend statewide workshops and to travel to Multnomah County and other sites recommended by the Annie E. Casey Foundation. GJJAC suggests some funding to offer performance-based contracts with individual counties to enable them to do the detention data analysis, the planning, and the convening of county decision makers, and staffing that is necessary to implement the JDAI within each of the five counties. GJJAC, either by hiring a part time staff member or through a contract, would then do the central organizational, administrative, logistical, and fiscal work, such as providing travel to the inter-site training conferences, and reporting to Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Although the GJJAC and the first **five** counties have the “will” to implement the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, it is clear that to establish new detention policies and operations takes time – time for planning, creating and convening county steering committees, conducting detention data analysis, and visiting model programs – all of which are beyond the normal duties of each county’s juvenile justice professionals.

Funding to these counties would be provided to the counties, through the GJJAC, and the GJJAC would be responsible for reporting to the Annie E. Casey Foundation. The GJJAC is experienced in writing performance-based contracts for organizations and agencies to carry out specific work products, by a specific date. These types of performance-based contracts would be very effective in promoting the Juvenile Alternatives to Detention Initiative, with counties that seek to implement detention alternatives.

## **Technical Assistance Needed**

Counties in Cohort One need continued *secondary-level* technical assistance from the Annie E. Casey Foundation. They are off to a great start, but will need continued technical assistance. It is understood that Pierce County is currently receiving technical assistance from the Multnomah County faculty team as a replication county. King County has done much of what is required of a JDAI replication site, and its presiding juvenile court judge and juvenile court administrator are very committed, but it needs technical assistance from the Annie E. Casey consultants.

Counties in Cohort Two need *primary-level* technical assistance from the Multnomah County faculty team. Cohort Two county representatives need to hear the information from the Multnomah faculty, and to be able to ask questions by the end of November 2003, in order to make use of GJJAC funds, which expire on December 31, 2003. GJJAC funding will be used to pay for the meeting room and associated expenses of the two-day meeting with Multnomah County faculty team. This conference is only the beginning of the technical assistance these five counties will need.

Possible Cohort Three, should additional counties *want* to participate, Washington will need technical assistance from the Multnomah County faculty team, from Annie E. Casey Foundation

research professionals, to know how to best analyze current arrest, detention and prosecution patterns; and to understand where they might most effectively make changes in policies and operations. Chris Murray in Washington State has a good start with his work in King County, but if there are additional variables to consider or additional methodologies to consider, the technical assistance is needed soon, because other counties now want to contract with him.

**Funding Requested**

Washington State’s GJJAC requests \$200,000 per year from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, plus technical assistance, to carry out its plan with its county partners. The funding period would be for three years, beginning on January 1, 2004, to December 31, 2006, following upon the GJJAC’s funding to the counties.

The budget below is for each year of three calendar-year periods, January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2006.

Planning and Administration of JDAI roll out <i>(for a part-time statewide coordinator, either on contract, or as a part-time staff person, to coordinate the work of the five counties, to work with the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and technical assistance providers; for contract monitoring; for statewide meeting preparation, for meeting room rentals, for five county representatives’ travel to inter-site training conferences, for copying material, for fiscal reporting to Annie E. Casey Foundation; and for staffing the state steering committee, etc.)</i> .....	\$100,000.
Funding for Counties to Achieve Outcomes <i>(GJJAC will distribute up to \$20,000 directly to each of the five counties for performance-based contracts with local coordinators, for planning and staffing local steering committees meetings of juvenile justice professionals, government officials, researcher for detention data analysis, and planners; for local county workshops and meetings, and for starting county alternatives, .....</i>	\$100,000.
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>\$200,000.</b>

**We understand that this budget is typical of Washington’s GJJAC’s approach, but may not be typical of Annie E. Casey Foundation’s awards to states for JDAI.**

**We understand that this budget may be modified as Annie E. Casey Foundation sees fit, to better enable Washington to benefit from Annie E. Casey Foundation technical assistance.**

## Conclusion

We have just begun the first steps to make this Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative highly successful in five counties with over 50% of the juvenile population, but we need funding, and technical assistance that is sustained for three years, intensive, and site-specific to fully implement our plan.

If these five counties are successful, and show positive outcomes, as we believe they will, the following organizations would disseminate the information statewide:

- Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee
- Superior Court Judges Association
- Juvenile Court Administrators Association
- Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys
- Washington Defender Association
- Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Social and Health Services
- Children's Administration, Department of Social and Health Services

By disseminating positive information about how JDAI was implemented in the participating counties, it would, in turn, encourage the adoption of the initiative statewide. We are poised to begin, but we need your assistance.

We propose a meeting of Bart Lubow, Senior Associate of the Annie E. Casey Foundation; representatives of the **five** counties; Ann Carey, the GJJAC Chair; GJJAC Executive Committee members; Dick Van Wagenen, Executive Policy Staff in OFM; Cheryl Stephani, Assistant Secretary, JRA; and Ida Leggett, Executive Director, of the Sentencing Guidelines Commission.

The purpose of this meeting would be to clarify our understanding of JDAI and what is required of each participant.

This meeting would occur very soon, perhaps not before the end of the year, yet *before* the legislative session begins. The possible dates for this meeting would be during the week of January 5-9, 2004.

The meeting would take place in the Pierce County Juvenile Court or SeaTac, whichever site is most convenient to the majority of participants, and will be arranged by GJJAC staff.