

Not a formal meeting since we didn't have a quorum of the four Task Force CLS RT members.

Via Zoom 12-1:25pm.

Attend: Marcia Owen, Mike Sstrom, Leslie Nydick, Jessica Fludd, Libria Stephens, Kelly Andrews, Renee Shaw, and Kimberly Davis.

We discussed with Kelly how to proceed with post-arrest diversion expansion discussion.

- She explained the current parameters for PAD and where eligibility could be expanded. In general, there's more opportunity to expand and improve referrals to/buy-in for PAD and the services PAD provides than to expand eligibility.
  - There is no age limit on PAD.
  - Eligible charges: lower level felonies, excluding sexual offenses. No gun charges except w/ DA discretion.
  - Already accept participants with prior records. Don't have to be first offenders.. *[Can someone who's been through PAD once participate again? We're going to propose eliminating the 1st offense, "no repeating" for MDP/pre-arrest diversion. Do the same for PAD?]*
  - General cautionary note when considering eligibility expansion. Only want to consider participants for PAD if the DA or judge would have otherwise prosecuted. If case/charges could be dismissed, that's still preferable to referral to PAD.
  
- Referrals to PAD.
  - General challenge of increasing referrals and buy-in. Don't want the DA's office to be the only source of PAD referrals. Defense attorneys could/should play a larger role. *[Mike's interpretation of the discussion that ensued and as it connects with other built-in paradigms of systems, such as we've encountered with the DA and law enforcement wrt victims' support. Defense attorneys would rather get their clients' cases/charges dismissed, rather than make them participate in PAD. That might be "better" for the client and the community, but the defense attorney's role is to represent their client and help them avoid justice-involvement, even if that would be "best" for them and the community. So getting the Public Defenders and private attorneys to buy into PAD and refer more clients to it will take a paradigm shift.]*
  - Kelly and Danny Spiegall, ADA who oversees PAD, are planning to meet with the NC Bar Association about expanding PAD referrals. *[We will also want to engage Dawn Baxton and the Durham PD's Office on this]*
  - There is a potential for more dismissals to come through PAD for transitional age youth = 18-26 years old. Especially for those with gun charges and gang activity.
  
- PAD programming. Current limitations. Areas to expand.
  - Limited programming, language services for Latino participants, especially in restorative justice programs.

- General cautionary note when considering program expansion and looking at other models. Do NOT want PAD to become another version of probation.
- Leslie asked about PAD programs in other municipalities we could look at as models to adapt, especially with creative and varied programming options. To also see how those PADs secured the needed resources for those programs. Kelly said there are several. She's willing to make initial inquiries about sharing information, which other RT members can then help follow through on:
  - King County, Washington. Also has good pre-arrest diversion and other CLS programs.
  - Cook County, IL. Also has good pre-arrest diversion and other CLS programs. CJRC already has a good relationship w/ Cook County
  - Brooklyn, NY DA. Has an art-focused PAD program.
  - Leslie also recommended looking into PAD's with employment focus, job-training, job placement.

We then went over the [A/N/D Court Plan](#) document and made additions to it, divided up responsibilities for initial outreach, and when that could happen. Jessica led us through this. (See that document for those additions.)

Dwayne let us know that according to the city manager's office, we have to stick to meeting every two weeks. We thought we were set up to do that, since we met last on Wednesday, March 2, skipped the 9th, and met today on the 16th. So we'd meet next March 30th. (Mike had the wrong date before when he'd said we'd meet next on April 6.) Due to some miscommunication/misunderstanding, Dwayne had our meeting schedule as March 9, March 23, and April 6. So, we are required to meet on March 23rd. Then we'll meet again on April 6. Then we'll be on the correct every other Wednesday meeting schedule.

For our agenda for the 23rd, we can continue to discuss the A/N/D plan, if Toia will be able to attend. We can get updates from anyone regarding the initial outreach they agreed to do on A/N/D.. We can then move on to discussing how to proceed with our examination of potential improvements to the Office of Pretrial Services/Pretrial Supervision and the Magistrate's Court, based on our initial meetings and discussion on these topics. See the [CLS RT Work Plan](#) document for more on that. We should also discuss/decide if, how, and when we want to try to organize a Listening Session/s later in the spring or summer for people who've been through pre-arrest and post-arrest diversion programs and existing specialty courts.