R2020-43 PUBLIC REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

October 14, 2020 at 2:00 P.M.

Zoom/Team Meeting Code: Members will receive own code unique to them as a participant. Public meeting access is provided by either call in or web access:

Call in: (253) 215-8782 Webinar ID: 955 6211 6915

Web Access: https://piercecountywa.zoom.us/j/95562116915

Facilitator: Judge Frank E. Cuthbertson (ret.)

Committee Members:

District 1: Pablo Monroy, Tim Reynon
District 2: Erin Calata, Paul M. Herrera
District 3: Ken Garvy, Anthony McDaniel
District 4: Preston Anderson, Tisha Wosencroft
District 5: Shalisa Hayes, Jim Walton
District 6: Alfred Authorlee, Jim Cook
District 7: Richard Benson, Roxanne Simon

County Council Staff: Chris Carlson, Bill Vetter, Rebecca Chapman, and Audrey Persons

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Administrative Reviews:
   a. Meeting notes
4. Review of Department of Assigned Council
5. Review of Medical Examiner’s Office
6. Review of Department of Economic Development
7. Review of Written Comments
8. Public Comment
9. Adjournment
MEETING SUMMARY  
R2020-43 Public Review Committee  
October 7, 2020  2:00 p.m.  

Meeting summaries are not verbatim; however, meeting recordings are available at:  
https://www.piercecountywa.gov/7006/Law-Justice-Public-Review-Committee  

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:  
Pablo Monroy, District 1  
Tim Reynon, District 1  
Paul M. Herrera, District 2  
Erin Calata, District 2  
Ken Garcey, District 3  
Anthony McDaniel, District 3  
Preston Anderson, District 4  
Jim Walton, District 5 (Joined after the meeting convened.)  
Shalisa Hayes, District 5  
Jim Cook, District 6  
Alfred Author Lee, District 6  
Richard Benson, District 7  
Roxanne Simon, District 7  

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:  
Tisha Wosencroft, District 4  

COUNCIL STAFF PRESENT:  
Chris Carlson, Bill Vetter, Brynn Grimley, Rebecca Chapman, Audrey Persons, Amy Cruver  

FACILITATOR:  Hon. Frank Cuthbertson  

There were six guests present.  

1. Call to Order – 2:01 p.m. by Cuthbertson.  

2. Roll Call – No roll call was taken, however, Committee Members and Council staff introduced themselves.  

3. Administrative Reviews -  
   a. Meeting Notes – Carlson gave clarification on additional comments from Committee Members. It was stated that assessment worksheets should be sent to Carlson.  

4. Review of Prosecuting Attorney’s Office – Cuthbertson introduced Mary Robnett, Pierce County Prosecuting Attorney. Robnett gave an overview of the structure of the Prosecuting Attorney's office. Robnett, Joseph Evans, Attorney, Assigned Counsel, and Diane Clarkson, Supervising Senior Deputy, Prosecuting Attorney’s Office, answered questions from Committee members. Discussion ensued. Andrea Kelley, Acting Social Service Administrative Manager, Clerk of the Superior Court’s Office, provided information on pretrial services. Discussion between Committee members and County Officials ensued.
Carlson gave an overview of County departments up for discussion at future meetings.

5. **Review of Written Comments**

6. **Public Comment** – Eva Bowen

Robnett responded to questions from Bowen. Discussion among Committee Members and Robnett ensued.

7. **Adjournment** – 5:03 p.m.

[Signature]

Audrey Persons
Administrative Clerk
CRIMINAL JUSTICE REVIEW OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Public Review Committee Assessment Worksheet

Department/Court Reviewed: Assigned Council

I. Gaps in Analysis:

(a) Does the review identify challenges or barriers to serving low-income, minority and rural communities fairly and equitably?

(b) Does the review identify programs or plans to address these problems?

(c) Does the Review identify reasons for disproportionate arrests and incarceration rates for minorities and especially people living in poverty?

(d) In addition to race and national origin, does the review address economic factors impacting equal justice?

(e) Does the review provide adequate data? What, if any, additional data would be helpful?

II. Best Practices:

Are there programs, best practices or training that would assist in improving the agency’s ability to provide effective and equal justice to all citizens of Pierce County? Are there other programs currently underway in Pierce County worthy of expansion or increased support?

III. Recommendations to the County Council:

Name: __________________________________________ Date________
IV. **Gaps in Analysis:**

(f) Does the review identify challenges or barriers to serving low-income, minority and rural communities fairly and equitably?

(g) Does the review identify programs or plans to address these problems?

(h) Does the Review identify reasons for disproportionate arrests and incarceration rates for minorities and especially people living in poverty?

(i) In addition to race and national origin, does the review address economic factors impacting equal justice?

(j) Does the review provide adequate data? What, if any, additional data would be helpful?

V. **Best Practices:**

Are there programs, best practices or training that would assist in improving the agency’s ability to provide effective and equal justice to all citizens of Pierce County? Are there other programs currently underway in Pierce County worthy of expansion or increased support?

VI. **Recommendations to the County Council:**

Name:_____________________________ Date___________
VII. **Gaps in Analysis:**

(k) Does the review identify challenges or barriers to serving low-income, minority and rural communities fairly and equitably?

(l) Does the review identify programs or plans to address these problems?

(m) Does the Review identify reasons for disproportionate arrests and incarceration rates for minorities and especially people living in poverty?

(n) In addition to race and national origin, does the review address economic factors impacting equal justice?

(o) Does the review provide adequate data? What, if any, additional data would be helpful?

VIII. **Best Practices:**

Are there programs, best practices or training that would assist in improving the agency’s ability to provide effective and equal justice to all citizens of Pierce County? Are there other programs currently underway in Pierce County worthy of expansion or increased support?

IX. **Recommendations to the County Council:**

Name:______________________________ Date___________
Pierce County, Washington has been selected to join Advancing Pretrial Policy and Research: A Project of the National Partnership for Pretrial Justice (NPPJ) as a Research-Action Site. Research-Action Sites will be critical partners in NPPJ, a grant-funded community of practice that combines research, innovative policy development, and advocacy to reform and advance pretrial justice across the nation. Your partnership reflects Arnold Ventures’ commitment to an integrated strategy pairing research and implementation to ensure jurisdictions have access to the latest findings on the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) and effective use of pretrial risk assessment in the context of broader pretrial reform.

Upon acceptance of this invitation, Pierce County justice partners are committing to a sustained five-year effort of planned research and implementation activities (April 2019 – April 2024). Justice partners will work closely with our lead NPPJ partners, the Center for Effective Public Policy (CEPP) and Research Triangle Institute International (RTI). CEPP will conduct intensive training and technical assistance to implement the PSA and equip sites for sustainable practices of fidelity, validation, quality assurance and performance tracking for the long-term. CEPP will be supported by a community of experts from across the country, including Applied Research Services, the Center for Court Innovation, FrameWorks and many others that you will meet and work with first-hand. RTI will lead the research effort to document effective implementation processes, develop and validate local risk models, and investigate potential model improvements. Stanford University and New York University will provide additional analytic expertise and support. Research findings will be disseminated to promote an evidence base on developing, implementing, and using pretrial risk assessments that provide valid, empirically based risk scores; minimize bias; and support fairness in judicial decision making. RTI will use data from sites in reports to Arnold Ventures and in research presentations and publications.

It is critically important to the Arnold Ventures team that Pierce County justice partners have a complete picture of Research-Action Site partnership responsibilities before accepting this invitation. This agreement explains the roles of our lead partners, CEPP and RTI, and the benefits that your jurisdiction will receive from this partnership. It also clearly outlines our expectations of jurisdictions who decide to participate as Research-Action Sites.

Please thoroughly review this agreement and consider whether this level of partnership is the appropriate fit for Pierce County. Before signing and submitting the agreement, please consult with agencies and organizations that will be directly involved in this initiative.
I. ROLES OF LEAD NPPJ PARTNERS

A. Center for Effective Public Policy (CEPP)

The Center for Effective Public Policy (CEPP) has been selected to serve as Arnold Ventures' National Provider. CEPP will deploy a team of implementation, research, and data experts to each site. A Lead Technical Assistance (TA) Provider, Research Support Partner, and Data Support Partner will guide jurisdictions through the steps of PSA implementation while setting up sustainable fidelity and performance tracking practices. Assistance will include regular off-site contact by the Lead TA Provider as well as frequent on-site visits in years 1 and 2, and periodic visits in years 3 through 5. In addition, Data and Research Support Partners will be on-site regularly over the five-year period. Other structured training activities will be conducted at strategic points throughout the initiative. After the PSA has launched, Research and Data Support Partners will help jurisdictions collect, monitor, and report on quality assurance, inter-rater reliability, and performance measures.

Beyond implementation of the PSA itself, CEPP will work with local stakeholders to form a strong collaborative team of stakeholders that will serve as leadership to this effort; ensure a common base of knowledge regarding local pretrial policy and practice, as well as evidence-informed and best practices in pretrial justice; advance knowledge around the appropriate use of risk assessment and contextualize the use of the PSA within the broader pretrial system and local policy landscape; build a high fidelity infrastructure for implementation of the PSA; and identify, where desired by the local team, areas of pretrial improvements beyond implementation of the PSA. CEPP will work closely with sites to address local issues of transparency, ongoing validation, and racial/gender disparities.

CEPP will support the research objectives of RTI on the ground by establishing clear lines of communication among all partners and continuously translating research activities and local data priorities so that needs and expectations are as clear as possible and next steps are coordinated efficiently.

B. Research Triangle Institute International (RTI)

Research Triangle Institute International (RTI) has been selected to serve as Arnold Ventures' National Research Partner. RTI will (1) conduct ongoing validations of the PSA, (2) study implementation (and use) of the PSA, and (3) identify improvements to the PSA. During the first 6-12 months, jurisdictions will collaborate with RTI to develop a research design suitable for your site. In the first two months of assistance, RTI and CEPP will conduct data capacity assessments to understand your IT infrastructure and relevant administrative databases (e.g., court, jail, and criminal history records). RTI will request data extracts that will be used to conduct an initial validation of the original PSA using two years of your historical data. Although these initial validations may uncover some fine-tuning (e.g., factor weight or cutoff adjustments), RTI will engage in regular validations and analyses to conduct more substantive improvements over time.

RTI will conduct a series of studies to understand if and in what ways the PSA affects the Research-Action Sites. RTI will use surveys, interviews, and observations to measure defendant and system outcomes, stakeholder characteristics, and judicial decision making prior to (i.e., baseline) and after implementing the PSA (i.e., follow-up). These studies will demonstrate the extent to which judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys use the PSA to make release decisions, whether PSA use is related to the speed by which individuals are released prior to trial, and if PSA use influences the size
and composition of jail populations. The timeline and specific steps will be adjusted, as necessary, to align with the pace of your work with CEPP and will result in pretrial risk assessments that are developed specifically for each Research-Action Site.

II. BENEFITS OF PARTNERSHIP

Arnold Ventures’ support to Research-Action Sites is provided in the form of technical assistance and research offered by the highly credentialed CEPP and RTI teams. Support does not include direct financial grants to jurisdictions.

A. Implementation Participation

Jurisdictions that accept the invitation to become Research-Action Sites can expect the following benefits related to implementation activities:

- Significant technical assistance around pretrial planning, implementation, and performance tracking provided by a team of experts, including:
  - A dedicated Lead TA Provider, skilled in facilitating and leading jurisdictions through the process of criminal justice policy and practice changes;
  - A Data Support Partner, with deep experience in developing and integrating risk assessments and tracking data for performance measurement purposes;
  - A Research Support Partner, who is focused on translating research findings to day-to-day practices and will serve as a liaison between your team and the RTI team;
  - A number of subject matter experts prepared to support specific local needs;
  - A team of experts to provide education, training, and coaching around proactive and responsive racial justice strategies;
  - A team of experts to provide education, training, and coaching around proactive and responsive communication strategies;
- A host of written and online resources, including but not limited to materials designed to support implementation of the PSA;
- Technical assistance to implement the PSA with high fidelity; collect and evaluate data on a variety of matters related to pretrial justice; and evaluate the impact of pretrial reform efforts locally;
- Opportunities to meet and engage with colleagues in other Research-Action Sites across the nation; and
- An opportunity to contribute to the national body of knowledge regarding pretrial justice, including new resources that Arnold Venture’s technical assistance and research partners will develop based upon site partners’ experiences.

B. Research Participation

Jurisdictions that accept the invitation to become Research-Action Sites can expect the following benefits related to the research activities:

- Contribute to the larger body of research about pretrial practices and risk assessments;
- Receive rigorous policy-relevant research to help your jurisdiction in local decision-making and adjustments;
• Receive a profile of local characteristics including arrest and crime rates, jail populations (e.g., average daily population, proportion unconvicted), composition of jail populations (e.g., demographic distributions), rural/urban distinctions, and composition of the community (e.g., racial distributions, economic indicators), updated annually throughout the research project;

• Gain a nuanced understanding of the dynamics of pretrial decision making to understand (among other things):
  o How pretrial decisions impact communities of color,
  o How stakeholders perceive and react to risk related to pretrial release,
  o How cognitive processes influence decision making and the implications for pretrial activities,
  o How organizational readiness for change and implementation climate (e.g., expectations, support, and reward structures) may influence implementation and use of the PSA;

• Receive a locally validated and periodically updated PSA:
  o Local historic datasets will be used to develop a PSA specific to your jurisdiction,
  o The local PSA will be re-validated semi-annually to make any needed adjustments;

• Receive findings from in-depth local research to understand:
  o PSA implementation and use (e.g., concurrence between judicial release decisions and the locally-determined Release Conditions Matrix recommendations),
  o Case processing (e.g., lengthened or shortened times), and disposition (e.g., sentencing outcomes),
  o Defendant outcomes including short-term (i.e., failure to appear, new criminal activity and new violent criminal activity) and longer-term recidivism, and their relationship to the PSA,
  o Impacts such as changes in pretrial population size and composition (e.g., racial/ethnic disparity and disproportionality) and changes in public safety,
  o Costs and potential cost benefits related to the PSA;

• Receive tools to provide your jurisdiction with the needed analytic capacity to re-validate and conduct ongoing evaluations of the PSA to develop and adjust local policies. RTI will develop dashboards that:
  o Include features to estimate PSA models, calculate error rates, and test for bias,
  o Are tailored to provide jurisdiction-specific information about defendant outcomes and jail metrics,
  o Will help your site sustain PSA use and assessment well beyond the research period.

III. EXPECTATIONS FOR PARTNERSHIP

A. Implementation Participation

  a. Local Management Structure for Implementation Support. Jurisdictions will set up a management structure to implement the PSA and, as determined, other pretrial advances.
EXPECTATIONS:

1. Designate three persons as permanent local points of contact (POC): An Implementation POC, a Data and Research POC, and a Communications POC. These persons should be identified by name and contact information when this invitation is accepted.
   - The Implementation POC will work closely with the Lead TA Provider to coordinate policy team efforts, including all on- and off-site work. This individual should have strong organizational and project management skills and sufficient time to dedicate to the effort (estimated to be .25 FTE throughout the five-year period).
   - The Data and Research POC will work closely with research partners to identify necessary data elements and sources; interpret data fields; manage requests for data extracts; review reports and findings; coordinate in-person meetings and conference calls; assist in database development and analysis as needed; and, importantly, serve as the local liaison to each department/entity's IT and research contacts (estimated to be .25 FTE in years 1 and 2, and slightly less in years 3-5).
   - The Communications POC will work closely with the Lead TA Provider and CEPP Communications Director to support proactive communications strategies and receive media inquiries.

2. Establish a multidisciplinary policy team that will guide the effort. The policy team, unless exceptional circumstances exist, will include:
   i. the Chief Judge (or other judicial representative with significant authority within the jurisdiction)
   ii. a commissioner or magistrate (if applicable locally)
   iii. the Court Administrator
   iv. the elected prosecutor
   v. a pretrial services agency representative (if applicable)
   vi. the Chief Public Defender (or, where no public defense system is in place, a representative of the defense bar)
   vii. a victim services representative
   viii. a law enforcement representative (Chief of Police, Sheriff)
   ix. a communications expert (communications director; public information officer)
   x. the jail administrator.

3. Conduct policy team meetings on a monthly basis for approximately 2 hours, likely more frequently or for more extended periods in the first 12 months of the effort.

4. Establish ad hoc subcommittees, as needed, to address specific, discreet implementation issues (e.g., development of a release conditions matrix, development of a local PSA Scoring Manual).

5. Register key representatives on psapretrial.org (the initiative's website and key means of communication and information dissemination).

b. Local Systems Change Participation. Jurisdictions will set up a process to implement and sustain the PSA.
EXPECTATIONS:
1. Support the CEPP and RTI teams in developing a working knowledge of local pretrial laws, policies, practices, agencies, and key representatives.
2. Engage in a critical review of the jurisdiction's pretrial laws, policies, and practices by participating in intensive system-mapping exercises, reviewing system-wide data and performance outcomes, and learning about evidence-based and best practices in pretrial justice.
3. Implement the existing PSA or a locally validated version thereof, and explore and possibly implement other pretrial reforms (such as expanding the use of citations, developing and/or enhancing pretrial supervision and services, and implementing other measures as identified by the local policy team).
4. Implement protocols and processes to sustain the initiative's pretrial efforts long term, (such as convening a standing pretrial policy team and regularly reviewing pretrial outcome reports).

c. Stakeholder Engagement Support. Jurisdictions will commit to engaging justice and community-based stakeholders throughout the initiative.

EXPECTATIONS:
1. Commit to engaging local justice system professionals, reaching deep into agencies to ensure that the policy team's efforts penetrate upper-level management to all levels of mid-management, line staff, and support staff.
2. Commit to engaging community-based organizations, community leaders and members, including those directly impacted by the criminal justice system, in meaningful and genuine ways.

d. Communications Engagement Support. Jurisdictions will coordinate on media inquiries related to the initiative with Arnold Ventures and CEPP, including providing regular updates.

EXPECTATIONS:
1. Designate a permanent local point of contact (POC) equipped to support proactive communications strategies and to receive media inquiries. The POC should be identified by name and contact information when this invitation is accepted.
2. Coordinate communication efforts and media contacts with Arnold Ventures and CEPP.
3. With support from technical assistance communications experts, develop and implement proactive and responsive communications strategies.
4. Engage in ongoing dialogue, coordinated by CEPP, with communications POCs from other Research-Action Sites.
5. Participate in two, locally-convened in-person training events—in addition to off-site TA—designed to equip local leaders to develop and effectively implement a communication strategy designed to advance understanding among professionals and the broader community around matters related to pretrial justice.
6. Develop and implement an evidence-informed, locally-tailored, communications strategy.
7. Assist the broader, national initiative by participating in a peer-based communication network.
Arnold Ventures

c. **Resources for Training Activities.** Jurisdictions will support local trainings related to the initiative.

**EXPECTATIONS:**
1. Support local training events (such as structured trainings on the PSA and on communications and messaging, among others). Identify and, if needed, support the costs of meeting space; provide standard audiovisual equipment (projectors, screens); and provide logistics coordination for these events.

f. **Initiative Kick-off Meeting Attendance.** Research-Action Sites will attend an initiative kick-off meeting to meet their colleagues from across the country as well as the Arnold Ventures Pretrial Justice team and its technical assistance and research partners. The 3.5-day meeting will begin Tuesday July 30, 2019 and conclude Friday, August 2, 2019. The meeting location is TBD. CEPP will cover the costs of travel and attendance for up to six policy team members, including airfare, lodging, ground transportation, and meals. Additional team members may participate at their own expense.

**EXPECTATIONS:**
1. TA Providers will work with each local team to determine the ideal composition of their six-person team, however key policy team members are required to attend, including the Chief Judge or designee, commissioner/magistrate (if applicable), prosecutor and chief public defender.

B. Research Participation

a. **Local Management for Research Support.** Similar to your site setting up a structure and process to implement the PSA, you are expected to set up a structure and process to support research.

**EXPECTATIONS:**
1. Designate a person as a permanent local point of contact (POC) for the data and research activities.
2. Support RTI by providing information on local pretrial laws, policies, practices, agencies, and key representatives.
3. Execute a Data Transfer Agreement with RTI that specifies (a) what data will be provided to RTI and how, (b) how RTI will safeguard the data, and (c) how RTI is allowed to use the data.

b. **Local Validation of the PSA.** RTI will develop and validate local risk models that are empirically valid and minimize bias across gender and race. RTI will do this (1) during the preparation phase using historical data, to tailor the initial PSA to your local defendant population, and (2) semi-annually throughout the research project, to fine-tune the PSA as needed to ensure that the PSA continues to work as intended and does not exacerbate bias. As an example, this fine-tuning may be needed if your site puts new practices in place that result in defendants being released who differ from those who had been released in the past.
EXPECTATIONS:
1. Within the first two months, facilitate completion of data capacity assessments to understand local IT infrastructure, capacity and data quality.
2. Provide available documentation about data (e.g., codebooks, data dictionaries) to RTI. If documentation does not exist, collaborate with RTI to produce the necessary documentation.
3. Provide datasets to RTI that will include, at a minimum, all PSA factors, race, gender, date of birth, booking date, release date, case ID, and the three outcome variables (i.e., failure to appear [FTA], new criminal activity [NCA], and new violent criminal activity [NCVA] during the pretrial release period).
4. In preparation for implementing the PSA, you will provide a minimum of two years of historical data, which will be used to validate the PSA for your jurisdiction. Thereafter, you will provide data twice annually for purposes of ongoing validation and research.

Measuring Judicial Decisions, Defendant and System Outcomes. RTI will analyze (1) judicial decisions (e.g., release/detention, conditions of release, pretrial length of stay), (2) defendant outcomes (i.e., FTA, NCA, and NCVA) and (3) system outcomes (e.g., size and composition of jail populations), both prior to your site using the PSA and throughout the research period. Once your site is using the PSA, RTI will track the percentage of defendants whose release decisions correspond with the Release Conditions Matrix (i.e., concurrence rates) and, when judicial decisions do not correspond, RTI will track the nature of the difference (e.g., did judges impose a higher or lower supervision level).

EXPECTATIONS:
1. Provide RTI with data on case level judicial decisions, recommended release conditions, and defendant outcomes.
2. Twice per year, provide raw data files on the size and composition of jail populations (e.g., average daily population, pretrial population, racial/ethnic distribution of jails).

Preparing for and Using the PSA. A major focus of the research will be on how sites, working with the National Provider, prepare to use the PSA and how they actually use it. These research activities will assess stakeholders and system characteristics prior to and after your site begins to use the PSA. This information will demonstrate what is needed for sites to use the PSA effectively and the expected system outcomes related to using the PSA. RTI will study several aspects of system characteristics related to preparing for and using the PSA including:
- Organizational readiness for change, implementation climate, communication and collaboration networks, and perceptions of pretrial risk assessment and decision making;
- Courtroom dynamics (e.g., how prosecutors, defense attorneys, and judges interact when making decisions) and decision-making styles (e.g., intuitive vs. deliberate);
- Formation and performance of an Implementation Team and subcommittees;
- Creation and execution of an Implementation Plan;
- Integration of the PSA into existing IT systems or installing a stand-alone platform;
- Development of a pretrial Decision Framework to articulate the sequence of major pretrial decisions;
• Development of a Release Conditions Matrix to assist judicial officers in deciding release conditions;
• Identification of state-specific offenses that will be considered “violent” for purposes of scoring the PSA and measuring pretrial violent criminal activity;
• Creation of a template PSA Report to convey information to help judicial officers make pretrial decisions;
• Education of stakeholders to increase knowledge and support so the PSA may help inform pretrial decisions as intended;
• Development and implementation of a strong quality assurance process.

Some aspects of this research will likely be repeated at key points. For example, as your site begins using the PSA, RTI will study how the local PSA is implemented; if the local PSA or the Release Conditions Matrix were to change, RTI will study how those changes are put in place and what effects are observed (e.g., is there resistance to changes; are judges more likely to agree with recommendations). This research on changes in local use of the PSA will be linked with findings on judicial decisions, with the defendant and system outcomes described above, and to assess if (and how) the changes affect outcomes.

EXPECTATIONS:
1. Secure the participation of selected prosecutors, public defenders, judges, and pretrial officers in a series of brief surveys (i.e., 3-4 per year) and telephone interviews (i.e., 2-3 per year).
2. Support two research site visits per year that will include courtroom observations and interviews with key stakeholders, community members, and justice involved individuals.

Enhanced and Focused Studies on Specific Aspects of Using the PSA. In addition to broadly assessing site activities to prepare for and use the PSA, RTI will conduct enhanced and focused studies in selected sites. Arnold Ventures is especially interested in randomized controlled trials (RCTs), which often hold the greatest promise for building a rigorous evidence base. An example related to using the PSA would be to randomly assign cases such that judicial officers would receive PSA risk scores and recommendations for some cases and not for other cases (though the information would also be generated for the latter cases, to later identify similar cases) and release decisions and defendant outcomes would subsequently be compared for cases in each group.

RCTs are not always possible and RTI will work with each jurisdiction to develop study designs that are suitable for each site. The development process is anticipated to take 6-12 months and may occur at different points throughout the project. The timeline for each study will depend on factors such as the study’s complexity and length of data collection.

EXPECTATIONS:
1. Work in partnership with RTI to develop study designs appropriate for your site.
2. Obtain approvals and commitments needed to conduct agreed-upon study designs.
3. Work with RTI to rigorously implement agreed-upon study designs.

[Signature page follows on page 10.]
ACCEPTANCE OF INVITATION TO BECOME A RESEARCH-ACTION SITE AND COMMITMENT TO EXPECTATIONS OF PARTNERSHIP

PIERCE COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Andrea Kelley - Pierce County Superior Court Clerk Pretrial Services

On behalf of Pierce County and the Policy Team

Printed Name and Title of Signatory

Prior to signing this agreement, please consult with representatives from all agencies and organizations that will sit on the Policy Team and its committees. Please name the persons who reviewed this agreement and were consulted prior to signing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Rumbaugh</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Pierce County Superior Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Cuthbertson</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Pierce County Superior Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina Ahrens</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Pierce County Superior Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Gaddis</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Pierce County Superior Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lana Weinmann</td>
<td>Chief of Staff</td>
<td>Prosecuting Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kawamura</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department of Assigned Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patti Jackson-Kidder</td>
<td>Jail Chief</td>
<td>Pierce County Sheriff Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Roberts</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Crystal Judson Family Justice Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Mitchell</td>
<td>Senior Counsel to Justice Services</td>
<td>Pierce County Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Stock</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Pierce County Superior Court Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Young</td>
<td>Councilmember</td>
<td>Pierce County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Gezelius</td>
<td>IT Manager</td>
<td>IT Software Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgang Opitz</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Finance Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty Robison</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Pierce County District Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Jasprica</td>
<td>Presiding Judge</td>
<td>Pierce County District Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Perkins</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Practical Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Archer</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
