1					
2					
3					
4					
5	The Henry 11, MADQUA I DECUMAN				
6	The Honorable MARSHA J. PECHMAN				
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE				
8					
9	CASSIE CORDELL TRUEBLOOD, next friend of A.B., an incapacitated person, et al.,				
10	Plaintiffs,				
11	v. ORDER ADOPTING (IN PART) THE WASHINGTON STATE STLEMENT AGREEMENT				
12	DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES, et al.,				
13	Defendants.				
14	Derendants.				
15	Having reviewed the Joint Motion to Adopt the Mediated Settlement Agreement, Dkt. #				
16	389, and discussed the proposed agreement with all Parties at the status hearings held on March				
17	21, 2017 and April 18, 2017, the Court partially adopts the Agreement of the parties, and				
18	ORDERS that the prior orders of the Court are MODIFIED in the following manner:				
19					
20	1. <u>Outreach</u> : The Parties will jointly generate outreach documents to inform state courts of their statutory obligations to provide orders for competency services within twenty-four hours, as well as to inform the state courts of a summary of the Trueblood litigation and injunction. The Parties will jointly request the opportunity to present to Washington State judicial education programs and other outreach that the Parties jointly deem necessary to ensure third Parties are aware of their obligation to timely provide orders				
21					
22					
23					
24	for competency services.				
25	2. Deadline for in-jail evaluations: DSHS shall complete in-jail competency				
26	evaluations within the shorter of either a) 14 days from receipt of order or				

1		b) 21 days from signature of order Bo	th sets of data will continue to be	
2	b) 21 days from signature of order. Both sets of data will continue to b tracked in DSHS' monthly reports.		sets of data will continue to be	
3	3. <u>Deadline for in-patient evaluation and restoration services</u> : DSHS shall admit class members for either inpatient competency evaluation or restoration within the shorter of either a) 7 days from receipt of order or b)			
4) 7 days from receipt of order or b)	
5		14 days from signature of order. Both set in DSHS' monthly reports.	ts of data will continue to be tracked	
6	1	Receipt of Order: When sent electronic	ally orders are deemed received as	
7		of the time they are electronically transi	•	
8	5.	Trigger Point for Notice to Plaintiffs' C	ounsel: If at any point in the future	
9	the percentage of orders received within 3 days of signature drops below the table 1 benchmarks for two consecutive months, the Parties shall meet and			
10		confer within 30 days to determine if there are factors within Defendants'		
11	control that are causing delays in order transmission that can be changed and/or if there are factors beyond the Defendants' direct control that the Parties can collaborate to influence in the direction of faster transmission of			
12				
13		orders.		
14	Table 1. Percentage trigger for orders received within 3 days of			
		signature		
15		signature		
15 16		signature Jail-based evaluation orders Inpatient competency orders	<u>93</u> 85	
	6.	Jail-based evaluation orders	85	
16		Jail-based evaluation orders Jail-based evaluation orders Inpatient competency orders Data Collection: Defendants will continuparagraphs 2, 3, and 5, above, and currer Monthly Reports. Additionally, when D	85 the to track the data referenced in atly reflected in Appendix A of DSHS' SHS issues its monthly reports, it will	
16 17		Jail-based evaluation orders Inpatient competency orders Data Collection: Defendants will continuparagraphs 2, 3, and 5, above, and currer	85 the to track the data referenced in atly reflected in Appendix A of DSHS' SHS issues its monthly reports, it will	
16 17 18		Jail-based evaluation orders Jail-based evaluation orders Inpatient competency orders Data Collection: Defendants will continuparagraphs 2, 3, and 5, above, and currer Monthly Reports. Additionally, when D simultaneously provide the data from Appendix and a simultaneously provide the data from Appendix a	85 the to track the data referenced in atly reflected in Appendix A of DSHS' SHS issues its monthly reports, it will	
16 17 18 19	The Court OF	Jail-based evaluation orders Jail-based evaluation orders Inpatient competency orders Data Collection: Defendants will continuparagraphs 2, 3, and 5, above, and currer Monthly Reports. Additionally, when D simultaneously provide the data from Ap RDERS that from this point forward, cal	85 the to track the data referenced in atly reflected in Appendix A of DSHS' SHS issues its monthly reports, it will opendix A in Excel format to Plaintiffs.	
16 17 18 19 20	The Court OF Injunction, D	Jail-based evaluation orders Jail-based evaluation orders Inpatient competency orders Data Collection: Defendants will continuparagraphs 2, 3, and 5, above, and currer Monthly Reports. Additionally, when D simultaneously provide the data from Ap RDERS that from this point forward, cal kt. #131, calculation of compliance with	85 ne to track the data referenced in htly reflected in Appendix A of DSHS' SHS issues its monthly reports, it will opendix A in Excel format to Plaintiffs. culation of compliance with the Court's	
16 17 18 19 20 21	The Court OF Injunction, D Evaluations, I	Jail-based evaluation orders Jail-based evaluation orders Inpatient competency orders Data Collection: Defendants will continuparagraphs 2, 3, and 5, above, and currer Monthly Reports. Additionally, when D simultaneously provide the data from Ap RDERS that from this point forward, calkt. #131, calculation of compliance with Dkt. #303, calculation of contempt under	85 ne to track the data referenced in htly reflected in Appendix A of DSHS' SHS issues its monthly reports, it will opendix A in Excel format to Plaintiffs. culation of compliance with the Court's th the Modified Injunction as to In-jail	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	The Court OF Injunction, D Evaluations, I any other aspe	Jail-based evaluation orders Jail-based evaluation orders Inpatient competency orders Data Collection: Defendants will continuparagraphs 2, 3, and 5, above, and currer Monthly Reports. Additionally, when D simultaneously provide the data from Ap RDERS that from this point forward, calkt. #131, calculation of compliance with Dkt. #303, calculation of contempt under	85 ne to track the data referenced in htly reflected in Appendix A of DSHS' SHS issues its monthly reports, it will opendix A in Excel format to Plaintiffs. culation of compliance with the Court's the Modified Injunction as to In-jail of the Order of Contempt, Dkt. #289, and but consistent with the Agreement text set	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	The Court OF Injunction, D Evaluations, I any other aspe	Jail-based evaluation orders Inpatient competency orders Data Collection: Defendants will continuparagraphs 2, 3, and 5, above, and currer Monthly Reports. Additionally, when D simultaneously provide the data from Ap RDERS that from this point forward, cal kt. #131, calculation of compliance with Dkt. #303, calculation of contempt under ect of the Court's prior rulings that are not set of the Court's prior rulings that are not set of the Court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rule prior rule prior prior rule prior rule prior prior rule prior	85 ne to track the data referenced in htly reflected in Appendix A of DSHS' SHS issues its monthly reports, it will opendix A in Excel format to Plaintiffs. culation of compliance with the Court's the Modified Injunction as to In-jail of the Order of Contempt, Dkt. #289, and but consistent with the Agreement text set	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	The Court OF Injunction, D Evaluations, I any other aspe	Jail-based evaluation orders Inpatient competency orders Data Collection: Defendants will continuparagraphs 2, 3, and 5, above, and currer Monthly Reports. Additionally, when D simultaneously provide the data from Ap RDERS that from this point forward, cal kt. #131, calculation of compliance with Dkt. #303, calculation of contempt under ect of the Court's prior rulings that are not set of the Court's prior rulings that are not set of the Court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rulings that are not set of the court's prior rule prior rule prior prior rule prior rule prior prior rule prior	85 ne to track the data referenced in htly reflected in Appendix A of DSHS' SHS issues its monthly reports, it will opendix A in Excel format to Plaintiffs. culation of compliance with the Court's the Modified Injunction as to In-jail of the Order of Contempt, Dkt. #289, and but consistent with the Agreement text set	

Presented By: ACLU OF WASHINGTON FOUNDATION s/ La Rond Baker La Rond Baker, WSBA No. 43610 Margaret Chen, WSBA No. 46156 900 Fifth Avenue, Suite 630 Seattle, Washington 98164 (206) 624-2184 lbaker@aclu-wa.org mchen@aclu-wa.org CARNEY GILLESPIE ISITT PLLP *s/ Christopher Carney* Christopher Carney, WSBA No. 30325 Sean Gillespie, WSBA No. 35365 Kenan Isitt, WSBA No. 35317 315 Fifth Ave South, Suite 860 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 445-0212 Christopher.Carney@CGILaw.com Sean.Gillespie@CGILaw.com Kenan.Isitt@CGILaw.com DISABILITY RIGHTS WASHINGTON s/ Emily Cooper David R. Carlson, WSBA No. 35767 Emily Cooper, WSBA No. 34406 315 Fifth Avenue South, Suite 850 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 324-1521 davidc@dr-wa.org emilyc@dr-wa.org Attorneys for Plaintiffs

DATED this 26th day of __April__, 2017.

Maeshuf Helens

Marsha J. Pechman United States District Judge

ROBERT W. FERGUSON Attorney General

<u>s/ Nicholas Williamson</u>

Sarah J. Coats, WSBA No. 20333 Amber L. Leaders, WSBA No. 44421 John K. McIlhenny, WSBA No. 32195 Nicholas A. Williamson, WSBA No. 44470 Office of the Attorney General 7141 Cleanwater Drive SW P.O. Box 40124 Olympia, WA 98504-0124 (360) 586-6565 Sarahc@atg.wa.gov Amberl1@atg.wa.gov NicholasW1@atg.wa.gov

Attorneys for Defendants

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
13
14
16
17
18
19
20
21
23
24
25
 22 23 24 25 26