

1
2
3 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON
4 FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON

5 State of Oregon, Plaintiff; Cases No. 18CR79052, 18CR84154
6 v. Carlos Zamora-Skaar, Defendant. Hon. Charles D. Bailey
7

8 State of Oregon, Plaintiff; Cases No. 19CR01852, 18CR79575,
9 v. Dustin Lee Wood Defendant. 17CR75655
10 Hon. Charles D. Bailey
11

12 State of Oregon, Plaintiff; Case No. 18CR65775
13 v. Gale Merrill Defendant. Hon. Charles D. Bailey
14
15

16
17 State of Oregon, Plaintiff; Case No. 18CR65775
18 v. Jay Mendoza, Defendant. Hon. Charles D. Bailey
19
20

21
22
23 Page 1 – *Amicus Curiae Disability Rights Oregon’s Memorandum Regarding Contempt
24 Motions*

1 **AMICUS CURIAE DISABILITY RIGHTS OREGON’S MEMORANDUM REGARDING**
2 **CONTEMPT MOTIONS**

3 In 2002, Disability Rights Oregon (then “Oregon Advocacy Center”) filed a lawsuit
4 against the Oregon Department of Human Services and the head of the Oregon State Hospital.
5 The lawsuit alleged that the Oregon State Hospital wrongly delayed for “weeks and months” the
6 admission of defendants in criminal cases found unable to aid and assist in their defense. *Oregon*
7 *Advocacy Ctr. v. Mink*, No. CV 02-339-PA, 2002 WL 35578910, at *1 (D. Or. May 10, 2002)
8 [*Mink I*]. The federal district court held a trial in the matter and found that Oregon detainees
9 unable to aid and assist their counsel waited in jail an average of roughly 32 days for transport to
10 the state hospital. *Mink I*, at *3. One prisoner waited 166 days for transport. *Id.*

11 The court held that detaining people in psychiatric crisis indefinitely was “unjust and
12 inhumane” and that protracted jail detention “increases the likelihood that they may
13 decompensate and suffer unduly.” *Mink I*, at *4. The district court also held that “[t]he *lack of*
14 *funds, staff or facilities* cannot justify defendants' failure to provide persons found unfit with the
15 treatment that is necessary to attempt restoration of competency.” *Mink I*, at *6 (emphasis
16 added).

17
18 The district court then ordered the Department of Human Services (which later split its
19 behavioral health function into the Oregon Health Authority) to provide “full admission of such
20 persons into a state mental hospital or other treatment facility so designated by the” agency, “in a
21 reasonably timely manner, and completed not later than seven days” after the determination of
22

1 incapacity. *Oregon Advocacy Ctr. v. Mink*, No. CV 02-339-PA, 2002 WL 35578888, at *1 (D.
2 Or. May 15, 2002) [*Mink II*].

3 The *Mink* defendants appealed the case to the Ninth Circuit on several points, each of
4 which the Ninth Circuit rejected. *Oregon Advocacy Ctr. v. Mink*, 322 F.3d 1101, 1123 (9th Cir.
5 2003) [*Mink III*]. Of chief concern to the above-captioned proceedings, the State argued that the
6 district court erred because its failures to achieve timely care of detainees with mental illnesses
7 should have been determined individually and under a “deliberate indifference” standard. *Id.* at
8 1121.

9
10 The Ninth Circuit rejected this argument and held that a less strict “balancing of
11 interests” standard should apply and that the general untimeliness of assessments could be
12 addressed as a whole. *Id.* Since the state could not advance any legitimate interest in keeping
13 detainees with serious mental illness in jails, the substantial liberty interests of the detainees
14 weighed in favor of the verdict against the state. *Id.* The Ninth Circuit reiterated the district
15 court’s admonition that “lack of funds, staff or facilities” cannot defend the unnecessary delay of
16 services to aid and assist detainees. *Id.*

17
18 The Ninth Circuit also observed that “OSH is solely responsible for the timely treatment
19 of incapacitated criminal defendants” under Oregon law. *Id.* at 1119-20. It also recognized the
20 “undisputed harms” of protracted detention of people with serious mental illnesses: that the
21 continued lack of treatment would impair their defense, that county jail disciplinary processes,

1 often including protracted isolation 22-23 hours a day, were unhelpful and often harmful to
2 detainees, and that protracted detention tended to increase the risk of suicide and
3 decompensation. *Id.* at 1120.

4 The holdings of the district court and the Ninth Circuit are just as valid today as when
5 determined. If anything, a greater body of knowledge and expertise underlines and accentuates
6 the extreme harms done to people with serious mental illness who remain unnecessarily detained
7 in jail.¹

8 Unlike the state’s posture prior to the filing of the *Mink* complaint in 2002, , the state has
9 now been on specific notice of the need to provide treatment within seven days and has remained
10 under court order to that effect since 2002. The population of aid-and-assist patients at OSH has
11 been regularly monitored. Since 2010, that population has grown precipitously. The daily
12 population of aid-and-assist patients at OSH rose from 76 in March 2010, to 150 in December
13 2013, to 263 in March 2019, with 40 detainees on the waiting list.² While that population growth
14
15

16
17 ¹ Jeffrey Metzner & Jamie Fellner, *Solitary Confinement and Mental Illness in U.S.*
18 *Prisons: A Challenge for Medical Ethics*, 38 *J. Amer. Acad. Psych. & Law* 104 (2010)
19 (describing the isolation of people with mental illnesses as akin to “torture” in its clinical effects,
20 as well as exacerbating the risk of suicide). “[P]rolonged segregation of inmates with serious
21 mental illness violates basic tenets of mental health treatment.” *Id.*

22 ² Oregon State Hospital, Aid and Assist Presentation to the Oregon Legislature (2014), at
23 <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2013I1/Downloads/CommitteeMeetingDocument/31877> ; OSH
24 statistics, e-mail communication from OHA, March 22, 2019.

1 has complex origins, the Oregon Health Authority has the ultimate authority to manage
2 behavioral health care throughout the state.

3 The Oregon Health Authority manages the Oregon State Hospital, but also manages a
4 complex array of community-based behavioral health services, operates the state Medicaid
5 program, administers the grant of behavioral health funding to county authorities, and regulates
6 all Oregon behavioral health placements, both public and private. No other entity in the state has
7 such a substantial role in determining the course of behavioral health care in Oregon.
8

9 As part of a dispute resolution with the United States Department of Justice, the state of
10 Oregon promised in 2016 to make changes to improve services to people with mental illnesses,
11 in a document called the Oregon Performance Plan.³ The Oregon Health Authority promised in
12 that plan to meet certain benchmarks for performance in providing mental health care, many of
13 which it has not met. For instance, OHA was to serve 2,000 individuals with a specific
14 community-based service, Assertive Community Treatment, by June 30, 2018. *Id.* at 5. By that
15 date, OHA had only gotten 1,248 people into that service.⁴ OHA also promised in its plan that,
16

17
18 ³ State of Oregon, Oregon’s Performance Plan for Mental Health Services for Adults with
19 Serious and Persistent Mental Illness (2016) [Oregon Performance Plan] *available at*
[https://www.oregon.gov/oha/HSD/BHP/Oregon%20Performance%20Plan/Oregon-Performance-
Plan.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/oha/HSD/BHP/Oregon%20Performance%20Plan/Oregon-Performance-Plan.pdf)

20 ⁴ Oregon Health Authority, Oregon Performance Plan Semi-Annual Narrative Report,
21 January 2019, at 2, [Jan. 2019 OHA Report] *available at*
[https://www.oregon.gov/oha/HSD/BHP/Oregon%20Performance%20Plan/January%202019-
Narrative-Report-with-Data-Report.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/oha/HSD/BHP/Oregon%20Performance%20Plan/January%202019-Narrative-Report-with-Data-Report.pdf)

1 as of June 30, 2018, it would get 1,355 people into supportive housing, a type of independent
2 housing with on-site supports. Or. Performance Plan, at 8. By June 30, 2018, only 1,036 had
3 found supportive housing. Jan. 2019 OHA Report, at 7.

4 OHA further promised that it would get 85% of patients at the Oregon State Hospital out
5 of the hospital within 25 days of them being determined ready for placement in the community.
6 Or. Performance Plan, at 9. Not only did OHA not meet this goal, its performance on this metric
7 actually got worse, dropping from 54% in early 2017 to 48% in early 2018. Jan. 2019 OHA
8 Report, at 9. It promised to get 90% of patients out of the hospital in 120 days from admission
9 by mid-2017. Or. Performance Plan, at 10. Even by mid-2018, OHA still only managed to
10 release 54% of its patients within 120 days. Jan. 2019 OHA Report, at 10.

12 Without fully recapitulating the state's performance on the goals it set for itself (some of
13 which it has met), the state's overall performance has been poor, especially on those relating to
14 moving patients quickly through the hospital and into community placements. This backlog of
15 patients creates a glut in the hospital, including many patients who, by OHA's own reckoning, do
16 not need to be in the hospital.

17 The origins of this problem are complex, but many of the solutions are within OHA's
18 capacity to address. Avoiding psychiatric crises that result in hospitalization or criminal charges
19 requires adequate community-based resources, but OHA controls the community-based funding
20 for those services. Fostering an adequate supply of community-based post-hospital care services
21

1 because the court system is crowded, or that it will only seek search warrants before searching
2 some homes because the police are too busy.

3 This Court is not charged with enforcing the Mink order or determining the extent of
4 OHA's compliance with its own announced goals described the Oregon Performance Plan. This
5 background, however, may be helpful to the Court in understanding the backdrop of the hospital
6 crowding and in assessing whether any disobedience to this Court's orders was conducted
7 willfully, since by tradition the contempt power should be used to protect a "recognized
8 statutory, procedural, or constitutional right." *United States v. Woodley*, 9 F.3d 774, 782 (9th Cir.
9 1993). This Court can likewise consider whether OHA's noncompliance with its order
10 constitutes "undue interference" with the judiciary's "core function." *Oregonians for Sound*
11 *Econ. Policy, Inc. v. State Accident Ins. Fund Corp.*, 218 Or. App. 31, 49, as modified, 219 Or.
12 App. 310 (2008).

13 Submitted this 30th day of April, 2019,

14
15
16 

17
18 _____
19 Thomas Stenson, OSB 152894
20 Deputy Legal Director, Disability Rights Oregon
21 511 SW 10th Avenue, Suite 200
22 Portland, OR 97205
tstenson@droregon.org
23 503-243-2081 (phone)
24 503-243-1738 (FAX)

25 Page 8 – ***Amicus Curiae Disability Rights Oregon's Memorandum Regarding Contempt***
26 ***Motions***

Disability Rights Oregon
511 S.W. 10th Avenue, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 243-2081