Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

Minutes

April 10, 2015
Lakewood Civic Center – Employee Relations Training Rm
480 S. Allison Parkway
Lakewood, CO 80226

Commission Members Attendance

Stan Hilkey, Chair	Evelyn Leslie	Lang Sias
Doug Wilson, Vice-Chair	Beth McCann	Pat Steadman
Jennifer Bradford - **ABSENT**	Jeff McDonald	Alaurice Tafoya-Modi
Sallie Clark	Norm Mueller	Pete Weir
Cynthia Coffman - **ABSENT**	Kevin Paletta	Robert Werthwein
John Cooke	Joe Pelle	Meg Williams- **ABSENT**
Kelly Friesen – **On Phone**	Eric Philp	Dave Young - **ABSENT**
Charles Garcia	Rick Raemisch - **ABSENT**	State Judicial Rep. - **ABSENT**
Kate Horn-Murphy	Brandon Shaffer	Jeanne Smith, *Ex Officio*- **ABSENT**

Substitutes: David Blake for Cynthia Coffman, Attorney General's office; Kellie Wasko for Rick Raemisch, Department of Corrections

CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING REMARKS
Stan Hilkey, Chair

Mr. Hilkey (Chair and CDPS Executive Director) welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending. He announced that two legislators have recently been appointed to the Commission including Representative Lang Sias and Senator John Cooke. Mr. Hilkey added that Senator Cooke would be unable to attend the meeting but that Representative Sias is expected to arrive soon. Mr. Hilkey also took a moment to share that the Deputy Executive Director of the Department of Public Safety (CDPS), Kathy Sasak, recently announced her retirement and would be leaving CDPS effective May 1, 2015. He shared that Ms. Sasak has worked in the public safety community for many years and that she will be missed. Mr. Hilkey also informed commissioners that a retirement luncheon has been scheduled for Ms. Sasak on April 23, 2015.

Mr. Hilkey requested any corrections to the Minutes and none were offered. A motion to approve was made and seconded and, with all in favor, the motion passed and the Minutes were approved.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE
Jana Locke, CDPS

Legislative Update. Ms. Locke began the legislative update by directing members' attention to a handout summarizing the status of the Commission produced bills. She noted that there had been a couple of very recent updates that are not included in the handout. The handout is summarized as follows:

- HB 2015-1022: Juvenile Petty Offense Contracts. This bill was derived from the work of the Juvenile Justice Task Force (Recommendation FY15-JJ#01) and was signed by the Governor in March. Ms. Locke thanked and congratulated Representative McCann and Senator Steadman for their work on the bill.
- HB 2015-1072: Interactive Electronic Harassment. This bill was derived from the work of the Cyberbullying Subcommittee (the related report from the Subcommittee may be found at, cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ccjj/Resources/Report/2014-12_CCJJCyberbullyingRpt.pdf). Ms. Locke noted that this bill started out straight-forward but ended up getting amended in the Senate to state that the bill would result in infringements on a person's first amendment rights. That action pushed the bill to a conference committee with a resulting minor modification that reads that the bill does not prevent the constitutionally protected expression of any religious, political or philosophical views. The Senate voted to adopt the conference committee report and verbiage. Representative McCann added that the House also voted to adopt the language this morning. The bill is now headed to the Governor for signature.
- Early Discharge from Lifetime Supervision for Sex Offenders due to Disability or Incapacitation. There are no sponsors for this bill at this time. This recommendation was derived from the work of the Comprehensive Sentencing Task Force (Recommendation FY15-CS#01). Ms. Locke added that the bill has not been introduced but that Maureen Cain is working to coordinate bipartisan sponsors. Given the remaining time in the session, it appears unlikely it will be introduced this year.
- HB 2015-1203: Retroactively Provide Earned Time Credit to Certain Individuals Sentenced Under the Habitual Criminal Statute. This bill is derived from the work of the Comprehensive Sentencing Task Force (Recommendation FY14-CS#03). This bill is based on a 2014 recommendation to fill a gap in the earned time statute. This bill passed the House 64 to 1 and has been introduced in the Senate and assigned to the Judiciary Committee, however it has yet to be scheduled on the calendar so it is unclear when it will be heard. This bill is being sponsored by Representative Rosenthal and Senator Steadman.
- SB 2015-007: Community Corrections Boards Standards. This bill, derived from the Community Corrections Task Force (Recommendations FY15-CC#01, 03, 04, 06, & 08). It passed the Senate Judiciary but failed in the Senate Appropriations Committee this morning. The bill had an approximate $950,000 general fund fiscal note and the sponsor (Senator Guzman) did not feel confident she could find the funding for the totality of the bill. Discussions between members of the Community Corrections Task Force and The Legislative Subcommittee resulted in a consensus that pieces of the bill by themselves would not be useful and therefore it would be preferable either to have the bill funded in total or not at all. Given the budget concerns the bill was Postponed Indefinitely this morning.

TASK FORCE AND SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

Re-entry Task Force. Mr. Hilkey informed commissioners that the Re-entry Task Force held its first meeting on Wednesday, April 8th. He added that while the group was short on Commission members due to a handful of unavoidable absences, there was still great attendance from the remaining task force members. During this initial meeting the task force reviewed the preliminary work of the Re-entry Planning Committee which determined the top three priority

areas for the Re-entry work. Mr. Hilkey added that, as a reminder for commissioners, those three priority areas include technical violations, issues surrounding collateral consequences and issues regarding access to medical and mental health care. Mr. Hilkey stated that the bulk of the Re-entry Task Force meeting was spent on in-depth presentations from Probation, Community Corrections and Parole regarding technical violations. He added that the presentations generated a lot of discussion and that it was fascinating to see the many areas where stakeholders are doing a lot of great work, along with the places identified for improvement.

Mr. Hilkey said that during the upcoming May meeting the task force will recap the presentations from the April meeting and decide on next steps to move forward.

Data Sharing Task Force Update. Eric Philp presented the outcomes of the initial Data Sharing Task Force meeting on behalf of task force chair, Jeanne Smith. Mr. Philp shared that the first meeting of the task force was held yesterday (Thursday, April 9th) and that there was nearly full group attendance. Mr. Philp clarified that the members of the Data Sharing Task Force have decided to call themselves a 'Strategic Planning Group' rather than a 'Task Force' at this early stage of work. He shared that at this time the group has a plan to move forward by setting up a handful of focus groups to gather information from various stakeholders regarding what the different needs are for the exchange of data and information in the criminal justice system.

Mr. Philp reported that representative from Adams County made two presentations during the meeting, one from Debbie Allen and one from Sharon Dunlap. He noted that Adams County is currently working on a new initiative so that within the County all the criminal justice and social services agencies could share information. He said that Adams County is basing much of their work off of an extensive data sharing system being used in North Carolina. Mr. Philp reported that Meg Williams, the chair of the Juvenile Parole Board also presented information at the meeting regarding what is being done in the juvenile justice arena when it comes to data sharing. There has been a long-standing need by the juvenile justice system to enhance information sharing and they have apparently made some progress in that regard. That progress will be useful to this committee as it moves forward.

The next steps for this committee include contacting stakeholders to set up focus groups over the next couple of months. With that in mind the strategic planning committee plans to start small and grow the project. The focus groups will be held with stakeholders from probation, pretrial, community corrections and with the county planners group. After running focus groups and gathering information, the Data Sharing Strategic Planning Committee will use what they learn to determine next steps.

Mandatory Parole Subcommittee. Mr. Wilson reported the first meeting for this task force has been set for Monday May 11, 2015 in the Supreme Court Building. Subcommittee members include Commissioners Brandon Shaffer, Charlie Garcia, Norm Mueller, Robert Werthwein and Kate Horn-Murphy. Non-commission members include James Quinn from the Attorney General's office, Michael Dougherty from the Jefferson County District Attorney's office, Christie Donner from the Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition and Kellie Wasko from the Department of Corrections (with Alison Morgan as back-up). Two legislative representatives have also been invited to attend, Representative Kagan and Senator Roberts.

Mr. Wilson added that start-up materials will be sent to subcommittee members by the first part of May including the history of the law changes over the last several years along with other information. At this point the Subcommittee is aiming for five months of targeted work with recommendations produced by October.

Community Corrections / Recommendations Update
Pete Weir, Task Force Chair

FY15-CC#2 / Reliable and consistent Information from DOC. CCJJ Consultant Paul Herman provided the update on this recommendation in Pete Weir's absence. Mr. Herman reminded the group that this issue goes back to the November, 2014 Commission meeting when the Community Corrections Task Force presented a number of recommendations for approval. Mr. Herman added that this recommendation (FY15-CC#2) was tabled at that time and that the task force members have been working over the past few months to revamp certain details. FY15-CC#2 was originally voted down by the Commission primarily in response to the objections by Rick Raemisch. In the spirit of collaboration the Task Force met with Mr. Raemisch and Kellie Wasko to explore options and see if there was some common ground. However, by the time those conversations began Ms. Wasko and her administrative team had already revised the administrative regulation that included all of the elements of the recommendation. Therefore, all of the elements contained in the recommendation are now included in the revised Administrative Regulation #150-03 at the Department of Corrections.

FY15-CC#10 / Risk Informed Referral Process. Mr. Herman reminded the group that this recommendation was tabled by Brandon Shaffer to be sent back to the task force for some collaborative conversations. The essence of the recommendation is to allow an inmate at the Department of Corrections to be automatically referred to Community Corrections 19 months prior to their presumptive release date. Mr. Herman clarified that currently, by statute, an inmate cannot be placed in community corrections until 16 months in advance of his/her parole eligibility date, but this proposal would allow for the referral to occur at 19 months. The Task Force members thought the current process was arbitrary in terms of time and risk, and therefore recommended a tiered date of referral based on the recidivism risk posed by the offender and to a certain extent the offense that the offender was convicted of. One of the original concerns of Director Raemisch was that the recommendation called for statutory changes. Mr. Herman clarified that while a majority of the elements in this recommendation dealt only with policy issues, there were indeed a few elements that are statutory. The Task Force has agreed (again) to insert the language that allows for inmates to be referred based on both the offense and the risk level that they pose. Mr. Herman added that Task Force Chair Pete Weir has, from the beginning, argued against this recommendation primarily as he is opposed to the idea of immediate referrals for low risk offenders. However, the Task Force members came to agreement yesterday on that particular language and all the other parts of the recommendation are going to be rolled into a policy recommendation to avoid the statutory issues. There are still a few remaining items to work out but the Task Force is close to wrapping up the revisions on this recommendation.

In conclusions, Mr. Herman stated that both of these issues should come to a conclusion at the Task Force level by the next (May) meeting and will hopefully be formally presented back to the Commission at its next meeting.

Representative McCann shared that when the Appropriations Committee was looking at some bills she noticed that the funding for Community Corrections was being reduced. She added that the JBC analyst said that was due to the fact that referrals to Community Corrections are down and that the beds are being occupied by direct sentence referrals rather than referrals from DOC. She said she was surprised because she thought the goal was to try to encourage more referrals from DOC to Community Corrections. Mr. Herman answered that while he cannot speak for the Office of Community Corrections, he does know that the trend has been toward more transition beds as opposed to direct sentence beds. He believes that the statement regarding more direct sentence beds is not accurate to his knowledge. He said it is true that there are vacant beds at times.

Mr. Philp added that one of the things Glenn Tapia from the Office of Community Corrections says about vacant beds is that the growth in Community Corrections is not about the establishment of general 'beds' but rather the real demand for services is for *specialized* beds for intensive residential treatment, sex offenders, and mental health beds. Therefore there is growing demand in one area resulting in available space in other areas. Meeting the demand for growth in specialized beds would require moving money from one bucket to another.

--Mr. Weir arrived at this point in the meeting—

Mr. Weir added that, anecdotally, from his experience on the Jefferson County Community Corrections Board, they have seen a significant increase in transition referrals in the last six or seven months. He said he does not believe Jefferson County has seen the same increase in direct sentence referrals. Mr. Weir added that he agrees with the policy underlying this recommendation and the notion of risk-related referrals. He added his only concern is with respect to low risk offenders and his belief that there should not be a threshold or trigger point for automatic referral. He believes that results in harm to the structure of truth in sentencing. Conceptually he believes great work has been accomplished on this.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS/CTAP PRESENTATION
Kellie Wasko and Carmen Estrada, Department of Corrections

Stan Hilkey introduced Kellie Wasko from the Department of Corrections who in turn introduced Carmen Estrada, the Administrative Officer for the Office of Offender Services at the Department of Corrections. Ms. Wasko explained that Ms. Estrada would provide an overview on DOC's new Colorado Transitional Accountability Plan (CTAP). She went on to explain that through a strategic planning process in 2011 with then DOC Executive Director Tom Clements, DOC identified the need for a meaningful process for addressing offender's needs from the moment they enter DOC through their incarceration and release. DOC then began a collaborative effort with a variety of stakeholders and the University of Cincinnati. Ms. Wasko added that that process resulted in a final product called CTAP. She explained that CTAP provides the ability to assess the offender when they are admitted, program them through their incarceration and then prepare them to transfer to specialized services in their release communities. She explained that Ms. Estrada would discuss the CTAP process including status of the program implementation as it stands now and next steps moving forward including validation and assessment of risk.

Ms. Estrada introduced herself to Commissioners and explained that she would expand on the information provided by Ms. Wasko and would start by explaining the process and outcomes of the partnership with the University of Cincinnati.

Process and Outcomes of the Partnership with the University of Cincinnati
- The partnership resulted in the development of the Colorado Transitional Accountability Plan or CTAP, which has several evidence-based components.
- DOC discovered through an evaluation of their programming efforts there was a need for more effective case management and use of nationally recognized evidence based practices.
- CTAP provides:
    - A seamless and comprehensive case plan,
    - An automated system that improves information sharing and guides offender progress from incarceration through discharge, and
    - An integrated case management program which optimizes resources, focusses on criminogenic needs, uses validated assessments and utilizes ongoing collaborative efforts with the offender and other departments to assist offenders with a smooth transition into communities.

Ms. Estrada explained that in order to bring all of the aforementioned components into fruition DOC developed an implementation team.

Implementation Process
- There were four components to the implementation team:
    - An Automation Committee
    - A Communications Committee
    - A Policy Committee, and
    - A Training Committee

- The Automation Committee worked on the basic model of an automated system that would include administration of the validated assessments along with case planning. As part of the system set-up it was decided that everyone who would need access to this would have access and could follow the progress of the offender.
- The Communication Committee visited facilities to bring all employees up-to-speed and to discuss the importance of CTAP and evidence-based practices. This group tried to emphasize DOC's goal of working to reduce recidivism. Also, the CTAP implementation coordinator spoke with several stakeholders about what CTAP would bring to the Department.
- The Policy Committee focused on the procedures involved in managing offender behavior in the context of facility operations. It was critical that CTAP was aligned with current DOC policy. This committee looked at current regulations to ensure that relevant policies supported CTAP.
- The Training Committee worked with the University of Cincinnati to develop 12 T-for-T instructors (training for trainers). These 12 trainers then trained 300 staff in the first 6 months including case managers, pre-release specialists, community reentry specialists, and any staff member who wanted to participate. They also trained staff on how to administer assessments and how to effectively case plan. University of Cincinnati trainers trained over 150 case managers.

Ms. Estrada shared that the second phase of implementation focused on supporting the CTAP endeavor to ensure integrity of the assessment instruments.

Implementation Process Phase II / Three CTAP Subcommittees
Three subcommittees were developed to assist in this phase of implementation including:
- **The Staff Development Subcommittee.** The DOC is currently concentrating on staff development. This Subcommittee is focused on coaching, training, mentoring and bringing staff to fidelity in terms of case planning. Goals include ensuring staff have the tools and resources necessary to effectively case plan and case manage. This committee is also considering work around future issues and future refresher training.
- **The Automation Enhancements Subcommittee.** This subcommittee is working on continued software upgrades and enhancements to support effective case management, expand on reporting measures, and to make the system more user friendly by integrating the program referral process into the automated case management system.
- **The Policy Subcommittee.** This subcommittee will be working on an ongoing basis to ensure that DOC policy is in line with all aspects of the CTAP.

Ms. Estrada continued her presentation with a more in-depth look at the CTAP Assessments.

CTAP Assessments
The CTAP assessments were developed in conjunction with the University of Cincinnati.
- The University of Cincinnati has five assessment instruments but DOC is only using three of these:
    - The Prison Intake Tool is an assessment that has five domains.

- o The Re-entry Tool is administered to offenders that have been incarcerated more than four years.
- o The Supplemental Re-entry Tool is administered to prisoners that have been incarcerated less than four years.

Ms. Estrada emphasized that it is extremely important to DOC to utilize principles of effective classification that are evidence-based, including the Risk-Need-Responsivity model. She added that DOC is continually working with a multi-disciplinary approach, which means that anytime there is an offender behavior that needs to be addressed, multiple staff work together to formulate reviewing options for that offender, be it behavior management, case planning or transition to the community.

Ms. Estrada outlined the criminogenic needs and dynamic risk factors that research shows have more of an impact regarding an offender's potential to change:
- Antisocial attitudes
- Antisocial peers
- Antisocial personality
- Family/Social connections
- Education/employment
- Prosocial activities
- Substance abuse

The Department is implementing a phased approach including an Institutional Phase, a Pre-Release Phase and a Community Phase. DOC is currently in the Institutional Phase which includes informing staff, training staff, conducting assessments and case-plans, and coaching and developing support networks for case managers. DOC is working with the Division of Criminal Justice's (DCJ) Implementation Specialists from the EPIC Unit. EPIC staff are training staff and management at DOC to ensure streamlined communication.

During the Pre-Release phase DOC will begin working with offenders who are three to six months from their release date. During this phase DOC will refer offenders to Pre-Release programming as well as working to establish continuity of care for those offenders who may need medical or behavioral health services upon release. This is also the phase where DOC plans to begin sharing case plans and risk scores with community corrections boards and parole board members so they have more information when determining release decisions. DOC is not at this phase just yet as they want to ensure that they have fidelity before sending case plans and assessments to outside stakeholders. Ms. Estrada added that the information that will be shared once this phase is fully implemented will be "monumental." It will include the most thorough, comprehensive information that has ever been released by DOC to outside stakeholders (parole, TASC, and Community Corrections boards and programs) including risk assessment and treatment outcomes.

During the Community Phase the case plan will move from the case manager in the institution to the parole officer. This phase is also still pending but coming soon.

In response to a question from Chair Hilkey, Ms. Estrada clarified that the Risk Assessment Instrument measures three domains including criminal history, employment and criminal attitudes and beliefs. She added that the Prison Intake Tool has five domains, the Re-entry Tool has three domains and the Supplemental Re-entry tool has four domains.

Mr. Weir asked if the assessment tools take into account the facts of the case. Ms. Estrada replied yes, there is information regarding the crime of conviction and facts of the case, along with criminal history. She clarified that other criminal history factors are both self-reported and gathered from an extensive review of the offender's history through the PSIR (pre-sentence investigation report) and other information.

Alaurice Tafoya-Modi asked if these materials are also made available to the offender so they can verify that the information is correct. Ms. Estrada replied that yes, this is a collaborative effort that includes the offender.

Mr. Weir asked how important it is that DOC receives the PSIR from Probation. Ms. Estrada replied that this information is very important. Mr. Weir added that at times there are stipulated sentences that eliminate the PSIR. Mr. Philp clarified that DRDC receives the PSIR in 98% of the cases that go to DOC. Currently, instead of the courts taking responsibility for the transfer of the PSIR to DOC; Probation now ensures delivery of the report. Mr. Philp added that DOC is receiving this report on 94-97% of cases. Mr. Philp went on to add that staff at DRDC also has authorization to go into a restricted public access website to view the mittimus and determine whether the case carried a stipulated sentence.

Norm Mueller asked what happens with mistakes or inaccuracies in materials. He asked if there is a formal system allowing an offender to try to correct those mistakes. Ms. Estrada replied that if there is a concern regarding a possible error DOC will look into it. Mr. Mueller asked again, if there is an official time when an offender has a chance to look at their file for inaccuracies. He added that he has had several clients who have had months-long battles trying to correct inaccurate information. Ms. Estrada explained that inmate self-report is not sufficient to change the information in records, and that only official documentation is used to correct inaccuracies.

Representative McCann asked how many offenders one case manager supervises. Ms. Estrada replied that with the implementation of CTAP, DOC was funded to hire 24 more case managers, and case managers carry a caseload of 80 inmates. Previously case managers at certain facilities carried a caseload of 150 to 175 inmates.

Mr. Philp commented that there is a statute requiring DOC, Parole, Community Corrections and the Office of Behavioral Health to collaborate, develop and use a common assessment tool, which up until now has been the LSI and the ASUS. He asked if DOC is planning to phase out the LSI with their new assessment tool. Ms. Estrada replied that DOC continues to use the LSI that is provided by Probation; however the LSI is no longer administered *during* an offender's incarceration (as the score would not change during that time). Parole then uses the assessment score produced from the CARAS (Colorado Actuarial Risk Assessment Scale) instrument (which includes the LSI score).

Brandon Shaffer asked how the ORAS (Ohio Risk Assessment System) fits into the new CTAP system. Ms. Estrada replied that DOC uses (solely) the risk scores identified while the offender is incarcerated. Ms. Wasko added that the ORAS will be used for incarcerated inmates, but that the parole board will still use the LSI. The ORAS is the key tool that DOC uses for the 'inside management' of an offender for things like programming, identifying criminogenic risk factors, making regression decisions etc. The LSI total score is then used as one of the risk factors of the CARAS. The ORAS is part of the CTAP and the LSI is part of the CARAS.
Ms. Estrada returned to her PowerPoint presentation and outlined DOC's completed and on-going efforts regarding CTAP.

Completed and ongoing efforts
DOC is offering training to CTAP users on a monthly basis. DOC also continues to offer the case plan training monthly. DOC also continues to work with the EPIC team at DCJ for coaching and mentoring in order to support staff and maintain the integrity of effective case planning. DOC continues to test all components built into the new automated system to ensure all elements are accurately performing as intended. DOC continues to present information about the new system to stakeholders along with answering and clarifying any questions. There is also continued ongoing policy development.

What does this mean?
Ms. Estrada summarized that what all of this work means in the end is increased communication both internally and with external stakeholders such as Community Corrections Boards, the Parole Board and the Division of Parole. The increased information and communication is equally important for the work of pre-release specialists and community reentry specialists. The goal is to work toward preventing duplication of efforts while aiding all stakeholders in speaking the same language. A main goal is improved offender outcomes with a resulting positive impact on recidivism and public safety.

Where DOC is now
With the help of EPIC's Implementation Specialists, DOC is in the process of coaching and mentoring case managers to reach implementation fidelity. DOC is also continuing with CTAP electronic/automation enhancements.

DOC has provided a CTAP introduction for parole staff but the goal is to go a bit further and present a more in-depth overview of CTAP to show parole officers how to maneuver through the automated system so they are locating the case plans more efficiently and effectively.

Ms. Estrada adds that underlying all of this work is the continued efforts to ensure that policy recommendations are in-line to support successful implementation.

Questions
Kevin Paletta asked if recidivism is the key measure of success. Ms. Estrada replied that one of the main goals in the plan is to see if the assessments do identify risk to recidivate, and therefore have an impact on recidivism.

Ms. Wasko added that recidivism will be one of the greatest outcomes that will determine the impact of the process. Another goal is to see if during an offender's incarceration DOC is able to address behaviors more quickly on the front end resulting in less acting out, less negative behaviors and less violent behavior, along with increased program completion rates, completion of GED's and engagement in educational/employment opportunities. Under the old system if an offender came in with a ten year sentence, programming did not start until four years before release. CTAP and behavior modification begins the moment an offender starts his or her sentence, regardless of how long they have to serve.

External driving factors will be the recidivism rate, but as far as internally DOC is hoping to see a change in behavior measures on the inside.

Mr. Hilkey added that having gone through a similar process at a local level, sometimes the easiest thing to do is to come up with the idea in the beginning, but that the more problematic areas start to surface when trying to navigate the pitfalls of implementation. Ms. Estrada said she agreed and that DOC is working to be extremely proactive about possible pitfalls and challenges during the implementation process.

Adjournment

Mr. Hilkey announced that the meeting is a full hour ahead of schedule and will be concluding early. Mr. Hilkey also acknowledged the arrival of Representative Lang Sias to the meeting and added that Representative Sias is the newest member to the Commission. Mr. Hilkey and the commissioners introduced themselves to Representative Sias. In turn, Representative Sias shared information about his background including the fact that he is the new to the state legislature in the past two months and represents House District 27 which is Arvada. He added that he spent much of his career in the military and that he holds a law degree. Along with his work in the state legislature he currently is also a pilot for Federal Express. He shared that while he is very interested in criminal justice issues, he does not have extensive background or experience in the criminal justice world.

Mr. Hilkey called for anything else for the good of the order. Commissioner Kate Horn-Murphy shared that April marks Sexual Assault Awareness and Child Abuse Awareness month and that April also includes National Victim's Rights Week. Robert Werthwein added that the Division of Youth Corrections transparency bill has been introduced. The bill allows for redacting of critical incidents at DYC operated institutions.

Mr. Hilkey informed commissioners that the May meeting will be cancelled and that the Commission will reconvene on Friday, June 12th.

There being no further business, Mr. Hilkey adjourned the meeting at 2:00 p.m.