



Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

Minutes

June 9, 2017

Employee Relations Training Room
 Lakewood Civic Center
 480 South Allison Parkway, Lakewood, CO 80226

Commission Member Attendance

Stan Hilkey, Chair	Daniel Kagan	Lang Sias
Doug Wilson, Vice-Chair - ABSENT	Bill Kilpatrick	Scott Turner
Jennifer Bradford	Evelyn Leslie	Michael Vallejos
John Cooke	Joe Morales	Dave Weaver
Valarie Finks - ABSENT	Norm Mueller	Peter Weir
Kelly Friesen	Joe Pelle	Robert Werthwein- ABSENT
Charles Garcia	Rick Raemisch - ABSENT	Meg Williams
Mike Garcia	Rose Rodriguez	Dave Young - ABSENT
Jessica Jones - ABSENT	Joe Salazar - ABSENT	Joe Thome, <i>Ex Officio</i>

Substitutions: Melissa Roberts for Rick Raemisch

CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING REMARKS

Stan Hilkey, Chairman and Executive Director of the Department of Public Safety

Stan Hilkey, Chairman of the Commission and Executive Director of the Department of Public Safety, called the meeting to order at 1:08 pm. He thanked Commissioners for attending, explained that there were a handful of absentees, and asked those in attendance to introduce themselves. Mr. Hilkey reviewed the agenda and asked for any additions, deletions or comments to the May minutes. A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded, and Commissioners unanimously approved the minutes.

IMPACT OF SENATE BILL 13-250 / CONCERNING CHANGES TO SENTENCING OF PERSONS CONVICTED OF DRUG CRIMES

Kim English and Peg Flick, Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics

Kim English, Research Director for the Division of Criminal Justice introduced herself and Senior Analyst Peg Flick. Ms. English explained that the goal for the presentation is to inform Commissioners on the impact of Senate Bill 13-250 (Concerning changes to sentencing of persons convicted of drug crimes) which created a new drug sentencing grid and which was the result of years of Commission work.

Ms. English and Ms. Flick began a PowerPoint presentation, the full content of which can be found on the Commission website at colorado.gov/ccjj.

DISCUSSION

During the presentation Ms. Flick explained a new sentencing option under Senate Bill 13-250, called a “Wobbler,” which provides the opportunity for someone to avoid a felony conviction by meeting certain criteria. She noted that in her report on the analysis of Senate Bill 13-250, there were 160 cases resulting in a successfully completed sentence, meaning the felony conviction was replaced with a misdemeanor

conviction. Mr. Hilkey asked if the 160 cases that were completed resulted in people's supervision being suspended. Ms. Flick replied yes, those people completed their sentence successfully and since they were a "Wobbler" their felony was dismissed and replaced with a misdemeanor conviction.

Ms. Flick explained that another revision resulting from Senate Bill 13-250 is the exhaustion of remedies for Drug Felony 4 (DF4) convictions. That is, the court is instructed by statute to exhaust all remedies before sentencing an offender to the Department of Corrections (DOC) for a DF4. She added that those sentences have declined from 18% to 14% in the post Senate Bill 13-250 period. She added that sentences to DOC for higher level felonies (Drug Felony 1 through Drug Felony 3) also declined from 42% to 38%. Norm Mueller asked if the drug felony level references are from the original charge or the final plea. Ms. Flick replied that those references are for the conviction charge. She clarified that DF4's are primarily possession cases.

Pete Weir pointed out that Senate Bill 13-250 eliminated some mandatory sentencing provisions for DF2's, DF3's and DF4's and that this could account for some of the decrease in the commitment numbers to DOC.

Charles Garcia noted that before this bill many felonies were pleaded down to misdemeanors. He asked if there are any statistics that show exactly how many felonies pleaded down to misdemeanors before and after. Ms. Flick replied that there was a significant increase in felony level cases convicted at the misdemeanor level after SB 13-250.

Ms. Flick concluded by reminding Commissioners that the full report, "Analysis of Senate Bill 13-250," can be found on the Commission website at https://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ors/docs/reports/2017_SB250-Rpt.pdf

REENTRY TASK FORCE

FINAL RECOMMENDATION PRESENTATION AND VOTE (FY17-RE #01, #02, & #03)

Mark Evans, Office of the State Public Defender

Mr. Hilkey introduced Mark Evans from the Office of the State Public Defender. Mr. Evans explained that he will present three recommendations from the Re-entry Task Force and its Collateral Consequences Working Group. He added that he will begin the presentation with a brief review of the work by both the Working Group and the Task Force and how they arrived at the recommendations. As background, he reminded Commissioners that the study of collateral consequences was one of the original duties given to the Re-entry Task Force from the Commission.

Mr. Evans began a PowerPoint presentation, the full content of which can be found on the Commission website at colorado.gov/ccjj. At the conclusion of his presentation Mr. Evans directed Commissioners to the final recommendations in their packets as follows:

Recommendation FY17-RE #01

Allow Orders of Collateral Relief after the time of sentencing.

Update statutory orders of collateral relief to:

- Allow eligible individuals to request a court order of collateral relief after the time of sentencing;
- Eliminate duplicative statutory language regarding orders of collateral relief; and
- Create an order of collateral relief in the Children's Code.
- Encourage the judiciary to develop a mechanism that will allow the identification of instances when orders of collateral relief are requested, granted, or denied.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Evans explained that this mechanism offers an effective way to allow for punishment while at the same time allowing individuals with past convictions to remain productive members of society. He added, however, the current statute has some issues that severely limit the effectiveness of collateral relief, most significantly the fact that these orders are only available at the time of sentencing. The result is that the orders of collateral relief have no impact whatsoever on someone who, long after their conviction, is trying to make themselves into a more productive citizen. The biggest impact of this proposal is to expand the timeframe in which an order of collateral relief is available.

Mr. Mueller asked how this change would logistically be implemented. Mr. Evans replied that most court actions carry a four-letter designator that gets entered into the court data system, and that a four-letter designator has been developed for instances when an order of collateral relief is granted. Currently there appears to be an issue with the designator not being used for either applications for orders of collateral relief, or denials of these orders.

Mr. Weir commented that he appreciates the efforts of both the Working Group and the Task Force and he believes that in general the recommendation is fairly benign. However, Mr. Weir is concerned that licensing boards set criteria, policies and practices for good reason and that this proposal would allow a judge to trump a decision by a regulatory board. He asked if the Working Group considered the erosion of the authority of these regulatory boards by granting this power to judges. Mr. Evans replied that the Working Group did not consider this element in detail because the statute currently already grants a judge that same authority. Mr. Evans added that the way the law currently reads requires notification to whatever governmental body has purview over the collateral consequence in question. Therefore, the agency is notified and has the opportunity to be present at a hearing, which is what currently takes place. The professional board is not being removed from the decision making process; instead, the time frame is being modified. Mr. Evans reiterated that judges will not have the power to do anything under this proposal that they do not have the power to do now.

Mr. Mueller said that the current statute already has this provision and that the recommendation simply proposes to change the timeframe and expand the provision to juveniles. Mr. Hilkey added that it creates the opportunity for a judge to do what he is currently able to do now, but at a later date or at another opportunity.

Charles Garcia asked if anyone from the Department of Regulatory Agencies (DORA) was a member of the Working Group. Mr. Evans replied that DORA is aware of this proposal but did not participate on the Working Group.

Judge Vallejos explained that under the current or proposed statute, if someone asked him to enter an order of collateral relief, he might be reluctant to take the place of a licensing authority. He went on to say he is not familiar with the current statute and asked if there is a provision for notice to the licensing agency. Mr. Evans replied that the person requesting the order of collateral relief is required to notify the government agency that has the control over the collateral consequence that they are requesting relief from. The agency then has the ability to appear at the hearing and to state their position.

Mr. Weir reiterated that his concern is around the mandatory language that states the court has the final discretion, but he added he is not opposed to the goals that the Working Group is trying to achieve. Mr. Evans replied that this conversation is challenging because very few orders of collateral relief have actually been granted with the limitations in the statute as it exists now.

Mr. Weir asked Scott Turner about the opinion of the Attorney General regarding this proposal. Mr. Turner replied that DORA's attorneys at the Attorney General's Office have not yet been consulted but

that typically the Attorney General's Office does not take an opinion on matters such as this in terms of the legal aspect, especially at this point in the process.

Judge Vallejos added that with licensing issues there is always some sort of hearing and that as a practical matter the court will typically defer to a regulatory agency. Regardless of that, making these types of decisions is what courts do on a daily basis.

Chairman Hilkey asked for a motion to approve recommendation FY17-RE #01. Mr. Mueller moved to accept the recommendation as written and Meg Williams seconded the motion.

The process for voting on a final recommendation was explained. To pass, a Commission recommendation requires approval by 66% of the members, combining the A and B votes of:

A = I support it

B = I can live with it

C = I do not support it

Final Vote: FY17-RE #01

Allow Orders of Collateral Relief after the time of sentencing.

- A: 15
- B: 1
- C: 3

FY17-RE #01 was APPROVED

At this point in the recommendation presentation Mr. Evans explained that the second recommendation, Recommendation FY17 – RE #02, was the proposal that garnered the most conversation during the preliminary presentation in May, and because of that he proposed addressing Recommendation FY17 – RE #03 first, then returning to the second recommendation afterwards.

Recommendation FY17-RE #03

Revise statutory guidance on state licensure and employment

Promote community safety and economic growth by:

- Preventing consideration of arrests that did not result in a conviction, and convictions that have been pardoned, sealed, or expunged, in state licensure and employment decisions;
- Empowering the Department of Regulatory Agencies to delist certain conditional licenses;
- Collecting data;
- Encouraging the elimination of mandatory collateral consequences;
- Incentivizing opportunity expansion by state contractors; and
- Increasing transparency of agency policies.

DISCUSSION

Senator Cooke asked for more information regarding the clause on incentivizing opportunity expansion by state contractors, as he is concerned about the implication for private employers. Mr. Evans responded that there is an existing state contracting incentive for environmentally preferable products that essentially states if a bidder is trying to get the state to buy their (environmentally preferable) goods, and they are within five percent of the lowest bidder, they will receive the bid. Under this proposal the incentive would not require private employers to take any action, it would simply establish a state purchasing preference for products and services sold by employers that have hiring and retention policies that are substantively equivalent to the State's policies for licensure and employment of people with a criminal history.

Chairman Hilkey asked for a motion to approve recommendation FY17-RE #03. Charles Garcia moved to accept the recommendation and Joe Pelle seconded the motion.

Final Vote: FY17-RE #03

Revise statutory guidance on state licensure and employment.

- A: 12
- B: 4
- C: 2

FY17-RE #03 was APPROVED

Recommendation FY17-RE #02

Prevent adverse private employment actions on the basis of non-conviction, sealed, and expunged records.

Promote community safety and economic growth by preventing adverse employment action on the basis of arrests that did not result in a conviction, or criminal justice records that have been sealed or expunged.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Evans pointed out that over 190,000 people were arrested in Colorado in 2015 and approximately one in three Americans of working age has some sort of criminal record. He explained that the reduction in employment rates caused by a criminal record when applied to that many people has a negative impact on the health of the economy as a whole. Additionally, negative impacts associated with a criminal record disparately impact communities and neighborhoods of color. Mr. Mueller asked if the criminal record numbers that Mr. Evans reported include arrests only and not necessarily convictions. Mr. Evans replied yes.

Mr. Evans described that this recommendation is about private employment, and unlike many other states, Colorado places no restrictions on the ability of a private employer to withhold or terminate employment based on an individual's criminal record. Colorado law does prohibit employers from asking about sealed records but currently there is no enforcement mechanism. This means an employer can either fire or refuse to hire someone based on an arrest that never resulted in a conviction, sealed record or an expunged record, without facing any sort of penalty under Colorado law. This recommendation would simply give meaning to Colorado's sealing and expungement laws.

Mr. Evans recounted that when this recommendation was first presented in May, Commissioners did not pushback about the goal of the recommendation, but there was concern about DORA's Civil Rights Division as the enforcement entity. The Working Group considered that feedback and has explored alternative enforcement mechanisms. One other option would be to place the same substantive language in Title 8 under the purview of the Colorado Department of Labor and Employment (CDLE). Similar to DORA, CDLE has existing mechanisms for regulating private industry and can do so by either a cease and desist order, or by civil fine.

Mr. Evans reported that the Working Group would prefer to leave the enforcement mechanism within DORA because this is ultimately a civil rights issue. However, if the Commission is more comfortable with an alternative enforcement mechanism the Working Group can accommodate that amendment.

Mr. Mueller pointed out that if this recommendation makes it to the legislature, and if at that point the legislature wants to change the enforcement mechanism, the Commission's Legislative Subcommittee would review the changes for consistency with the original recommendation. With that said Mr. Mueller

offered that the enforcement mechanism should not necessarily be a reason to not approve the recommendation at this stage.

Mr. Hilkey added that the Commission has traditionally approved recommendation that represent an ideal philosophy of reform while understanding that all final legislative decisions are ultimately made by the General Assembly.

Melissa Roberts echoed the statement by Mr. Hilkey and said she believes the Commission should put forward what it believes is the ideal proposal.

Mr. Hilkey asked for either a motion to vote on the recommendation as is or a motion to return it to the Collateral Consequences Working Group and the Re-entry Task Force for revisions. Charles Garcia made a motion to add a caveat that the recommendation be modified to include an option giving the Commission's Legislative Subcommittee the authority to move the enforcement mechanism from DORA to CDLE, if it becomes necessary during the legislative process. The motion was seconded and a vote was held on the revised recommendation.

Final Vote: FY17-RE #02

Prevent adverse private employment actions on the basis of non-conviction, sealed, and expunged records.

- A: 13
- B: 2
- C: 3

FY17-RE #02 was APPROVED

**JUVENILE CONTINUITY OF CARE TASK FORCE
PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION PRESENTATION (FY17-JCC #01, #02, & #03)
Meg Williams, Juvenile Parole Board**

Mr. Hilkey introduced Meg Williams and noted that she has offered to present the Juvenile Continuity of Care Task Force recommendations on behalf of the Chair of the Task Force, Robert Werthwein, who is absent.

Ms. Williams explained that she will be presenting three recommendations along with background information on the work of the Task Force. She began a PowerPoint presentation, the full content of which can be found on the Commission website at colorado.gov/ccjj. At the conclusion of her presentation Ms. Williams directed Commissioners to the recommendations in their packets as follows:

Recommendation FY17-JCC #01

Create a plan to formally recognize and address the needs of *crossover youth*.

Define *crossover youth*¹ and *crossover plan* in statute and require each local Juvenile Services Planning Committee, established in C.R.S. 19-2-211, to devise a crossover plan for the identification and notification of cases involving crossover youth.

¹ Crossover youth, sometimes referred to as "dually involved" or "multisystem" youth, are youth who are involved in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. In Colorado, it is estimated that upwards of 80% of the youth committed to the Division of Youth Services have a prior history of child welfare involvement. It is further estimated that 60% have experienced prior out-of-home care placement through the child welfare system. Research has found these youth to be at higher risk for poor developmental outcomes (see Haight, et.al. (2016) for a review) and to have higher recidivism rates compared to those involved only in the juvenile justice system (Huang, et al. (2015)). Crossover youth are described as higher risk by juvenile justice

- I. Add crossover youth definitions to 19-1-103 C.R.S.
- II. Add a new section to 19-2-211 C.R.S. numbered 19-2-211.5 C.R.S.
 - a. To require the Juvenile Service Planning Committee in each judicial district to adopt a plan for identifying and notifying the human/social services representatives, probation representatives, S.B. 94 coordinators, juvenile court representatives, public defenders, district attorneys, parents and guardians ad litem of a youth 's crossover status.
- III. Add language to 24-1.9-102 (1)(e) C.R.S. (Collaborative Management Statute)
 - a. To explicitly include and permit local Collaborative Management Programs to establish memorandum of understanding with the local Juvenile Services Planning Committees for the coordination of services for crossover youth.
- IV. Add a new section to Title 19 Article 2 C.R.S.
 - a. To require the court to consider a youth's crossover status at all stages of the proceedings (i.e., pre and post adjudication) and not be used against the youth in a manner contrary to the principles informing the crossover youth practice model

DISCUSSION

Mr. Weir asked if the Task Force discussed the role of schools or school involvement. Ms. Williams replied that schools are partners on both the Juvenile Service Planning Committees and the Collaborative Management Programs. Once the child is identified the schools are a major partner.

Recommendation FY17-JCC #02

Utilize existing funds for local crossover youth plans and services.

Authorize the utilization of existing marijuana tax revenue distributed to Senate Bill 1991-94 entities to allow these funds to be used to support the development and implementation of local crossover youth plans and services.

DISCUSSION

Kelly Friesen pointed out that this recommendation does not aim to expand the scope of Senate Bill 94 and does not request additional funds. The recommendation simply allows more flexibility with the use of dollars already being funneled into those communities.

decision-makers and receive harsher dispositions than their non-crossover counterparts (Ryan, Hertz, Hernandez, & Marshall, 2017; Morris & Freundlich, 2005; Conger & Ross, 2001; Jonson-Reid & Barth, 2000). Research reflects importance of designing comprehensive, integrated approaches for improving the outcomes of crossover youth (e.g., Cusick, Goerge, & Bell, 2009; Munson & Freundlich, 2005). Such approaches typically involve multisystem collaborations, minimally between child welfare and juvenile justice professionals, but also law enforcement, education, behavioral health, and court personnel (Wiig & Tuell, 2004; Siegel & Lord, 2004; Halemba & Lord 2005; American Bar Association, 2008; Herz & Ryan, 2008; Nash & Bilchik, 2009). Without integrated and comprehensive efforts—including coordinated case assignment, joint assessment processes, coordinated case plans and coordinated supervision—crossover youth are less likely to receive the appropriate services and placements they need to improve their outcomes in both the short- and long-term (Widom & Maxfield, 2001; Cusick, Goerge, & Bell, 2009).

Recommendation FY17-JCC #03

The Colorado Department of Human Services, Division of Child Welfare, should promulgate rules that provide guidance on *permanency planning*² to county departments of social/human services under Social Service Rules Volume 7.³ These rules should provide guidance to counties in circumstances involving a *legally free*⁴ youth (where parental rights have been terminated and there is no legal guardianship) who is either returning to county custody after a period of DYS commitment or is projected to emancipate from Division of Youth Services (DYS).

DISCUSSION

Charles Garcia asked for clarification on the recommendation and noted that this one is difficult to comprehend. Ms. Williams explained that oftentimes it is unclear where a child is going to go upon release from commitment. The recommendation states that if a child is coming into Division of Youth Corrections and they have no parent, that the county continue to work with the young person to help them form connections in the community that will be available to them when they are released.

Commission Consultant Richard Stroker added that the recommendations were unanimously approved by the Juvenile Continuity of Care Task Force.

Mr. Hilkey stated that the Commission would hold a final vote on the three Juvenile Continuity of Care Task Force recommendations during its July meeting.

OF THE PEOPLE CAMPAIGN**Jen Bradford, Metropolitan State University****Brittany Fitzgerald, James Adam, Dacia Messing, Metropolitan State University**

Commissioner Jen Bradford explained that she became involved with a student project in January through the Department of Homeland Security which encouraged bringing a team of students together to develop an anti-hate campaign. The initiative includes participation from student groups both around the country and around the world, all of which have been asked to develop anti-hate campaigns. The only directive given to the Metropolitan State University group specifically was to focus on anti-government, militia and white supremacy groups.

The team consists of eight Metropolitan State students and two faculty members. Ms. Bradford introduced students Brittany Fitzgerald, James Adam and Dacia Messing. The students explained that Of the People is an initiative that promotes community driven, proactive, positive and inclusive responses to acts of hate via anti-diversity or anti-government groups. The students then offered a PowerPoint presentation to Commissioners, the full context of which can be found on the Commission website at colorado.gov/ccjj/ccjj-mtgs2017.

At the conclusion of the presentation Mr. Hilkey thanked the students for their efforts and offered some feedback and reflections. He explained that while he does not encourage students to place themselves in a

² Permanency for youth includes a permanent legal connection to a family, such as reuniting with birth parents, adoption, kinship care, or legal guardianship. Physical permanency is having a home or a place to be; relational permanency is having a relationship or connection with a caring adult (e.g., maternal and paternal kin, teachers, neighbors, former foster parents) (Mallon, 2011).

³ The majority of *Colorado* regulations affecting social services are included in the Code of Colorado Regulations under *CDHS: Social Service Rules, Volume 7*. See the Colorado Secretary of State CCR website at: sos.state.co.us/CCR/ (Browse to CDHS: 1008, Rule 12 CCR 2509).

⁴ *Legally free* is a term applied to children and youth where parental rights have been terminated and there is no identified "second" family or legal guardianship.

conflict, there is always a good learning lab of understanding of many of the groups on the steps of the Capitol usually every weekend. He explained it could be a good opportunity to see some hate groups in action from a safe place. Additionally, the Colorado Informational Analysis Center (CIAC) is operated through the Department of Public Safety and does an enormous amount of work gathering intelligence about hate events and trying to respond to them. Mr. Hilkey offered to meet with Ms. Bradford and her students and introduce them to the CIAC unit so the CIAC is aware of the efforts by Of the People.

Ms. Roberts also thanked the students and asked if they would present to her staff at the Division of Adult Parole. She also offered to connect the students with some former gang members who operate a non-profit and have developed a gang disengagement program for the Department of Corrections.

ADJOURNMENT

Stan Hilkey, Chairman and Executive Director of the Department of Public Safety

Mr. Hilkey thanked the presenters and asked Commissioners for any final comments.

Mr. Weir noted that he believes the first presentation by Ms. English and Ms. Flick regarding drug policy reform reflects the best of the work by the Commission. He reminded Commissioners that the work took four years and that it took a lot of effort to produce good public policy reform. With that in mind, he added that the District Attorney community is concerned and curious about where the Commission stands in light of the legislative interim committees established by the General Assembly this year. The General Assembly has authorized two interim committees to meet this summer, one focusing on local public safety costs including issues related to jail overcrowding, and another which is intended to study sentencing. Mr. Weir said he believes the jail overcrowding issue lends itself to fairly focused, narrow investigation, but the problem with the other interim committee is that its charge is extraordinarily broad and includes examining parole, probation and sentencing policy, many of the issues the Commission has addressed.

Mr. Weir explained that he is not questioning the General Assembly or its prerogative or authority, but he would like to ask Commissioners where they stand in light of this trend to form interim committees to address significant broad criminal justice policy.

Mr. Weir went on to describe that the District Attorney community will likely be writing a letter to the Governor and the leaders of the General Assembly expressing their concern around this current trend. Mr. Weir asked for support from fellow Commissioners in requesting that the chairs of the legislative interim committees attend the next Commission meeting and describe the focus, purpose and the scope of their work and how it intercepts with the work of the Commission. Mr. Weir asked Senator Cooke if he had any further information on the interim committees.

Senator Cooke replied that he has been appointed as the vice-chairman of the Interim Study Committee Regarding Comprehensive Sentencing Reform in the Criminal Justice System, but that, similar to Mr. Weir, he is confused about the purpose of the interim committee in light of the ongoing work by the Commission. He added that at this point he is unaware of the scope of the interim committee.

Charles Garcia offered that perhaps it would make more sense for representatives from the interim committees to present at the August Commission meeting instead of July, in order for them to better establish their scope of work. Mr. Weir replied August would likely be too late because the final reports are due from the interim committees by the end of September, and that each committee is authorized five bills. Representative Sias replied that he, too, is perplexed about the creation of the interim committees and is frustrated about criminal justice bills presented to the legislature that do not come from the

Commission. Representative Sias said he will inquire about the schedule for the committees and that it may be possible to change their trajectory. He added that he is supportive of asking leadership from those committees to attend the next Commission meeting. Mr. Hilkey offered that on behalf of the Commission he will make an inquiry as to the goals of the committees and how those goals dovetail with the work of the Commission.

Mr. Mueller pointed out that the authorization letter of the interim sentencing committee calls for the study and evaluation of the continued viability of extraordinary risk crimes. He noted that the Commission already addressed this issue and approved a recommendation to eliminate extraordinary risk crimes, but that no legislators offered to carry the recommendation as a bill.

Bill Kilpatrick stated that he supports Mr. Weir's proposal and that he believes it is the responsibility of the Commission to perform the work being assigned to the interim committees. He added that after participating in years of drug sentencing reform work by the Commission he believes it is impossible for the interim committees to achieve their established goals in six to eight meetings. He summarized that it would be wise for the Commission to author a letter on these issues.

Mr. Weir made a motion for the Commission to extend an invitation to the chairs of the legislative interim committees asking them to attend the next Commission meeting and describe the focus, purpose, and the scope of their work and how it intercepts with the work of the Commission. Scott Turner seconded the motion. Mr. Hilkey asked for any further discussion regarding the motion. Seeing none he called for a vote to approve the motion and the motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Hilkey thanked Commissioners for their time and asked the group for any final comments. He added that the next two meetings are scheduled for Friday July 14th and Friday August 11th. With no further business, Mr. Hilkey adjourned the meeting at 3:22 p.m.