

Drug Policy Task Force

Date: July 14, 2010 Time: 1:00 – 5:00

Attendees:

Members

Grayson Robinson/Arapahoe County Sheriff, CCJJ Member / Chair
Bill Kilpatrick/ Golden Police Chief / CCJJ Member
Don Quick/District Attorney, 17th Judicial District / CCJJ Member
Brian Connors/ State Public Defender's Office
Kathleen McGuire/ Douglas County Office of the Public Defender
Tom Raynes/ Attorney General's Office
Miles Madorin/ District Attorney's Office, 1st Judicial District
Nancy Feldman/ Office for Victims Programs, Division of Criminal Justice
Christie Donner/ Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition
Pat Steadman/Colorado State Senator, Senate District 31
Shane Bahr/ Problem Solving Courts, Judicial Department

Absent:

Reo Leslie/ Colorado School for Family Therapy / CCJJ Member
Regina Huerter/Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission/ CCJJ Member
Greg Long/District Attorney's Office, 2nd Judicial District
Maureen Cain/Colorado Criminal Defense Bar
Carmelita Muniz/Colorado Association of Alcohol and Drug Service Providers
Evie Hudak/Colorado State Senator, Senate District 19
Doyle Forrestal/ Colorado Behavioral Healthcare Council
Paul Thompson/Peer 1 Therapeutic Community
Dan Rubinstein/ District Attorney's Office, 21st Judicial District
Mark Hurlbert/District Attorney, 5th Judicial District
Jim Welton/ Department of Corrections
Sean McAllister/Private Defense Attorney
Mark Waller/State Representative, House District 15
Dolores Poeppel / Victims Assistance Unit, Colorado State Patrol
Rod Walker / Colorado Springs Police Department

Guests: Janet Wood / Division of Behavioral Health

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Introductions and Review of Agenda</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>Grayson Robinson called the meeting to order, reviewed the day’s agenda and gave a status report on the Commission. During the last CCJJ meeting, the future direction of the Commission was discussed. Several areas of examination were suggested and four mini-groups were selected. The mini-groups will only meet twice before the August CCJJ meeting. Their purpose is to identify topics that need improvement, areas they believe consensus can be reached and the structure of how the group could begin discussing the issues. The four mini-groups are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Juvenile 2. Sex Offender 3. Offender Profile / Data Sharing 4. Comprehensive sentencing system <p>Will any of the issues discussed in these groups affect the work done in the Drug Policy Task Force? There may be areas that could be discussed in more than one group. However, the Drug Task Force will continue regardless of which mini-groups are selected to continue as larger task forces. The Drug Task Force has always been able to decide what issues it wants to examine.</p>

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Treatment Funding Group</p> <p>Action</p> <p>Have a copy of the “White Paper” available to the Drug Policy Task Force.</p>	<p>The “White Paper” needs to be completed and brought to the Treatment Funding Group for recommendations that can then be brought to the Task Force.</p>

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Structure Group</p> <p>Action</p> <p>Structure Working Group will meet to review issues that were unresolved from last year. They will also discuss the new issue of parole eligibility dates for individuals incarcerated under the old sentencing scheme.</p> <p>Meeting: August 5, 1:30pm, Maureen Cain’s office (150 10th St.).</p>	<p>Why does the structure group need to continue? What are the next issues it should examine?</p> <p>Option 1:</p> <p>Should we observe the results of HB1352 that passed last year before moving forward? Is the money going to show up like we think it will? Will the money be directed toward effective treatment programs? How do we know which treatment programs are effective? Who determines if the treatment programs are effective and what is being used to measure their efficacy? What kind of timeline is reasonable for us to get a feel on the effectiveness of HB-1352? Who is responsible for developing the standards and collecting the data about the effectiveness of the bill?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More information is needed from the treatment funding group before anyone can determine the effectiveness of the new law. 2. The mechanism for the allocation of the funds after it has been collected is unclear in the current legislation. This could be cleaned up. 3. If the funds come in, is there a structure in place to disburse them? Is there a means to determine the efficacy of a program?

4. In the legislation, DCJ was tasked to prepare a report on the cost savings. What should be included in the report?

What outcomes of the new legislation needs to be tracked? How do we define success so that we will know what programs are effective? What are the key identifiers that would define success? Is a program successful because an offender completed treatment? Is it tied recidivism?

If a program wants to provide substance abuse treatment to offenders, the standards issued by Division of Behavioral Health must be met. These standards are used in the licensing report to determine who is successful. The Division of Behavioral Health has the treatment provider licensing reports available on line. These reports give their success rates for specific programs.

The Division of Behavioral Health is developing a system that focuses on sharing of data (DACODES). Everyone in the state will be given a unique identifying number that would be used throughout the state. Through the use of DACODES, questions like, "Is the DUI offender also receiving TANF funds?", "Are the offender's children on assistance?" would be known. DACODES are being developed for DUI offenders. Once that is completed, other codes will be established for non-DUI offenders. It is anticipated that the system will be done in approximately 18 months.

1. Can a CCJJ task force impact what codes are being developed so that when the system goes on-line, specific data can be collected by law enforcement? It is possible.
2. Can this system provide a common report on how a program measures up to national outcome measures?

Impact of 2010 legislation:

1. Who tracks the outcomes of the new legislation? DCJ has to produce an annual report on HB-1352. But it will primarily be a budget report. This was to ensure that if there were cost savings that they be driven back into the system. Does the structure group want other measures to be reported?
2. How will the funding be directed and who will do that? There is an interagency group that will oversee the funding. Jeanne Smith is the Chair.

Issues unresolved from last year:

The issues that were discussed last year but tabled because of insufficient time are:

1. Habitual criminal
2. Record sealing
3. School zones
4. Bail bonds
5. Clean-up issues

Christie Donner brought up a new issue: Is there room for discussion surrounding individuals who were sentenced under the old drug laws to see if they can be given special consideration for early release at their Parole Eligibility Date?

The structure group will meet and move forward on discussing unresolved issues from last year and Christie Donner's new question. The membership of the structure group is: Pat Steadman, Maureen Cain, Mark Hurlbert Kathleen McGuire, Tom Raynes, Miles Madorin, and Christie Donner. The working group will make arrangements to meet (see above, under action for meeting information).

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Prevention Group</p> <p>Action</p> <p>Prevention Leadership Counsel (Jose Esquibel) will speak to the Drug Policy Task Force at the August meeting.</p> <p>Christine Adams will send out an email to reschedule the August meeting.</p> <p>Email article from the Washington State Institute for Public Policy to task force members</p> <p>Ask Del Elliott to speak about prevention programs (September 8th meeting)</p>	<p>What is expected to be accomplished by this group? Do we know what is out there when we talk about prevention? That would be one area that the group would be tasked to research – what are the existing programs.</p> <p>What do you mean by prevention? There are risk factors that are associated with criminal behavior and there are groups set up to deal with targeted individuals to prevent further transgressions. Five state departments fund various prevention programs and participate in the state Prevention Leadership Counsel lead by Jose Esquibel. This counsel also maintains a database of to the various prevention programs both private and public. Can the Prevention Leadership program come in and speak to the group about what they are doing? Yes. Janet Wood will speak to Mr. Esquibel. The meeting date may have to be changed to assure attendance.</p> <p>There are some blue print programs that are out there such as life-skills training that is taught at the junior high level, and the Nurse / Family program. These two programs are evidence-based and very successful. If we have limited funds, we should be directing funds to programs like these? Del Elliott can come in and speak about these successful programs. Don Quick will contact Del Elliott about his availability in September.</p> <p>Can we recommend successful prevention programs through after-school programs? Schools are facing funding constraints and are reluctant to use school time for these programs.</p> <p>The prevention group will investigate programs, identify funding issues, look at short and long-term programs and provide recommendations to the CCJJ. Its focus is to bring back a clear picture of the current state of prevention in Colorado; the gaps in Colorado; and general recommendations on how to address these gaps.</p> <p>Membership of the Prevention group: Doyle Forrestal and Carmilita Muniz. Sheriff Robinson will ask Ms. Forrestal who else should be on the group.</p>

The meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.