

# **Drug Policy Task Force – *Draft* Minutes**

**Date: June 8, 2011 / Time: 1:30 – 4:30**

## **Attendees:**

Grayson Robinson/Arapahoe County Sheriff, CCJJ Member / Chair  
Maureen Cain / Colorado Criminal Defense Bar  
Carmelita Muniz / Colorado Association of Alcohol and Drug Service Providers  
George DelGrosso / Colorado Behavioral Healthcare Council  
Christie Donner / Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition  
Rod Walker / Colorado Springs Police Department  
Christine Flavia / Division of Behavioral Health  
John O'Dell / Parole Board  
Don Quick / District Attorney, 17<sup>th</sup> Judicial District / CCJJ Member  
Kathleen McGuire / Douglas County Office of the Public Defender  
Mark Hurlbert / District Attorney, 5<sup>th</sup> Judicial District (on phone)  
Pat Steadman / Colorado State Senator, Senate District 31  
Sean McAllister / Private Defense Attorney  
Evie Hudak / Colorado State Senator, Senate District 19  
Heather Garwood/Colorado Judicial Department

## **Additional Attendees:**

Mike Elliott, Medical Marijuana Industry Group  
Art Way, Drug Policy Alliance  
Paul Herman, CCJJ Consultant  
Adrienne Loye, Colo. Department of Public Safety  
Germaine Miera, Division of Criminal Justice  
Kim English, Division of Criminal Justice

## **Absent:**

Dolores Poeppel / Victims Assistance Unit, Colorado State Patrol  
Brian Connors / State Public Defender's Office  
Bill Kilpatrick / Golden Police Chief / CCJJ Member  
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, 2<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District  
Tom Raynes / Colorado District Attorney's Council  
Matt Durkin / District Attorney's Office, 1<sup>st</sup> Judicial District  
Tim Hand / Department of Corrections  
Mark Waller / State Representative, House District 15  
Dan Rubinstein / District Attorney's Office, 21<sup>st</sup> Judicial District (by phone)  
Shane Bahr / Problem Solving Courts, Judicial Department

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Welcome and Review of Agenda	Grayson Robinson called the meeting to order at 1:41 and reviewed the day's agenda.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Update on Current Legislation	<p>Jana spoke about the CCJJ legislation from 2011 Session. Seven of the eleven proposals have been signed. Two failed and two did not have sponsors.</p> <p>There is an explanation of all the bills on the matrix.</p> <p>Senator Steadman was unaware of the two recommendations that had no sponsors. What happened? On Friday, the CCJJ will have a lengthy discussion on the legislative process. The Mental Health screening recommendation carried a fiscal note. The Changes to Sex Offender Registration Statute second one had logistical issues.</p> <p>Over the last two years, the CCJJ had an easier experience with the legislative session. Bills were put forward and we were extraordinarily successful. Experience of this last session has driven CCJJ members to become more engaged in the bills, who will be responsible for how the bill is written and who will be responsible for the bill as it is amended.</p> <p>If a lead is assigned to a specific bill by CCJJ, the lead can then ask for assistance from Task Force members during testimony.</p> <p>Can the CCJJ provide guidance to Task Force Members on what they can say and do during the legislative session? Can members testify and say they support the CCJJ bill?</p> <p>We should brief key legislators on the work of the CCJJ prior to the session. The CDPS briefs a joint session of the Judiciary Committees, but during the past two years, the briefing did not include information on CCJJ. Each bill should have a position paper that can be used by all.</p> <p>The Governor was present at the last CCJJ meeting and admitted he was not as aware of the CCJJ work as he should have been. The Governor stated he and his staff will be more informed during the next session. We need to make sure the Governor's office receives position papers. The Governor was asked to support the continuation of the Commission beyond 2013.</p>

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Update of May meeting</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Chairs of each of the working groups will send the meeting dates and times to Mr. Robinson and Germaine Miera</p>	<p>Three working groups were identified during the May Task Force meeting. We need to determine the scope of work for each working group and their membership.</p> <p>The Prevention Task Force by Carmelita Muniz:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Muniz had the opportunity to speak with other professionals in the field. She talked to Stan Paprocki about the Juvenile Task Force and was told its focus would not be on prevention. She also spoke to the State</li> </ol>

The Structure Group will be June 20<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 at 10<sup>th</sup> & Sherman (where they have always met).

Prevention Council. Ms. Muniz will send out an email to individuals who expressed an interest in this working group as well as subject matter experts in order to establish a meeting schedule.

2. Last month the Task Force talked about focusing on prevention and infusing the idea in schools, faith-based organizations, as well as DAs and Sheriffs. We should be working in concert with other community groups in developing good prevention programming.
3. The working group should attempt to identify what evidence-based programs are in the community so local agencies would know what is available.
4. Is the focus just on "don't use drugs?" How broadly are you going to look? After school programs and faith based organizations can be used. Are you limiting your focus to a specific age group? Not all of substance abuse is done by juveniles who are experimenting. There are juveniles that use drugs to "self medicate" because of other issues.
5. We need to get a clear definition of "prevention" so the work can be focused.
6. Should we focus on a specific population? Should you start from the cradle? At what point do you intervene? When someone is in crisis or before they get to that point?
7. The task force should be very specific as to what its end goal would be and then examine the various paths to get there. Once the goal is established, and the path chosen, then the appropriate subject matter experts can be asked to work on the project. What is the goal? When you want the work to be done? By the next legislative session or by next summer? If you are not clear, this can go on for a long time.
8. The working group will develop the scope and the areas of focus the group wants to work on and report back in July.
9. Thus far, Carmelita Muniz, George DelGrosso and Don Quick are on the working group.

#### DUI-D Working Group:

1. Sean McAllister and Grayson Robinson will co-chair the group. Mark Hurlbert and Rod Walker were also volunteered. Mike Elliott and Art Way said they would like to participate if possible as well. There is some expectation from the law enforcement side of the equation that this issue will be brought back to the legislature.
2. The medical marijuana groups have gathered and agreed that a public information campaign needs to occur. The focus would be to not consume and drive.
3. Where did the DUI-D bill come from? What was the perceived need? Law enforcement does not have a tool to accurately measure DUID specifically with marijuana. This was an attempt to mirror DUI- Alcohol statutes.

#### The Structure Group:

1. Tom Raynes and Maureen Cain will be the co-chairs of this working group. Brian Connors, John O'Dell and Bill Kilpatrick would like to participate. Tom Raynes will talk to Representative Barker.
2. The Structure Group has three items it will be examining:
  - a. **Tracking treatment dollars and looking at the funding silos** (IACP, SB318, 1284) to see if the use of treatment dollars can be more useful. In addition to the treatment funding groups, the new

Medicaid dollars should also be included. A probation officer may be told a client cannot get medicine because he/she does not have coverage. With the new medical health coverage benefits, that may not be the case anymore. It is an opportunity for people who have not been able to get medical treatment to be able to obtain it now. How can we work together to help providers understand what new funds are available?

- b. The second task is developing a **drug sentencing grid**.
- c. The third task revolves around **SB134 and classification** etc. on new drugs called Spice and Salvia. There is not a lot of information on these drugs. Along with this is the question, does the working group want to develop a process for classification etc. for any new designer drugs that come along.

A new potential topic is the practice of some case managers and probation officers interpreting the results of drug screens and then making a decision that affects their client. There is some concern that some case managers, probation officers and parole officers may not be qualified to make these interpretations

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Report on Oversight Committee</p> <p><b>Action</b></p>	<p>The Re-Entry Oversight Committee met to discuss past recommendations of the Commission and their implementation. The recommendations were put into categories. There was a group for completed recommendations. There was a group of recommendations that were in process. The final group consisted of recommendations that have had little or no progress.</p> <p>The Oversight Committee also developed a process on how to track recommendations. The tracking of these recommendations will be put on line.</p>

Meeting adjourned at 3:27