# Drug Policy Task Force / Amendment 64 Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

## Minutes

September 18, 2013, 1:30PM-4:30PM Ralph Carr Judicial Building

#### ATTENDEES:

<u>Chair</u>

Eric Philp, Division of Probation Service Charlie Garcia, CCJJ At-Large Representative

#### TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Maureen Cain, Criminal Defense Attorney Pat Steadman, Senate District 31 Brian Connors, Public Defender's Office Lewis Koski for Ron Kammerzell, Department of Revenue Thor Eells for Vince Niski, Colorado Spring Police Department Kevin Paletta, Lakewood Police Department Tom Raynes, Colorado District Attorney's Council

#### <u>Staff</u>

Kim English, Division of Criminal Justice Germaine Miera, Division of Criminal Justice

#### ABSENT

Marc Condojani, Division of Behavioral Health Evie Hudak, Senate District 19 Mike Foote, House District 12 Christie Donner, Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition Matt Durkin, Attorney General's Office

#### ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES

ART WAY, DRUG POLICY ALLIANCE LAURA PEGRAM, DRUG POLICY ALLIANCE

	Discussion:
Issue/Topic: Welcome and Introductions	Eric Philp and Charlie Garcia welcomed the group and previewed the agenda.
	The Co-chairs explained that the documents task force members have in front of them are the proposed final outcomes for policy statements to be included in the report to the legislature. The one exception is the issue of MIP which is yet to be determined.
	The goal today is to move through these items one by one and make sure there is group consensus.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Review Position Statements on Legislative Directives	Task force members reviewed each of the five position statement.
Action	Statement #1 DISCUSSION
• CCJJ to discuss funding issues for education, prevention and treatment.	<ul> <li>There were four elements included here         <ul> <li>1.a. Decriminalizing consumption of small amounts of marijuana</li> <li>1.b. Creating a lawful marketplace for adults to obtain safe and legal marijuana</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Need to revise 24-31-314 verbiage to address DRE training in POST rather than the academy</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>1.c. Protecting against youth access and consumption of marijuana, and</li> <li>1.d. Eliminating the illicit drug marketplace</li> <li>These four issues have been addressed individually.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Need to revise 42-4- 1305.5 verbiage to add an AND between II and III</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Regarding 1.a., the group found no statutory change needed.</li> <li>For 1.b, the group found no statutory change needed.</li> <li>For 1.c., what's missing is funding for public education, money designated to the treatment fund, and issues around advertising, etc.</li> </ul>
• Clarification on legislative directive in statement #3	<ul> <li>For 1.d., the group found no statutory change needed.</li> <li>These four directives are found in 16-11.3-103, which established</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Clean-up only on statement #4</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>this task force and outlined the work.</li> <li>The task force can't vote on or finalize "c" until we have consensus on the issue of Minor in Possession (which is still in the works).</li> <li>The group agreed to vote on A, B, C and D / with the caveat of adding a question mark on "c" and noting more clarification on including 18-13-122.</li> <li>All members are in favor.</li> <li>CCJJ shall discuss the funding issue on "c" and details about where the money comes from in regards to surcharges, etc.</li> <li>MIP will be dealt with separately in 12.5</li> </ul>

locus/Tonics (continued)	
Issue/Topic: (continued)	Statement #2
Review Position Statements on Legislative Directives	Statement #2 deals with the 6 recommendations that came out of the Amendment 64 Task Force in regards to criminal law.
	DISCUSSION
Action	A64 recommendation 12.1
	-This task force supports this recommendation through HB13-1325.
	Consensus = Yes.
	A64 recommendation 12.2
	<ul> <li>-ARIDE training was addressed in SB13-283 encouraging training if sufficient funds are available.</li> </ul>
	-However, this is about providing advanced DRE training for entry
	level officers at the academy. Advanced DRE training should be
	available for more seasoned officers in subsequent POST trainings,
	not at the academy level. The way it's worded now won't help
	accomplish the intent of the recommendation, especially in regards
	to public safety.
	<ul> <li>At first glance this looks like a good recommendation, but the details are unrealistic.</li> </ul>
	-Ideally this should've been POST supervised training with funding.
	-There's an impression that we'll have robust capabilities of DRE's,
	but if training happens at the academy it won't make a difference.
	-We need to change verbiage to say the training should happen at
	POST.
	-Thor Eells will provide amended verbiage for 24-31-314, to present
	to CCJJ for a recommendation.
	-The verbiage will still recognize the value of training; it just shouldn't happen at the academy.
	-Vote – there is consensus minus one. Brian Connors votes against
	this. Brian has concerns about the DRE training in general.
	<ul> <li>A64 recommendation 12.3</li> </ul>
	-There is group consensus that this issue is taken care of under
	current statute.
	A64 recommendation 12.4
	-This has to do with Transfer of marijuana to 18 to 20 year olds
	<ul> <li>Adults used to be considered 18 and over and minors were</li> </ul>
	everything else
	-This changes things
	- Strike first three bullets on this 12.4 policy statement
	- One reason not to make any changes at this juncture is because
	there are not a lot of cases.
	-Let's watch how this starts to play out and make a recommendation
	if needed

	-12.4 Consensus / Yes
Issue/Topic: (continued)	A64 recommendation 12.5
	-This is about consequences for Juvenile Possession. The group will
Review Position Statements on	return to this issue later.
Legislative Directives	A64 recommendation 12.6
Action	- The task force recommends amending verbiage on 42-4-1305.5
	(c)(l) to read:
	(I) That is open or has a broken seal; or
	(II) The contents of which are partially removed: AND
	(III) There is evidence that marijuana has been consumed
	within the motor vehicle
	- The 'AND' goes between II and III.
	<ul> <li>With this change there is consensus</li> </ul>
	Statement #3
	DISCUSSION
	<ul> <li>This Legislative Directive needs clarification only.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Nothing needs to be stricken.</li> </ul>
	• This was in the introduced version, just not the final version. It really
	just needs clarification. No statutory changes.
	Consensus / Yes
	Statement #4
	<u>Statement #4</u> DISCUSSION
	<ul> <li>This is not about juveniles because it is for people age 18-20 years</li> </ul>
	old. However, it does include people affected by MIP, because MIP is
	under 21 years of age.
	<ul> <li>Do we have consensus that absent the MIP discussion, everything</li> </ul>
	else is resolved regarding the transfer issue?
	-Yes, as long as the second bullet is changed from one to two ounces,
	and highlight unlawful activities regarding TRANSFER.
	Consensus here /Yes
	Statement #5
	DISCUSSION
	• As discussed in the Amendment 64 Task Force, the rate of taxation
	will have an effect on the elicit market place as will municipalities
	that don't allow marijuana retail stores. Both of these things will
	encourage an illicit marketplace, but this is out of our purview.
	• The group agrees that yes, there is consensus.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Consequences for Juvenile Possession and MIP Action:	Tom and Maureen have been working on the issues of consequences for Juvenile Possession and for Minor in Possession as it pertains to marijuana. They haven't yet reached consensus on a proposal to present to the group and they are continuing to deliberate on a few sticking points.
<ul> <li>Tom and Maureen to submit a draft proposal</li> <li>Germaine to get ballot details out to the group</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>DISCUSSION</li> <li>Tom and Maureen are honing in on a couple of issues around someone's first offense <ul> <li>One issue has to do with whether or not a plea would actually be entered and then immediately sealed.</li> <li>As far as the overall model it doesn't appear to be a big problem.</li> <li>There is consensus that there should be a separate statute for MIP alcohol vs. MIP marijuana – one of the plusses of this would be for tracking and data collection purposes as it pertains to the impact on marijuana cases.</li> <li>One of the main goals for consequences on juvenile and minor possession is to emphasize education and responsible usage, not to criminalize this population but to make sure we're treatment and education oriented.</li> <li>Tom and Maureen say they are not far off from finding common ground.</li> <li>Tom, Maureen and Miles are going to continue work on this.</li> <li>Another problem is around multiple offenses (2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup>) and whether those take place in municipal court or in state court and are they then accounted for as far as subsequent offenses.</li> <li>Keep in mind this is a problem with many crime classifications, however individual jurisdictions can have policies to keep track of that.</li> <li>Tom and Maureen will submit a draft proposal that will be distributed through email.</li> <li>We also need to discuss paraphernalia and education funding.</li> <li>Is there an allocation formula for tax dollar education funding through DDRA? Can we add to the treatment fund?</li> <li>The exise is for public education but not sure about the rest.</li> <li>Let's look at the ballot.</li> </ul> </li> <li>If we could separate out some of that money to this fund that should be a priority.</li> <li>As for funding – is there an attempt to make this mandatory? Has there been any thought given to 'What if there's inadequate funding?' We're assuming the bill will pass and it will be overth millions of dollars. There is often a big difference between projected money generated and actual dollars</li></ul>

Issue/Topic: (continued) Consequences for Juvenile	<ul> <li>Are we talking general education? Education for kids? Level 1 and level 2 education? Marijuana specific education?</li> </ul>
Possession and MIP	<ul> <li>Behavioral Health just completed a curriculum for MIP alcohol so it's more robust</li> </ul>
Action:	<ul> <li>As for paraphernalia – why does this have to be a crime? What about the kid who gets stopped with marijuana and a pipe. It will be a civil summons on the marijuana and the paraphernalia charge could end up in court.</li> <li>Next steps – wait for Tom and Maureen proposal.</li> <li>Depending on MIP outcomes – the group will need to revisit and resolve the separate funding issues for treatment, education and prevention.</li> </ul>

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Public Comment	None.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Next Steps	<ul> <li>WHAT'S NEXT</li> <li>We will try to address the remaining issues through email, if we are unable to come to consensus we'll meet one more time the afternoon of October 2<sup>nd</sup>.</li> </ul>

### Future Meeting Dates:

### Meeting Schedule 2013

October 2<sup>nd</sup>

1:30pm – 4:30pm 1300 Broadway, Room 11-107