

Juvenile Justice Task Force
 August 6, 2014 - 9:30 am-12:00 pm
 JAC Center, Lakewood, CO

Attendees:

Jeff McDonald, Jefferson County JAC
 Regina Huerter, Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission
 Norene Simpson, Indigent Defense Counsel
 Steve Brittain, La Plata Youth Services
 Susan Colling, State Court Administrators , Probation Services
 Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice
 Hal Sargent, CDAC, 1st District Attorney's Office
 Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Department
 Kim Dvorchak, CJDC
 Stan T. Paprocki, Division of Behavioral Health
 Julie Krow, Department of Human Services
 Ann Gail Meinster, 1st Judicial District

Task Force Members Absent:

Charles Garcia, Community at Large
 Jacob Eppler, Attorney at Law
 Kelly Friesen, SB94, 14th JD/Grand Co. J.J. Dept
 Donia Amick, JJDP Representative
 Michelle Brinegar, 8th Judicial District
 Sarah Ericson, 18th Judicial District
 Beth McCann, Co. House of Representative

Guests:

Kelly Kissell, 18th District Attorney's Office (on the phone)
 Jim Gault, At large

Staff:

Ken Plotz, Consultant to the JJTF
 Laurence Lucero, Division of Criminal Justice

<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Welcome, Introductions/ Review of minutes</p>	<p>Welcome, introductions, review of minutes of July 2, 2014 meeting.</p> <p>Jeff McDonald welcomed the group. Members and guests introduced themselves.</p> <p>The group reviewed the minutes of July 2, 2014. Steve Brittain moved for the approval of the minutes of 07/02/14. Hal Sargent seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Review of Actions Plans</p>	<p>Professionalism</p> <p>The recommendation to develop professional standards of juvenile practice was presented at the Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice on June 13, 2014 and vote is scheduled to be taken at the next CCJJ meeting on Friday, August 8, 2014.</p> <p>Some of the questions expressed by the CCJJ members were around whether this recommendation requires specific commitments in this effort by the Commission, and if the Commission would be involved in the curriculum development or some aspect of training.</p> <p>It will be clarified that the JJTF is asking that the Commission support the general concept of this training and that Commission members or their representatives participate in the creation and discussion around these core standards and how the training will be delivered. The implementation of the recommendation would fall to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council (JJDP).</p>

	<p>Age of Detention</p> <p>The Age of Detention recommendation was also presented at the CCJJ meeting on June 13, 2014.</p> <p>Some of the concerns expressed during the CCJJ meeting were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that the recommendation doesn't include the discretion of courts, - that this option is limited to only offenses below Classes 1 to 3 Felonies (with the exclusion of some Class 4 Felonies) and crimes of violence, - the necessity to identify appropriate alternative to detention. <p>At the JJTF meeting in July, it was suggested that a meeting be coordinated with Colorado Commissioners (CCI) and the CHS county directors to engage counties in the discussions and identify possible alternatives to detention for younger population and agree on a process that could be easily implemented at the county level.</p> <p>The meeting has not been set up and it was suggested that discussions with CCI and CHS county directors should take place before the vote at the CCJJ and ensure support of CCI and CHS as key stakeholders in communities.</p> <p>Julie Krow motioned to defer the CCJJ vote at CCJJ until September so the information can be presented to key stakeholders at CCI and CHS. Steve Brittain seconded the motion.</p> <p>The motion passes unanimously.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Juvenile Justice Task Force</p>	<p>Jeff McDonald reported that the CCJJ Chair Stan Hilkey and CCJJ Vice Chair Doug Wilson asked the JJTF to complete its current work and present at the CCJJ meeting on September 12, 2014. The Juvenile Justice Task Force is anticipated to conclude in September 2014.</p> <p><u>Group discussion</u></p> <p>Members of the group indicated that they were surprised at this directive because, when they were given the report of the CCJJ retreat in March, they believed that the CCJJ had decided that it would direct the JJTF to finish its current work by summer of 2014 and then would consider allowing the Task Force to work on Article 2 of the Children's Code. Other members examined the CCJJ minutes and it appears that there may be an ambiguity as to whether or not the JJTF will continue. Therefore, the group agreed that it would ask the CCJJ to allow the JJTF to make a presentation to the CCJJ on why it should be allowed to remain in existence and work on revising Article 2 of the Children's code.</p> <p>Jeff McDonald will report the request at the CCJJ meeting on August 8, 2014.</p>

<p>Issue/Topic: Pre-Filing Options</p>	<p>Discussion of Pre-filing Option Working Group’s revision of diversion statutes.</p> <p>Meg Williams reminded that the proposed recommendation defines the term diversion in statute C.R.S. 19-2-704 as a pre-filing option. The intent is to encourage jurisdictions to develop or enhance pre-filing process, out of the judicial system and consequently avoid the long term, unintended consequences of criminal justice system involvement. Post-diversion programs would still be available to jurisdictions.</p> <p><u>Group discussion:</u></p> <p>Some of the concerns expressed in regards to limiting diversion as pre-filing included :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • state funds and other funding resources may no longer be available. The sex offender program in the 1st Judicial District was described to explain the concern. When a juvenile who has committed a sex offense is taken into custody, he/she is assessed, receives a sex offender evaluation, and is placed under pre-trial supervision. After several weeks, the district attorney reviews the case and based on how the juvenile responds to the services, the district attorney decides whether to offer deferred judgment, Informal Adjustment (IA) or to continue with an adjudicatory process. With this recommendation, funding would no longer be available for the services preceding the district attorney’s decision. In the 1stJD, the services describe allow the juveniles to address behavior and recidivism is at a very low rate. Additionally, there is a public demand to file charges in most sex offense cases. • the number of juveniles offered diversion and the representation of minorities in diversion programs may be affected. • There could be an impact on the diversionary practices provided by law enforcement agencies. • There may be reduced opportunities for defense representation in a pre-filing process. <p>The JJTF group asked the working group to continue working on the recommendation and extend the definition of diversion to pre-plea in order to address the above discussed concerns.</p> <p>Next JJTF meeting in September will end at 11 a.m. to allow the Diversion Working group to meet at 11 a.m. at the JAC on September 3, 2014.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Next meeting</p>	<p>Next meeting will be on September 3, 2014 at 9:30 am at the Juvenile Assessment Center. Meeting adjourned at 11:45 pm.</p>