

***Re-entry Task Force***  
***Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice***  
**Minutes**

August 12, 2015, 1:30PM-4:30PM  
700 Kipling, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference room

**ATTENDEES:**

**CHAIR**

Stan Hilkey, Dept. of Public Safety

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS**

Jennifer Bradford, Metro State University of Denver

Monica Chambers, Department of Corrections (phone)

Christie Donner, Colo. Criminal Justice Reform Coalition

Mark Evans, Public Defender's Office

Tom Giacinti, Representing Community Corrections

Regi Huerter, Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission (phone)

Russha Knauer for Sherri Hufford, Division of Probation Services

Hassan Latif, Second Chance Center

Evelyn Leslie, Colo. School for Family Therapy

Marjorie Lewis for Alfredo Pena, Parole Board

Beth McCann, State Representative

Joe Pelle, Boulder County Sheriff's Office

Rick Raemisch, Dept. of Corrections

Pat Steadman, State Senator

**STAFF**

Paul Herman/CCJJ consultant

Kim English/Division of Criminal Justice

Germaine Miera/Division of Criminal Justice

**ABSENT**

Kelly Friesen, Grand County Juvenile Justice Department / SB94

Charles Parkins, Division of Youth Corrections

Robert Werthwein, Division of Youth Corrections

Dave Young, District Attorney 17<sup>th</sup> JD

<b>Issue/Topic:</b>	<b>Discussion:</b>
Welcome and Introductions	Stan Hilkey welcomed the group and thanked everyone for attending. Task force members and guests introduced themselves.

<b>Issue/Topic:</b>	<b>Discussion:</b>
<p>Task Force Process and Expectations</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p>	<p>Stan started the meeting with a PowerPoint presentation and discussion aimed at educating and reminding task force members that the CCJJ process, particularly the recommendation process, can take months to (sometimes) years to complete. He noted that true system change does not happen overnight and that the process of exploring effective change requires patience and thoughtfulness.</p> <p><i>PRESENTATION DISCUSSION</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior CCJJ reforms include recommendations aimed at clarifying jail time credits, mandating that parolees receive credit for time spent in jail pending a technical parole violation and eliminated statutes that require mandatory revocation / suspension of a driver's license.</li> <li>• Recommendations similar to the three mentioned above can take place pretty quickly, often in just a few months.</li> <li>• Other recommendations, like restructuring the theft statute can take a full year to go from the original 'idea' to a recommendation, a bill and then law.</li> <li>• Another reform that involved embarking on something new to Colorado was the recommendation to introduce a structured decision-making guide for use by the Colorado Parole Board (SB09-135, HB10-1374 and SB11-241).</li> <li>• This effort took a full two years; it involved many different stakeholders and lots of different interests.</li> <li>• One of the Commission's most intensive and lengthy efforts was that of drug law reform and revising Colorado's drug grid. This effort started in 2009 and successfully concluded in 2012.</li> <li>• Reform highlights included changes such as distinguishing between use/possession and manufacturing/distribution. Subsequent results included savings of nearly a million dollars in the first 12 months. Also, 250 fewer individuals were sentenced for a drug offense, and 79 fewer people were sentenced to prison.</li> <li>• Had it not been for the dedication and collaboration of a small group this would never have taken place.</li> <li>• Stan also reminded task force members that in order to get the work done, task forces break into smaller <i>working groups</i> and it's in those working groups where the majority of the work is accomplished.</li> <li>• He concluded by saying it's important to realize that patience is needed for knocking down pins and getting things accomplished. Change is hard and takes a while to accomplish.</li> </ul>

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Technical Violation and Revocation Process (cont. from July)</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p>	<p>Russha Knauer from the Division of Probation Services offered a PowerPoint presentation to task force members outlining pre-release termination and post-release recidivism rates for Colorado probationers. This was the third in a series of presentations on technical violations and the revocation process. Representatives from the Department of Corrections and Community Corrections presented on this topic during the July Re-entry Task Force meeting.</p> <p><i>PRESENTATION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Probation has two definitions for recidivism, one for pre-release recidivism/failure and one for post-release recidivism.</li> <li>• Those definitions are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Pre-release recidivism/failure: an adjudication or conviction for a felony or misdemeanor, or a technical violation relating to a criminal offense, while under supervision in a criminal justice program.</li> <li>-Post-release recidivism: a filing for a felony or misdemeanor within one year of termination from program placement for a criminal offense.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Russha presented a snapshot of what the numbers look like for total adult terminations from FY2004-FY2013.</li> <li>• Success rates have increased and failure rates for new crimes have decreased.</li> <li>• She presented the numbers for adult post-release recidivism from FY2004-FY2013 noting 5.2% for 2013.</li> <li>• As for Juvenile Terminations, JV new crimes have slowly increased over time while post release supervision numbers are better over time.</li> <li>• Probation produces both an Annual Report and a Recidivism Report and those can be found on the Colorado Judicial website.</li> <li>• The Annual Report captures successful terminations and those are defined as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Regular Supervision: Probationer who successfully completes probation</li> <li>-Intensive Programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Successful Transfer: Probationer who successfully transitions to regular probation supervision during the period of supervision</li> <li>*Successful Completion: Probationer who successfully completes probation while being supervised on intensive probation</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• There are several definitions of revocation (unsuccessful) terminations as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Technical Violation: probation is revoked for violating the terms and conditions of probation (other than new crime) and is resentenced by the court to something other than probation supervision (e.g. jail, prison, fine)</li> <li>-New Crime: probation is revoked for a new crime while on probation supervision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Felony: new felony offense committed while on supervision</li> <li>*Misdemeanor: new misdemeanor offense committed while on supervision</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- For an adult technical violation a probation officer can select up to six reasons for termination.
- The three reasons most often used are substance abuse and testing, reporting, treatment.
- A probationer terminates due to 'Absconding' (unsuccessful) when they are no longer reporting to their P.O. and the P.O. doesn't know where they are. The P.O. will then file a request; it goes to court, if the judge agrees a warrant is filed for their arrest.
- When someone absconds they are taken off probation's roles.
- Question – If they're off the roles are they considered as far as recidivism rates? Yes, once they're off roles for 30 days they can be considered in a recidivism category.
- The FY2014 Grand Total Terminations of 43,294 cases look as follows:
  - Successful 72%
  - Revoked 16%
  - Absconded 12%
- The second part of Russha's presentation focused Probation's program entitled Strategies for Behavior Change or SBC.
- She explained that this is tool which guides probation officers on how to respond to violation behavior.
- The program is currently in five districts statewide.
- The **Nature of Violation Behaviors** includes conditions related to substance use and abuse, conditions related to education/employment/treatment and conditions related to PO/Law enforcement contact.
- Responses to Violation Behavior can include things like a warning, an increase in substance abuse testing, homework, daily check-ins or a complaint filed with the court.
- The **Nature of Positive Behaviors** includes displaying pro-social attitudes and behaviors, positive behaviors related to education/employment/treatment and positive behaviors related to substance use.
- Responses to Positive Behavior can include verbal recognition, payment for treatment or UAs, bus tokens or modified reporting.
- One of the main drives for SBC is for an officer to respond to positive behavior on a 4 to 1 frequency. The goal being to make sure engagement in prosocial behavior is encouraged.
- P.O.'s have the ability to file a complaint on a low risk, but the goal is to avoid pulling low risk folks into court.
- Russha noted that the Terms and Conditions of probation were updated and revamped in 2013 with goals as follows:
  - To reduce barriers to success
  - To create opportunity to tailor to the individual's risk/needs
  - To connect to the research and EBPs
- The differences from the previous conditions were:
  - Language/phrasing
  - Categories: crime-free lifestyle, treatment supervision
  - Options for the court
- The court is open to waiving fees for clients who can't pay

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other than restitution most fees are discretionary, some are statutory</li> <li>• Question - What about the idea of verbiage like "not using alcohol to excess"? Probation officers may or may not cross out alcohol. Since it's legal, making sure to target for individuals need is important on this issue.</li> <li>• Hassan raised a different issue about a new problem for people on supervision regarding interest rates on unpaid restitution.</li> <li>• Apparently Judicial was audited last year, and an auditor picked up on the fact that Judicial wasn't enforcing a statute requiring 12% annual interest on unpaid restitution.</li> <li>• The State Court Administrators Office reviewed the legislation and has plans to begin requiring collection of the interest rate.</li> <li>• This is supposed to go into effect in September and will be applied retroactively.</li> <li>• Hassan stated that a package is being distributed to parolees informing them of this issue.</li> <li>• Question - Who gets the interest? The victim to who it's owed.</li> <li>• This is going to have a huge impact on success rates going forward if offenders are forced to comply</li> <li>• This group should wrestle with this topic right now and have a stance. Legislators are looking at this, advocacy groups, Hassan's group.</li> <li>• There are requests into Leg. Council.</li> <li>• Judicial has said that for right now as far as back payments - they will only add back payments on victims who requested the interest. But starting in September the interest will be mandated.</li> <li>• This will result in disparate impacts because it's dependent on whether the victim requests or not.</li> <li>• This could also potentially impact pleas – because a plea bargain may have been agreed to on a negotiated amount that was likely not based on interest charged, but based on a fixed number.</li> <li>• In theory you're not supposed to revoke probation with inability to pay.</li> <li>• If someone completes probation with outstanding debt it goes to collections.</li> </ul>
--	--

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>July meeting outcomes</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p> <p><u>Definitions Working Group</u> Stan, Rick and Eric to convene and discuss the possibility of common recidivism and technical violation definitions across stakeholder</p>	<p>Paul Herman walked the task force members through the outcomes of the July meeting, including a review of agreement areas and a look at target areas for possible future work.</p> <p><i>DISCUSSION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paul directed the group to a handout entitled 'CCJJ Re-entry Task Force / July meeting outcomes'</li> <li>• The document highlighted three general agreement areas as follows: -What ARE the issues with TV's</li> </ul>

<p>agencies (Probation, Parole, Community Corrections)</p> <p><u>Conditions Working Group</u> Mark, Jen B., Melissa Roberts, Sherri Hufford, Glenn Tapia and a Parole Board Rep. to get together to discuss condition setting</p> <p><u>Race/Ethnicity/Gender Working Group</u> Kim, Regi, Hassan and Anne Carter to meet and discuss race, ethnicity and gender issues as they relate to recidivism and technical violations</p>	<p>-Issues with Conditions of Supervision -Alternatives to Incarceration for TV responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each general agreement area included more specific detail along with Action Items to address the issues.</li> <li>• One of the pressing issues is that stakeholder agencies define recidivism and technical violations differently – which makes it hard to work on a common strategy to address these issues.</li> <li>• Paul directed the group to another document which compared recidivism and technical violations definitions agency-to-agency.</li> <li>• DOC defines a new offense as a felony - misdemeanors are considered a technical violation.</li> <li>• One of the other issues agency to agency is frequency of violations.</li> <li>• For example, a probation officer may list six violations on an offender, but it's unknown which one the judge determined was the deal breaker.</li> <li>• A question was raised about community corrections and why there is no definition for a community corrections technical violation. Paul answered that comm. corr. doesn't have blanket 'conditions' like parole or probation, so they don't have similarly defined violations. What comm. corr. does have are returns for program violations, new offenses, and substance abuse violations. Their record keeping is different than the other two stakeholders (Probation and Parole). The difficulty is also that 32 programs have 32 sets of rules.</li> </ul> <p>Paul presented a PowerPoint titled: <b>'Imposing Conditions in Light of Evidence Based Principles'</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He began the presentation noting that the Center for Effective Public Policy (CEPP) has done the most work on this issue.</li> <li>• He explained that the presentation will cover three main areas including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The importance of focusing on your objectives and goals concerning the use of conditions</li> <li>-The integration of conditions into an overall offender management system, and</li> <li>-Practical considerations that might aid the Court/Board in imposing the "right" conditions at the "right" time</li> </ul> </li> <li>• When it comes to field supervision, Probation and Parole officers are expected to monitor compliance with conditions, motivate the offender, make referrals, and respond to violations along with counseling and mentoring the offender.</li> <li>• Conditions should in fact establish some kind of roadmap in terms of what the officer needs to have in mind as far as goals and outcomes and what the person being supervised needs to have in mind.</li> <li>• This is to give a roadmap to be filled in as time goes on.</li> <li>• Courts and boards have great latitude to determine the number of type of conditions that will be imposed.</li> <li>• The reality is that most offenders under supervision are going to violate one or more of their conditions over time, and officers need to be ready for that.</li> <li>• Our system should be set up and expected to handle failure.</li> <li>• This is an area where we can make so much difference in terms of what</li> </ul>
---	---

	<p>we're doing with people on supervision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In examining conditions it's helpful to consider four general things: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Why do we impose conditions and what is our overall objective</li> <li>-What conditions do we choose to impose</li> <li>-What process do we follow in imposing conditions and what are the practical considerations, and</li> <li>-When are conditions imposed, and could they be more effectively or efficiently imposed at other points in the process.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There are lots of reasons why conditions are set, but some of them bump up against each other.</li> <li>• What the field is saying and folks are saying is that conditions should be set in a way that helps PROMOTE people to be successful. It's not just about the person succeeding – it's also about the impact on their neighborhood and communities.</li> <li>• The benefits of success are not only about the individual, but success also benefits neighbors and communities..</li> <li>• Again, the thought to always keep in mind is "Does imposing particular conditions help achieve the end goal?"</li> <li>• Conditions that are set in a blanket fashion without consideration for whether they're needed for a particular offender can take up resources for no reason. We need to ask if that is an effective way to use everyone's resources – offender and system alike.</li> <li>• Risk management has to do with classification systems and by using that kind of classification we can better manage supervision.</li> <li>• Risk reduction means addressing criminogenic needs to address behavior.</li> <li>• We need to always consider whether the set conditions help in risk management and risk reduction.</li> <li>• Also – how many conditions are the right amount?</li> <li>• We need to be clear about what we're trying to do with conditions.</li> <li>• In the past we used to say more is better, but some would say erring on the side of fewer is better. Targeted conditions are ideal.</li> <li>• There are issues not only with the number of conditions but also with prioritizing of conditions.</li> <li>• It's important to keep in mind 'How' conditions are imposed. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Do we look at the PSIR or institutional case plan?</li> <li>-Do we use the objective information derived from assessment tools?</li> <li>-What discussion occurs before conditions are imposed and how are conditions agreed upon?</li> <li>-What factors drive the decisions concerning particular conditions? And,</li> <li>-How are conditions "prioritized" and do some matter more than others in particular cases</li> </ul> </li> <li>• We need to consider 'need and value'.</li> <li>• Fortunately we've come to a time in our system where risk and need assessments are used to look at some of our conditions.</li> <li>• A question was raised on risk/needs assessments and recent findings of unintentional racial bias in risk assessments.</li> <li>• There is agreement among many criminal justice think tanks (PEW, CEPP,</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>NIC, VERA, CSG) on effective condition setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Effective Condition Setting</b> agreement areas are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Target higher risk cases – use scarce resources / interventions on this population</li> <li>-Focus on criminogenic needs</li> <li>-Develop a single case plan that follows the offender through the system</li> <li>-Impose conditions that attack appropriate issues or reinforce necessary actions</li> <li>-Encourage the use of incentives to shape behavior</li> <li>-Focus on cognitive behavioral interventions</li> </ul> </li> <li>• When starting any endeavor including someone new to supervision, bumps in the road are more likely early on. Folks fail early, we need to expect it, be ready for it and do what we can to prevent it. But this is not a new lesson.</li> <li>• It's worthy to consider staggering or prioritizing conditions.</li> <li>• It's important to be clear about what is expected from an offender <u>today</u>, not only the condition on the individual but the likelihood of impact on the end goals.</li> <li>• Start small, focus on the initial supervision period, then add and remove as needed. Currently many conditions go on forever.</li> <li>• If we follow the research about helping people get better that in turn helps the community and helps neighborhoods.</li> <li>• HOPE (the program in Hawaii) has some of these elements. The theory of 'Swift and Sure' is popular now. Probation is doing this with their Strategies for Behavior Change.</li> <li>• There are nuances people use, it's not that hard to figure out what we should be doing – it's just hard to do it.</li> <li>• Some of the things we're doing actually get in the way, like community return to custody.</li> <li>• During the July meeting this group agreed to take a look at recidivism and technical violation definitions agency to agency.</li> <li>• Other issues from the last meeting include looking at substance abuse – which appears to be one of the main drivers for TV's across all agencies.</li> <li>• Probation, Parole and Community Corrections have all done something to address substance abuse. The trick may be getting people together from those three agencies along with behavioral health and treatment providers to see if there's something we know to be effective to help someone who continues to relapse.</li> <li>• As for recidivism, this group needs to decide if there could or should be standardized agreement on recidivism and technical violation definitions across agencies.</li> <li>• Rick shared that DOC is working on performance-based measurements. He added there is a movement nationally to use the same language (recidivism) state to state across DOC's so the data could be compared state to state.</li> <li>• Can we form a small working group to explore the possibility of common recidivism and technical violations definitions agency-to-agency?</li> <li>• Stan, Rick and Eric to get together and talk about this before the next meeting.</li> </ul>
--	---



- As for conditions – should a small group to take a look at these across agencies? Is it important and is it worth going into that issue? Or are we doing the best we can?
- There are always going to be ‘people’ obstacles like there were with trying to implement the bail legislation.
- Rick noted that if there’s a Conditions Working Group the parole director would need to be present for that discussion.
- Question – Is there a way to check the efficacy of a condition on the usefulness to the offender or the ease of management for the agency?
- Is there a balance test against EBP on conditions?
- The Conditions group could look at three categories:
  - Basic accountability
  - Evidence-based practices, and
  - Criminogenic needs
- The Conditions Working Group should also keep in mind the idea of sequencing.
- Russha clarified that when meeting with a client a probation officer goes through t and c’s, then talk about criminogenic needs and increasing protective factors. They make sure their officers spend a short amount of time focused on terms and conditions and spend more time on skill building practices and how to strengthen criminogenic needs (e.g., where are they motivated to start, what are their strengths, where is the biggest bang for their buck, etc.).
- To clarify, the group looking at conditions will look at three categories plus sequencing, which could be how much is enough? What about looking at adding and subtracting conditions?
- Maybe Sherri could talk to the working group or the whole task force next month about the years of work Probation put into revising their terms and conditions. She could discuss what that experience was like.
- The working group could get together and talk about ‘what do we need to know’ on this topic.
- CCJJ has looked at this before, that’s why Probation already undertook this work.
- Also, there may be work that could be done on RESPONSES to violations.
- If we were to encourage a discussion in this area, what would be the purpose?
- Probation can track the six behaviors that are most recently violated and how the officer chooses to respond to them.
- Regi noted that she agrees on getting a similar definition. But what do we know about why a probation officer chooses what they’re choosing from the violations list. Does it make a difference? Does it make a difference in whether they get revoked or not? There are rabbit holes in the system issues when looking at how to improve the processes.
- The Behavioral Health Transformation Council tried to get uniform practices years ago around behavioral health and mental health. We are not having the conversation about ‘What do we do with folks who reoffend and terminate’. It’s usually because they’ve under-managed behavioral health and substance abuse failures.
- We shy on the side of saying how do we help you get management skills

	<p>around addiction behaviors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hassan noted that in looking at the issues of supervision and the verbiage of 'ideal' conditions, ethnic and racial decisions made by PO's are also huge factors in who gets sent back.</li> <li>• Racial and ethnic factors bias decisions made about the offender all the way through the system.</li> <li>• When we talk about conditions being set, they can be unreasonable and are often unreasonable.</li> <li>• There are things we do historically with conditions but any blanket condition is stuff we need to get away from.</li> <li>• This also gets back to racial bias embedded in risk assessment tools – which then drives all the other decisions.</li> <li>• The agencies using these instruments should be doing analysis on their instrument outcomes to determine bias.</li> <li>• We should be looking at all the instruments so we have the information and know exactly how the instruments are determining.</li> <li>• Is there a racial bias in Code of Penal Discipline (COPD) violations?</li> <li>• In looking at all the current assessments that are being used including CARAS and LSI – can we go back to the creators and say what are you doing with this in regards to bias?</li> <li>• We need information about outcomes by ethnicity, risk level and gender across agencies– need greater transparency and measures around accountability. (KIM)</li> <li>• One example is that the LSI is normed on men.</li> <li>• New court commitments and TV's are increasing for women – and we should be paying attention.</li> <li>• Colorado still uses the first version of the LSI, not the updated current LSI. State judicial and DOC would need to update the contract.</li> <li>• Denver uses Women's Risk/Needs Assessment (WRNA) out of Cincinnati which has specific domains for women. Regi has talked to Judicial about using that. And again, none of the instruments take into account mental health issues.</li> <li>• Updating the LSI in Colorado would be a huge undertaking, the domino effect would include updating and purchasing licenses for new instrument, then there would be extensive training for trainers, then training staff would have to travel across the entire state and train people. Case management assessment would need to be updated in all agencies as well.</li> <li>• Versions of the LSI include the LSI, LS/CMI, LSI-Revised.</li> <li>• Have other states made the upgrades and what are the cost benefits of the upgrade? Is there any work that shows updating eliminated bias? Kim to check.</li> <li>• There's actually more bias around inner-rater reliability than issues with the instrument itself.</li> <li>• It seems we should at least have the conversations around whether we're using the right tools to engage the outcomes.</li> <li>• We've got to get our head around risk factors and how we address them.</li> <li>• Can we take a look at instruments based on race/ethnicity and age?</li> <li>• If we're not looking at age, DNA, mental health and environment when it</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>comes to recidivism – what’s the point?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alison Morgan from DOC has started an in-house dialogue in DOC around mental health mapping including the quality of mental health care that is provided.</li> <li>• MH mapping includes identifying facilities, criteria for providing services and thinking about outcomes that could be successful.</li> <li>• OBH just produced a 300 page report identifying similar issues statewide as well.</li> <li>• Colorado has huge ‘geography and needs level’ gaps – if someone needs a residential MH bed they’ll more likely get it at Boulder County Jail than in the community.</li> <li>• Paul noted that three different possible work areas are surfacing during this meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Definitions</li> <li>-Conditions</li> <li>-Race, Ethnicity &amp; Gender</li> </ul> </li> <li>• He asked who would be willing to work in a small group regarding Conditions to look at the initial framework of how to approach this and what do we need to know. Volunteers included Mark Evans, Jennifer B., Rick volunteered Melissa from Parole, Russha said she would let Sherri know that someone from Probation would be needed as well. Marjorie added that she would let the Parole Board know someone is needed from there too.</li> <li>• The Conditions Working Group is to look at the possibility of sequencing, and of prioritizing and clarifying conditions.</li> <li>• When looking at accountability issues this group needs to look at what EBP’s suggest as far as specialized conditions. Need to talk about the purpose of conditions, sequencing and some of the other issues that were in Paul’s PowerPoint.</li> <li>• Should this group talk about the technical violation response to hot UAs and whether that should be a condition at all? Yes.</li> <li>• And what about sex offenders? Should this group be talking about that?</li> <li>• Paul suggests starting with regular conditions. A second phase down the road could include work with the SOMB.</li> <li>• The first step is to identify the problem - can we break this down by looking at revocations? Is there’s any way to determine revocations by race and ethnicity? There’s been a concern expressed about bias based on race, ethnicity and gender. We need to find out the bias.</li> <li>• Paul explained that before pulling data it’s important to define what info is desired for all working groups and then do the data pull.</li> <li>• In all of this we also need to look at risk as part of those factors.</li> <li>• Would we look at risk when identifying a subset rather than the entire population?</li> <li>• As for data – the first cut of data needs to be by race, ethnicity gender in terms of success failure.</li> <li>• Then look at race, ethnicity, and gender in terms of risk.</li> <li>• There’s something going on in Denver populations with high level of risk – we should try to figure that out.</li> <li>• This goes back to the question of if there is bias - what do we do about</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Let's get the info first, and then move toward the discussion of what's going on and breaking out the info.</li> <li>• Paul asked who would be willing to work on the Race/Ethnicity/Gender Working Group - Kim, Regi, Anne and Hassan agreed to meet (possibly just on the phone at first).</li> <li>• Looking at assessment instruments and inter rater reliability may be step 2.</li> <li>• What about Behavioral Health? Christie asked how do we carve out savings and move money into community behavioral health issues?</li> <li>• Joe responded that with jails and mental health it's about cost avoidance, not cost savings.</li> <li>• Jails have many fixed costs with staff, electricity, etc.</li> <li>• Christie noted that Colorado has moved 30 million dollars from DOC into the community. Joe replied that it's different at the state level because that's moving money from private beds.</li> <li>• Regi added that she's continuing to work on medication purchasing. She explained that if Colorado can create a common formulary with DOC, jails and mental health centers - the rest of it is about savings. If we did joint purchasing we could cut millions of dollars on budget around medication. That's HARD money. WE could capture those dollars for sure to go into mental health treatment.</li> <li>• Mental health and behavioral health are different issues.</li> <li>• MH and BH conversation would need to be in conjunction with mitigating factors as far as technical violations and their behavior on supervision.</li> <li>• Paul summarized that the task force will move forward with three working groups as follows:  <u>The Definitions Working Group:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stan Hilkey / lead</li> <li>-Rick Raemisch</li> <li>-Eric Philp</li> </ul> <u>The Conditions Working Group:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Mark Evans and Jen Bradford / leads</li> <li>-Melissa Roberts</li> <li>-Sherri Hufford</li> <li>-A parole board rep.</li> <li>-Glenn Tapia</li> </ul> <u>The Race/Ethnicity/Gender Working Group:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Kim / lead</li> <li>-Regi Huerter</li> <li>-Anne Carter</li> <li>-Hassan Latif</li> </ul> <u>The Technical Violations Alternatives Group</u>  This group will discuss the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-How things are being implemented and are there any results.</li> <li>-What is the role of incarceration in responding to technical violations?</li> <li>- There are things that could be considered like day reporting centers, to avoid the significant driver of over use of incarceration.</li> <li>-Since race, gender and conditions will inform the technical violations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>group → the Technical Violations Alternatives Group won't be created until we see how the first group's play out.</p> <p>-We do, however, need to talk about alternatives to incarceration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about fees, surcharges, restitution and other costs like costs of a drug test?</li> <li>• What about all the surcharges? What is the impact on success with this many fees if someone doesn't have the means or the means are being taken from them every month?</li> <li>• Offenders are paying for the drug offender surcharge, and they're going to pay for your own treatment as well. Paul responded that this should be part of the conditions conversation. Add on top of this that community corrections clients have to pay \$18/day.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Issue/Topic:</b>	<b>Discussion:</b>
<p>Next Steps and Adjourn</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p>	<p>The three working groups will convene between now and the September meeting. The 'leads' for each of the groups will be responsible for pull together their teams.</p>

### **Next Meeting**

September 9<sup>th</sup>, (Wednesday) 1:30pm – 4:30pm      700 Kipling St., 4<sup>th</sup> floor conference room