

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

August 10, 2016, 1:30PM-4:30PM
700 Kipling, 4th Floor Conference room

ATTENDEES:

CHAIR

Consultant Richard Stroker for Stan Hilkey, Dept. of Public Safety

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Rick Raemisch, Dept. of Corrections (phone)
Tom Giacinti, Representing Community Corrections
Mark Evans, Public Defender's Office
Monica Chambers, Department of Corrections (phone)
Sherri Hufford, Division of Probation Services
Jennifer Bradford, Metro State University of Denver
Hassan Latif, Second Chance Center
Jessica Jones, Criminal Defense Attorney
Gary Darling, Larimer County Criminal Justice Services
Christie Donner, Colo. Criminal Justice Reform Coalition
Regi Huerter, Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission
Adam Zarrin, Governor's Office
Anne Carter for Alfredo Pena, Parole Board

STAFF

Richard Stroker/CCJJ consultant
Kim English/Division of Criminal Justice
Germaine Miera/Division of Criminal Justice

ABSENT

Stan Hilkey, Dept. of Public Safety
Rose Rodriguez, Community Corrections
Pat Steadman, State Senator
Beth McCann, State Representative
Dave Young, District Attorney 17th JD
Melissa Roberts, Parole Division

<p>Issue/Topic: Welcome and Introductions</p>	<p>Discussion: CCJJ Consultant Richard Stroker chaired the meeting in place of Stan Hilkey who was working out of town. Richard welcomed the task force members and reviewed the agenda. He asked attendees to introduce themselves and called for any additions or deletions to the minutes. Seeing none the minutes were approved and the meeting began at 1:40 p.m.</p>
--	---

<p>Issue/Topic: REPORT BACK Collateral Consequences Working Group</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Collateral Consequences Working Group will continue to meet and will explore collateral consequences relief options both in regards to legal matters and other non-legal barriers. 	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Mark Evans, the lead for the Collateral Consequences Working Group offered an update on the group’s progress. Mark noted that state law defines the term “collateral consequence” and that in most contexts it means either a mandatory “collateral sanction,” or a discretionary “disqualification” under C.R.S 18-1.3-107(8). He added that outside of the strict legal definition of collateral consequences there are other consequences outside of the government sector (e.g. Landlord issues, employers, etc.) that still have an impact on somebody’s success once they’re back in the community. Mark said he wanted to clarify that the task force members are in agreement that the working group is not confined exclusively to the legal aspects. He asked if the task force embraces going beyond the strictly legal ramifications of ‘consequences of conviction’ and task force members agreed.</p> <p>Richard summarized that the working group is studying two areas as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relief from collateral consequences including remedies and actions to clear records or seal record and seek relief, and 2. Work on policies, practices and approaches that may impact somebody including barriers to employment or housing due to conviction or nature of conviction. <p>Mark explained again that these are two distinct realms and the working group plans to explore both. He added that the group is still in the problem identification phase and isn’t at the brainstorming phase yet. The task force agreed that the Collateral Consequences Working Group continued with the plan as described.</p>
--	---

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>HOUSING WORK PLAN – NEXT STEPS</p> <p>Action:</p> <p>Housing issues will be addressed by two working groups as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Collateral Consequences working group will identify and address barriers to housing 2. The Capacity Working Group will address housing inventory and capacity issues 3. Volunteers for the Capacity WG include Adam Zirrin from the Gov’s Office, someone from DOC and someone from Larimer 4. This proposed plan will need buy in from Stan and the rest of the Task Force 5. The September CCJJ meeting will feature a housing panel presentation to Commissioners 	<p>Richard explained that this agenda item would include discussion on the following issues regarding a housing work plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-cap from July meeting • Continued discussion on possible housing issues/areas that could be explored by the task force • Develop agreement regarding the specific housing issues/problem areas that the task force will explore • Next steps and/or establishment of working groups (identify which task force members/stakeholders for which working groups) • Timeline <p><i>DISCUSSION</i></p> <p>Richard directed task force members to a handout in their packets that outlines some of the ongoing efforts around housing by other agencies and organizations. The document includes a list of efforts by local municipalities, the Governor’s office, the Department of Corrections, the Department of Local Affairs, the Mentally Ill in the Criminal Justice System Advisory Task Force and other alternative housing organizations.</p> <p>It was noted that although other organizations may be studying housing as one aspect of their effort, it’s hard to know if anybody else is really focusing specifically on the criminal justice population.</p> <p>Richard reminded task force members that housing was identified at the retreat as something the CCJJ wants to address. He said the hope for today’s discussion is to narrow the focus and hopefully create a working group or two to look at specific issues. Topics this group has touched on include a dearth of any housing let alone affordable housing, needs around housing specific to the CJ population, transitional housing, and issues with private landlords.</p> <p>Mark added that the Collateral Consequences Working group is already planning on looking at local housing authority restrictions. He noted they also plan to assess the CBI criminal history record which is used by both employers and landlords. The group is also discussing capacity building and landlord liability tort reform.</p> <p>A group discussion ensued highlighting the following issues as key for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work needs to be focused on justice involved people • Need to work with people where they are by setting up flexible housing funds (for example, King County is looking at housing by ‘person’ – there needs to be understanding of all the other issues and services needed for a person along with housing). • General fund money for vouchers • Supportive housing needs to be considered

- A 'champion is needed at the state level in the same way that Gary is a champion in Larimer
- There is no capacity in Denver and surrounding areas, capacity is one of the biggest issues
- Some people need treatment in housing, some just need transitional housing
- This is a problem for back-end parolees and front-end probationers
- Can't rely on the Feds to solve the problem

Richard summarized the discussion and concerns into four main areas:

- A. Whittle down to justice involved individuals
- B. Capacity – using existing capacity, expanding capacity, need for flexible capacity
- C. Returning offenders and community supervision, housing options (Flexible housing fund / LA)
- D. Matching people to need, look at the individuals, this is not issue specific.

Jessica suggested one working group could look at capacity while the Collateral Consequences Working Group works on barriers. Regi added that the group should keep in mind hundreds of thousands of dollars are going to funding hotels and motels - maybe it's more advantageous to develop different relationships and modes of working with the people who are currently managing and owning those hotels. Jessica clarified that discussions around buying a floor of a hotel still fall under the umbrella of capacity.

The issue of capacity can be about building capacity or working with situations that are already ongoing. Richard agreed that the work around housing could fall into two groups: the current Collateral Consequences group could work on identifying and resolving barriers while a newly created Capacity Working Group could take a look at inventory of what is currently available and what is needed. They could also explore alternatives for creating and expanding capacity.

Group members discussed that even if there is a recommendation or movement around acquiring more funds, the barriers will remain because municipalities will always push back. One way to address this may be to figure out how to incentivize municipalities to find housing for offenders. HB-1451 incentivized counties to look at 0-21 year olds and how they could use funds to meet goals. Using 'Pay for Success' is always an option as well.

Rick added that this is not just a Denver problem, but a huge statewide problem as well. Sherri agreed and stated approximately 10 to 12 % of the Probation population is homeless; another 30% are in unsatisfactory housing. That's out of a total of 78,000 adults on Probation.

Task Force members suggested that a Capacity working group should keep the following ideas/issues in mind:

- Ask someone to provide ten housing vouchers somewhere in the state. Use them to focus on a specific population.
- Need to identify whether it is lack of capacity due to literally not having enough space and beds, or is it barriers because people are justice

	<p>involved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What can be done to stimulate better outcomes for people • How do we incentivize communities who want to do this and people who want to do this on a local level • Need to figure out how to grow capacity or maximize the resources available • Need a champion to lead that group, someone who understands state level and federal level housing • Is there a possibility of conducting a vulnerability study? <i>Mark pointed out that a study was done in 2007 and the single biggest issue at that time was employment, followed by housing. But it's a different landscape now</i> • Even if barriers are addressed and resolved, people re-entering are going to be priced out of the market. • The number one question is what do we do with all these people, how do we get rid of barriers, and then how do we deal with capacity. • Explore other funds that may be available – is there a possibility to tap into money around the increasing fines and fees for offenders and use those for housing? Or tap into other funds and fees. • Need to figure out how to use sources and expand the message, but this task force doesn't have the capacity to actually build a building. <p>Mark shared that he can send the most recent Piton Study on housing to the group, but that it was done quite a while back.</p> <p>Richard asked if anyone would be willing to work on a Capacity Working Group. The purpose of the group would be to come up with legislative or policy changes regarding creating capacity. Adam Zirrin from the Governor's Office said he's passionate about housing issues and has background experience, but he needs to check his availability. Rick added that he will provide someone from DOC, Gary said that he could see if someone from Larimer would be available to participate as well.</p>
--	---

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>NEXT STEPS</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Richard summarized that the task force agreed to address housing issues with two Working Groups. The current Collateral Consequences Working Group will be working on identifying and addressing barriers while the newly created Capacity Working Group will focus on building capacity. Richard added that the task force will need to meet with Stan to ensure he thinks the group is moving in the right direction before firming up an action plan.</p> <p>Richard reminded everyone that there will be a housing panel presentation at the September CCJJ meeting in order to bring all Commissioners up to speed with the work being done by the Task Force.</p>

Next Meeting

September 7th, 2016 1:30pm – 4:30pm 700 Kipling, 4th floor training room