

MINUTES
Sex Offense/Offender Task Force
Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice
February 29, 2012, 1:30PM-4:30PM
710 Kipling, 3rd floor, Lakewood

These are the last minutes for the final meeting of the Sex Offense/Offender Task Force. The final report to the Commission from the Sex Offense/Offender Task Force is appended at the end of these Minutes.

ATTENDEES:

CHAIR

David Kaplan, Chair, Private Defense Attorney

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Michael Anderson, Parole Board *(by phone)*

Norma Anderson, Former State Senator

Peggy Heil, Department of Corrections

Erin Jemison, Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault

Laurie Kepros, Colorado Criminal Defense Bar

Dianna Lawyer-Brook, Boulder Community Corrections, SOMB, and CURE

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky, Division of Criminal Justice

Richard Schneider, Denver PD, SO Registration

Steve Siegel, Victim Advocacy, Victim organizations and 2nd Judicial District DA's Office (Denver) *(by phone)*

Adrian Van Nice, Colorado District Attorneys' Council *(by phone)*

PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS

Pat Harris, Advocates for Change

Carolyn Turner, Advocates for Change

STAFF

Kevin Ford, Division of Criminal Justice

ABSENT MEMBERS

Maureen Cain, Criminal Defense Bar

Angel Weant, Probation Services, Colorado Judicial Branch

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p data-bbox="142 212 483 275">Welcome and Introductions David Kaplan</p>	<p data-bbox="561 212 1078 239">David Kaplan welcomed the attendees and:</p> <ul data-bbox="573 247 1094 317" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="573 247 1053 275">• Attendees introduced themselves, and <li data-bbox="573 283 1094 317">• There was a brief overview of the agenda.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p data-bbox="142 501 483 600">Updates: Registration Working Group David Kaplan/Kevin Ford</p>	<p data-bbox="561 501 1528 600">David and Kevin offered a brief update on the Working Group issues: the “Lacks a fixed residence” recommendation, issues with cancellation of registration, and the Griffin (intent-to-reside) issue.</p> <p data-bbox="561 642 1240 669">“Lacks a fixed residence” recommendation (FY12-SO #1)</p> <p data-bbox="561 678 1523 1031">Although there are still concerns regarding the 14-day threshold to establish residency and the 30-day threshold to differentiate those who have and those who do not have a fixed residence, there has been little response from Tom Raynes at the CDAC (CO District Attorney’s Council) to work on the issue. As has been established previously, the advocates for the homeless who participated in the Registration Working Group state that the 30-day threshold is a more viable threshold when addressing the residency status of individuals who are homeless. Due to the late date legislatively speaking, the CCJJ “point person” for the legislation, Maureen Cain, is being encouraged to proceed with drafting of the bill “as is” and getting it to the proposed sponsor, Rep. Bob Gardner.</p> <p data-bbox="561 1073 1036 1100">Issues with cancellation of registration.</p> <p data-bbox="561 1108 1528 1423">As described more fully in the Minutes of the November 30 Task Force meeting, there are continuing concerns from law enforcement and CDAC with the function of the cancellation of registration process. Tom Raynes of the CDAC has stated that his organization cannot support a transient bill without also addressing this cancellation of registration issue. This issue is related but not perceived as directly related to the “transient bill.” Tom Raynes has been unavailable to work with point person, Maureen Cain, to draft additional language for inclusion in the “transient bill.” The Task Force feels Maureen, as mentioned above regarding the 14/30 day issue, should proceed with drafting.</p> <p data-bbox="561 1465 919 1493">Griffin (intent-to-reside) Case</p> <p data-bbox="561 1501 1523 1816">Similar to the above, Tom Raynes, representing CDAC, has indicated there will be no support for the “transient bill,” if it is not drafted to address the Griffin issue. Like the above, this is seen as a related, but not an essential, element for inclusion in the preparation of the transient bill. Also, It is difficult to include language to address the Griffin issue when the CO Supreme Court may issue a ruling on the case. However, as also stated above, Mr. Raynes has not been available to draft language with point person Maureen Cain. The Task Force would like Maureen to proceed with or without the input of Mr. Raynes on the Griffin issue.</p>

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p data-bbox="147 212 483 348" style="text-align: center;">Update: Refinement Working Group Tabled Recommendations Peggy Heil/Members</p>	<p data-bbox="561 212 1523 489">Peggy Heil reported on the Refinement Working Group meeting held the previous day on February 28th and presented the materials prepared to address Recommendations FY12-SO #5, #6, #9, and #11 that were tabled by the Commission at its October 14 CCJJ meeting. The data request by David Kaplan to the Office of Planning and Analysis at the Department of Corrections has not been fulfilled. Although it was reported that the request was approved by a review committee at DOC, it was unclear why there was no further response from DOC. The Working Group finalized its materials without this information.</p> <p data-bbox="561 531 1523 701">Peggy described several handouts that, with the approval of the Task Force, will be presented to the Commission on March 9 (the information is included in the Final Report to the Commission that is appended to these Minutes). Peggy explained that Recommendations #5, 9, and 11 will be discussed, but that #6, upon further, investigation, was now considered moot.</p> <p data-bbox="561 743 914 772">Recommendations #5 and #9</p> <p data-bbox="561 779 1523 949">These recommendations concern funding and the number of beds for sex offenders in treatment in community corrections. The WG felt it had prepared supporting materials that show that these offenders can be treated effectively in community corrections. The support of these treatment programs will likely be cost neutral rather than produce a cost savings.</p> <p data-bbox="561 955 699 984">Comments:</p> <p data-bbox="561 991 1495 1056">If the outcome is cost neutral rather than resulting in cost savings, why pursue the expansion of residential sex offender treatment in community corrections?</p> <ul data-bbox="586 1062 1523 1556" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="586 1062 1523 1127">➤ Evidence supports that the delivery of such services in the community leads to positive outcomes. <li data-bbox="586 1134 1523 1234">➤ This option offers a smaller “step-up” destination for selected sex offenders on probation who need additional shorter-term intervention, rather than sending them to prison with the collateral consequences of a prison stay. <li data-bbox="586 1241 1523 1306">➤ There is the opportunity for community corrections residents to continue to have a job and pay taxes. <li data-bbox="586 1312 1523 1413">➤ There may be some individuals returning to the community from prison who need the additional services at this “step-down” destination to re-establish themselves. <li data-bbox="586 1419 1523 1556">➤ There may be some individuals who, due to safety concerns, we would prefer a more gradual re-introduction into the community in a structured and secure program rather than to parole these persons directly to the street. <p data-bbox="561 1598 813 1627">Recommendation #6</p> <p data-bbox="561 1633 1503 1944">This recommendation concerns a 30-day funding limit for the treatment of offenders in community corrections who are placed there as a condition of probation. Upon further examination, it was found that the limit is based on an agency rule and not by statute or court ruling. There was a Chief Justice Directive (from the CO Supreme Court) issued in 1986 that did set this limit. However, this directive was repealed the following year on Oct. 12, 1987. It is within the purview of the Office of Community Corrections to change its own rule without additional intervention or external action. Therefore, the Refinement WG suggests no further action on this recommendation.</p>

Issue/Topic:

Update:
Refinement Working Group
Recommendation Suggestions
Peggy Heil/Members

Suggestions

The Working Group also discussed, and would like to forward to the Commission, suggestions on the follow-up and tracking of some of recommendations that were previously approved by the Task Force and the Commission. Additionally, the Ref. WG would like the Task Force to forward a suggestion that the Commission create a Data Task Force.

On Previous Recommendations

FY12-SO2. Develop collaborative training programs.

Recommend the Sex Offender Management Board organize a collaborative effort (with identified partners, such as agency and/or EPIC staff) to provide regular training through agency resource sharing and report back to CCJJ by January 2013. Recommend the collaborative effort also address the training needs identified in FY12-SO12: Parole Board training on Lifetime Supervision.

FY12-SO3. Improve the collection and consistency of data to evaluate the impact of the lifetime supervision act.

See "Recommendations for Future CCJJ Priorities" below.

FY12-SO12. Conduct regular and ongoing training on Lifetime Supervision and sex offender management as a part of the required Parole Board member training.

As mentioned previously as a part of this recommendation, it is recommended that regular lifetime supervision sentence training be included in the Parole Board Policy Manual.

FY12-SO13. The State Board of Parole and treatment staff of the DOC Sex Offender Treatment and Monitoring Program should develop a regular system of feedback when sex offenders who meet SOMB criteria are denied parole.

Recommend the Parole Board and SOTMP develop a system of feedback, document the process in the parole board manual and report back to the CCJJ by February 2013.

FY12-SO15. The commission supports a statewide public policy and an education strategy led by the Sex Offender Management Board to promote the use of child safety zones in lieu of residency restrictions and zoning ordinances regarding sex offender housing.

Request a report to CCJJ on January 11, 2013 by the Sex Offender Management Board on the efforts and accomplishments regarding work with stakeholders, including representatives of Colorado counties and municipalities, to provide education about sex offender housing restrictions and ordinances and evidence-based practices of shared living arrangements. When these efforts are determined to be sufficient, the outcome should be a recommendation for legislation to address restrictions and ordinances regarding sex offender housing.

CCJJ Data Task Force

The Refinement WG also discussed the limitations on its work due to data availability and accessibility. The prevailing example being the data request from DOC that had not been fulfilled in 2.5 months since the request. The group felt that the Task Force should request that CCJJ seat a task force to address data issues. The idea was also floated that this task force could, rather than exploring

	<p>and solving the issues itself, develop plans for an entity in Colorado similar to the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/). In whatever form, this group, if created, should address data issues related to sex offenders.</p> <p>The issues surrounding the need for data in order to make evidence-based decisions has emerged across past and present CCJJ task forces. In fact, in the summer of 2010, the Commission explored the creation of such a task force, but set aside its creation with the intent to return to the possibility at a point in the future.</p> <p>The SO Task Force unanimously supports forwarding the suggestion to create a Data Task Force to the Commission.</p>
--	---

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Task Force: Final Thoughts David Kaplan/Members</p>	<p>The Task Force discussed any final thoughts related to or beyond those mentioned earlier in the meeting.</p> <p>Data Needs Can the Sex Offense/Offender Task Force be reinstated once the data circumstances are resolved? This seems unlikely in the short term, but is always possible. The Data Task Force would be a logical place to resolve pending sex offender issues that were dependent on data.</p> <p>Adam Walsh Act There were still very divergent opinions on the value of Adam Walsh compliance. Some expressed that it seems Colorado has been so busy pursuing compliance that there has been inadequate study regarding the actual value or harm done by Adam Walsh compliance. This was not a unanimous opinion.</p> <p>Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky explained that the remaining “sticking point” preventing compliance is primarily that Colorado does not display the address where sex offenders work on the internet. There are those that vehemently oppose this action, given the potential risk to reduce employment options for sex offenders because employers do not want their business address displayed on a sex offender registry. Others don’t like the idea, but do not want the CCJJ to take a definitive stand on the issue because it could harm compliance negotiations with the SMART Office (http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/smart/).</p> <p>A lengthy discussion ensued debating whether there should be a motion and how the motion should be worded regarding the employer address issue. The thoughts are grouped logically here, rather than in the order that thoughts were expressed in the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The motion could state a prohibition against public posting of employer address, but allow law enforcement access to this information. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is viewed as too limiting for those arguing for complete negotiation flexibility. ○ The SMART Office would not be satisfied if the information was only

Issue/Topic:

Task Force:
Final Thoughts
David Kaplan/Members

- available to law enforcement.
- If the motion is a recommendation, what actions do we expect to take and who takes those actions?
- Regardless of the wording, can't the Task Force and CCJJ simply take a policy position that others (e.g., SOMB, the State, or whomever) can take or leave as they see fit? There is no pre-ordained outcome. The motion could pass or fail either here (the Task Force) or at the Commission.
- Would posting the employer address really have any impact on the employer or on the employment options of offenders? It is felt that more study and discussion should take place before voting on a statement of opposition is conducted.
- It is felt by some that the display of employer addresses is an obviously "bad thing" that does not require "study."
- A motion was made.

The Sex Offense/Offender Task Force issues a position statement that the following is a priority for the State of Colorado in regard to compliance with the Adam Walsh Act:

The Sex Offense/Offender Task Force urges the State of Colorado to not implement any requirement that employer address be a part of the public access portion of the sex offender registry.

VOTE PASSED: 6 approve, 5 disapprove (2 absent)

Due to the small margin of passage, those in the minority request that the exact distribution of the vote be shared with the Commission. It will be expressed that the 6-5 vote in favor obviously represented a divided opinion on the matter. Although all members indicate that they informally agree on philosophical grounds (that the inclusion of employer address is not desirable), those opposing do so for practical considerations of granting the freedom to work with the SMART Office without the constraints of such a policy statement.

Concluding Thoughts

David offered some final observations.

- David described how he felt there was still work that could be done on the topics of sex offenses, sex offenders, and the Lifetime Supervision Act. However, he respects the decision to call a conclusion to the current work acknowledging that the CCJJ could decide in the future to re-open consideration on these matters.
- Any effort on the topic of sex offenders can be fraught with contention as stakeholders on all sides hold very passionate views. Nonetheless, the Task Force members and public participants did excellent work together over the last year and half. Even though some goals may not have been met, the Task Force produced good work and accomplished quite a bit in this short period.
- The CCJJ and its process of seating Task Forces to addresses and propose solutions is a good forum for this type of policy work to be carried out.
- David expressed his appreciation to members and all participants for their attendance, investment of time, research and study, and the willingness to solve problems with a spirit of compromise.

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
<p>Final Steps David Kaplan</p>	<p>David summarized plans for the conclusion of the Task Force and final presentations to the CCJJ at its March 9 meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peggy Heil and Glenn Tapia will present the materials on the tabled recommendations. • David will present the two policy suggestions to the Commission, specifically, the Data Task Force and the motion to exclude employer addresses from registry information. • David will acknowledge at the CCJJ meeting the hard work of those who participated in the Task Force. • The next CCJJ meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 9, 2012, 12:30-4:30pm at the Jefferson County District Attorney's Bldg., 500 Jefferson County Parkway, Golden, CO 80401 <p>The final report to the Commission from the Sex Offense/Offender Task Force is appended to these Minutes.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm</p> <p>The link to the CCJJ: Sex Offense/Offender Task Force page is: http://cdpsweb.state.co.us/ccjj/Sex_offender_task_force.html</p> <p>The link to the CCJJ Master Meeting Calendar is: http://cdpsweb.state.co.us/ccjj/CCJJCalendar.html</p>

Sex Offense/Offender Task Force Meeting Dates:

Date	Location	Time
Wednesday, February 1, 2012		CANCELED
Wednesday, February 29, 2012	710 Kipling, Lakewood, Denver	1:30-4:30PM

February 29 was the final meeting of the Task Force.

Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice Sex Offense/Offender Task Force FINAL REPORT

March 9, 2012

The Sex Offense/ Offender Task Force concluded its final meeting on February 29, 2012. This handout contains the final elements of work and feedback for consideration by the Commission.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

- David Kaplan*, Chair
- Steve Siegel*, 2nd Judicial District representing Victim's Organizations
- Norma Anderson, Former State Senator
- Michael Anderson, CO State Board of Parole
- Maureen Cain, CO Criminal Defense Bar
- Peggy Heil, Department of Corrections
- Erin Jemison, Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault
- Laurie Rose Kepros, Sex Offender Defense, State Public Defender's Office

*Commission members

- Dianna Lawyer-Brook, Boulder Community Corrections Board, SOMB and CURE
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky, DCJ/SOMB
- Richard Schneider, SO Registration, Denver PD
- Adrian Van Nice, CDAC and 20th Judicial District, Boulder DA's Office
- Angel Weant, Sex Offender Programs, Probation Division
- Former Members:
Ted Tow, previously CDAC
Scot Smith, Judicial

Report Contents	Page
Tabled Recommendations FY12-05, FY12-09, FY12-11 - actionable FY12-06 - no action	2
Sex Offenders In Community Corrections Summary (November 2011)	3
Census (November 10, 2011)	4
Sex Offender Differential Per Diem	5-10
Feedback to CCJJ	11
FY12 SO Recommendations	12-18

TABLED RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommendations tabled by the Commission on October 14, 2011.

FY12-SO5. Support funding an enhanced per diem differential (\$33.02) that applies to specialized Diversion, Transition, Condition of Probation and Condition of Parole community corrections programs for sex offenders.

The goal of this recommendation is to increase community corrections placement options and bed capacity for sex offenders as an intermediate alternative to placement in the Department of Corrections or Probation. When appropriate and warranted, based on evidence-based practice and public safety considerations, some sex offenders could be managed and treated more cost effectively in community corrections. Without this intermediate option, the only options become either the most expensive but, possibly, excessive option - incarceration - or the less expensive but, possibly, insufficient option - probation or parole.

Currently, the funding for the enhanced per diem differential is supported by a Justice Assistance Grant that expires at the end of FY 2012. Without the enhanced per diem, most programs will not accept sex offenders because higher paid, specialized staff are required to work with sex offenders. Additional costs to programs are incurred because sex offenders are less able to pay the required subsistence fees due to the greater challenge for sex offenders to find and maintain employment while paying for treatment and monitoring costs. The Office of Community Corrections (OCC) at the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) would define the program criteria and specialized scope of work to qualify for the enhanced per diem which would include having a minimum of 5 beds in each funded program. The implementation of this recommendation would be most effective in conjunction with Recommendation #6.

FY12-SO9. Support funding for the Division of Parole (DOC) to negotiate an increase in the number of beds in Community Corrections agencies and programs to house COPa (condition of parole) sex offenders for residential sex offender treatment.

Currently there are only 10 beds funded through HB10-1360 that are designated for the residential treatment of sex offenders in community corrections.

FY12-SO11. Support continued funding of the Sex Offender Victim Specialist (SOVS) FTE to work in coordination with the sex offender treatment program to continue the current DOC grant-funded SOVS services.

This Specialist is assigned to provide education to victims (enrolled in the DOC victim notification program) regarding sex offender treatment in DOC, to prepare victims for parole release applications hearings, and to prepare victims for the possible re-entry of sex offenders into the community. If victims are amenable, the specialist can provide an opportunity for victims to be informed of and to provide input into the offender's treatment. The funding for this grant-funded position expires September 30, 2012.

MOOT - Task Force recommends no further action**FY12-SO6. Change the DCJ OCC rule to remove the 30-day funding limit for treatment of sex offenders in community corrections.**

There are several instances where Probation has requested that the Office of Community Corrections (OCC) of the Division of Criminal Justice fund the placement of COPr (Condition of Probation) sex offenders in community corrections. The OCC enforces a contractual funding imperative that places a 30-day maximum for regular COPr offenders. This 30-day period is not a sufficient length of stay for sex offenders in residential supervision and treatment. Given an enhanced differential per diem, the OCC should change this limitation for COPr sex offenders in order to provide a sufficient length of stay for supervision and treatment. This recommendation would enhance the implementation of Recommendation #5.

Sex Offenders in Community Corrections Summary (November 2011)

JD	Program	Currently Accept Sex Offenders?	If Yes, Accept SVP?	Any plans to accept SXO?	Barriers to Accepting Sex Offenders?
1	ICCS-Jeffco	Yes	No	NA	NA
2	CMI-Dahlia	No	NA	No	Funding, Staff, Community, Neighborhood
2	CMI-Fox	No	NA	No	Funding, Staff, Community, Neighborhood
2	CMI-Ulster	No	NA	No	Funding, Staff, Community, Neighborhood
2	CMI-Columbine	No	No	No	Funding, Staff, Community, Neighborhood
2	Peer I	No	NA	No	Focus on Substance Abuse
2	Haven	No	No	No	Not qualified, children on grounds
2	Tooley Hall	No	NA	No	Family Programming
2	Williams St. Ctr.	No	No	NA	Location
2	Ind House - Pecos	No	NA	No	Lack of funding, training, DVOMB and DCJ standards
2	Ind House - Fillmore	No	NA	No	Dual DX is conducive to SOM at the same time
2	Phase I	Yes	No	NA	NA
4	CAE	No	NA	Unknown	Cost of programming, staff, training, liability
4	COMCOR Inc	Yes	No	NA	NA
4	Gateway	Yes	No	NA	NA
6	Hilltop House	No	NA	Yes	Location to parks, transitional housing, shelters and soup kitchens
8	Larimer County	Yes	Yes	NA	NA
9	Garfield	No	NA	Yes	Training for the staff
10	Crossroads TC	No	NA	No	Board will not allow
10	Minnequa	No	NA	NA	Board will not allow
10	CCSI	No	NA	NA	The board
12	SLVCC	Yes	No	NA	High risk community
13	ATC-Sterling	Yes	No	NA	NA
14	CAPS	No	NA	No	Do not meet SOMB req, Case Managmt. training, negative comm, lack of recruitmt.
17	TTC - Adams	No	NA	Yes	Zoning
17	TTC - Commerce City	No	NA	No	Zoning
17	Phoenix Center	Yes	Yes	NA	NA
18	CCTC	No	NA	No	Conditional Use Permit
18	ACTC	Yes	No	NA	NA
18	ACRC	No	NA	No	Littleton conditional use permit
19	ICCS-Weld	Yes	Yes	NA	NA
20	CMI-BCTC	Yes	Yes	NA	NA
20	CMI-LCTC	Yes	Yes	NA	NA
21	Mesa County	Yes	Yes	NA	NA

Census of Sex Offenders (November 10, 2011)

Judicial District	Provider	Diversion	Transition	Condition of Parole	Total	Number of Beds with Enhanced Per Diem
1	ICCS Jeffco	9	10	2	21	8
4	COMCOR Inc	21	4	1	26	16
8	Larimer	11	7	10	28	13
12	SLVCC	1	1	0	2	0
13	ATC Sterling	1	0	2	3	0
17	Phoenix Center	14	18	4	36	0
18	ACTC	3	1	0	4	0
19	ICCS-Weld	7	2	1	10	0
20	BCTC	3	1	0	4	0
20	LCTC	0	0	0	0	0
21	Mesa	22	4	2	28	2
Overall Total		92	48	22	162	39

Shaded = Primary locations for Specialized Beds at Enhanced Per Diem

Sex Offender Differential Per Diem

Base Facts (from Fiscal Year 11 Data Analysis)

- The average length of stay for sex offenders in residential community corrections is 275 days for successful clients.
- Without a differential per diem, the average sex offender participates in a total of 32 treatment sessions per stay (individual and group sessions)

General Funding Basis

- Rate: \$33.02 Differential Per Diem
- Amount: \$12,052 per bed (per year)
\$9,080 per offender (based on 275 day Avg. LOS x Per Diem of \$33.02)

General Assumptions and Premise

- Sex offenders must be supervised and treated according to individualized risk and needs. Therefore, sex offenders in community corrections do not require identical service profiles.
- The enhanced funding proposal is based on an estimation of a “typical” sex offender client. However, the *typical sex offender* needs profile is without deference to the index offense or actual risk/need differences among convicted sex offenders.
- The enhanced funding must be flexible enough to adapt to changing needs among sex offenders.
- The enhanced funding would be directed at the following services and costs for a maximum period of 12 months. After 12 months of residential supervision, sex offenders would assume financial responsibility for their offense-specific supervision and treatment costs.
- The base per diem of \$37.74 is not intended for any specialized sex offender services. This basic funding level is the same as it was in 2003 with no net increases since that time despite cost increases to providers.
- The proposal for enhanced per diem for sex offenders is considered most effective when a single provider has a minimum of five (5) beds that are allocated for specialized sex offender supervision, management, and treatment.

Funding Summary

- **Direct Client Services** - \$8,980 per client, per year (average)
- **Indirect/Discretionary Client Services** - \$7,120 per client, per year (maximum)
- **TOTAL CLIENT SERVICES – Maximum of \$16,100 per client, per year**
- **Additional Program Costs** – Amount unspecified

Direct Client Services (Annualized for a Single Client)

Direct Client Services				
Service	Average Cost Per Service	Unit	Average Number of Services, per Client, Per Year	Cost Per Year
Intakes (annual intake)	\$100.00	per service	1	\$100.00
Individual Sessions (semi-monthly treatment)	\$100.00	per service	24	\$2,400.00
Group Sessions (weekly treatment)	\$65.00	per service	52	\$3,380.00
Polygraphs (quarterly polygraphs)	\$300.00	per service	4	\$1,200.00
PPG/Abel (annual service)	\$275.00	per service	1	\$275.00
Psychosexual Evaluations (one time service)	\$950.00	per service	1	\$950.00
Family Session (quarterly service)	\$150.00	per service	4	\$600.00
Sex Offender Registration (quarterly requirement)	\$75.00	per service	1	\$75.00
SUBTOTAL - Direct Client Services				\$8,980

Indirect/Discretionary Client Services (Annualized for a Single Client)

Indirect/Discretionary Client Services				
Service	Average Cost Per Service	Unit	Average Number of Services, per Client, Per Year	Cost Per Year
GPS Monitoring	\$330.00	per month	12	\$3,960.00
Treatment Community Supervision (Trackers)	\$30.00	per hour	20	\$600.00
Subsistence Offset for 90 Days	\$17.00	per day for 90 days	1	\$1,530.00
Parental Risk Assessment	\$850.00	per service	1	\$850.00
Transportation Assistance to Services (3 month Bus Pass)	\$60.00	per month	3	\$180.00
SUBTOTAL - Indirect/Discretionary Client Services				\$7,120.00

TOTAL - Direct and Indirect/Discretionary Client Services	\$16,100.00
--	--------------------

Sex Offender Differential Per Diem (cont'd)

Additional Program Costs

In addition to direct and indirect/discretionary client services, programs often realize additional costs related to sex offender supervision and treatment. Any funds that are not spent in direct or indirect client service costs should be used to offset the program costs below.

Staff and Management Training Including Travel and Registration

- 40 to 60 Hours of Formal Initial and Ongoing Training
- Experienced staff training new staff on sex offender management policies, and sex offender research

Program Infrastructure

- Some providers may elect to compensate sex offender case managers more in order to retain them longer as employees. Staff retention in community corrections is a problem. Programs must invest in high levels of training for sex offender case manager staff and may need to pay higher salaries in order to avoid staff turnover among well-trained staff.
- State contracts result in requirements for providers to maintain certain levels of liability insurance. Often, adding sex offenders to program populations requires additional levels of liability insurance for providers.

Intensive and Enhanced Case Management Services

- Additional Sex Offender Risk Assessments
- Review and Approval of Safety Plans
- Supervision Team Staffings
- Safety Plan Education for Clients
- Additional Time in Weekly Case Management Meetings
- Sex Offender Family Orientation
- Additional Work for Setting up Intakes, Polygraphs, GPS, Registration, and other specialized sex offender services
- Reading Client Journals, Polygraphs, and Treatment Documents
- Inspecting Client Email accounts, cell phones
- Smaller caseloads for sex offender case managers result in larger caseloads for other staff and, sometimes, additional case management staff/FTE. Often case managers have caseloads 40% to 50% smaller than regular offenders due to more intensive SOMB and DCJ standard requirements.
- Additional room searches, pat downs, off site monitoring and training for security staff
- Additional on-site verifications for sex offenders who have sign out privileges
- Pre-acceptance interviewing, screening and staffing with community corrections board
- Additional phone contact with therapist, polygraphist, and referral agency

Sex Offender Differential Per Diem (cont'd)

Offender Types

Community Corrections serves adult offenders who have been convicted of felony offenses. There are two major groups of community corrections offenders: Diversion and Transition. Diversion offenders are sentenced directly by the courts or, in rare instances, have been sentenced as a condition of a probation placement for up to 30 days.

DIVERSION BEDS (Including Condition of Probation Placements)

"Diversion" is the component of Community Corrections that provides a sentencing option to judges at the time of conviction. Judges may place offenders on probation, or sentence any felon to prison or to Community Corrections. An offender may be sentenced directly to a diversion placement, or may be sentenced as a condition of probation for up to 30 days.

The legislative preference has been to use Community Corrections Diversion primarily as an alternative to a prison sentence. Diversion beds also serve as an option for judges when probationers violate their *terms and conditions* of probation supervision. This is an intermediate sanction sentencing option for judges in lieu of a prison sentence for violations of probation supervision.

TRANSITION BEDS

"Transition" refers to the component of Community Corrections that places prison inmates in local residential facilities prior to their parole release. The purpose is to establish employment, begin contacts with family, and develop community support systems within a structured setting before full release to the community.

PAROLE BEDS

Legislative changes in 1987 enabled the Parole Board to refer parolees to Community Corrections. The availability of Parole beds allows the Parole Board to place parolees who are exhibiting unstable behavior in the community, into a residential bed to control the behavior, stabilize the offender and reduce the number of regressions or revocations of parolees who violate "technical" conditions of their parole agreement. Parolees committing new crimes or who are involved in serious violations of parole must be returned to secure facilities. "Technical" conditions refer to rules of parole release, such as reporting to a parole officer, that do not involve violations of laws or ordinances.

Sex Offender Differential Per Diem (cont'd)

Contracting Mechanism:

Requirements for Providers to be Eligible for Enhanced Per Diem

The Office of Community Corrections uses the Request for Proposal (RFP) procurement method in order to secure contracts with providers for specialized supervision and treatment programs that have enhanced funding. Only those offerors that score highest in the RFP process are awarded an increased per diem for a specified number of beds. Below is a brief summary of the RFP process in community corrections:

- 1) The DCJ issues a Request for Proposal (RFP) outlining the program requirements and expectations for the enhanced funding. The RFP also sets forth formal evaluation criteria for the award process.
- 2) Proposals are submitted by providers that are interested in being awarded the specialized contract. Providers that do not submit a proposal are ineligible for the funds.
- 3) All proposals are reviewed by a panel of Subject Matter Experts (SME) that are experienced and knowledgeable about specialized offender supervision and treatment programs – in this case – sex offender programs.
- 4) The SME panel meets and scores each proposal against several criteria that are established in the RFP document. All proposals are ranked, according to their total score. With highest scoring proposals being ranked higher than lower scoring proposals.
- 5) Contract awards are allocated to the most appropriate and responsive provider(s) – as measured by their scores in the evaluation process. Providers with completely inadequate or incomplete proposals are not eligible for a contract award.
- 6) One of the statutory functions for the Office of Community Corrections is to audit programs regarding their compliance with Colorado Community Corrections Standards. The Standards and Guidelines of the Sex Offender Management Board, and any special contract requirements. Accordingly, the OCC is enabled and required by law to assess the degree to which a provider meets the Scope of Work and contract requirements of the RFP contracting process.

Sex Offender Differential Per Diem (cont'd)

Larimer County Community Corrections Outcomes

Larimer County Community Corrections provided a narrative report entitled, *Treatment Support for Sex Offenders in Community Corrections: A Demonstration Project*, to the Division of Criminal Justice following the conclusion of a recent JAG grant. There were 10 beds in the program funded at the enhanced per diem. The program has another JAG grant to continue 9 beds for another year. The following is a summary (compiled by Glenn Tapia) of the services and outcomes provided in the report mentioned above:

- The program served a total of 30 sex offenders in community corrections.
- The funding led to all sex offenders starting treatment immediately rather than having to wait to find employment.
- No offenders were terminated from offense specific treatment due to inability to pay.
- All offenders had 100% of their polygraphs paid for.
- All offenders had 100% of treatment costs paid for during the first 30 days of supervision.
- All offenders had 50% of their treatment paid for after the first 30 days.
- No sex offenders in the program were charged with new sex offenses while under supervision.
- The funding facilitated better transition to independent living since offenders could use earned wages to find suitable housing – a major challenge for convicted sex offenders.
- Program successful completion rates are increasing as a result of the funding.
- Offenders have become less of a management problem for staff as their attitudes toward supervision and treatment are improved due to grant-supported treatment funding.
- Staff attitudes toward offenders have improved.
- Due to increased polygraphs, GPS monitoring, and treatment information, public safety has been greatly enhanced due to program staff having more information about sex offender behavior and treatment progress. Staff are able to better and more closely supervise sex offenders and to make better decisions accordingly.
- Compliance with SOMB standards has increased by the provider due to ability to pay for treatment and additional supervision costs.
- Acceptance rates of sex offenders by the Community Corrections board have increased since they are aware that funding is available to properly supervise and treat the sex offender population.

FEEDBACK TO CCJJ

#1. The Sex Offense/Offender Task Force issues a unanimous proposal that the Commission address the following as a priority for future efforts:

- **CCJJ should seat a Data Task Force or Subcommittee** to explore the improvement and consistency of criminal justice data collection systems and to propose methods for simpler access to criminal justice data (by approved agencies) for the purpose of research and evaluation. If such a task force is seated, the Sex Offense/Offender Task Force requests the inclusion of sex offender-related data as part of the charge to this task force.

and/or

- **CCJJ should, as part of the work of the above or as a separate effort, define and recommend a Colorado Institute of Data and Public Policy** (modeled after the Washington State Institute of Public Policy) to improve criminal justice data collection systems, to propose and establish methods for simpler access to criminal justice data, and to conduct criminal justice policy and cost benefit research. The definition of the Policy Institute should differentiate the role and function of the proposed Policy Institute, the Colorado Legislative Council, the Joint Budget Committee, and the various research units located within state agencies.

#2. The Sex Offense/Offender Task Force issues a **divided*** position statement that the following is a priority for the State of Colorado in regard to compliance with the Adam Walsh Act:

The Sex Offense/Offender Task Force urges the State of Colorado to not implement any requirement that employer address be a part of the public access portion of the sex offender registry.

* Reflects a 6-5 (2 absent) vote in favor on practical considerations, although all agree philosophically with the position.

The following are supplemental advisements regarding CCJJ-approved, FY12 Sex Offense/Offender Task Force recommendations for the purpose of tracking for performance measurement:

FY12-SO2. Develop collaborative training programs.

Recommend the Sex Offender Management Board organize a collaborative effort (with identified partners, such as agency and/or EPIC staff) to provide regular training through agency resource sharing and report back to CCJJ by January 2013. Recommend the collaborative effort also address the training needs identified in FY12-SO12: Parole Board training on Lifetime Supervision.

FY12-SO3. Improve the collection and consistency of data to evaluate the impact of the lifetime supervision act.

See "Recommendations for Future CCJJ Priorities" above.

FY12-SO12. Conduct regular and ongoing training on Lifetime Supervision and sex offender management as a part of the required Parole Board member training.

As mentioned previously as a part of this recommendation, it is recommended that regular lifetime supervision sentence training be included in the Parole Board Policy Manual.

FY12-SO13. The State Board of Parole and treatment staff of the DOC Sex Offender Treatment and Monitoring Program should develop a regular system of feedback when sex offenders who meet SOMB criteria are denied parole.

Recommend the Parole Board and SOTMP develop a system of feedback, document the process in the parole board manual and report back to the CCJJ by February 2013.

FY12-SO15. The commission supports a statewide public policy and an education strategy led by the Sex Offender Management Board to promote the use of child safety zones in lieu of residency restrictions and zoning ordinances regarding sex offender housing.

Request a report to CCJJ on January 11, 2013 by the Sex Offender Management Board on the efforts and accomplishments regarding work with stakeholders, including representatives of Colorado counties and municipalities, to provide education about sex offender housing restrictions and ordinances and evidence-based practices of shared living arrangements. When these efforts are determined to be sufficient, the outcome should be a recommendation for legislation to address restrictions and ordinances regarding sex offender housing.

FY 2012 RECOMMENDATIONS**CCJJ-PASS: 14-2-3 (84% - 16%)****FY12-SO1. Clarify and create in statute the registration requirement for and self-verification by sex offenders who “Lack a Fixed Residence.”**

DISCUSSION: The registration of offenders who lack a fixed residence (often referred to as “transient” or “homeless”) is implied but not explicitly defined in Colorado statute. Law enforcement jurisdictions have differing policies regarding the treatment of such offenders. In some cases, the registration of these offenders is accepted and in other cases the registration of these offenders is not accepted and offenders are encouraged to travel to a jurisdiction where their registration will be accepted. This places an unfair burden on “accepting jurisdictions.” Additionally, the People v. Griffin case regarding intent to reside is pending in Colorado courts and may require statutory clarification regarding the definition of “residence.”

Colorado statute should be modified to clarify the responsibility of offenders, who lack a fixed residence, to register and to require that law enforcement jurisdictions accept the registration of such offenders. Offenders who find themselves without a traditional, stable living situation will not be referenced as “transient” or as “homeless,” but as offenders who “lack a fixed residence.” The terms “transient” and “homeless” have specific meaning defined by Federal law that direct specific provision of services and individual rights. The following 9 items comprise this single recommendation.

- a) **“Lacks a Fixed Residence.”** Add definition: 16-22-102 (7.6) – “lacks a fixed residence” means that a person does not have a living situation that meets the definition of residence pursuant to 16 -22-102(5.7). This includes, but is not limited to, outdoor sleeping locations or any public or private locations not designed as **TRADITIONAL LIVING** regular sleeping accommodations. “Lacks a fixed residence” also includes public or private housing or temporary shelter facilities, residential treatment facilities, or any other residential program or facility if the owner or facility providing the housing consents to the person utilizing the location as his or her temporary address for purposes of registration as a person without a fixed residence and if the person remains at the location for less than 30 days.

Also, Move 16-22-102 (5.7) to 16-22-102 (7.5).

[PLEASE NOTE: This definition will conflict with language in 16-22-105(3) which says, “Notwithstanding the existence of any other evidence of intent, occupying or inhabiting a dwelling for more than 14 days in a thirty day period shall constitute the establishment of a residence.” Also, language throughout article 22 of title 16 is currently in dispute in the case of People vs. Griffin (08CA2694) regarding “intent” to reside. Modifications of the above (and other conforming revisions of statute) may be required by the Griffin case.]

- b) **Shelters as a residence.** Amend definition in 16-22-102(5.7) of “residence” to clarify that it only applies to occupancy in a shelter for a time period longer than 30 days.
- c) **Requirement to register and to accept registrations.** Change 16-22 -108 -- each person who is required to register pursuant to 16-22-103 shall register with local law enforcement in each jurisdiction in which the person resides “or is located without a fixed residence pursuant to 16-22-102 (7.6).” Law enforcement is required to accept the registration of offenders who “lack a fixed residence.”

If the location at which a person attempts to register would be in violation of a local ordinance, law enforcement shall so advise the offender. The offender shall then be required to secure alternate residence and remain in compliance with all other provisions of this article. Law enforcement officials are not required to accept a person’s registration to an unlawful location or residence.

FY12-SO1 (continued)

- d) **“Geo-locations.”** Change 16-22-109(1) – If a person lacks a fixed residence as defined in 16-22-102 (7.6), the person shall be required to provide to local law enforcement the public or private locations where the offender habitually sleeps. This can include, but is not limited to cross streets, intersections, direction and identifiable landmarks of the locations.
- e) **Self-verification.** Change 16-22-109 (3.5) to add:
(I) If a person lacks a fixed residence, verification of the location reported by the registrant shall be accomplished by self-verification reporting as described in section 16-22- (INSERT THE NEW SECTION REFERENCE HERE THAT DEFINES THE ENHANCED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS/VERIFICATION EVENT AS SEEN BELOW IN “1g”).
Also, add language that says:
(II) “Law enforcement shall not be required to verify the physical address of an offender who is required to comply with section 16-22-.... (AS SEEN in “1g”)
- f) **Residence/non-fixed residence changes.** Add new section regarding changing to and from “lacks a fixed residence”:
- i. a person with a residence as defined in 16-22-102 (7.5) who vacates the residence and, subsequently, has no fixed residence shall report that change in status within 5 days after ceasing to have a fixed residence and shall comply with the requirements of 16-22 – (AS SEEN IN “1g”) and 16-22-109 for the time period during which the person has no fixed residence.
 - ii. A person who lacks a fixed residence as defined in 16-22-102 (7.6) who obtains fixed residence as defined in 16-22-102 (7.5) shall report the change in status within 5 days after establishing the residence.
 - iii. Make clear that failure to comply with this section is a failure to report a change of address and punishable as provided under current law as a failure to register.
- g) **Reporting requirements and Penalties.** Add a new section regarding the self-verification process describing the enhanced reporting requirements and penalties:
- i. In addition to any other requirements pursuant to this section, a person who is subject to annual registration and without a fixed residence shall, **AT LEAST** every 90 days, report to local law enforcement in whose jurisdiction or jurisdictions the person is registered for self-verification of the location of the offender. This self-verification process shall be accomplished consistent with any time schedule established by the local jurisdiction, **WHICH MAY INCLUDE A TIME SCHEDULE THAT IS WITHIN 5 BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE OR AFTER THE OFFENDER’S BIRTHDATE.** The person shall verify his or her location and provide any information required to be reported pursuant 16-22-109.
 - ii. In addition to any other requirements pursuant to this section, a person who is subject to quarterly registration pursuant to this section and who is without a fixed residence shall, **AT LEAST** every 30 days, report to local law enforcement in whose jurisdiction or jurisdictions the person is registered for self-verification of the location of the offender. This self-verification reporting shall be accomplished consistent with any time schedule established by the local jurisdiction, **WHICH MAY INCLUDE A TIME SCHEDULE THAT IS WITHIN 5 BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE OR AFTER THE OFFENDER’S BIRTHDATE.** The person shall verify his or her location and provide any information required to be reported pursuant 16-22-109.

FY12-SO1 (continued)

- iii. An offender without a fixed residence who fails to comply with the provision of this section shall be subject to prosecution for the crime of failure to verify location. Failure to verify location by an offender without a fixed residence shall constitute a criminal misdemeanor offense punishable by a sentence to the county jail of up to 30 days. A third or subsequent offense shall constitute a misdemeanor offense punishable by a sentence of up to one year in the county jail. Failure to verify location shall not be labeled a sex offense per 16-11.7-102(2)(a)(II) which would subject the offender to the requirements of evaluation and identification required in CRS 16-11.7-104 and the treatment required by CRS 16-11.7-105.
- iv. Determine whether the drafter thinks this offense should be in Title 18.
- h) **Offender notification.** Amend section 16-22- 106 and 107 to require a notification to any offender required to register, pursuant to this section, of the duty to report the change of address to “lacks a fixed residence” status and the requirement to comply with the statutory provisions regarding self-verification.
- i) **Data reporting.** Add language that requires local law enforcement and CBI to report to CDPS information regarding the number of offenders who lack a fixed residence and any other information requested by the Department to follow up with this legislation to assess its effectiveness and/or need for modification.

CCJJ-PASS: 19-0-0 (100% - 0%)**FY12-SO2. Develop collaborative training programs.**

Individuals from, but not limited to, the Sex Offender Management Board, the Judicial Department, law enforcement, the Department of Corrections, and the EPIC project* shall collaborate to develop and provide a uniform curriculum of sex offender training modules that could be offered to various groups (supervising officers, treatment providers, community corrections staff, State Board of Parole, judges, legislators, law enforcement, etc.). It is anticipated that training could be offered more frequently and consistently through this collaborative effort to address such topics as information on the Lifetime Supervision Act, an overview of the SOMB standards, motivational interviewing, and trauma informed treatment.

(*The Evidence-Based Practice Implementation for Capacity project would require funding to continue beyond its current funding conclusion date. See cdpsweb.state.co.us/ccjj/epic.html)

CCJJ-PASS: 17-1-0 (100% - 0%)**FY12-SO3. Improve the collection and consistency of data to evaluate the impact of the lifetime supervision act.**

A committee shall be created including, but not limited to, representatives from the Department of Corrections, the Colorado Bureau of Investigation, the Division of Criminal justice, and the Judicial Branch, to evaluate and improve the consistency of data collected across agencies to facilitate the study of the impact of the Lifetime Supervision Act. The collaborating agencies should identify and resolve the gaps and inconsistencies in electronic databases. The agencies shall review and provide recommendations to improve the annual Lifetime Supervision Report by July 1, 2012.

CCJJ-FAIL: 4-7-7 (61% - 39%)**FY12-SO4. Identify a group to study sex offender specialty courts and determine their viability in Colorado.**

Gather information on other states' experiences with sex offender courts to determine the viability of sex offender courts in Colorado and whether such courts would increase communication, consistency, and public education and would result in more informed decisions regarding sex offender management in the criminal justice system. At a minimum, this group could include representatives from the Judicial Department, the Sex Offender Management Board, and the Department of Corrections and the work should be conducted within the Refinement Working Group of the Sex Offense/Offender Task Force, or a succeeding group as designated by the CCJJ.

FY12-SO5. TABLED - See above**FY12-SO6. TABLED - See above****CCJJ-PASS: 14-3-1 (94% - 6%)****FY12-SO7. Charge the Refinement Working Group of the Sex Offense/Offender Task Force or a succeeding group as designated by the CCJJ to work in collaboration with, but not limited to, the Division of Criminal Justice, the Department of Corrections, and Probation, to study the potential, long-term cost savings related to the placement of sex offenders in community corrections (with enhanced per diem) relative to the costs of the retention of sex offenders in or revocation of sex offenders to DOC. This work must be completed by January 1, 2012.**

It is expected that the intermediate placement option in community corrections for sex offenders determined to be appropriate for this placement will result in a cost savings relative to placement or retention in the Department of Corrections. This cost savings could fund the increased availability and the enhanced per diem of this intermediate community corrections option. The average length of stay for the treatment of specific and appropriate offenders may be shorter in community corrections than if these offenders are retained or returned to the Department of Corrections. Due to the potential wait time for treatment and for parole release, the length of stay in DOC is likely to extend well beyond the stay for the necessary treatment in community corrections. This recommendation would support the implementation of Recommendations #5 and 6.

CCJJ-PASS: 18-0-0 (100% - 0%)**FY12-SO8. The Office of Community Corrections in the Division of Criminal Justice in collaboration with the SOMB shall work with the CACCB* and the GCCAC^ on training for community corrections board members regarding the Lifetime Supervision Act and sex offender supervision.**

Community corrections board members are especially cautious about accepting sex offenders into community corrections programs. Training to address the standards and specifics of treatment and supervision of sex offenders could enhance understanding and inform the evaluation of sex offender application for community corrections programs. (*Colorado Association of Community Corrections Boards; ^Governor's Community Corrections Advisory Council)

FY12-SO9. TABLED - See above

CCJJ-PASS: 18-1-1 (95% - 5%)**FY12-SO10. Increase treatment resources at DOC.**

Expanded treatment resources would increase the availability of treatment for the backlog of wait-listed lifetime supervision offenders (indeterminate sentence) and provide treatment to sex offenders with determinate sentences.

FY12-SO11. TABLED - See above**CCJJ-PASS: 19-0-0 (100% - 0%)****FY12-SO12. Conduct regular and ongoing training on Lifetime Supervision and sex offender management as a part of the required Parole Board member training.**

The necessity for this training should be added to the list of topics in the annual training schedule in the Colorado State Board of Parole Policy Manual [CRS 17-2-201 (1) (e) requires specific hours of parole board member training and (3) (c) requires a Parole Board Policy Manual].

CCJJ-PASS: 17-1-1 (95% - 5%)**FY12-SO13. The State Board of Parole and treatment staff of the DOC Sex Offender Treatment and Monitoring Program should develop a regular system of feedback when sex offenders who meet SOMB criteria are denied parole.**

Without creating liberty benchmarks, the intent is to increase the communication between parole board members and treatment staff.

CCJJ-FAIL: 3-1-16 (20% - 80%)**FY12-SO14. Recommend there be multiple-member review of all parole release applications to the State Board of Parole (full board or 3-person review) when a sex offender meets all SOMB treatment criteria.**

This practice would avoid placing a single individual Parole Board member in a position to be solely accountable for sex offender release application decisions whether the decision is to release or to defer. This policy should be included in the Colorado State Board of Parole Policy Manual [CRS 17-2-201 (3) (c)].

CCJJ-PASS: 11-3-4 (78% - 22%)

FY12-SO15. The Commission supports a statewide public policy and an education strategy led by the Sex Offender Management Board to promote the use of child safety zones in lieu of residency restrictions and zoning ordinances regarding sex offender housing.

DISCUSSION: Colorado municipalities and counties continue to implement sex offender housing restrictions and zoning ordinances which reduce options for housing that promotes public safety. These actions tend to result in a domino effect causing adjacent municipalities and counties to also implement restrictions to discourage the “re-settlement” of displaced offenders. These restrictions result in negative consequences that impede better public safety options for managing sex offenders on probation and parole. Child safety zones define protected areas that sex offenders are prohibited from entering except in limited and safe circumstances. These zones are a more effective public safety option that is typically included among the conditions required of sex offenders who are under parole or probation supervision. The size and design of child safety zones should be carefully defined to prevent the zone from becoming a de facto residency restriction. The Commission will monitor the educational efforts and will consider legislative solutions on this matter at some point in the future after the 2012 legislative session.

This recommendation is consistent with a resolution by the Sex Offender Management Board, passed September 19, 2011, that states:

“The Board does not support sex offender residency restrictions or zoning restrictions that are counter-productive to the effective supervision of sex offenders.”

Child Safety Zone

Protected areas that sex offenders would be prohibited from entering except in limited and safe circumstances. Such areas might include schools and childcare facilities.

[Statement on Sex Offender Residency Restrictions in Iowa,
Iowa County Attorneys Association (December 11, 2006).]

CCJJ-PASS: 14-7-0 (100% - 0%)

FY12-SO #16.

Modify CRS 16-22-108 (1) (d) (I) to allow quarterly re-registration to occur within 5 business days before or after the offender's required re-registration date.

DISCUSSION: For *quarterly* sex offender registrants, statute currently requires re-registration to occur exactly on a required date or on the first business day following a weekend or holiday. This change will allow an offender who registers quarterly to re-register within 5 business days before or after their required re-registration date. For *annual* registrants, this "5-day" modification was already enacted by HB11-1278. This recommendation will allow consistency across re-registration procedures for all sex offenders and for law enforcement.

Proposed modification:

[The language will be refined by the drafter.]

16-22-108. Registration - procedure - frequency - place - change of address - fee.

(d) (I) Any person who is a sexually violent predator and any person who is convicted as an adult of any of the offenses specified in subparagraph (II) of this paragraph (d) has a duty to register for the remainder of his or her natural life; except that, if the person receives a deferred judgment and sentence for one of the offenses specified in subparagraph (II) of this paragraph (d), the person may petition the court for discontinuation of the duty to register as provided in section 16-22-113 (1) (d). In addition to registering as required in paragraph (a) of this subsection (1), such person shall reregister **IN** ninety days **WITH A GRACE PERIOD OF FIVE BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE OR** after the date he or she was released from incarceration for commission of the offense requiring registration, or **IN** ninety days **WITH A GRACE PERIOD OF FIVE BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE OR** after the date he or she received notice of the duty to register, if the person was not incarcerated, and **EVERY NINETY DAYS WITH A GRACE PERIOD OF FIVE BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE OR AFTER THE NINETIETH DAY** thereafter until such person's birthday. Such person shall reregister **WITHIN FIVE BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE OR AFTER THE PERSON'S** ~~on his or her~~ birthday and shall reregister every ninety days **WITH A GRACE PERIOD OF FIVE BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE OR AFTER THE NINETIETH DAY** thereafter. ~~If a person's birthday or other reregistration day falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the person shall reregister on the first business day following his or her birthday or other reregistration day.~~ Such person shall reregister pursuant to this paragraph (d) with the local law enforcement agency of each jurisdiction in which the person resides **WITHIN FIVE BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE OR AFTER** ~~on~~ the reregistration date, in the manner provided in paragraph (a) of this subsection (1).

STATUTE SHOULD MAKE CLEAR...

Regardless of the actual date of registration during the period 5 days before or 5 days after the required registration date, the 90-day period for re-registration is always calculated:

- A. From the offender's OFFICIAL date of re-registration, or
- B. Upon applicability, from the offender's BIRTHDATE (following the transition to the offender's birthdate as the OFFICIAL re-registration date).

In other words, re-registering on any day, 5 days before or after the "required date" or birthdate, is the equivalent of registering on the "required date" or birthdate. An earlier or later actual date of re-registration (by no more than the 5 days before or after) does not shift any required future date of re-registration.