

CCJJ RE-ENTRY RECOMMENDATIONS

Commission Member Voting Record

September 11th & 12th, 2008



Recommendation Generation

Over approximately seven bi-monthly meetings from May 14, 2008 to August 14, 2008, the Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice (CCJJ) Re-Entry Task Forces on Probation, Incarceration, Transition, and Post-Incarceration Supervision met to generate recommendations to meet the goals and mission of the CCJJ. Ninety-seven recommendations were forwarded to and reviewed by the Re-Entry Oversight Committee of the CCJJ Commission. At meetings on August 21st and September 4th, the Re-Entry Oversight Committee clarified wording and combined some recommendations yielding seventy-four recommendations that were then forwarded to the CCJJ Commission.

Commission Recommendation Review and Voting Protocol: DAY 1

Members of the Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice met over two days, September 11th and 12th, to discuss and vote on these seventy-four recommendations. On the first day, Commission members provided an initial vote of their degree of support for each of the seventy-four recommendations. The vote alternatives were: I support it, I can live with it, I do not support it, or I need additional information or to discuss it (“it” being the specific recommendation under consideration). Recommendations with approximately 70% or more of members indicating “I support,” were approved “as is” with little or no modification. Any recommendation with approximately 50% or more indicating “do not support” were not considered further. Recommendations not approved nor rejected in this meeting were held over for further discussion and a re-vote on the second day of the Commission meeting. Thresholds were only “approximate” when rounding was necessary (e.g., a threshold of 15.4 members was rounded to 15 members, resulting in slightly less than 70%).

The following is a report of the votes on the first day of the meeting by Commission members for each of the seventy-four recommendations. The Commission members in attendance are listed on the left side of the spreadsheet and each of their votes is displayed to the right across the recommendation columns. The recommendations are listed by the original task force numbering system. Below each recommendation column, the vote totals, approval thresholds and vote descriptions are provided. The full text of the first day recommendations may be found at the end of this document after the presentation of the voting record. Please note that this document presents an embedded coding scheme using variable text colors that reflected ratings of the extent of support and perceived impact of each recommendation as determined by the members of the Re-Entry Oversight Committee

On this first day of recommendation deliberation, the Commission members approved forty-nine recommendations “as is,” rejected one recommendation, and held over twenty-four recommendations for a second day of deliberation. Over the two days of voting, sixty-six recommendations were approved and six recommendations were rejected. The record of the second day of voting may be found at the link, titled “CCJJ Re-Entry Recommendations and Votes for Day 2.”

CCJJ - Re-Entry Recommendation Review

Day 1, September 11, 2008

PARTICIPANTS			LEGISLATIVE								
			I-23	PIS-92	I-57	P-17	PIS-89	I-24	I-48	I-58	
Last Name	First Name	Pad ID	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Beye	Karen L.	1	B	A	A	D	B	A	D	A	
Carroll	Terrance	2	absent								
Conder	Dean J.	4	B	A	B	A	C	B	D	B	
Esquibel	Melissa M.	5	absent								
Fields	Rhonda C.	6	A	B	C	D	C	A	D	B	
Gordon	Ken	7	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	A	
Groff	Regis F.	8	A	A	A	A	B	A	D	A	
Harvey	Ted	9	absent								
Hautzinger	Peter G.	10	A	A	A	B	C	A	D	A	
Huerter	Regina M.	11	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	A	
Kilpatrick	William C.	12	A	A	A	A	D	A	D	A	
Leslie Jr.	Reo N.	13	absent								
Martinez	Gil	14	A	B	A	A	B	A	D	A	
Michaud	David L.	15	absent								
Morris	Inta B.	16	A	D	A	A	A	A	D	A	
Quick	Don	17	C	A	B	B	B	B	D	A	
Quinn	Tom	18	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	A	
Roberts	Ellen	19	B	A	A	A	A	B	D	B	
Robinson	J. Grayson	20	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	A	
Siegel	Steven R.	21	B	A	C	C	B	B	D	A	
Smith	Jeanne	22	A	A	A	B	A	A	D	A	
Suthers	John	23	B	A	B	B	B	A	D	A	
Wilson	Douglas K.	24	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	A	
Zavaras	Aristedes W.	25	A	A	A	A	B	A	D	A	
Zwirn	Debra L.	26	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	A	
Weir	Peter A.	28		A	A	B	A	A	D	A	
Kaplan	David	27	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	A	
~ If the number of A votes is at least 70% (within rounding), the recommendation meets the threshold for Commission approval.			A	15	19	17	14	11	18	0	19
			B	5	2	3	5	7	4	0	3
			C	1	0	2	1	3	0	0	0
~ If the number of C votes is at least 50% (within rounding), the recommendation does not pass out of the Commission.			D	0	1	0	2	1	0	22	0
			Tot	21	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
~ All other results are discussed on Day 2 of the Commission meeting.			0.70	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
			0.50	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11

A ~ I support it C ~ I do not support it
 B ~ I can live with it D ~ Need further discussion

Received CCJJ approval
 Forwarded for review on Day 2
 Did not receive CCJJ approval

CCJJ - Re-Entry Recommendation Review

Day 1, September 11, 2008

PARTICIPANTS			LEGISLATIVE					
			T-66	I-60	I-56	I-25	I-22	
Last Name	First Name	Pad ID	9	10	11	12	13	
Beye	Karen L.	1	D	D	A	B	B	
Carroll	Terrance	2	absent					
Conder	Dean J.	4	A	A	A	A	C	
Esquibel	Melissa M.	5	absent					
Fields	Rhonda C.	6	A	C	A	A	A	
Gordon	Ken	7	A	A	A	A	A	
Groff	Regis F.	8	A	A	A	A	B	
Harvey	Ted	9	absent					
Hautzinger	Peter G.	10	C	C	A	A	C	
Huerter	Regina M.	11	A	A	A	A	A	
Kilpatrick	William C.	12	A	C	A	A	A	
Leslie Jr.	Reo N.	13	absent					
Martinez	Gil	14	A	A	A	A	B	
Michaud	David L.	15	absent					
Morris	Inta B.	16	D	B	B	A	B	
Quick	Don	17	B	C	A	A	C	
Quinn	Tom	18	B	B	A	A	A	
Roberts	Ellen	19	B	C	A	A	C	
Robinson	J. Grayson	20	B	A	A	A	A	
Siegel	Steven R.	21	C	C	C	B	C	
Smith	Jeanne	22	B	C	A	A	C	
Suthers	John	23	C	B	A	A	C	
Wilson	Douglas K.	24	A	A	A	A	A	
Zavaras	Aristedes W.	25	D	C	A	A	C	
Zwirn	Debra L.	26	C	C	A	A	C	
Weir	Peter A.	28	B	C	A	A	D	
Kaplan	David	27	A	A	B	A	A	
~ If the number of A votes is at least 70% (within rounding), the recommendation meets the threshold for Commission approval.			A	9	8	19	20	8
~ If the number of C votes is at least 50% (within rounding), the recommendation does not pass out of the Commission.			B	6	3	2	2	4
~ All other results are discussed on Day 2 of the Commission meeting.			C	4	10	1	0	9
			D	3	1	0	0	1
			Tot	22	22	22	22	22
			0.70	15	15	15	15	15
			0.50	11	11	11	11	11

A ~ I support it C ~ I do not support it
 B ~ I can live with it D ~ Need further discussion

Received CCJJ approval
 Forwarded for review on Day 2
 Did not receive CCJJ approval

CCJJ - Re-Entry Recommendation Review

Day 1, September 11, 2008

PARTICIPANTS			GENERAL PRINCIPLES								
			I-44	O-99	PIS-84	PIS-95	I-41	PIS-96	I-21	I-54	
Last Name	First Name	Pad ID	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
Beye	Karen L.	1	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	
Carroll	Terrance	2	absent								
Conder	Dean J.	4	A	B	B	A	A	A	B	A	
Esquibel	Melissa M.	5	absent								
Fields	Rhonda C.	6	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Gordon	Ken	7	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Groff	Regis F.	8	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Harvey	Ted	9	absent								
Hautzinger	Peter G.	10	D	A	A	A	A	A	C	A	
Huerter	Regina M.	11	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Kilpatrick	William C.	12	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Leslie Jr.	Reo N.	13	absent								
Martinez	Gil	14	A	A	A	B	A	A	C	A	
Michaud	David L.	15	absent								
Morris	Inta B.	16	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Quick	Don	17	D	A	A	A	A	B	C	A	
Quinn	Tom	18	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	A	
Roberts	Ellen	19	A	A	D	B	A	A	B	A	
Robinson	J. Grayson	20	D	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Siegel	Steven R.	21	C	A	A	A	A	D	D	A	
Smith	Jeanne	22	D	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	
Suthers	John	23	C	B	B	A	A	C	C	A	
Wilson	Douglas K.	24	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Zavaras	Aristedes W.	25	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Zwirn	Debra L.	26	D	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Weir	Peter A.	28	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	
Kaplan	David	27	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	
~ If the number of A votes is at least 70% (within rounding), the recommendation meets the threshold for Commission approval.			A	15	18	19	20	21	19	12	21
~ If the number of C votes is at least 50% (within rounding), the recommendation does not pass out of the Commission.			B	0	4	2	2	1	1	5	1
~ All other results are discussed on Day 2 of the Commission meeting.			C	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	0
			D	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
			Tot	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
			0.70	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
			0.50	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11

A ~ I support it C ~ I do not support it
 B ~ I can live with it D ~ Need further discussion

- Received CCJJ approval
- Forwarded for review on Day 2
- Did not receive CCJJ approval

CCJJ - Re-Entry Recommendation Review

Day 1, September 11, 2008

PARTICIPANTS			GENERAL PRINCIPLES								
			T-75	I-29	I-47	PIS-97	T-64/65	I-43	P-4	I-40	
Last Name	First Name	Pad ID	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	
Beye	Karen L.	1	D	A	B	B	D	A	A	B	
Carroll	Terrance	2	absent								
Conder	Dean J.	4	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Esquibel	Melissa M.	5	absent								
Fields	Rhonda C.	6	A	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	
Gordon	Ken	7	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Groff	Regis F.	8	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Harvey	Ted	9	absent								
Hautzinger	Peter G.	10	A	A	A	A	D	A	A	B	
Huerter	Regina M.	11	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Kilpatrick	William C.	12	C	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Leslie Jr.	Reo N.	13	absent								
Martinez	Gil	14	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	
Michaud	David L.	15	absent								
Morris	Inta B.	16	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	A	
Quick	Don	17	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Quinn	Tom	18	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Roberts	Ellen	19	B	D	A	A	B	A	A	B	
Robinson	J. Grayson	20	B	A	A	A	D	A	A	A	
Siegel	Steven R.	21	A	D	A	D	D	A	A	A	
Smith	Jeanne	22	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	A	
Suthers	John	23	B	A	A	B	C	B	B	B	
Wilson	Douglas K.	24	A	A	A	A	B	A	B	A	
Zavaras	Aristedes W.	25	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Zwirn	Debra L.	26	D	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Weir	Peter A.	28	A	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	
Kaplan	David	27	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	A	
~ If the number of A votes is at least 70% (within rounding), the recommendation meets the threshold for Commission approval.			A	15	20	19	19	12	20	20	18
			B	4	0	3	2	5	2	2	4
			C	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
~ If the number of C votes is at least 50% (within rounding), the recommendation does not pass out of the Commission.			D	2	2	0	1	4	0	0	0
			Tot	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
~ All other results are discussed on Day 2 of the Commission meeting.			0.70	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
			0.50	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11

A ~ I support it C ~ I do not support it
 B ~ I can live with it D ~ Need further discussion

Received CCJJ approval
 Forwarded for review on Day 2
 Did not receive CCJJ approval

CCJJ - Re-Entry Recommendation Review

Day 1, September 11, 2008

PARTICIPANTS			GENERAL PRINCIPLES				
			P-18	I-45	T-72	T-74	I-46
Last Name	First Name	Pad ID	30	31	32	33	34
Beye	Karen L.	1	A	B	A	C	B
Carroll	Terrance	2	absent				
Conder	Dean J.	4	A	D	A	A	A
Esquibel	Melissa M.	5	absent				
Fields	Rhonda C.	6	A	A	A	A	A
Gordon	Ken	7	A	A	A	A	A
Groff	Regis F.	8	A	A	A	B	A
Harvey	Ted	9	absent				
Hautzinger	Peter G.	10	A	B	D	C	A
Huerter	Regina M.	11	A	A	A	A	A
Kilpatrick	William C.	12	A	A	A	C	A
Leslie Jr.	Reo N.	13	absent				
Martinez	Gil	14	A	A	A	C	A
Michaud	David L.	15	absent				
Morris	Inta B.	16	A	A	A	D	A
Quick	Don	17	A	A	A	C	D
Quinn	Tom	18	A	A	A	D	A
Roberts	Ellen	19	A	A	B	C	A
Robinson	J. Grayson	20	A	A	A	A	A
Siegel	Steven R.	21	A	A	A	C	C
Smith	Jeanne	22	D	B	A	C	C
Suthers	John	23	A	B	B	C	A
Wilson	Douglas K.	24	A	A	A	C	A
Zavaras	Aristedes W.	25	A	A	A	A	A
Zwirn	Debra L.	26	A	A	A	B	A
Weir	Peter A.	28	D	A	A	D	D
Kaplan	David	27	A	B	B	D	A
~ If the number of A votes is at least 70% (within rounding), the recommendation meets the threshold for Commission approval.	A	20	16	18	6	17	
	B	0	5	3	2	1	
	C	0	0	0	10	2	
	D	2	1	1	4	2	
~ If the number of C votes is at least 50% (within rounding), the recommendation does not pass out of the Commission.	Tot	22	22	22	22	22	
~ All other results are discussed on Day 2 of the Commission meeting.	0.70	15	15	15	15	15	
	0.50	11	11	11	11	11	

A ~ I support it C ~ I do not support it
 B ~ I can live with it D ~ Need further discussion

- Received CCJJ approval
- Forwarded for review on Day 2
- Did not receive CCJJ approval

CCJJ - Re-Entry Recommendation Review

Day 1, September 11, 2008

PARTICIPANTS			BUSINESS PRACTICES								
			O-98	T-62	T-67	T-70	T-76	PIS-87	PIS-88	I-50	
Last Name	First Name	Pad ID	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	
Beye	Karen L.	1	A	B	A	A	B	A	B	B	
Carroll	Terrance	2	absent								
Conder	Dean J.	4	A	A	A	A	A	C	A	A	
Esquibel	Melissa M.	5	absent								
Fields	Rhonda C.	6	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Gordon	Ken	7	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Groff	Regis F.	8	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Harvey	Ted	9	absent								
Hautzinger	Peter G.	10	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	A	
Huerter	Regina M.	11	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Kilpatrick	William C.	12	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Leslie Jr.	Reo N.	13	absent								
Martinez	Gil	14	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Michaud	David L.	15	absent								
Morris	Inta B.	16	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Quick	Don	17	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	
Quinn	Tom	18	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Roberts	Ellen	19	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	A	
Robinson	J. Grayson	20	D	A	A	A	B	A	A	A	
Siegel	Steven R.	21	A	A	A	A	D	A	C	A	
Smith	Jeanne	22	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	B	
Suthers	John	23	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	
Wilson	Douglas K.	24	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Zavaras	Aristedes W.	25	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Zwirn	Debra L.	26	D	A	A	A	D	A	A	A	
Weir	Peter A.	28	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Kaplan	David	27	A	A	B	A	B	A	A	A	
~ If the number of A votes is at least 70% (within rounding), the recommendation meets the threshold for Commission approval.			A	19	20	20	21	15	19	15	20
			B	0	2	2	1	5	2	4	2
			C	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
~ If the number of C votes is at least 50% (within rounding), the recommendation does not pass out of the Commission.			D	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
~ All other results are discussed on Day 2 of the Commission meeting.			Tot	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
			0.70	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
			0.50	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11

A ~ I support it C ~ I do not support it
 B ~ I can live with it D ~ Need further discussion

Received CCJJ approval
 Forwarded for review on Day 2
 Did not receive CCJJ approval

CCJJ - Re-Entry Recommendation Review

Day 1, September 11, 2008

PARTICIPANTS			BUSINESS PRACTICES								
			P-2	P-3	PIS-85	I-30	T-68	I-26	PIS-94	PIS-83	
Last Name	First Name	Pad ID	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	
Beye	Karen L.	1	B	A	A	B	B	B	A	D	
Carroll	Terrance	2	absent								
Conder	Dean J.	4	B	B	A	A	A	B	D	C	
Esquibel	Melissa M.	5	absent								
Fields	Rhonda C.	6	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	B	
Gordon	Ken	7	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Groff	Regis F.	8	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Harvey	Ted	9	absent								
Hautzinger	Peter G.	10	A	A	A	B	A	A	A	C	
Huerter	Regina M.	11	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Kilpatrick	William C.	12	A	A	A	A	A	D	A	C	
Leslie Jr.	Reo N.	13	absent								
Martinez	Gil	14	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	C	
Michaud	David L.	15	absent								
Morris	Inta B.	16	B	A	B	D	A	A	A	D	
Quick	Don	17	B	D	A	B	A	B	A	C	
Quinn	Tom	18	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	D	
Roberts	Ellen	19	D	B	A	A	B	D	D	D	
Robinson	J. Grayson	20	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	
Siegel	Steven R.	21	A	A	A	A	A	D	D	C	
Smith	Jeanne	22	C	A	A	A	B	B	A	D	
Suthers	John	23	B	B	B	B	C	B	B	C	
Wilson	Douglas K.	24	A	A	B	D	A	A	A	A	
Zavaras	Aristedes W.	25	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	D	
Zwirn	Debra L.	26	B	A	D	A	D	B	A	D	
Weir	Peter A.	28	D	A	A	B	B	A	A	D	
Kaplan	David	27	A	A	B	B	B	A	A	A	
~ If the number of A votes is at least 70% (within rounding), the recommendation meets the threshold for Commission approval.			A	13	16	17	14	15	12	18	5
~ If the number of C votes is at least 50% (within rounding), the recommendation does not pass out of the Commission.			B	6	5	4	6	5	7	1	2
			C	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	7
			D	2	1	1	2	1	3	3	8
~ All other results are discussed on Day 2 of the Commission meeting.			Tot	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
			0.70	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
			0.50	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11

A ~ I support it C ~ I do not support it
 B ~ I can live with it D ~ Need further discussion

Received CCJJ approval
 Forwarded for review on Day 2
 Did not receive CCJJ approval

CCJJ - Re-Entry Recommendation Review

Day 1, September 11, 2008

PARTICIPANTS			BUSINESS PRACTICES							
			P-15	P-12	PIS-91	I-27	P-16	T-63	I-61	P-6
Last Name	First Name	Pad ID	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58
Beye	Karen L.	1	A	B	A	B	C	B	C	B
Carroll	Terrance	2	absent							
Conder	Dean J.	4	A	A	C	B	A	A	C	A
Esquibel	Melissa M.	5	absent							
Fields	Rhonda C.	6	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	A
Gordon	Ken	7	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Groff	Regis F.	8	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Harvey	Ted	9	absent							
Hautzinger	Peter G.	10	A	C	A	A	A	B	C	A
Huerter	Regina M.	11	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Kilpatrick	William C.	12	A	A	A	A	D	A	D	A
Leslie Jr.	Reo N.	13	absent							
Martinez	Gil	14	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Michaud	David L.	15	absent							
Morris	Inta B.	16	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B
Quick	Don	17	A	B	A	C	C	B	C	A
Quinn	Tom	18	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B
Roberts	Ellen	19	A	D	A	A	B	A	B	D
Robinson	J. Grayson	20	A	A	B	A	A	A	A	A
Siegel	Steven R.	21	A	A	A	A	A	C	D	D
Smith	Jeanne	22	A	B	A	A	C	C	B	A
Suthers	John	23	A	B	A	B	B	B	C	B
Wilson	Douglas K.	24	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	D
Zavaras	Aristedes W.	25	A	A	A	A	A	A	C	A
Zwirn	Debra L.	26	B	C	A	B	D	B	B	D
Weir	Peter A.	28	B	B	A	A	A	B	B	D
Kaplan	David	27	B	A	A	B	A	A	B	B
~ If the number of A votes is at least 70% (within rounding), the recommendation meets the threshold for Commission approval.	A	19	14	20	16	15	13	7	12	
	B	3	5	1	5	2	7	7	5	
	C	0	2	1	1	3	2	6	0	
	D	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	5	
~ If the number of C votes is at least 50% (within rounding), the recommendation does not pass out of the Commission.	Tot	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	
~ All other results are discussed on Day 2 of the Commission meeting.	0.70	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	
	0.50	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	

A ~ I support it C ~ I do not support it
 B ~ I can live with it D ~ Need further discussion

Received CCJJ approval
 Forwarded for review on Day 2
 Did not receive CCJJ approval

CCJJ - Re-Entry Recommendation Review

Day 1, September 11, 2008

PARTICIPANTS			BUSINESS PRACTICES								
			P-8	I-53	P-11	P-9	I-49	P-5	I-38	I-28	
Last Name	First Name	Pad ID	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	
Beye	Karen L.	1	A	A	C	A	A	A	B	B	
Carroll	Terrance	2	absent								
Conder	Dean J.	4	B	A	A	B	A	A	A	B	
Esquibel	Melissa M.	5	absent								
Fields	Rhonda C.	6	A	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	
Gordon	Ken	7	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Groff	Regis F.	8	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	
Harvey	Ted	9	absent								
Hautzinger	Peter G.	10	A	B	B	B	A	A	A	C	
Huerter	Regina M.	11	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Kilpatrick	William C.	12	A	A	C	A	A	A	D	C	
Leslie Jr.	Reo N.	13	absent								
Martinez	Gil	14	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	C	
Michaud	David L.	15	absent								
Morris	Inta B.	16	D	B	A	A	A	A	A	B	
Quick	Don	17	B	A	D	A	A	C	A	D	
Quinn	Tom	18	A	C	D	C	A	A	C	A	
Roberts	Ellen	19	B	A	B	C	A	B	A	A	
Robinson	J. Grayson	20	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Siegel	Steven R.	21	A	A	C	B	A	A	A	C	
Smith	Jeanne	22	A	A	C	C	A	C	A	B	
Suthers	John	23	B	B	C	C	B	B	A	C	
Wilson	Douglas K.	24	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Zavaras	Aristedes W.	25	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Zwirn	Debra L.	26	D	A	D	D	B	B	A	C	
Weir	Peter A.	28	A	C	D	C	B	D	A	D	
Kaplan	David	27	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	
~ If the number of A votes is at least 70% (within rounding), the recommendation meets the threshold for Commission approval.			A	16	17	10	13	19	16	17	10
			B	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4
			C	0	2	5	5	0	2	1	6
~ If the number of C votes is at least 50% (within rounding), the recommendation does not pass out of the Commission.			D	2	0	4	1	0	1	1	2
~ All other results are discussed on Day 2 of the Commission meeting.			Tot	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
			0.70	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
			0.50	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11

A ~ I support it C ~ I do not support it
 B ~ I can live with it D ~ Need further discussion

Received CCJJ approval
 Forwarded for review on Day 2
 Did not receive CCJJ approval

CCJJ - Re-Entry Recommendation Review

Day 1, September 11, 2008

PARTICIPANTS			BUSINESS PRACTICES		
			P-13	P-14	P-7
Last Name	First Name	Pad ID	67	68	69
Beye	Karen L.	1	B	D	B
Carroll	Terrance	2	absent		
Conder	Dean J.	4	A	B	C
Esquibel	Melissa M.	5	absent		
Fields	Rhonda C.	6	A	B	B
Gordon	Ken	7	A	A	A
Groff	Regis F.	8	A	A	A
Harvey	Ted	9	absent		
Hautzinger	Peter G.	10	A	A	C
Huerter	Regina M.	11	A	A	A
Kilpatrick	William C.	12	A	A	C
Leslie Jr.	Reo N.	13	absent		
Martinez	Gil	14	A	A	A
Michaud	David L.	15	absent		
Morris	Inta B.	16	D	A	D
Quick	Don	17	B	B	C
Quinn	Tom	18	B	C	C
Roberts	Ellen	19	D	B	C
Robinson	J. Grayson	20	A	A	A
Siegel	Steven R.	21	A	C	C
Smith	Jeanne	22	C	C	C
Suthers	John	23	A	C	C
Wilson	Douglas K.	24	B	A	A
Zavaras	Aristedes W.	25	A	A	A
Zwirn	Debra L.	26	D	D	C
Weir	Peter A.	28	D	C	C
Kaplan	David	27	B	A	A
~ If the number of A votes is at least 70% (within rounding), the recommendation meets the threshold for Commission approval.	A	12	11	8	
~ If the number of C votes is at least 50% (within rounding), the recommendation does not pass out of the Commission.	B	5	4	2	
	C	1	5	11	
~ All other results are discussed on Day 2 of the Commission meeting.	D	4	2	1	
	Tot	22	22	22	
0.70	15	15	15		
0.50	11	11	11		

A ~ I support it C ~ I do not support it
 B ~ I can live with it D ~ Need further discusion

- Received CCJJ approval
- Forwarded for review on Day 2
- Did not receive CCJJ approval

CCJJ - Re-Entry Recommendation Review

Day 1, September 11, 2008

PARTICIPANTS			COST SAVINGS				
			PIS-86	PIS-93	P-1	60 Day	30 Day
Last Name	First Name	Pad ID	70	71	72	73	74
Beye	Karen L.	1	A	B	A	D	D
Carroll	Terrance	2	absent				
Conder	Dean J.	4	A	A	B	D	D
Esquibel	Melissa M.	5	absent				
Fields	Rhonda C.	6	A	A	A	D	D
Gordon	Ken	7	A	A	A	D	D
Groff	Regis F.	8	A	A	A	A	A
Harvey	Ted	9	absent				
Hautzinger	Peter G.	10	A	A	B	D	D
Huerter	Regina M.	11	A	A	A	D	D
Kilpatrick	William C.	12	A	A	A	D	D
Leslie Jr.	Reo N.	13	absent				
Martinez	Gil	14	A	A	A	D	D
Michaud	David L.	15	absent				
Morris	Inta B.	16	A	A	A	D	D
Quick	Don	17	A	A	A	D	D
Quinn	Tom	18	A	A	A	D	D
Roberts	Ellen	19	A	A	B	B	D
Robinson	J. Grayson	20	A	A	A	D	D
Siegel	Steven R.	21	A	A	A	D	D
Smith	Jeanne	22	A	A	A	D	D
Suthers	John	23	A	A	B	D	D
Wilson	Douglas K.	24	A	A	A	A	A
Zavaras	Aristedes W.	25	D	A	A	D	D
Zwirn	Debra L.	26	B	A	D	D	D
Weir	Peter A.	28	A	A	A	D	D
Kaplan	David	27	A	A	A	A	A
~ If the number of A votes is at least 70% (within rounding), the recommendation meets the threshold for Commission approval.	A	20	21	17	3	3	
	B	1	1	4	1	0	
	C	0	0	0	0	0	
~ If the number of C votes is at least 50% (within rounding), the recommendation does not pass out of the Commission.	D	1	0	1	18	19	
	Tot	22	22	22	22	22	
~ All other results are discussed on Day 2 of the Commission meeting.	0.70	15	15	15	15	15	
	0.50	11	11	11	11	11	

A ~ I support it C ~ I do not support it
 B ~ I can live with it D ~ Need further discusion

- Received CCJJ approval
- Forwarded for review on Day 2
- Did not receive CCJJ approval

CCJJ RE-ENTRY RECOMMENDATIONS

For PHASE 1

Sept 11, 2008

LEGISLATIVE

I-23 (Support 3.00) (Impact 3.00) (Total 9.00)

Legislation should be drafted to permit judicial districts to develop a percentage bond-to-the-court (see HB 08-1382), as is provided by the federal court system. Such percentage bond does not eliminate other types of bonds.

PIS-92 (Support 3.00) (Impact 3.00) (Total 9.00)

Encourage the General Assembly to provide funding that promotes partnerships between local and state public or private entities for the construction on publically owned lands of multi-purpose correctional supervision and re-entry facilities.

I-57 (Support 2.81) (Impact 3.00) (Total 8.43)

Modify CRS 17-26-109 to include the ability for jail administrators to award discretionary earned time of 3 to 5 days per 30-day period for the completion of certain programs or education, or for an unusual or extraordinary accomplishment by a jail inmate. This requires that each county sheriff develop an earned time schedule for their jail in keeping with community expectations and standards.

P-17 (Support 2.58) (Impact 3.00) (Total 7.75)

Because the loss of a driver's license is a significant barrier to employment, and because employment is linked to crime reduction, abolish those portions of a statute that require the mandatory revocation or suspension of the defendant's driver license for a conviction/adjudication of non-driving offenses. This recommendation does not apply to child support enforcement.

PIS-89 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.56) (Total 7.67)

The Commission request that the Department of Corrections develop and implement a standardized policy regarding early terminations of parole and require parole officers to submit such requests to the parole board when a parolee has served at least half of the parole period, and has met other risk reduction benchmarks. In addition, the Department of Corrections should provide data on the numbers and decisions of early termination requests to the Division of Criminal Justice. The Task Force further requires that such request comply with the Victim's Rights Act.

I-24 (Support 2.50) (Impact 3.00) (Total 7.50)

When courts use the percentage bond-to-the-court, per Recommendation I-23 in Group 1, and the court plays the role of the surety, it shall retain a percentage of the bond.

I-48 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.43) (Total 7.29)

Inmates should be eligible for the College Opportunity Fund while they are still inmates.

I-58 (Support 2.90) (Impact 2.50) (Total 7.25)

Remove the word “calendar” from CRS 17-26-115 to apply the Trustee statute to a 30-day period rather than a calendar month.

T-66 (Support 2.73) (Impact 2.57) (Total 7.01)

Ensure all parolees receive “gate money” upon release, including inmates who have been previously revoked.

I-60 (Support 2.27) (Impact 3.00) (Total 6.82)

NOTE: This does not require legislation. It requires an administrative rule change.

Rule 35(b), the time to file the motion for a reconsideration of sentence, should be increased from the current 120 days to 365 days to allow offenders sentenced to the Department of Corrections time to engage in programs and other positive activities that might demonstrate to the court some reasons to reconsider the sentence.

I-56 (Support 2.36) (Impact 2.88) (Total 6.80)

Clarify legislation to provide a standardized range of good time credits available to jail inmates.

I-25 (Support 2.17) (Impact 3.0) (Total 6.50)

Before any refund to the defendant at the conclusion of the case, the bond held by the court shall be applied according to the priority of payments per CRS 18-1.3-204(2.5).

I-22 (Support 2.17) (Impact 2.71) (Total 5.88)

Modify CRS 16-5-206 to empower the court to issue a summons in lieu of an arrest warrant, requiring the input but not the consent of the prosecutor.

Yellow = Unanimous SUPPORT and IMPACT (10 recommendations)

Blue = Total score in top 25% (9 recommendations)

Rust = Total score in top 50-75% (20 recommendations)

Purple = Total score 25-50% (17 recommendations)

Black = Total score bottom 25% (16 recommendations)

GENERAL PRINCIPLES (ID Agency and timeline)**I-44 (Support 3.0) (Impact 3.0) (Total 9.00)**

The state should invest in community-based, evidence-based mental health and substance abuse treatment for all citizens to prevent the need for incarceration, and to provide such treatment as an alternative to incarceration.

O-99 (Overarching)

New budget requests should include an analysis and discussion of the full fiscal and non-fiscal impact of new initiatives on other agencies (for example, the impact of a state-level initiative might have on a county jail).

PIS-84 (Support 3.0) (Impact 2.89) (Total 8.67)

The General Assembly must substantially increase state funding for evidence-based and promising practices in substance abuse and mental health treatment.

PIS-95 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.88) (Total 8.63)

The Commission supports the work of the Governor's Community Corrections Advisory Council (See the five specific initiatives in the "Re-Entry Recommendations" document).

I-41 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.86) (Total 8.57)

Every case plan shall be fully implemented and updated regularly to reflect treatment progress and new skills learned.

PIS-96 (Support 2.64) (Impact 2.78) (Total 7.32)

The Commission support an initiative by the Governor's Community Corrections Advisory Council to pilot a carefully controlled study to address the value of providing a two to 4 week "grace period" in which fees and subsistence payments are delayed until the offender is stabilized in the community. After appropriate data is collected and analyzed, the Advisory Council should determine whether further recommendations to the executive and legislative branches are appropriate.

I-21 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.43) (Total 7.29)

Per CRS 16-5-206 and 16-5-207, a summons should be issued for class 4, 5, and 6 felonies unless there is imminent risk of flight or when victim safety may be compromised.

I-54 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.38) (Total 7.13)

The Commission support efforts by the Department of Corrections to expand existing apprenticeship programs.

Yellow = Unanimous SUPPORT and IMPACT (10 recommendations)

Blue = Total score in top 25% (9 recommendations)

Rust = Total score in top 50-75% (20 recommendations)

Purple = Total score 25-50% (17 recommendations)

Black = Total score bottom 25% (16 recommendations)

T-75 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.22) (Total 6.67)

Educate and encourage housing authorities to be no more restrictive than the HUD guidelines in refusing housing to people with criminal records.

I-29 (Support 2.92) (Impact 2.29) (Total 6.67)

The Commission supports the current work by the Interagency Committee on Adult and Juvenile Correctional Treatment and its study of the reliability and validity of the Standardized Offender Assessment-Revised (SOA-R).

I-47 (Support 2.73) (Impact 2.43) (Total 6.62)

Post-secondary educational opportunities should be expanded for both inmates and staff.

PIS-97 (Support 2.82) (Impact 2.33) (Total 6.58)

The Commission support the initiative proposed by the Governor's Community Corrections Advisory Council to pilot and study the outcome of two groups of offenders: (1) a control group sentenced to standard diversion residential community corrections, (2) a study group sentenced to nonresidential status with enhanced services. After appropriate data is collected, the Advisory Council should determine whether further recommendations to the executive and legislative branches are appropriate.

T-64 and 65 (Support 2.18) (Impact 3.00) (Total 6.55)

Each judicial district should be required to conduct an inventory of the services and resources, including housing, available and the capacity of those resources to address the needs of offenders in reentering the community. This information should be paired with an analysis of the risk/needs of offenders releasing from the Department of Corrections. Re-entry service gaps must be identified, along with the costs to fill those gaps. Using this information, a plan should be developed that identifies the appropriate parties to provide services and a funding scheme. Inventory reports should be provided to the Division of Criminal Justice, which will forward the information to the Commission.

I-43 (Support 2.25) (Impact 2.86) (Total 6.43)

Invest in evidence-based programs and emerging best practice, treatment and education so that there is sufficient programming available to meet the needs of the offender population.

P-4 (Support 2.50) (Impact 2.56) (Total 6.39)

The Task Force supports the efforts of the Division of Probation Services and district probation offices to enhance the consistent use of appropriate incentives and intermediate sanctions, particularly in response to technical violations.

I-40 (Support 2.55) (Impact 2.43) (Total 6.18)

Provide resources to evaluate the assessment practices and program delivery of community based and institutional treatment providers.

P- 18 (Support 2.75) (Impact 1.88) (Total 5.16)

Yellow = Unanimous SUPPORT and IMPACT (10 recommendations)

Blue = Total score in top 25% (9 recommendations)

Rust = Total score in top 50-75% (20 recommendations)

Purple = Total score 25-50% (17 recommendations)

Black = Total score bottom 25% (16 recommendations)

The 19 standard conditions of probation should be reviewed by the Probation Advisory Committee. The PAC should consider requiring only those conditions that are tailored to each individual, and based on criminogenic risks and needs, and victim and community safety, by the Probation Advisory Committee. The PAC should invite members of the CCJJ Re-Entry Probation Task Force to participate in this review. The condition to remain crime-free is reasonable for all offenders.

I-45 (Support 2.00) (Impact 2.43) (Total 4.86)

To identify the gaps between available services and needs, survey the availability and capacity of all programs in the Department of Corrections, local jails, and community corrections, and compare these with the assessed needs of the corresponding populations.

T-72 (Support 2.00) (Impact 2.33) (Total 4.67)

Encourage the use of discretionary parole to community corrections in lieu of homeless parole plans to provide a stable living situation prior to the offender's mandatory parole date (MRD). Six to 8 months prior to the MRD, a case manager should submit an application to community corrections for individuals who are likely to parole homeless.

T-74 (Support 1.70) (Impact 2.56) (Total 4.34)

The Task Force recommends that community corrections boards revise their policy regarding referrals to community corrections from DOC so that people who are going to be released homeless are prioritized over those with a parole sponsor. The application form to the community corrections boards would need to be revised to include this information.

I-46 (Support 1.64) (Impact 1.71) (Total 2.81)

When possible, participation in programs and treatment phases by offenders in jail or prison should be transferable and accepted across agencies.

Yellow = Unanimous SUPPORT and IMPACT (10 recommendations)

Blue = Total score in top 25% (9 recommendations)

Rust = Total score in top 50-75% (20 recommendations)

Purple = Total score 25-50% (17 recommendations)

Black = Total score bottom 25% (16 recommendations)

BUSINESS PRACTICES (ID Agency and timeline)**O-98 (Overarching)**

Ensure every offender leaving jail and prison has obtained a driver's license or state ID before release to the community.

T-62 (Support 3.0) (Impact 3.0) (Total 9.00)

Using the Level of Supervision Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) and other tools as appropriate, DOC shall conduct a comprehensive risk/needs assessment of each offender prior to release for the development of a case plan. This plan will form the basis of providing vouchers (or other approved mechanisms) that assist the offender in accessing immediate services, including housing, medication (i.e., insulin), mental health services, addiction treatment, and related programs.

T-67 (Support 3.0) (Impact 3.0) (Total 9.00)

Ensure current (within the last six months) release assessment information is provided to the parole board and community corrections boards.

T-70 (Support 3.0) (Impact 3.0) (Total 9.00)

Any limitation or restriction of an offender's driver's license while on parole and community corrections must be based on specific, written, and standardized criteria.

T-76 (Support 3.0) (Impact 3.0) (Total 9.00)

Form a collaborative of public and private agencies to identify and develop additional housing resources for special populations who have a criminal record (for example, the aging, those with mental illness, people with developmental disabilities, sex offenders, and those medical problems).

PIS-87 (Support 3.0) (Impact 3.0) (Total 9.00)

The Commission request that an independent agency with expertise in paroling authorities (e.g., the Center for Effective Public Policy) provide technical assistance to the parole board to increase efficiency and effectiveness. This assistance would involve bringing to Colorado experts in parole and release to engage in the following tasks (See the six specific tasks in the "Re-Entry Recommendations" document).

PIS-88 (Support 3.0) (Impact 2.89) (Total 8.67)

As part of the contract award process, the Department of Corrections will give preference to private service vendors (treatment, drug tests, etc.) who provide extended hours of operation during the week and/or weekend hours. The Department of Corrections can waive this requirement for vendors in under-served areas of the state, or for those providers whom this requirement would prevent them from being able to deliver services.

Yellow = Unanimous SUPPORT and IMPACT (10 recommendations)

Blue = Total score in top 25% (9 recommendations)

Rust = Total score in top 50-75% (20 recommendations)

Purple = Total score 25-50% (17 recommendations)

Black = Total score bottom 25% (16 recommendations)

I-50 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.86) (Total 8.57)

Because the research is conclusive that stable and meaningful employment is critical to recidivism reduction, the Department of Corrections should work with the Department of Labor and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and private business, trade unions, along with the state, city, county, and private employers, to expand the number and scope of vocational programs offered in prison, and to ensure that the job skills offered by these programs are relevant and transferable to the current job market. Job placement and job readiness programs should be added in the Department of Corrections, and should be a priority for offenders approaching their release date. A focus on creating jobs for individuals coming from the Department of Corrections should be a priority for the collaborating entities.

P-2 (Support 2.82) (Impact 3.00) (Total 8.45)

Research shows that positive reinforcement is an important component of behavior modification. The use of incentives to facilitate successful completion of probation should be placed in statute. Such incentives should be interpreted as evidence-based efforts to encourage the offender's positive performance for the purpose of enhancing public safety and preventing victimization.

P-3 (Support 2.92) (Impact 2.88) (Total 8.39)

To reduce the number of offenders with probation violations resulting in a prison sentence, the Division of Probation Services should implement a technical violations program that focuses on these offenders and encourages them to become compliant with probation supervision.

PIS-85 (Support 3.0) (Impact 2.78) (Total 8.33)

Provide funding to enhance the technology available to the parole board members, hearing officers, and administrative law judges so that they may obtain items such as laptop computers, other hardware, software, and video conferencing, to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of parole board hearings and operations. Allow electronic requests for modifications of conditions of parole.

I-30 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.67) (Total 8.00)

Representatives from probation, community corrections, DOC, and local jails must work together to develop and implement a protocol whereby a standardized, comprehensive profile of an offender, the offense, and the victim impact--which may include the PSIR--and individual empirically-based assessment information (such as the Level of Supervision Inventory, and specialized assessments), should follow all individuals convicted of a felony throughout the system, from pre-sentence to release. This assessment should be regularly updated, at a minimum prior to significant decision points in custody or during community supervision, to assure that program placement is linked to criminogenic needs and to document treatment progress and new skills obtained. A systematic quality assurance procedure must be implemented with this initiative. Protocols to share this information

Yellow = Unanimous SUPPORT and IMPACT (10 recommendations)

Blue = Total score in top 25% (9 recommendations)

Rust = Total score in top 50-75% (20 recommendations)

Purple = Total score 25-50% (17 recommendations)

Black = Total score bottom 25% (16 recommendations)

while protecting the privacy of the individual must be developed and implemented within and across agencies.

T-68 (Support 2.73) (Impact 2.71) (Total 7.40)

Develop an efficient system for transferring an offender from DOC institutional custody to the custody of community corrections and/or parole supervision.

I-26 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.43) (Total 7.29)

Each judicial district should be encouraged to establish a bond commissioner and process that give authority to the specially trained commissioner or their designee to undertake an individual assessment of the accused and set bonds and/or summonses as appropriate.

PIS-94 (Support 2.60) (Impact 2.78) (Total 7.22)

The Commission support the Department of Corrections' effort to develop more flexibility in reporting options for parolees.

PIS-83 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.33) (Total 7.00)

When someone has been transitioned out under inmate status, provide a date-certain release for offenders in community corrections while retaining the authority of the parole board to conduct a rescission hearing and extend or vacate the parole date in the event of noncompliance. Specifically, when an inmate is accepted in community corrections as a transition client, the parole board should set a parole date no later than 12 months from the date of placement in residential community corrections. Likewise, when an inmate has been placed in the Intensive Supervision Program-Inmate (ISP-I), the parole board should set a date for parole at 180 days from the placement on ISP-I.

P-15 (Support 2.42) (Impact 2.88) (Total 6.95)

Judicial and probation officer training should be expanded to develop curricula that promote a culture of successful supervision of probationers.

P-12 (Support 2.67) (Impact 2.50) (Total 6.67)

When appropriate, and considering the safety of the victim, expand the use of home detention in lieu of jail, as a condition of probation or for a probation revocation.

PIS-91 (Support 2.44) (Impact 2.67) (Total 6.51)

To promote continuity of supervision, the Department of Corrections should develop consistent policies and trainings that promote uniformity in establishing and implementing discretionary conditions and privileges of parole supervision.

I-27 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.14) (Total 6.43)

A statewide committee should be formed to develop an advisory, statewide bond schedule that is generally consistent across jurisdictions. Each judicial district shall develop a committee of stakeholders to review the existing bond schedule.

Yellow = Unanimous SUPPORT and IMPACT (10 recommendations)

Blue = Total score in top 25% (9 recommendations)

Rust = Total score in top 50-75% (20 recommendations)

Purple = Total score 25-50% (17 recommendations)

Black = Total score bottom 25% (16 recommendations)

P-16 (Support 2.08) (Impact 2.75) (Total 5.73)

As a way to provide incentives without sacrificing public safety, a working group shall be formed of representatives from the Division of Probation Services, district court probation departments, prosecutors, defense attorneys, victim representatives, and judges to develop an earned time schedule that links specific behaviors, such as completing drug treatment and maintaining “clean” urinalysis tests, to specific reductions in the term of the probation sentence.

T-63 (Support 2.27) (Impact 2.44) (Total 5.56)

For individuals entering community corrections facilities provide the opportunity to waive the first two to four weeks of subsistence payments for those who are indigent.

I-61 (Support 2.82) (Impact 1.88) (Total 5.28)

Funding should be provided for programs for women who give birth while incarcerated that permit the child to live with the mother. The Commission supports the Department of Corrections’ effort to expand parenting and bonding programs.

P-6 (Support 2.25) (Impact 2.25) (Total 5.06)

Encourage the use of summons and “cash only” bonds rather than arrest and incarceration for offenders on revocation status when the total amount of fees and costs owed is minimal. The judge can convert the cash bond into costs owed.

P-8 (Support 2.25) (Impact 2.25) (Total 5.06)

The imposition of special conditions of probation should be based only on specific, individual needs/risk assessment information.

I-53 (Support 2.36) (Impact 2.13) (Total 5.02)

Upon request and as appropriate, job supervisors at the Department of Corrections should be encouraged to write job recommendations for individuals being released from incarceration.

P-11 (Support 2.09) (Impact 2.38) (Total 4.97)

It is recommended that judges at the initial sentencing hearing consider the negative impact a jail sentence imposed as a condition of probation may have on the offender’s ability to maintain employment, housing, and maintain SSI and SSDI benefits, and therefore successfully complete probation.

P-9 (Support 2.08) (Impact 2.38) (Total 4.95)

To reduce docket overload and interruptions to the offender’s employment, minimize court review hearings and appearances. Educate judges and probation officers on prioritizing support for the offender’s employment since research shows that stable employment is linked to recidivism reduction. This does not apply to specialty courts.

I-49 (Support 2.45) (Impact 2.0) (Total 4.91)

Yellow = Unanimous SUPPORT and IMPACT (10 recommendations)

Blue = Total score in top 25% (9 recommendations)

Rust = Total score in top 50-75% (20 recommendations)

Purple = Total score 25-50% (17 recommendations)

Black = Total score bottom 25% (16 recommendations)

Technological advances should be explored to provide long distance learning opportunities so that to individuals registered in these classes will not lose time or momentum when transferred to a different facility.

P-5 (Support 2.0) (Impact 2.38) (Total 4.75)

Implement existing statutes (CRS 16-5-206 and 16-5-207) encouraging the use of a summons rather than arrest for probation revocations.

I-38 (Support 2.0) (Impact 1.71) (Total 3.43)

Determine the cost and feasibility to develop for each offender a standardized comprehensive profile, to include Pre-Sentence Information Report (PSIR), entered into an automated system and made accessible to authorized personnel.

I-28 (Support 1.67) (Impact 1.86) (Total 3.10)

Advisory criteria should be established for departing from the actual bond schedule and setting a reduced bond based on a defendant's ties to the community. It is recommended that judges be advised to take the defendant's income into consideration when establishing a bond amount. However, the task force recognizes that certain public safety issues may require an enhanced bond.

P-13 (Support 1.58) (Impact 1.63) (Total 2.57)

Resolve new county court cases as soon as possible because unresolved cases may interfere with the success of district court probation.

P-14 (Support 1.58) (Impact 1.50) (Total 2.38)

When explaining the rationale for a probation sentence, judges should verbalize the defendant's positive behaviors (such as participation in treatment, employment, family responsibilities) that support a community-based sentence. This approach is supported by research findings that link positive reinforcement to behavior change.

P-7 (Support 1.55) (Impact 1.38) (Total 2.13)

When appropriate, judges should waive costs and surcharges at sentencing when the offender is clearly unable to pay to ensure that this does not later become the basis for a revocation.

Yellow = Unanimous SUPPORT and IMPACT (10 recommendations)

Blue = Total score in top 25% (9 recommendations)

Rust = Total score in top 50-75% (20 recommendations)

Purple = Total score 25-50% (17 recommendations)

Black = Total score bottom 25% (16 recommendations)

COST SAVINGS¹

PIS-86 (Support 3.00) (Impact 2.89) (Total 8.67)

Clarify the statute and mandate that parolees receive credit for the time spent in jail pending a technical parole revocation.

Assumption: 50% of technical parole returns (no new crime) receive three weeks against their sentence for time spent in jail.

- Year 2 savings 442 Beds \$ 8.9 M
- Year 3 savings 533 Beds \$10.7 M
- Year 4 savings 475 Beds \$ 9.6 M
- Year 5 savings 399 Beds \$ 8.1 M
- Year 6 savings 322 Beds \$ 6.7 M

PIS-93 (Support 2.8) (Impact 3.0) (Total 8.40)

The Commission support the Department of Corrections' effort to establish a technical violations unit with the goal of enhancing consistency, preserving public safety, and reducing parole revocations for technical violations.

Assumption: Parole technical violations (no new crime) reduced by 15% each year over the previous year.

- Year 2 savings 228 Beds \$ 4.6 M
- Year 3 savings 431 Beds \$ 8.7 M
- Year 4 savings 517 Beds \$10.4 M
- Year 5 savings 602 Beds \$12.1 M
- Year 6 savings 687 Beds \$13.9 M²

P-1 (Support 2.75) (Impact 3.0) (Total 8.25)

To increase consistency across the state in the response to probation technical and criminal violations, the Division of Probation Services shall work with district probation departments to develop a range of probation sanction guidelines that hold offenders accountable while working toward successful completion of probation. These guidelines will be adopted and consistently implemented with the assistance of the court in each jurisdiction.

¹ The cost scenarios were developed by the Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics, using the population forecast model that projects the Division's annual and interim population projections. These numbers are estimates to give policymakers an idea of how changes in policy and practice can translate into dollars. These are marginal cost savings associated with the cost of private prison beds.

² Analysis by Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics. The scenario assumes that the revocation-to-prison rate decreases every year by 15% from the previous year.

Yellow = Unanimous SUPPORT and IMPACT (10 recommendations)

Blue = Total score in top 25% (9 recommendations)

Rust = Total score in top 50-75% (20 recommendations)

Purple = Total score 25-50% (17 recommendations)

Black = Total score bottom 25% (16 recommendations)

Assumption: Reduces admissions of probation revocations by 10% *each* year over the previous year.

- **Year 2 savings** **136 Beds** **\$ 2.7 M**
- **Year 3 savings** **376 Beds** **\$ 7.6 M**
- **Year 4 savings** **611 Beds** **\$12.3 M**
- **Year 5 savings** **829 Beds** **\$17.7 M**
- **Year 6 savings** **1064 Beds** **\$21.5 M³**

Funding proposal

60 Days good time for non-violent new intakes and current population, excluding technical violations:

- **Year 2 savings** **498 Beds** **\$ 10.1 M**
- **Year 3 savings** **602 Beds** **\$ 12.2 M**
- **Year 4 savings** **622 Beds** **\$ 12.6 M**
- **Year 5 savings** **655 Beds** **\$ 13.2 M**
- **Year 6 savings** **705 Beds** **\$ 14.2 M⁴**

30 Days good time for non-violent new intakes and current population, excluding technical violations:

- **Year 2 savings** **250 Beds** **\$ 5.1 M**
- **Year 3 savings** **299 Beds** **\$ 6.0 M**
- **Year 4 savings** **305 Beds** **\$ 6.2 M**
- **Year 5 savings** **322 Beds** **\$ 6.5 M**
- **Year 6 savings** **349 Beds** **\$ 7.0 M⁵**

³ Analysis, conducted by the Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics, assumes that the revocation-to-prison rate decreases *every year* by 10% from the previous year.

⁴ Analysis, conducted by the Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics. See Footnote 1.

⁵ Analysis, conducted by the Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics. See Footnote 1.

Yellow = Unanimous SUPPORT and IMPACT (10 recommendations)

Blue = Total score in top 25% (9 recommendations)

Rust = Total score in top 50-75% (20 recommendations)

Purple = Total score 25-50% (17 recommendations)

Black = Total score bottom 25% (16 recommendations)