

Invitations: 25

Surveys completed: 19 (not completed: 6)

## Participants: (Question #1: Name)

### Survey Submitted

Karen Beye\*  
 Rhonda Fields\*  
 Pete Hautzinger\*  
 Regina Huerter\*  
 David Kaplan\*  
 Bill Kilpatrick  
 Reo Leslie, Jr.\*  
 Claire Levy\*  
 Becky Lucero\*  
 Gilbert Martinez\*

Inta Morris\*  
 John Morse\*  
 Tom Quinn\*  
 Grayson Robinson\*  
 Steven Siegel\*  
 Alaurice Tafoya-Modi\*  
 Douglas Wilson\*  
 Ari Zavaras\*  
 Debbie Zwirn\*

### Surveys not submitted:

Regis Groff  
 Don Quick  
 John Suthers\*  
 Mark Waller  
 Mark Scheffel

### Resigned:

Dean Conder

(\*Member interviewed)

## QUESTION #2

Please indicate the strategy you feel will be most productive to address sentencing?

Reminder of tentative strategy alternatives:

- a). comprehensive approach - begins with a “blank slate” and considers the entire felony class structure and builds a new classification system based on our current values,
- b). targeted approach - revising specific criminal statutes, in turn, ultimately leading to comprehensive change, but requiring a process to reconcile each individual part into a comprehensible and coherent whole, or
- c). comprehensive (hybrid) approach - initiate the work with the comprehensive approach by addressing sentencing policy to devise a set of guiding principles and questions that are applied, in turn, to manageable parts of the criminal statute until each has been revised.

(The definitions are brief. Please choose an alternative simply based on your general impression.)

Please choose a) or b) below:

9 47% a. Comprehensive approach (“blank slate” or “hybrid” methods)

10 53% b. Focus on specific areas (targeted approach)

If b) on #2, answer #3.

## QUESTION #3

Because you answered b) to the previous question, please rate on a 1 to 5 priority scale the targeted areas for Commission attention.

1 = low priority for Commission attention

5 = high priority for Commission attention

	Priority					Priority Weighting (max =50)
	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5	
1. Statues pertaining to sex crimes	1	1	1	2	5	39
2. Extraordinary risk, crimes of violence, Mandatory minimums	0	3	0	4	3	37
3. Habitual criminal statutes	0	1	4	4	1	35
4. Property crimes	1	5	1	2	1	27
5. Other: Juvenile Justice	0	0	0	1	0	4
6. Other: Youthful Offender System	0	0	0	1	0	4

[Numbers in table reflect the response count. Priority weighting = Sum (all Count x Rating)]

**Question #4**

When you reflect on the Commission’s accomplishments in sentencing over the past year, which of the following best captures your current state of mind?

- 8 44% a. Energized to undertake and complete sentencing review
- 7 39% b. Ready to accept assignments on sentencing review
- 3 17% c. Can devote attention to sentencing review

1 - Don’t know

**Question #5**

How much time do you feel you can commit to task force work over the next year?

- 0 0% a. None
- 4 22% b. 4 hours/month
- 4 22% c. 6 hours/month
- 7 39% d. 8 hours/month
- 3 17% e. 10 hours/month

1 - Don’t know

**Question #6**

To what extent do you think you can represent your constituents while considering alternative views on sentencing?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Cannot do this	1	0	7	6	6	Can easily do this
Response count	0	0	7	6	6	
	0%	0%	37.0%	31.5%	31.5%	

**Question #7**

To what extent do you feel your constituent group is open to alternative solutions to sentencing concerns?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not at all open	1	3	6	4	6	Very open
Response count	0	3	6	4	6	
	0%	16.0%	37.0%	21.0%	31.5%	

## Question #8 (open-ended)

Please list the biggest barrier(s) to the Commission's successful study of sentencing? (15 comments)

Items preceded by a number in parentheses indicate the number of times a similar idea was expressed.

### Member-related Barriers

- Knowledge base lacking
- Succession planning needed
- Authority issues disruptive
- Time commitment demanding
- WIIFM attitude detrimental ("What's in it for me?")
- New member engagement needs improvement
- (3) Some members are strongly engaged while others are not; need to work harder to engage be inclusive of all members and their opinions (Perhaps additional group dynamic assessment is needed)

### Process-related Barriers

- (2) Hidden agendas; Continual re-evaluation of priorities is deceptive
- Too much offender advocacy
- Meetings seem to have a predetermined outcome while others are more free-flowing
- (2) Direction and focus of Commission unclear; no driving force for unified vision
- Issues too convoluted
- (2) Differing views among Commission members problematic when impedes listening, adjusting
- Commission diversity of backgrounds is ignored, over-run by certain viewpoints
- (2) Lack of voice for those impacted by the Commission (more input by non-Commission, the public)
- Lack of victim consideration
- Lack of desire to succeed
- Need better meeting facilitation
- (2) Need more comprehensive reforms and less targeted reforms
- Tasks are too large and unwieldy

### Goal/Outcome-related Barriers

- Too much focus on cost-saving
- Outcomes are only in the direction of greater leniency
- Political ramifications complicate goals
- Public pressure to be tough on crime

### Support-related Barriers

- Research capacity lacking
- Lack of availability of appropriate, timely and meaningful research
- Lack of funding
- Sustaining staff engagement/dedication

## Question #9 (open-ended)

What information would better equip you to actively participate in the Commission's study of sentencing? (14 comments)

### Data/ Information

- (2) Good comprehensive review of current sentencing
- (6) Information from other nationwide efforts, experiences, examples; the resources necessary; methodology
- More input from diverse stakeholders
- More victim community representation
- Current data and statistics
- Projections of outcomes to evaluate alternatives
- More training on sentencing alternatives and recidivism evidence
- More training for new members to the Commission

### Meeting Processes

- (2) Data and information sent earlier to members for review and constituent discussions
- When decision alternatives are prepared before meeting, send these to members for review
- Identify specific desired outcomes
- Foster open dialogue
- Use teleconferencing
- Do not move forward until current efforts have demonstrated their effectiveness
- When working on sentencing (targeted area), must be provided every single statute the work touches

## Question #10 (open-ended)

Do you have other comments about the Commission's work on sentencing? (12 comments)

### Member Attitude/Behavior

- (2) All must be open-minded
- We should be very proud of the work accomplished, acknowledge our work and dedicate ourselves to the vast amount of work to be done, and the little time left to accomplish the work
- There's too much finger-pointing and politics based on personal agendas
- If I can convince my apprehensive constituents and special interest groups of the value of reform (DUI bill), why can't others?
- Frustrated by the apathy of some Commission members

### Meeting Processes / Goals

- Need to understand the ultimate goal of sentencing in the 21<sup>st</sup> century
- The comprehensive (blank slate) sentencing approach is too large
- (2) Given what we've accomplished, it's time to tackle the tough issues (sex offenders); time to move to higher branches of the fruit tree.
- The alternatives suggested for dealing with sentencing are too limited: We can address comprehensive reform and work on isolated areas (drug sentencing and sex offenses).

## Question #11 (open-ended)

Do you have other comments about the Commission?  
(12 comments)

### Suggestions

- We need a balance in the leadership of work groups
- (3) Interest among Commission members seems to be waning and either folks need to recommit or reconsider their role and participation; replace absent members according to the by-laws.
- The early work of the Commission was better organized; the later work has been rushed and made overly complicated; tasks don't feel completed
- There was better preparation of Commission members early on
- (3) Commission should go on hiatus until after fall elections; can move forward following the endorsement by the new Gov./administration
- Go back to 2008 recommendations and tackle bond reform
- When do we get to juvenile?

### General Assessment of Commission

- (2) I am very proud to be associated with every member of the Commission and the staff. These are people of character and purpose, who are dedicated to making a difference.
- The Commission's work is critically important. Work on sentencing will not happen, if the Commission does not take it on. Resolution may or may not be reached, but the Commission should address and take a position on sentencing whether legislative recommendations are produced or not.
- Overall the commission has made good progress, despite differences.
- Most on the Commission members are invested in doing the right thing
- The Commission work and consensus-building is enjoyable.