



**Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice**

**Minutes**

August 8, 2014  
 Jefferson County District Attorney's Office  
 500 Jefferson County Parkway  
 Golden, CO

**Commission Member Attendance**

Stan Hilkey, Chair	Steve King - <b>ABSENT</b>	Rick Raemisch
Doug Wilson, Vice-Chair, by phone	Julie Krow - <b>ABSENT</b>	Brandon Shaffer
Jennifer Bradford	Evelyn Leslie	Pat Steadman - <b>ABSENT</b>
Theresa Cisneros	Beth McCann - <b>ABSENT</b>	Alaurice Tafoya-Modi
Sallie Clark	Jeff McDonald	Mark Waller
Matthew Durkin	Norm Mueller	Pete Weir
Kelly Friesen, by phone	Kevin Paletta - <b>ABSENT</b>	Meg Williams
Charles Garcia - <b>ABSENT</b>	Joe Pelle	Dave Young
Kate Horn-Murphy, by phone	Eric Philp	Jeanne Smith, <i>Ex Officio</i>

**CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

Commission Chair, Stan Hilkey, called the meeting to order at 12:37 p.m. Mr. Hilkey introduced himself as the new Executive Director of the Department of Public Safety and the new Chair of the Commission. Mr. Hilkey is the former Mesa County Sheriff and he described his introduction to the process of policy making as a key participant in the Evidence Based Decision Making Initiative in Mesa County. Members introduced themselves to Mr. Hilkey and each described the constituency they represent.

Upon a solicitation by the Chair, Sallie Clark offered a motion to approve the Minutes from the May 9, 2014 CCJJ meeting. Alaurice Tafoya-Modi seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

**EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING INITIATIVE**

Stan Hilkey, referencing a slide presentation, discussed the work by the Commission planning team on the National Institute of Corrections' Evidence Based Decision Making (EBDM) Initiative. The EBDM Initiative provides participants a framework to examine all the decision points - from arrest to discharge - in the criminal justice system for evidenced-based improvements. Mesa County was a pilot site for this initiative and, utilizing this framework, their team targeted five decision areas for change.

In March, the Commission agreed to send a letter to NIC expressing the State's interest in offering the EBDM framework to other jurisdictions in Colorado. The Commission's EBDM planning group has met four times since May to develop an EBDM Phase IV Plan to identify

local jurisdictions that wish to participate in the Initiative. An informational webinar was held on July 10<sup>th</sup> for thirty-six interested participants. On August 21<sup>st</sup>, a statewide awareness-building session will be held at the Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office from 9:00am – 4:00pm. Several counties, including Boulder, Jefferson, Arapahoe, Montrose, and Adams, will send contingents to this session. The expressed interest meets the initial expectation for the number of jurisdictions necessary to submit a robust application to the National Institute of Corrections (NIC). So far, there are five to six interested jurisdictions and there are a few other tentative expressions of interest. In preparation for the awareness-building session, the EBDM planning group is delineating the requirements of Initiative participation, the scope of the work, and the expected duration of the Initiative. Additionally, the state planning team will outline the amount and type of assistance it can provide to participants in the Initiative.

Following the August 21<sup>st</sup> awareness-building session, an application packet will be developed and, subsequently, distributed to interested jurisdictions. The deadline for local jurisdictions to submit an application to the state planning group has been set for September 26<sup>th</sup>. Based on the applications received, the planning team will determine whether there is sufficient state-wide interest and project feasibility to mount a statewide EBDM Initiative application. This determination will be made by October 17<sup>th</sup> and, if affirmative, the State must apply to NIC by November 14<sup>th</sup>. If Colorado is chosen as an expansion state, the Initiative will move to Phase V which will require the state planning team to select the final Initiative participants from the pool of interested applicants (the local jurisdictions).

As a reminder, the Initiative will offer technical assistance from NIC and its partners, but no funds, to engage in a self-study of the jurisdiction's criminal justice decision points where evidence-based research can be applied to improve decision making. The decision points selected for study and the breadth and depth of the intervention are at the discretion of the local jurisdiction.

### **TASK FORCE / SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES**

Mr. Hilkey introduced, in turn, a spokesperson to provide an update from each of the Commission task forces and subcommittees.

Jeanne Smith updated the Commission on two mandates from the Legislature that were assigned to two separate Commission groups: the Legislative Subcommittee and the Cyberbullying Subcommittee.

**Legislative Subcommittee.** The first mandate was included in House Bill 2014 - 1214 which concerned the creation of augmented penalties for the conviction of crimes against emergency medical service providers while engaged in the performance of their duties. The Commission assigned the associated tasks, described in C.R.S., 16-11.3-103.5 (Study of enhanced penalties for offenses against emergency service providers), to the standing Legislative Subcommittee. The subcommittee met and discussed:

- the best method to determine whether these augmented penalties are necessary and, if so, how they may be written into statute, and
- how members might locate data on the frequency of these incidents.

Those who advocated for the passage of the bill have provided some background information to the Subcommittee. The Colorado District Attorneys' Council will compile the types of crimes that are currently charged in these circumstances and which might be included in subsequent legislation. The Subcommittee concluded that the decisions around this topic will be driven more by philosophical and policy positions rather than by research findings, given the lack of research in this area.

**Cyberbullying Subcommittee.** The second mandate concerns cyberbullying and was submitted via a letter from the Legislative leadership and sponsors of an indefinitely-postponed bill on the topic (House Bill 2014-1131). The Commission created the Cyberbullying Subcommittee, chaired by Commission member Chief Kevin Paletta, to address this request. In Chief Paletta's absence, Ms. Smith summarized these points from the first meeting of the Subcommittee:

- Subcommittee members discussed a variety of issues related to this topic, which of the topics were most relevant to the legislative request, and a method to structure the work on this topic.
- Prior to the proposal of any solutions, it will be necessary to explore the relevant topics, to identify the impacted systems, and to discuss these topics with several stakeholders and interested groups, some of whom are already working on this issue.
- When possible, the Subcommittee would like to ensure that alternatives to criminal justice solutions are considered. Criminal justice solutions would likely add more juveniles to the criminal justice system for behaviors that may not warrant criminalization.
- Conversely, there are some bullying behaviors that may precipitate dire reactions in some victims for which criminal penalties may be appropriate.
- Subcommittee member Jennifer Bradford has offered that her colleagues at Metro State can provide a presentation on their research and best practices on this topic. This presentation is scheduled for August 26<sup>th</sup> at 2:00pm at 700 Kipling (see the calendar on the Commission website for details; coloradocccjj.org).
- Subcommittee member Christine Harms of the School Safety Resource Center is also gathering information on policies and best practices.
- The Legislature requested that any recommendations be submitted by December 1<sup>st</sup>. The Subcommittee may hold meetings more frequently than once a month in order to meet the challenge of this short deadline.

**Community Corrections Task Force.** Task Force Co-Chair Theresa Cisneros described the three different areas of ongoing work by this group:

1. the processes and training of community corrections boards;
2. the offender populations served by community corrections, and
3. the process of referral (of offenders to community corrections boards).

Ms. Cisneros offered the following updates:

- In regard to the first area, Board processes, the Task Force is exploring Board member training, maintaining representative and consistent stakeholders and characteristics among board members; and providing Boards with consistent and reliable information on offenders.
- The second area involves the identification of offenders who, based on risks and needs, would most benefit from placement in community corrections.

- The third area of work focuses on the design of an evidence-based referral system that relies on reliable measures of offender readiness and allows for the efficient exchange of information between the “referral parties,” including case managers, re-entry specialists, community corrections boards, and community corrections programs.
- Another potential topic under review is to explore ways to address the resistance by some communities to the placement of community corrections facilities in their jurisdictions.
- The Task Force will likely offer recommendations on some of these topics over the next few months.

**Comprehensive Sentencing Task Force: Sex Offense Working Group.** Norm Mueller, Co-Chair of the Task Force and Co-Chair of the Working Group, related that, since the March 2014 Commission retreat, the Working Group has met four times on the topics assigned by the Commission. The final meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>. By that date, the group will have completed its study of three issues:

1. early release from Lifetime probation supervision for those committing class 4 felonies;
2. a procedure for the early release of probationers who become severely disabled; and
3. whether there is a need for a determinate class 4 felony (for a sex offense).

Mr. Mueller provided the following details:

- The Working Group has been divided over whether and how to address these issues.
- Any conclusions upon which there is consensus or, alternatively, the different positions taken on the topics will be presented to the Comprehensive Sentencing Task Force for consideration.
- The Task Force will provide a summary of all this work to the Commission and will determine which, if any, of the topics is presented to the Commission as a recommendation.
- These assignments from the Commission represent the final charges for consideration by the Comprehensive Sentencing Task Force. Therefore, September 3<sup>rd</sup> will be the final meeting of the Task Force.

**Minority Over-Representation Subcommittee.** Commission consultant, Paul Herman offered an overview of two pending items from the Minority Over-Representation (MOR) Subcommittee. These are the last two of the original seven MOR items of work assigned by the Commission dating from June 2011.

- The first of these pending items is the cultural responsiveness tool kit, which was presented to the Commission for feedback in May 2014 by representatives of the Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission and the Denver Police Department. Based on this feedback, revisions of the tool kit continue. The Commission also awaits recommendations from the toolkit designers regarding methods by which distribution of the toolkit to law enforcement jurisdictions may be undertaken.
- The second pending item is the enhancement of data collection procedures to improve the quality of race and ethnicity data, particularly at the “front end” of the criminal justice system (for example, arrest data). The MOR Task Force will meet in September 2014 to finalize efforts on this remaining item.
- Therefore, this will conclude the work on the seven assigned MOR items. It is expected that this Subcommittee will enter a hiatus period until the Commission identifies new MOR issues for attention.

**Juvenile Justice Task Force.** Task Force Co-Chair, Jeff McDonald detailed the status of four recommendations from the Juvenile Justice Task Force.

1. The recommendation for a Petty Ticket Option (FY15-JJ#1) was approved by the Commission at the June 2014 meeting. Rep. McCann will be the sponsor of the bill derived from the recommendation.
2. A recommendation to develop Professional Standards of Juvenile Practice (FY15-JJ#3) will be voted upon today.
3. A recommendation concerning the Age of Detention (FY15-JJ#2) was to be presented for a vote today; however, this vote will be delayed until the September 2014 Commission meeting.
4. A last recommendation on Pre-filing Options is tentatively scheduled for initial presentation in September.

Mr. McDonald delivered these additional updates:

- At the March 2014 Commission retreat, the Task Force had been given the assignment to complete, by the end of summer 2014, the pending work on the four recommendations described previously. The Commission was then to determine whether there was additional work that required immediate attention by the Task Force or whether the Task Force was to take a hiatus to allow the re-assignment of Commission resources to other topics.
- Mr. McDonald reported that the Juvenile Justice Task Force would like to present reasons to continue its work concerning the revision of the Children's Code; specifically, to reorder Article 2 of the Children's Code.

Mr. Hilkey asked whether additional details of the request could be described today? (for example, the scope of work, the proposed timeline, etc.)

- Mr. McDonald reported that the Task Force members agree that the group is ready to address this more involved task, but it has not finalized the details of this request.
- At the September 2014 meeting, the Task Force will provide such details, including timelines and actions items.

Mr. Hilkey concluded by stating that, following this presentation in September, Commission members will discuss the merits and implications of the decision to continue or to suspend the work of the Juvenile Justice Task Force.

### **MARCH RETREAT OUTCOMES AND STATUS OF CCJJ INITIATIVES**

Paul Herman (Commission consultant), referring members to a handout, provided an overview of the updated work plan and timeline created at the March 2014 Commission retreat. As described previously in the meeting, work has progressed in several areas that were identified at the retreat or that were subsequently added to the Commission workload pursuant to legislative mandate (namely, Community Corrections, EBDM, Cyber-bullying, Medical Service Providers, Juvenile Justice and Sex Offenses).

The Commission will begin exploratory work on the issues of Re-entry and Data during Fall/Winter of 2014/2015. Because these new areas of work are rather broad, exploratory groups will be created to identify narrow, impactful topics that can be addressed in tightly defined time

periods. Mr. Herman repeated the request from the previous meeting for Commission members to volunteer to serve on at least one task force or subcommittee, if they have not yet done so. Members should submit to DCJ staff-person, Germaine Miera, the name of at least two preferred groups on which they would like to volunteer.

Mr. Herman addressed the status of the three groups identified at the March retreat for potential conclusion: the Juvenile Justice Task Force, the Comprehensive Sentencing Task Force and the Minority Over-representation Subcommittee. These groups have completed or are nearing completion of the specific tasks assigned at the retreat. The MOR Subcommittee and the Comprehensive Sentencing Task Force are slated for conclusion or hiatus in September. As reported earlier, the Juvenile Justice Task Force has requested to present reasons for its continuation at the September 2014 Commission meeting. Commission members will decide whether to approve continuation or to place this group on hiatus. A hiatus does not imply that there are no issues to be addressed in these respective areas, but that the Commission has decided to assign resources to new topics of study during, at least if not beyond, this fiscal year.

Jeanne Smith expounded on comments by Mr. Herman regarding the Commission's method to initiate efforts on the Re-Entry and Data topics. There will be a preliminary process of issue identification by small exploratory groups prior to the creation of task forces. This approach affords an opportunity for the Commission to review and prioritize potential issues, concerns and problems for the new task forces to study. The identification of narrowly-defined topics also enables the Commission to identify the expertise and representation necessary among potential task force members, to offer improved guidance in goal-setting and to create more reasonable timelines for the completion of work. This avoids previous complications resulting from the assignment of overly broad charges that left task force members unsure of their direction and goals. Also, a clearer task focus better informs a Commission member's choice to serve on a particular task force. Additionally, definitive topics and explicit goals can more effectively communicate the Commission's focus and intent to concerned stakeholders.

### **JUVENILE JUSTICE TASK FORCE - RECOMMENDATION VOTE**

Regina Huerter, Juvenile Justice Task Force member, reminded members of the general purpose and goals of Recommendation FY15-JJ#3 (see below). This recommendation was presented in detail at the June 2014 Commission meeting. The discussion regarding this recommendation may be found below.

#### **FY15-JJ #3    Develop professional standards of juvenile practice via a multi-agency collaborative.**

#### **Recommendation FY15- JJ #3**

The Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice supports agencies within the Executive and Judicial branches of government, and agencies involved in critical decisions of case processing and treatment of juvenile offenders, committing to and participating in the creation, adoption and implementation of statewide juvenile professional development standards as directed by the state's Juvenile

Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council. We recommend the following timeline for implementation:

- **Phase 1** (September 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Commit to and participate in the creation of statewide juvenile professional development, including core training standards, and an achievable implementation plan.
- **Phase 2** (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2018): Implement the plan, institutionalize core professional development standards in administrative practice, and ensure that training content will be continuously informed by new knowledge.

Implementation of adopted professional development and core training standards include:

- Expansion of organizational training offerings to better equip internal staff and contract provider staff with the competencies necessary to best meet the needs of the youth and families they serve.
- Institution of universal core standard trainings for professionals working with youth at entities such as, but not limited to, district attorney offices, the Colorado District Attorney's Council, the Department of Human Services, the Office of the State Public Defender, Colorado Office of Child's Representative, the State Court Administrator's Office, the Division of Probation Services, law enforcement and Colorado Association of Family and Children's Agencies (CAFCA).
- Participation of agencies in exploring potential federal, state and local funding opportunities that support collaborative workforce development efforts.
- Assessment by Colorado's Executive, Judicial and administrative agencies and, when applicable, nonprofit agencies, of their ability to make the trainings that they currently offer available to outside professionals
- Partnerships with existing and natural training entities such as colleges and universities, juvenile assessment centers, and professional organizations, in adopting and expanding professional development opportunities.
- Standardization of trainings in recommended core competency areas.
- Commitment of youth-serving agencies to improving public and private cross-system knowledge and working relationships through coordinated universal core standard trainings.

#### Discussion:

- Ms. Huerter responded to a few basic questions about the development of training resources and the potential delivery of the training suggested by the recommendation.
- Meg Williams reported that the Executive Committee of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Council met early on August 8th. This Council, appointed by the Governor and responsible for the oversight of dispersal of federal grant funds, confirmed its support for this recommendation. In 2012, the above recommendation was included among the priorities of the Council and will likely appear as a priority in the upcoming priorities report. Also, the Department of Human Services has already developed an on-line training course that meets several of the competencies included in the recommendation.

- The recommendation includes a list of agencies for which the professional development and core training standards are most applicable. Included on this list of agencies are the State Court Administrator's Office and the Division of Probation Services. There is no one in the State Court Administrator's Office (SCAO) or Probation Services working with the Task Force or JJDPC in these areas. Does the inclusion of these entities suggest that the training would be required or suggested for judges and probation officers?
  - Ms. Huerter reported that Judge Meinster, who is on the Juvenile Justice Task Force, has described a judicial group reviewing training needs and that the group is interested in joining the planning efforts.
  - Ms. Huerter is unaware whether there is anyone specifically from the SCAO involved in such training efforts.
  - In regard to Probation, representatives have attended task force meetings to describe the current training offered in this area. One would expect that the existing training will be reviewed to determine whether all the competencies are already addressed in the training offered by Probation.
- Law enforcement is included among those who are expected to adopt these standards. Among sheriffs and chiefs, there are always concerns regarding mandated training when the current training standards require 600 hours of basic training and 80 hours of annual training. Will this training actually be mandated? Will it be funded? Will it be expected of all officers or only of certain specialists?
  - The Task Force did not specifically discuss all the nuances, but there will be conversations as the training is developed. There are some existing trainings, for example, for community resource officers and within the juvenile version of crisis intervention training, that offer models for the delivery of this kind of information.
  - Ultimately, it is important for officers, who are on the "front line" of contact with juveniles, to learn the core competencies critical to effective interactions and interventions with juveniles.
- Ms. Huerter reiterated that the purpose of the recommendation is to seek Commission endorsement of the concept that the work with juveniles should be guided by special training and knowledge. This request is driven less by a desire *to prescribe* training and more by the desire *to encourage* training that incorporates practices informed by research in child development and uniform competencies.
- The Office of the Alternate Defense Council (ADC) is missing from the list of agencies for inclusion in the training. Starting in November 2014, a representative from either the State Public Defender's Office (SPDO) or the ADC will be present for every juvenile detention hearing in the state.
  - The ADC will be added to the list.
  - FOLLOW-UP: Similar to the concerns raised by law enforcement, defense counsel will be interested in whether there will be funds to pay for this training. The SPDO spends quite a bit on training and, with 260 lawyers, every training requirement increases training expenses. There are no qualms with the importance of the concept, but the implementation raises many questions.
- In an attempt to address concerns regarding implementation, Ms. Huerter directed members' attention to the proposed two-phase process to develop and implement the training.
  - *Phase 1* encompasses the study of existing practices and training needs and the development of an implementation plan. All entities identified for participation in the



- proposed training will be solicited to engage in the *Phase 1* process. The concerns and questions expressed thus far in the meeting cannot be fully answered until *Phase 1* is complete.
- *Phase 2* encompasses the implementation process. Prior to this, supportive funding streams must be identified.
  - It is assumed that options for relatively cost-neutral implementation will be explored. For example, training for lawyers could be integrated into law school coursework and there may already be training programs that provide the necessary training or would qualify with minor content additions.
  - Again, approval of the recommendation simply represents a statement of support that juvenile competency is important and that the effort to develop these standards and training should be initiated.
- The district attorneys are supportive of the concept; however, it is critical that the appropriate stakeholders are included in the curriculum development. Also, the core competencies appear to provide a good foundation, but one assumes there will be additional study to determine whether these are in fact valid and are evidence-based or represent best practice.
    - Ms. Huerter concurred that there will be a continual commitment to monitor research developments, to be guided by this research, and to gather information on best practices in this area.
  - It appears that the recommendation actually comprises three separate suggestions: (1) the creation of the standards; (2) the adoption of the standards; and (3) the implementation of the standards. It will be difficult to reach #2 or #3 without first seeing the outcome of #1. Supporting the first step appears reasonable, but it is difficult to commit to support for the other aspects of the project without evaluating the products of that initial step.
    - Ms. Huerter replied that the critical element of the request is to obtain support to initiate the work represented in *Phase 1* of the project. She assured Commission members that updates on the progress of *Phase 1* can be provided at future meetings.
  - Clarifying the previous points, it was observed that approval of the existing recommendation would implicitly grant approval to both phases of the project and not just the initial work described in *Phase 1*.
    - Ms. Huerter agreed with that assessment, but suggested that the Commission was free to amend the recommendation to only approve *Phase 1*. The Commission could request the opportunity to evaluate the outcome of each phase of work, rather than granting blanket approval to the entire project.
    - The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council would likely be supportive of this approach and, actually, may prefer to assess and secure support at each phase of the project.
  - A statement was offered from the county perspective regarding possible unintended financial implications. The goal of the overall concept is certainly worthy of support. However, concerns still remain regarding costs to both the state and to counties.
  - The judicial representatives reported that they do not have the authority to support any recommendation that implies that the Judicial Branch be *required* to take any specific action. The Chief Justice is the only person in the Judicial Branch who can provide a position on such a recommendation.
    - Ms. Huerter reiterated that, if the approval is limited to *Phase 1*, affirmative support only means that there is agreement that such standards are advantageous and that a varied and

- representative group of stakeholders, including Judicial, would be involved in the development of the standards and the implementation plan. This limited approval would not imply a requirement to abide by the training standards or the implementation plan.
- FOLLOW-UP: Because the Probation Division works under the supervision of the Court, Probation is also unable to take a position on the recommendation. Judges are trained in matters of the law and most aspects of the curriculum, as defined by the current core competencies, would not be characterized as “matters of law.” An argument could be made that the competency related to consent and the release of protected information might be relevant to judges. It was stated that Probation already includes these curriculum elements in its training academy.
  - A concern was expressed that the term “standard” will be applied to the identified practices. “Standard” can imply regulatory matters or expectations for job performance and, relatedly, that deficiency in meeting the “standard” may have employment or job assignment consequences.
    - Ms. Huerter offered the following points in response:
      - The term “standards” is primarily used to refer to the elements of training that should be included in the curriculum. There should be some basic, uniform elements in the training to work with juveniles.
      - Secondly, “standards” may also refer to an expectation for the level of proficiency an individual should attain to work effectively with the juvenile population. This would be decided by the stakeholders participating in the development of these standards.
      - Another part of the development process will be to determine which professionals should receive training in all or in specific aspects of the competencies and curriculum.
      - *Phase 1* will include a review of all the trainings being offered across the juvenile systems. This will enable the development group to identify and share the best curricular elements and to identify and fill any training gaps.

Pete Weir suggested amending the recommendation as follows:

The Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice supports agencies within the Executive and Judicial branches of government, and agencies involved in critical decisions of case processing and treatment of juvenile offenders, committing to and participating in the creation, ~~adoption and implementation~~ of statewide juvenile professional development PRACTICES ~~standards~~ as directed by the state’s Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council. We recommend the following timeline ~~for implementation~~:

- *Phase 1* (September 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Commit to and participate in the creation of statewide juvenile professional development PRACTICES. ~~including core training standards, and an achievable implementation plan.~~
- ~~*Phase 2* (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2018): Implement the plan, institutionalize core professional development standards in administrative practice, and ensure that training content will be continuously informed by new knowledge.~~

Pete Weir moved to amend the recommendation (as indicated above). Jeff McDonald seconded the motion. Theresa Cisneros and Eric Philp abstained from this vote. There was no further discussion.

**VOTE:** To amend Recommendation FY15-JJ#3, as indicated above.

A. I support it - 13

B. I can live with it - 5

C. I do not support it - 0

Abstain - 2

**Amendment to Recommendation FY15-JJ#3 - APPROVED**

(by supermajority vote; 75% voting A or B)

Norm Mueller moved the vote on the amended recommendation. Meg Williams seconded the motion. Theresa Cisneros and Eric Philp abstained from this vote. There was no further discussion.

**VOTE:** To approve Recommendation FY15-JJ#3 as amended.

A. I support it - 16

B. I can live with it.- 2

C. I do not support it - 0

Abstain - 2

**Recommendation FY15-JJ#3 - APPROVED**

(by supermajority vote; 75% voting A or B)

Mr. Hilkey thanked Ms. Huerter for her presentation and the responses to questions.

Mr. Hilkey reported that the Juvenile Justice Task Force had requested that the vote on Recommendation FY15-JJ#2 regarding the age of detention be postponed until the September 2104 Commission meeting. Recommendation FY15-JJ#2, any remaining recommendations, and the request for task force continuation from the Juvenile Justice Task Force will be heard at that meeting. No further business was raised by the Juvenile Justice Task Force.

**ADJOURNMENT**

No further business was raised by Commission members and Mr. Hilkey adjourned the meeting at 2:21 p.m.

The next Commission meeting will occur Friday, September 12, 2014 from 12:30 – 4:30 at the Jefferson County District Attorney's Office.