

Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice
Age of Delinquency Task Force

Minutes

February 6, 2019, 11:30AM-2:00PM
710 Kipling, 3rd Floor Meeting Room

ATTENDEES:

CHAIRS:

Joe Thome, Division of Criminal Justice
Jessica Jones, Criminal Defense Attorney

TASK FORCE MEMBERS:

Kelly Friesen, Grand County Juvenile Justice Services
Molli Barker, 18th Judicial District
Janet Drake, Attorney General's Office
Tariq Sheikh, District Attorney's Office, 17th Judicial District
Sara Strufing, Public Defender's Office
Gretchen Russo, Department of Human Services
Beth Sandberg, Victim Advocate

STAFF:

Richard Stroker, CCJJ Consultant
Kim English, Division of Criminal Justice
Stephane Waisanen, Division of Criminal Justice

ABSENT:

Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice
Shawn Cohn, Denver Juvenile Probation
Dan Makelky, Douglas County, Department of Human Services
Jim Bullock, District Attorney's Office, 16th Judicial District
Melanie Gilbert, Juvenile Court Magistrate
Bev Funaro, Victim Advocate

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Welcome/Introductions & Agenda	<p>Joe Thome, Co-chair of the Task Force, thanked everyone for coming to the meeting on a cold, snowy day. He asked for everyone in attendance to introduce themselves. He welcomed new Task Force member Janet Drake from the Attorney General's Office.</p> <p>Joe stated that there were a couple of adjustments to the agenda because he had to leave around 12:30 for another meeting. He mentioned that state Representative Gonzales-Gutierrez who has sponsored a bill (House Bill 19-1149) regarding the 18 to 20-year-old justice-involved population would be calling in at 1:30 to discuss the bill (Note: this did not occur).</p> <p>Joe mentioned that the agenda is focused on the recommendation that came out of the Working Group and, if acceptable to everyone, it would be voted on today and introduced as a preliminary recommendation to CCJJ on Friday, February 8. After reviewing and voting on the recommendation, we will see if there is any discussion regarding further work to be focused on the 10-12-year-old population and, if not, the Task Force will move toward studying the 18-20-year-old population in alignment with Representative Gonzales-Gutierrez's bill.</p>

Issue/Topic:	Discussion:
Recap of January Meeting	<p>Richard began the January recap by describing that the Task Force spent considerable time reviewing and editing the three recommendations that were submitted by the Working Group. Previously, we talked about at 10-12 year-olds that are eligible for placement in the juvenile justice system. The Working Group focused on improving and streamlining juvenile services planning documents, and this will benefit the 10 to 12-year-old population and older youth as well.</p> <p>The Working Group took the three original recommendations and consolidated them into a single recommendation. This recommendation involves expanding the membership of the JSPCs (Juvenile Services Planning Committees) for the purpose of developing a data-driven, comprehensive local planning document. There is also the potential to create four Juvenile Planner positions that can assist local jurisdictions in their planning needs and offering assistance if needed. This will be our topic for today's meeting.</p> <p>Kelly Friesen presented the revised recommendation and identified some omissions that need to be fixed in the version that was in everyone's packets. She clarified that the marijuana money was not going to be used to create the juvenile planner positions but rather that the statute should be expanded to allow for the marijuana money to be used in the development of the data-driven plan. However, she thought that the money would be better used for local services rather than having four juvenile planners. She believed that some of the smaller districts may not want planners and, therefore, would not benefit from services that they would provide. She felt that if we are going to ask for money, it would be better spent on services.</p>

Issue/Topic: Finalized Recommendation & Vote	Discussion:
	<p>This was discussed at the January meeting and the group decided that the money would be put towards planners rather than services. Kelly acknowledge that there was discussion on this topic but wasn't sure there was consensus. She mentioned that there was a consensus to get more data first so it could be a solid plan, and gaps in services identified in the data-driven plan would allow for local officials to determine what services should be initiated or expanded.</p> <p>Molli had concerns about mandating the JSPCs to look at the whole spectrum of juvenile justice without any additional resources to address the needs that they find.</p> <p>Molli concurred with Kelly that planners would most likely not be needed. She felt that the funding would most likely be needed for implementation of the plan.</p> <p>Kelly stated that the recommendation expands the responsibilities of the JSPCs by focusing on a system-wide, comprehensive local plan, developed every three years with annual updates. The recommendation describes who should be on the local JSPCs. The community victim services representative position was added in the latest draft because the Working Group felt that voice was missing.</p> <p>During the discussion there were a few modifications to the recommendation language and Gretchen suggested mirroring the marijuana tax language that was used in last year's Crossover Youth bill. It was also suggested to remove the four Juvenile Planners and to state instead that the marijuana tax revenue would be used to support development and implementation of the plan.</p> <p>Richard then asked the group for a vote. The recommendation was unanimously approved (with one abstention) and will be brought to the CCJJ as a preliminary recommendation this Friday. They will then vote on the final recommendation in March.</p> <p>For the record, Janet Drake stated that she likes the recommendation and all the effort that has gone into it. However, being new on the Task Force, she is not certain of the Attorney General's perspectives and so abstained from voting today.</p>

Issue/Topic: Future Study Topics	Discussion:
	<p>Richard stated that, before we move on, he wanted to know the group's thoughts: Have we completed our work regarding the 10-12-year-old population? The group believed that what the Task Force originally set out to do with this recommendation had been accomplished. The Task Force voiced interest in moving ahead to study 18, 19, and 20 year olds, as described in House Bill 19-1149. The group acknowledged the need to get better educated on this specific age group, and brainstormed topics for upcoming Task Force meetings. These included the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. YOS (Youthful Offender System). 2. Understanding more on brain development for that specific age group.

Issue/Topic: Future Study Topics (continued)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. DYC – Detention/Commitment continuum. 4. Federal OJJDP Act requirements. 5. Detention bed cap. 6. How many 18-20 year-olds are in DYS and DOC? 7. Probation/diversion statistics, and criminal charges. 8. What are other states doing about this population and what crimes are involved? 9. Recidivism – What is working? DYC juvenile system vs adult system. What is the difference in recidivism? 10. Direct file outcomes – crime severity/crime types. 11. Law enforcement/jail perspective. 12. Service provider’s perspective. 13. Need to add Task Force members: DYS and YOS representatives.
---	---

Issue/Topic: Next Steps & Adjourn	<p>Kelly Friesen and the group thanked Richard for all his hard work and for keeping the group focused and on task.</p> <p>Richard asked members to gather information, ideas, and to think of individuals who could help the group get started on the next topic. This will be the focus for March’s meeting.</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 1:35.</p>
---	--

Next Meeting

March 6, 2019/ 11:30am – 2:00pm
 710 Kipling, 3rd floor conference room