

**Age of Delinquency Task Force  
Minutes**

February 12, 2020 / 1:30PM-4:00PM  
2<sup>nd</sup> floor Meeting Room, 710 Kipling, Lakewood, CO

**ATTENDEES:**

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS**

Joe Thome, Task Force Co-chair, Division of Criminal Justice  
Jessica Jones, Task Force Co-chair, Private Defense Attorney  
David Bergman, Youthful Offender System/CO Department of Corrections  
Shawn Cohn, Denver Juvenile Probation  
Arnold Hanuman, Colorado District Attorney's Council  
Gretchen Russo, Department of Human Services

**STAFF**

Richard Stroker, CCJJ Consultant  
Kim English, Division of Criminal Justice  
Stephané Waisanen, Division of Criminal Justice  
Laurence Lucero, Division of Criminal Justice  
Kevin Ford, Division of Criminal Justice

**ABSENT**

Jim Bullock, District Attorney's Office, 16<sup>th</sup> Judicial District  
Maureen Cain, Office of the State Public Defender  
Kelly Friesen, Grand County Juvenile Justice Services  
Beverly Funaro, Victim Representative  
Priscilla Gartner, Office of the State Public Defender  
Serena Gonzales-Gutierrez, Representative, House District 4  
Anders Jacobson, Division of Youth Services  
Dan Makelky, Child Welfare, Local Agency representative  
Dafna Michaelson Jenet, Representative, House District 30  
Angie Paccione, Department of Higher Education  
Tariq Sheikh, District Attorney's Office, 17<sup>th</sup> Judicial District

**GUESTS**

Rich Persons, Youthful Offender System

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p><b>Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, &amp; Agenda Overview</b> Jes Jones/Joe Thome, Co-Chairs</p> <p><b>January Meeting Recap</b> Richard Stroker</p>	<p>Co-chairs Jes Jones and Joe Thome called the meeting to order, and asked the group to introduce themselves.</p> <p>Joe asked the Task Force whether there were any additions or corrections to the January minutes and, with no corrections, the minutes were approved.</p> <p>Joe mentioned that after the recap of January’s meeting, there would be a brief discussion of Senate Bill 20-076 that will be introduced next week. The Working Groups will provide an update on their progress, followed by the Task Force discussion of the creation of recommendations to meet the CCJJ timeline.</p> <p>Richard mentioned that at January’s meeting, the Youthful Offender System (YOS) Working Group presented some opportunities for recommendations in the following areas for the young adult population (18-24 yrs. old):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• criteria/eligibility for placement</li> <li>• information sharing to/from YOS</li> <li>• program/operations – individually tailored to individuals</li> <li>• re-entry/violations/revocations</li> </ul> <p>The Community Supervision Working Group presented some opportunities for recommendations in the following areas for the young adult population (18-24 yrs. old):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identifying the best assessments for this age group that may be drawn from either the adult or the juvenile assessment realms</li> <li>• improving case management by tailoring services for the emerging adults,</li> <li>• developing specialized training for staff working with this population,</li> <li>• creating specialized caseloads to allow staff to focus on and tailor services to this population</li> <li>• creating a pilot program in judicial districts where best practices could be identified for this age group</li> </ul> <p>The goal is to develop language and finalize recommendations by the March Task Force meeting and to vote on recommendations in April.</p>

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p><b>Legislative Update</b> <b>S.B. 2020 -076</b> Richard Stroker</p>	<p>Richard shared that last month, Sen. Pete Lee and Rep. Serena Gonzales-Gutierrez introduced S.B. 20-076 (Parole Eligibility for Youthful Offenders). The bill appears to address a number of topics concerning YOS such as parole eligibility and addresses individuals who have served a significant amount of time for crimes committed between the ages of 18-24, but who were not sentenced to YOS. The bill expands the eligibility for adult offenders to participate in the Juveniles Convicted as Adults program (JCAP). It was agreed that the S.B. 20-076 does not affect the focus of the Task Force.</p>

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p><b>Working Group Updates</b></p> <p><b>YOS Working Group</b> Rich Persons &amp; David Bergman</p>	<p>The <b>YOS Working Group</b> met prior to the Task Force meeting, and in Maureen Cain’s absence, Rich Persons described their discussion. Rich stated that there was agreement that the YOS program is not currently designed to expand the age eligibility, but that several program changes can be made within current statute to offer expanded opportunities for offenders and increase flexibility in the program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• expand Phase II of the YOS program from three months to six months, allowing offenders into the stage earlier. [Note: Phase II occurs in the last months of confinement just prior to release.]</li> <li>• shift language regarding YOS incentive privileges from statute to program policy to improve individualized programming</li> <li>• eliminate redundant data collection by D.A.s regarding individuals sentenced to YOS</li> <li>• revise criteria to allow training within 60 days of placement at YOS rather than prior to placement</li> </ul> <p>Other YOS-related topics have been discussed, but they are not within the scope of the legislative mandate to CCJJ and are being pursued by others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• revising statutory language to allow YOS to include older offenders as mentors (see, Senate Bill 2020-169)</li> <li>• fine-tuning statutory language regarding revocation and earned time</li> <li>• potential expansion of YOS eligibility related to crime types</li> </ul>
<p><b>ACTION</b></p> <p>Maureen will create a preliminary recommendation to be reviewed &amp; discussed by the Task Force</p>	<p>Rich stated that the Working Group will review the preliminary recommendation(s) and statutory language prepared by Maureen that will be presented to the Task Force at the March meeting.</p> <p>The mandate was to explore the expansion of YOS eligibility for the 18-24 year old population and shifting 18-19 year-olds to juvenile court. Because the group has concluded these are not viable/advantageous options, the Task Force should provide detailed explanations of these conclusions to CCJJ.</p>
<p><b>Community Supervision Working Group</b> Shawn Cohn</p>	<p>Shawn Cohn mentioned that the <b>Community Supervision Working Group</b> had not met recently. However, she is collaborating with probation officers to create policy standards for this young adult population. Working with chief probation officers, she will prepare a document on an outline for such standards for the next meeting of the Task Force. These standards would address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• case planning and engagement strategies</li> <li>• training to work with this population</li> <li>• better engagement of family members</li> </ul>

<p><b>Issue/Topic</b> <b>Working Group Updates</b> (continued)</p> <p><b>Community Supervision</b> <b>Working Group</b> Shawn Cohn</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> Create a preliminary recommendation for review &amp; discussion by the Task Force. Share prior to the March meeting, if possible.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• disseminating brain development research</li><li>• create a pilot program based on and to identify best practices</li></ul> <p>Shawn stated that in rural areas the adult probation officers (POs) manage caseloads for both adult and juvenile probationers, whereas in Boulder they have some juvenile POs managing the 18-20 year-old population. Juvenile Probation wants to ensure that adult POs who are managing both adult and young adult caseloads are well equipped and trained to manage such cases? Adult POs are amenable to following policy standards for the young adult population that offer guidance on assessment tools, case management, and training.</p> <p>Shawn mentioned that an opportunity presents itself for increasing awareness of the young adult population via the use of the Youth Level Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) by juvenile probation. The YLS/CMI is applicable for youth up to the age of twenty. Adult POs who are familiar with the Level of Service Inventory (LSI) could be trained easily in the YLS/CMI. The availability of these two tools would require the PO to be cognizant of adult versus juvenile or young adult needs and circumstances in order to make tailored supervision decisions.</p> <p>Who is responsible for creating the standards in juvenile probation? Shawn responded that the State Court and Division of Probation Services (DPS) create and develop statewide standards that are reviewed by the Chief POs and finalized by the Chief Justice. The juvenile standards are part of the Juvenile Justice Reform Committee (JJRC) that was created out of the SB 19-108.</p> <p>What approach is best for the CCJJ &amp; Task Force to suggest language or request a review of specific standards on the topic of young adults? Shawn indicated that statute is very specific regarding juvenile standards. Overall, probation has very well-developed, distinct adult and juvenile standards. A separate set of standards could be developed to address young/emerging adults based on elements from the juvenile and the adult standards. There is a preference to create such standards on a policy basis, rather than in statute. Although case management standards can be written, a major challenge is the lack of providers for the young adult population. For example, there is an increase in domestic violence among youth and currently there are no providers for domestic violence services for juveniles or young/emerging adults.</p> <p>Shawn mentioned that she would use the juvenile standards derived from S.B.19-108 and draft analogous language for young adults for the recommendation at the March meeting. Richard asked Shawn to identify specific standards and issues specific to this population for the recommendation.</p>
---	---

<b>Issue/Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<p><b>Next Steps and Adjourn</b></p> <p>Co-chairs, Jes Jones &amp; Joe Thome Richard Stroker</p> <p><b>ACTION</b></p> <p>Staff will provide recommendation templates/models to assist those writing recommendations</p>	<p>Richard suggested that recommendations be presented at the March meeting for discussion and in April for a vote by the Task Force. If possible, provide a draft to staff for distribution prior to the March Task Force meeting. Looking ahead, the Task Force should present preliminary recommendations to CCJJ in April and with a final vote in May.</p> <p>Jes stated that Task Force member attendance at the next few meetings is crucial to review, discuss and vote on recommendations.</p> <p>Jes and Joe thanked the Task Force members for their participation and adjourned the meeting.</p>

**NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday, March 11, 2020 / 1:30 - 4:00PM  
 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Meeting Room  
 710 Kipling, Lakewood, CO