

**Community Corrections Task Force  
MINUTES**

March 6, 2023/ 10:30AM-12:00PM  
Virtual Meeting

**ATTENDEES**

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS**

Glenn Tapia, *Task Force Chair*, Division of Probation Services  
Tim Hand, *Task Force Vice-Chair*, Larimer County Community Corrections  
Doug Carrigan, Advantage Treatment Centers  
John Draxler, Probation Services/ 13<sup>th</sup> Judicial District (JD)  
James Karbach, State Public Defender/ Arapahoe County  
Ken Kupfner, DA Office/ 20<sup>th</sup> JD  
Chris Meeks, Denver Community Corrections Board  
Katie Ruske, Office of Community Corrections/ Division of Criminal Justice  
Mark Wester, ComCor Inc.

**ABSENT**

David Coleman, Second Chance Center  
Kristiana Huitron, Voces Unidas for Justice  
Todd Rowell, Sheriff's Office/ Mesa County

**STAFF**

Richard Stroker, CCJJ Consultant  
Laurence Lucero, CCJJ Staff, Division of Criminal Justice  
Jack Reed, Research Director, Division of Criminal Justice  
Stephane Waisanen, CCJJ Staff, Division of Criminal Justice

**GUEST**

Justin Brakke, Joint Budget Committee  
Dianne Tramutola-Lawson, Colorado CURE

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Welcome <i>Glenn Tapia, Task Force Chair</i></p>	<p>Glenn Tapia, Task Force Chair, welcomed members and guests to the Community Corrections Task Force (CCTF) meeting. Glenn reviewed the agenda and solicited members for any additions or corrections to the January 9 and February 6 minutes. A motion was offered and seconded to approve the minutes. Task Force members unanimously approved the January 9 and February 6 minutes.</p>

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Review of Draft Proposal &amp; Discussion <i>All</i></p>	<p>Glenn reminded the group the draft proposal was forwarded to Task Force members before the meeting and summarized the broad concepts discussed at previous meetings. Glenn reviewed the proposal and invited the Task Force members to provide input. Glenn informed the members they would be polled regarding their support of or opposition to the overall concept of the recommendation.</p> <p>James Karbach asked for clarification regarding the characteristics of the clients. He also asked how “high-risk/high-need” would be defined.</p> <p>Richard and Glenn responded that the targeted population is at risk of probation revocation and assessed as high-risk/high-need. Probation does not have an adequate structure to supervise misdemeanants who continually violate their conditions of probation. Outcomes are poor for probationers scoring high risk/high need with a drug misdemeanor offense. Glenn suggested that the risk/need guidelines be defined between Probation Services and the Department of Public Safety (Office of Community Corrections). Jack Reed added he would participate in an outcome measurement development for this project.</p> <p>James Karbach asked what the recidivism definition will be, given the definition differences used by Probation and by Community Corrections. Jack Reed suggested adopting the standard recidivism definition used by Probation Services, namely, new misdemeanor or felony conviction.</p> <p>Ken Hupfner asked about the Community Corrections success rates for high-risk/high-need clients. Jack noted that the Level of Service Inventory (LSI) is the assessment instrument used by Community Corrections to measure risk. There is no “need indicator” in the LSI, and Jack suggested adding this indicator in the evaluation piece for the implementation of the recommendation.</p> <p>Katie Ruske responded that in the Fiscal Year 2021, 65% of high-risk clients successfully completed the program.</p> <p>John Draxler and Mark Wester agreed with such a concept to offer stability and to receive services that probation cannot provide. They also emphasized the importance of a program evaluation component.</p> <p>Katie expressed concern about the possible impact on the existing waitlists in community corrections facilities and the possible displacement of felony offenders for misdemeanants. James agreed with Katie’s hesitation and added</p>

<p><b>Issue/Topic</b> Review of Draft Proposal &amp; Discussion <i>All</i> (continued)</p> <p>VOTE: Concept of the recommendation was supported</p>	<p>the concern about this project possibly leading to automatic acceptance of this population into community corrections facilities, which is sometimes done with lower risk applicants.</p> <p>Mark Wester indicated that there is unused bed capacity in many jurisdictions due to various factors, including funding and the approval or denials of placements from local boards. Katie added that the limitation of bed capacity is often the result of staff and physical capacity issues.</p> <p>A straw poll was conducted to assess the extent of support for the overall concept of the recommendation, which yielded the following result: Support: 7      Do not support 2      Abstain 1 The concept of the recommendation was supported.</p>
---	---

<p><b>Issue/Topic</b> Recap of Draft Proposal and Next Steps <i>Glenn Tapia, Task Force Chair</i> <i>Richard Stroker, CCJJ Consultant</i></p>	<p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>The draft document will be refined to clarify the target population and include the issues raised by the group. James Karbach offered to assist with the statutory language drafting. The CCJJ staff will forward the draft recommendation before the next meeting.</p>
---	---

<p><b>Issue/Topic</b> Public Comment</p>	<p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>No public comment was offered.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Issue/Topic</b> Next Steps &amp; Adjourn <i>Glenn Tapia, Task Force Chair</i> <i>Richard Stroker, CCJJ Consultant</i></p>	<p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>Glenn asked if there were additional questions, and with none, thanked participants and guests and adjourned the meeting.</p>
---	---

**Next Meeting**

**Monday, April 10, 2023 / 10:30 am-12:00 pm**

**Details of the next meeting will be forwarded to the group and posted on the CCJJ web and calendar ([ccjj.colorado.gov/ccjj-meetings](http://ccjj.colorado.gov/ccjj-meetings) & [ccjj.colorado.gov/ccjj-calendar](http://ccjj.colorado.gov/ccjj-calendar)).**