

**Community Corrections Task Force
MINUTES**

May 8, 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
John Draxler, Probation Services/ 13th Judicial District (JD)
James Karbach, State Public Defender/ Arapahoe County
Ken Kupfner, DA Office/ 20th JD
Chris Meeks, Denver Community Corrections Board
Katie Ruske, Office of Community Corrections/ Division of Criminal Justice
Mark Wester, ComCor Inc.

ABSENT

Doug Carrigan, Advantage Treatment Centers
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
Chrystal Owin, DCJ
Jack Reed, DCJ
Tahnee Santambrogio, DCJ

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Welcome <i>Glenn Tapia, Task Force Chair</i></p>	<p>Glenn Tapia, Task Force Chair, informed attendees that <i>Senate Bill 2023-158</i> to approve reauthorization of the Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice was postponed indefinitely by the Colorado House Judiciary Committee on May 7, 2023. With the exception of the Community Corrections Task Force, the work of Commission committees will be suspended immediately.</p> <p>Jack Reed reminded the group that the current Community Corrections Task Force was seated by the Commission to address the mandates outlined in <i>House Bill 2022-1368</i>. The Task Force findings and recommendations are mandated to be submitted to the Commission before July 1, 2023.</p> <p>Glenn Tapia believed the group is nearing completion of its work and suggested finalizing the report. Members agreed the group has a statutory responsibility outlined in <i>House Bill 2022-1368</i>.</p> <p>The draft report, the original recommendation, and the alternative recommendation proposed by James Karbach were forwarded to the group prior to the meeting with a “cheat sheet” highlighting the main concepts of each recommendation.</p> <p>The goal of the meeting is to discuss and choose one of the recommendations proposed by a simple majority vote.</p> <p>The documents can be found on the Commission Community Corrections Task Force under the “Materials” tab at ccjj.colorado.gov/ccjj-cctf2022</p>

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Discussion of the alternative recommendation and comparative cheat sheet document <i>All</i></p>	<p>The group began by discussing and approving some changes to the report.</p> <p>The cheat sheet highlighting the main concepts of each recommendation was displayed in the virtual meeting.</p> <p>James Karbach presented an overview and described the content in the alternative recommendation. The overall concept is a grant program under the current statutory scheme that would allow small- or medium-sized local jurisdictions to enter into contracts to either provide work release through community corrections or residential treatments. The grant program would provide for data collection and reporting as a condition of receiving the grant, including recidivism, the acceptance rate for felony transition, felony diversion, misdemeanants, and reporting waitlists.</p> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <p><i>Which entities would apply for the grant?</i> James responded he envisioned that counties and local community correction boards would apply.</p>

<p>Issue/Topic</p> <p>Discussion of the alternative recommendation and comparative cheat sheet document</p> <p>Selection of Recommendation</p> <p><i>All</i></p>	<p>Ken Kupfner preferred the alternative recommendation as he believed a grant process would be more equitable for those jurisdictions needing funding to fill available beds or use work release programs to serve the misdemeanor population. He also expressed concern about the displacement of felony clients in community corrections. The grant option only allows for small- to medium-sized jurisdictions to apply.</p> <p>The group discussed the administration of the grant program and possible limitation of the data collection in the current Community Corrections Information and Billing System (CCIB). James clarified he envisioned the grant program would be administered by other units in the Division of Criminal Justice in collaboration with the Office of Community Corrections for grant and compliance reviews.</p> <p>Chris Meeks asked the providers' perspectives about why they would opt for the concepts in the original recommendation rather than the grant and work release option. Mark Wester responded that, in many jurisdictions, there is no case management in work release programs, whereas community corrections programs focus on a continuum of care, treatment, employment, and education.</p> <p>Ken Kupfner argued that in the 20th Judicial District, most of the work release programs are under the supervision of the probation office, and people are engaged in treatment.</p> <p>James Karbach suggested that the law would allow for the use or expansion of services in work release programs, and it would be at the discretion of local jurisdictions to decide how to enter into a contract and define the condition of the services.</p>
<p>VOTE</p> <p>Original recommendation selected</p>	<p><u>Selection between Recommendation Drafts</u></p> <p>John Draxler moved a vote to select between the two proposed recommendations. James Karbach seconded the motion.</p> <p>In favor of the original recommendation: John Draxler, (Mark Wester & Tim Hand), Glenn Tapia, Chris Meeks (*)</p> <p>In favor of the alternative recommendation: Ken Kupfner, James Karbach, Katie Ruske</p> <p>The original recommendation was selected.</p> <p>*Chris Meeks requested that his reservations regarding the original recommendation be noted in the meeting record. He believed the Task Force is missing representation^ and he is missing information to confidently vote on the recommendation. <i>(^ Note: The membership of the Community Corrections Task Force is defined and restricted by statute [see 16-11.3-103.3 (2)].)</i></p>

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Amendments <i>All</i></p>	<p>Below, the group discussed the amendments (in red) to add to the recommendation:</p>
<p>ACTION Add elements from the alternative recommendation regarding the data collection</p>	<p><u>Program Evaluation and Effectiveness</u> At the end of the paragraph under this section, the following will be added:</p> <p>The data collection and reporting should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparing outcomes from misdemeanants who are sentenced to community corrections, county jail, probation, and probation with other residential treatment in the district during the grant period. This should include a uniform definition of recidivism. • Tracking offenders by offense level, offense type, gender, age, race, ethnicity, and • Reporting acceptance rates and procedures for felony transition, felony diversion, and misdemeanants during the grant period. • Reporting every month any waitlist for each facility for the grant period.
<p>ACTION Clarify the length of placement is determined by the court</p>	<p><u>Proposed Program Structure</u> Length of placement will be determined by the court on an individualized basis based on the length of the sentence imposed, pre-sentence confinement and credits, the risk/need profile of the person to be placed, and the targeted dosage of services that would best meet the assessed risks and needs of the person served.</p>
<p>ACTION Data points to report process and outcome measures</p>	<p><u>Statutory language</u> The group discussed the issue of different definitions of recidivism and the need to establish data points to allow for a comparison of outcome of misdemeanant clients served in community corrections versus probationers not served in community corrections.</p> <p>Additionally, the group discussed the importance of establishing and tracking specific common data points for this population including the length of placement in community corrections (see <u>underlined CAPS</u> below).</p> <p>ON OR BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2029, THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY SHALL REPORT SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM OUTCOMES FOR MISDEMEANANTS PLACED IN COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS AS A CONDITION OF PROBATION TO THE STATE COURT ADMINISTRATORS OFFICE AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. <u>THE STATE COURT ADMINISTRATORS’ OFFICE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY SHOULD DEVELOP COMMON DATA POINTS TO REPORT PROCESS AND OUTCOME MEASURES FOR MISDEMEANANTS PLACED IN COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS AS COMPARED TO PROBATIONERS WHO HAVE NOT BEEN SERVED BY COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS.</u></p>

Issue/Topic	Discussion
Public Comment	No public comment was offered.

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Next Steps & Adjourn <i>Glenn Tapia, Task Force Chair</i> <i>Richard Stroker, CCJJ Consultant</i></p>	<p>At the next meeting on June 5, 2023, members will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consider and vote on the three amendments (indicated in the “ACTION” notes above) to the recommendation selected during the meeting (as described above). b. Conduct a final vote on the recommendation and any approved amendments. <p>If approved, the recommendation will be presented to the Commission following the June 5 Task Force meeting.</p> <p>June 5, 2023 will be the last meeting of the Community Correction Task Force.</p> <p>Glenn asked if there were additional questions, and with none, thanked participants and guests and adjourned the meeting.</p>

Next Meeting

Monday, June 5, 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 & ccjj.colorado.gov/ccjj-calendar).