

**Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice  
Sentencing Reform Task Force**

**Sentence Progression Working Group  
MINUTES**

February 2, 2021 / 3:00PM-4:00PM  
VIRTUAL MEETING

**ATTENDEES**

**WORKING GROUP MEMBERS**

Dean Williams, CDOC, *WG Leader*  
Joseph Archambault, Office of the State Public Defender  
Rick Kornfeld, Defense Attorney  
Andrew Matson, Colorado CURE  
Greg Mauro, Denver Division of Community Corrections  
Steve O'Doriso, Adams County Commissioner  
Amber Pedersen, CDOC  
Michael Rourke, District Attorney, 19<sup>th</sup> JD  
Catrina Weigel, District Attorney's Office/ 20<sup>th</sup> JD

**STAFF**

Kim English, Division of Criminal Justice  
Laurence Lucero, Division of Criminal Justice  
Richard Stroker, CCJJ Consultant

**ABSENT**

Valarie Finks, Crime Victim Compensation, DA's Office/ 1<sup>st</sup> JD  
Bob Gardner, State Senate/ Senate District 12

**GUESTS**

Hassan Latif, Second Chance Center  
Merideth McGrath, CDOC

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Welcome &amp; Introductions <i>Dean Williams, WG Leader</i></p>	<p>Working Group Leader Dean Williams thanked members for participating in the meeting.</p>

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Review of Recommendation draft <i>Dean Williams, WG Leader &amp; Members</i></p>	<p>Dean summarized that the group agreed that advice and consent to run a Transitional Confinement program should be obtained from local reentry boards and city/county governments, and that DOC should work with local communities to establish eligibility criteria. A draft recommendation was prepared and presented for review.</p> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rick Kornfeld shared that he recently provided an update on the work of the Sentencing Reform Task Force and Working Groups to Jacki Cooper from the Governor’s Office. Jacki stated that the Governor’s Office is supportive of the direction that the Progression Working Group is headed and asked the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Is the recommendation detailed enough?</i></li> <li>- <i>Is this recommendation “too much too soon” and is there an opportunity to delay to proposal to undertake more research and strengthen the recommendation?</i></li> <li>- <i>Is this recommendation supported enough? If otherwise, could it undermine the work from the Structure Working Group for this legislative session?</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rick mentioned that it was suggested to him by a Task Force member that the Working Group consider recommending a study to better define the scope of the problem, identify the gaps in the current release opportunities (ISP-I and parole), and design a new program addressing those gaps.</li> <li>• Some Working Group members echoed the concerns regarding the importance of clearly defining the problem this recommendation addresses, describing the program elements and explaining how this program compares to ISP-I and Community Corrections.</li> <li>• Several members agreed that a study could identify existing reentry programming gaps and define the elements of the program.</li> <li>• Dean expressed his discouragement as he believed that the recommendation from this Working Group was near completion.</li> <li>• Greg mentioned that it is important to identify which offenders need what type of intervention. Community Corrections and the ISP-I program are good resources but more work is needed regarding how to appropriately match the right offender to the right program.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Issue/Topic</b>                  Review of Recommendation draft  <i>Dean Williams, WG Leader &amp; Members</i>                  (continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greg suggested that, because of the existing statutory frameworks of ISP-I and Community Corrections, the recommendation could be amended to a policy recommendation encouraging the DOC director to work with local Community Corrections Boards to identify criteria for the automatic acceptance of those individuals who are close to their MRD into the ISP-I program.</li> <li>• <i>Is there an opportunity to enhance reentry through parole?</i> Often times, individuals are denied parole because they do not have housing or employment.</li> <li>• The group discussed whether the recommendation should be changed to undertake the study described above.</li> <li>• Dean stated that the Working Group has worked diligently over the past months to refine this proposal. The issue is “what happens when people are released with no support?” This recommendation allows for another opportunity for those who will not get ISP-I, community corrections, or parole.</li> <li>• The group discussed aspects of the recommendation that should be more detailed, including specific program elements. How will the needs of these individuals be addressed, and programs/services will be provided (housing, phone, assistance for employment, etc.)? Amber will draft the list of the elements that would be provided in the Transitional Confinement Program.</li> <li>• Dean proposed to complete the draft recommendation at the next meeting and submit for review at the February 10 Task Force meeting. Dean noted that next week’s meeting will be the final meeting of the Working Group.</li> </ul>
---	---

<p><b>Issue/Topic</b>                  Public Comment</p>	<p><b>Public Comment</b>                  No public comment was offered.</p>
<p><b>Issue/Topic</b>                  Next Steps &amp; Adjourn  <i>Dean Williams, WG Leader</i></p>	<p><b>Discussion</b>                  The agenda for the next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Recommendation draft.</li> </ul> <p>The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.</p> <p>The next Sentence Progression Working Group meeting is <b>Tuesday, February 9, 2021 at 3pm-4pm.</b></p>