

Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice
Sentencing Reform Task Force

Sentence Progression Working Group
MINUTES

February 9, 2021 / 3:00PM-4:00PM
VIRTUAL MEETING

ATTENDEES

WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

Dean Williams, DOC, WG Leader
Joseph Archambault, Office of the State Public Defender
Valarie Finks, Crime Victim Compensation, 1st JD DA's Office
Rick Kornfeld, Defense Attorney
Andrew Matson, Colorado CURE
Greg Mauro, Denver Division of Community Corrections
Steve O'Dorisio, Adams County Commissioner
Amber Pedersen, DOC
Michael Rourke, District Attorney, 19th JD
Catrina Weigel, 20th JD District Attorney's Office

STAFF

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

ABSENT

Bob Gardner, State Senate

GUESTS

Aaron Greco, DOC
Khalil Halim, Second Chance Center
Meredith McGrath, DOC
Adam Zarrin, Governor's Office

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

Issue/Topic	Discussion
<p>Review of Recommendation draft <i>Dean Williams, WG Leader & Members</i></p>	<p>Dean proposed to review the draft recommendation that will be presented at the Task Force tomorrow, Wednesday, February 10.</p> <p>He reminded the group that, following last week’s discussion, a list of the elements to be provided by the Transitional Confinement Program have been added to the recommendation.</p> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommendation should clearly indicate how the pilot program will be funded and who will be responsible for the supervision. These important elements are indicated in the statutory language but will be added in the description of the recommendation. DOC would be responsible for the funding and supervision of this pilot program. This would also provide the legal framework for DOC to reinvest or reallocate DOC funds towards this pilot. • Some Working Group members reiterated the importance of clearly defining the problem this recommendation addresses, and explaining how this program compares to ISP-I and Community Corrections. Additionally, the recommendation should explain the program response when there is non-compliance by participants. • It was suggested that the Working Group continue to refine the recommendation, examine existing reentry programming gaps and how to address those gaps. • The significant work undertaken by this Working Group was acknowledged and several members expressed interest in continuing to work on this issue. • <i>Is there an opportunity to amend the ISP-I statute instead of creating an entirely new statute?</i> Greg proposed the following statutory language to amend ISP-I. <i>“On or before September 30, 2021 each community corrections board shall develop in consultation with the department approved placement criteria and processes for the efficient selection of offenders referred who are within 15 months for the offenders mandatory release date for any crime not listed in 24-4.1-301, C.R.S. The acceptance criteria should consider opportunities to reduce unnecessary delays for the review of eligible offenders.”</i>

<p>Issue/Topic Review of Recommendation draft <i>Dean Williams, WG Leader & Members</i> (continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean reminded the group of the initial discussions regarding ISP-I. The acceptance to ISP-I requires the approval from the local community corrections boards. Unfortunately, many of the individuals approaching their MRD have either been denied by community corrections boards or have not applied and are left without resources. Dean reiterated that this pilot would provide an additional avenue for successful release. • Some members discussed a sense of urgency to find a solution. There is currently a high number of incarcerated individuals who are approaching their MRD and left without support when released. These individuals are at a high risk of failure. • The group expressed interest in continuing to work on this issue and strengthen the recommendation. As mentioned at the last meeting, several members suggested that a study could identify existing reentry programming gaps, determine who is appropriate for parole, community corrections or ISP-I and possibly design another alternative for pre-release. • The group discussed at length whether to present the recommendation at tomorrow’s Task Force meeting and it was agreed to present it with the understanding that the Working Group has not reached consensus on the recommendation. Rick and Dean will relay to the Task Force the Working Group’s interest in continuing the work. <p>Dean thanked all Working Group members and members of the public for their significant contributions. Dean mentioned that he will suggest to the Task Force Co-chairs that they select a new Working Group Leader who might be able to dedicate more time to these efforts. He re-affirmed his interest in continuing as a Working Group member.</p>
---	---

<p>Issue/Topic Public Comment</p>	<p>Public Comment No public comment was offered.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic Next Steps & Adjourn <i>Dean Williams, WG Leader</i></p>	<p>Discussion The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm. The next Sentence Progression Working Group meeting is Tuesday, February 16, 2021 at 3pm-4pm.</p>