



Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

Minutes

March 11, 2016

480 South Allison Parkway
Lakewood, CO 80226

Commission Member Attendance

Stan Hilkey, Chair	Beth McCann	Pat Steadman - ABSENT
Doug Wilson, Vice-Chair	Joe Morales	Scott Turner
Jennifer Bradford	Norm Mueller	Dave Weaver
John Cooke	Kevin Paletta	Michael Vallejos
Kelly Friesen	Joe Pelle - ABSENT	Peter Weir
Charles Garcia	Eric Philp	Robert Werthwein - ABSENT
Kate Horn-Murphy	Rick Raemisch	Meg Williams
Jessica Jones	Rose Rodriguez	Dave Young
Evelyn Leslie	Lang Sias - ABSENT	Jeanne Smith, <i>Ex Officio</i>

Substitutes: Luis Guzman, for Robert Werthwein

CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING REMARKS

Stan Hilkey, Chair

Stan Hilkey, chair of the Commission and Colorado Department of Public Safety Executive Director, welcomed Commissioners to the meeting. Members introduced themselves. Mr. Hilkey stated that there were expected absences including Joe Pelle and Robert Werthwein. It was noted that Scott Turner was on the phone and that a few people, including Mr. Weir and Representative McCann, were going to have to leave early.

Mr. Hilkey asked if everyone had reviewed the minutes and if there were any additions or corrections. Following a motion and a second, the minutes were approved unanimously.

MANDATORY PAROLE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS, DISCUSSION AND VOTE

Doug Wilson/All

Mr. Hilkey reminded the group that the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee recommendations had been tabled for three months until today’s meeting. He called for discussion, including any amendments to the recommendations.

Mr. Wilson summarized that the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee worked for more than six months and presented three recommendations to the CCJJ in December. There was a request that two of the three recommendations be tabled until this month. The other item was voted on in

January (modification of the statutory purposes of parole), was introduced as legislation by Senator McCann, and has now passed in the House.

Mr. Wilson continued that the Subcommittee received and incorporated input from community corrections stakeholders and also feedback from victim's group stakeholders regarding the other two recommendations prior to their presentation to the Commission in December. Modifications were made to the recommendations based on discussions with stakeholders, but the recommendations presented in December have not changed. The Mandatory Parole Subcommittee has not met since December. The recommendation has been presented twice to the Commission, and Mr. Wilson asked Commissioners if they would like to hear a summary of the recommendations again today. Mr. Wilson then provided a review of the processes and data that resulted in the recommendations, and then described the recommendations in detail.

Mr. Hilkey reminded the Commissioners that their packets have information from the Colorado Organization of Victims Assistance (COVA), the Above Waters Project, and the Colorado District Attorneys' Council (CDAC).

Mr. Hilkey invited Mr. Weir to present a PowerPoint that offered a counter proposal to the recommendations from the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee. Mr. Weir noted that the district attorneys (DAs) support the goal of clarifying the sentencing structure. Mr. Weir clarified that he was wearing his CDAC 'hat' and not his Community Corrections Task Force Chair 'hat' for this portion of the discussion. He noted that this is a significant recommendation and that the CDAC has concerns about certain aspects of the current proposals. He asked if the goal is to reduce the number of failures so reports look better, or is the goal to set up a system that will ensure success on parole. He said he believes the goal is to ensure greater success of those leaving the Department of Corrections.

Mr. Weir discussed Victim Rights Amendment crimes, and explained that it is the view of the district attorneys that there should be a special consideration for these crimes. Most are not Crime of Violence offenses but many are violent in nature. Some of the VRA crimes carry mandatory DOC sentences yet are not included in the current recommendation. The district attorneys were also concerned about the recommendations eliminating the discretion of the parole board. The DAs recommend that the parole board not only identify the conditions of parole supervision, but also the length of parole. The DAs believe that the periods of parole suggested by the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee are too short. (At this point, Mr. Wilson clarified that the recommended periods of parole are different than those shown on the PowerPoint, which were modified for the final recommendation following feedback from various stakeholders.).

Mr. Weir described the CDAC proposal (see the corresponding PowerPoint). He explained those convicted of COV offenses would serve at least 75% of the sentence, VRA crimes would require an offender to serve at least 65% of the sentence, and the remainder of the inmates would serve a minimum of 50% of the sentence, thus creating a three-tier system. The parole board would have the discretion to set a period of parole of up to three years, taking into account risk and program completion (including time to complete community corrections), along with victim impact. Earned time would not be awarded to parolees. Early termination of parole becomes the

incentive for parolees. An inmate can be placed in community corrections 12 months prior to parole release. Earned time is not provided to parolees in community corrections. Any cost savings would be split between victim and offender community based services. Mr. Weir expressed sincere appreciation for the work done by the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee. He noted the need to obtain data from DCJ on the impact on the prison and parole populations of this counter recommendation.

Mr. Weir referred to the COVA letter (see handout) and stated that their position is that COV and VRA crimes should both serve 75%. He reiterated that the DAs are actually comfortable with a tiered system of determining sentence lengths rather than a blanket 75% minimum sentence length.

Mr. Young shared his appreciation of the work by the Subcommittee and added that there were concerns about limiting the discretion of the parole board, and the need to provide incentives for individuals on parole. He compared it to the way specialty courts operate and how programming and timelines should be individualized.

Mr. Garcia told the group that he is frustrated with the process of this counter recommendation from CDAC. As a member of the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee, Mr. Garcia said that there was a CDAC representative on the subcommittee. He said it seems that only when CDAC agrees with a proposal will such a recommendation pass in the Commission.

Mr. Weir said that the elected DAs support this revised recommendation (21 of 22 DAs) but they are open to input. This is a significant policy change. Good work was done but there are issues that still need to be discussed. Just because there was DA representation on the Subcommittee does not mean that there was total DA agreement.

Mr. Philp noted that the CDAC plan does not include incentives in the way that the research supports.

Mr. Raemisch said he believes the purpose of committees is to engage in in-depth work on tough subjects and bring their ideas to the full Commission. He accepts and appreciates the great work of the Subcommittee. He noted that all commissioners want recidivism rates to go down while at the same time increasing public safety. DOC's recidivism numbers are improving and Mr. Raemisch said he is opposed to anything that takes away incentives for inmates to do better. He said that before sending something to the Legislature, he thinks the group should ask themselves: do we want to punish, to dissuade, or do we want to encourage people to succeed? The ability to terminate parole early is already in place. He summarized that without continuing to debate this topic, the DOC will vote no on #2 and yes on #3.

Dr. Bradford asked for a point of clarification regarding the CARAS (the Colorado Actuarial Risk Assessment Scale). Ms. English stated that the CARAS was developed by the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) and includes several 'needs' factors. People do not typically end up high risk if they are not also high need. Concerns have been mentioned about the low risk/high need individuals for whom a CARAS-based parole period would be too short. However, of 58,000 people released from DOC over 5 years, approximately 6% were low risk that had high needs.

Mr. Wilson expressed his belief that victims should be involved in the criminal justice system. He then discussed the Victim Rights Act (versus the Victim's Rights Amendment). The Amendment, not the Act, put victims at an equal level constitutionally with defendants. Mr. Wilson stated he is concerned the VRA (Act) reflects a very long list of crimes. If Mr. Weir could promise that the VRA (Act) crimes would remain the same over time, Mr. Wilson said he could perhaps support the DAs proposal. But the number of VRA (Act) crimes is expanded nearly every legislative session. Crimes of violence are more difficult to add because there are fiscal notes that go along with a mandatory minimum sentence. Further, incentives are being taken away in the CDAC proposal. There cannot be absolute clarity and absolute discretion at the same time. What the Subcommittee's proposal does is give some certainty to defendants and victims as well as incentives to do well with a goal of reducing recidivism. This Commission just voted to move away from parole being about punishment. That recommendation just made it through the House and is on its way to the Senate. Regarding the concept of reducing recidivism, it is important to remember that the current Mandatory Parole Subcommittee proposal captures 87% of the technical violations. Today there is a conviction crime-based parole period, which has no evidence-based support. Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Weir how the mechanics of over-riding the parole period would work and what the decision would be based on.

Mr. Weir stated that perhaps the CARAS could be a starting point for determining the parole period, but it is important not to take away the judgment and expertise of individuals serving on the parole board. The period of parole is being reduced to a maximum of three years. Mr. Weir clarified that the new purposes of parole bill states that the purposes of parole will support the purposes of sentencing, which include punishment.

Mr. Mueller clarified there is already early termination of parole, but that the CDAC proposal would be eliminating the incentive of earned time. Originally the Subcommittee had eliminated earned time, too, but after hearing from stakeholders, the Subcommittee put earned time back into the recommendation. What is missing is the average length of sentence for the three groups in the CDAC proposal (COV offenders, VRA offenders, and the rest). Mr. Mueller's concern is that there would be a big fiscal note with the CDAC proposal because it seems this result in an increase in sentence lengths for many people.

Mr. Morales (chair of the parole board) said he thinks it is important that the discretion of the parole board be retained. He explained board members meet with the offender and the victims and this adds insight to decision making. There were 41 applications for parole just yesterday and 40 were awarded. Mr. Morales said he was in favor of shortening the 4 and 5 year parole periods. Parole lengths based on risk is a worthy reform that should be explored, along with early release from parole as an incentive. Positive institutional behavior should be rewarded and sitting down with a person at a parole hearing is the responsible thing to do. Mr. Morales finished by saying most of these folks are doing well, and that the board is working hard with the Division of Parole to develop options to revocation.

Mr. Weir reiterated that there must be sufficient time on parole for people to successfully complete programs. It is assumed that most, if not all, earned time is automatic and the DAs would rather that inmates be required to earn these incentives. That is why the CDAC proposal

eliminates earned time. The proposal aims to give greater discretion to the parole officer to determine and recognize someone who is doing well.

Ms. Williams stated that she is having trouble with the process involved in the development of these recommendations. Having not been on the Subcommittee, she stated that she has to trust that hard work was done by this group. Were any of these concerns brought up to the Subcommittee or are they just coming up now? She asked how to better ensure that proposals originate within a Commission subcommittee or task force rather than through a special interest group. She noted that this causes process concerns for every subcommittee of the Commission.

Mr. Wilson stated that the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee had representation from the following groups: DAs, the Defense Council, victims, the Attorney General's office, the Parole Board and DOC. He explained the original concerns came from the community corrections community, which resulted in the Subcommittee meeting with community corrections stakeholders and incorporating their feedback into the Subcommittee's recommendations. The VRA crimes were never identified as an issue when the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee met. So, yes, the Subcommittee did its due diligence and had representation from both Mr. Weir's office and the Attorney General's Office. Mr. Wilson's personal concern is that this counter proposal subverts both the Subcommittee and the CCJJ process.

Ms. Horn-Murphy stated that she was a member of the Subcommittee and that they had a six month timeline and this tight timeframe was a problem. She believes what the commissioners have in front of them are evidence-based recommendations. It would be unfortunate if this issue is set aside due to frustration. She finished by saying this is important and can make a difference.

Mr. Weir said that while specific assignments are delegated to work groups, commissioners do not abdicate their responsibility to make the final decision. He reiterated that the Commission is 80-85% of the way there with this recommendation. He noted that he and Mr. Young represent the DAs who want to make this recommendation even better. Just because an idea came out of a task force does not mean that it cannot be improved upon.

Ms. Williams said that she is not proposing that recommendations from task forces and subcommittees be taken at face value but she does want to feel like the time she spends on committees is valuable.

Mr. Weir replied that 90 days ago he suggested a committee be formed to hear feedback. That suggestion was not supported so the only forum available was to convene the DAs and bring the information directly to the Commission.

Mr. Hilkey asked Commissioners if they wanted to discuss any of the material that had been provided from other groups. No one did, so Mr. Hilkey asked for a motion to take action.

Mr. Wilson moved and Mr. Garcia seconded, to bring Recommendation #2 and #3 to a vote. Mr. Hilkey asked commissioners to prepare to vote.

The process for voting on a final recommendation was explained. To pass, a Commission recommendation requires approval by 75% of the members, combining the A and B votes.

- A = I support it
- B = I can live with it
- C = I do not support it

Final Vote:

FY16-MP#02 Release Date Determined by COV/Non-COV

- A: 8
- B: 3
- C: 10

FY16-MP#02 failed.

FY16-MP #03 Mandatory Parole Period Based Upon Risk Score

- A: 11
- B: 4
- C: 6

FY16-MP#03 failed.

Ms. Williams asked that the Subcommittee reconvene. Mr. Hilkey said that that discussion should occur later in the agenda when future work of the Commission is addressed.

After the break Mr. Hilkey thanked the groups that submitted feedback to the Commission and stated that the material would be saved for future reference.

RETREAT OUTCOMES REVIEW / OPERATIONAL PRACTICES

Paul Herman/Stan Hilkey/All

Mr. Herman summarized the Commission's February retreat which focused on what commissioners would like to accomplish by June 30, 2018 (the current termination date of the Commission). The future work of the Commission was not finalized in February, which is why this issue is up for consideration this afternoon.

Mr. Herman directed commissioners to a handout in their packets which showed the flip chart notes and outcomes from the February retreat. He went on to explain that there was agreement at the February retreat that a document should be developed for Commissioners to sign annually that includes 1) a conflict of interest statement, 2) a statement regarding the fact that proxy voting is not allowed, and 3) meeting attendance expectations. This document will be drafted for review by Commissioners at the June meeting, and will be ready for signatures in July. He asked that if anyone has a draft conflict of interest document to please send it to Kim English (kim.english@state.co.us).

Another issue discussed at the February retreat was the role of public comment at Commission and task force meetings. The group decided that, for the CCJJ meetings, the executive committee would decide when public comment was desired and a formal process would be followed (that is, using a signup sheet with a time limit for comment). It should be made clear that the purpose of the comments would be to provide feedback on specific topics. Public comments would be allowed at task force, subcommittee or work groups meetings and this would be controlled by the chair of each individual group.

Another issue discussed at the February retreat was the super majority voting criteria. Currently the Commission operates with a voting process for *recommendations* that requires 75% to support the recommendation. The idea of a 2/3 majority was discussed at the retreat.

Mr. Wilson stated that in its first year the Commission approved 66 recommendations. This year the CCJJ passed one. If this Commission is to continue to be viable and evidence-based, something needs to change.

Ms. Smith reminded the group of some of the discussion when the decision was made to use the 75% voting rule. She stated that there is value in the three voting options of “support,” “can live with it,” and “do not support” because state agency representatives and elected officials may not feel they can fully support a recommendation. Combining the “support” and “can live with it” votes as affirmative, the 75% rule allowed for as much of a unified voice as possible.

Senator Cooke stated this is not the only group to have a 75% standard.

Mr. Young stated that he agreed with Jeanne that 75% has more weight and adds more credibility to recommendations.

Chief Palletta agreed that recommendations coming from this Commission represent significant changes and a 75% vote of support carries more weight.

Mr. Hilkey stated that the 75% was advantageous during a time when the Commission was working on less complicated issues and low hanging fruit. He noted it may not be as advantageous for the productivity of the group now as it moves forward on tougher issues. A recommendation still has to go through a careful decision making process to be enacted. So, in terms of the productivity of the group, Mr. Hilkey said he is slightly more in favor of the 66% option.

Mr. Garcia stated that he has served on many of the Commission’s task forces that produced considerable work but came to nothing because of the 75% bar. Members are now being asked to participate on more task forces but he is hesitant because he does not think 75% threshold can be met.

Mr. Morales asked if it is important to even have the “I can live with it” or would a simple “yay/nay” option work.

Mr. Philp moved that the issue be moved to the body of the whole for consideration. He did not believe the group would vote on the item today since it was brought up today and the general practice is for items that require a vote to be presented one month and voted on the next.

Mr. Herman clarified that this topic was discussed at length at the retreat last month and that is why the Commission is discussing the topic today.

Mr. Wilson stated that the issue of voting is not a recommendation (which requires presentation one month and voting the next) but rather +a procedural change. There would be no reason to delay a vote on a procedural change.

Mr. Young stated that he is opposed to voting on this now. He feels it is routine to vote on things the month after it is discussed. He said there is no need to rush things because there are no recommendations up for vote any time soon. Mr. Wilson noted that this was previously discussed in February and that documentation (minutes) went out with the meeting agenda.

Mr. Garcia asked if it would take 75% approval for 66% become the new rule. Ms. Smith and staff clarified that this would only take effect on the next round of recommendations and only needs 51% to pass because it is not a recommendation but rather a procedural change.

Mr. Philp withdrew his motion.

Mr. Garcia made a motion for a 66% majority vote, to include the options of “support,” “I can live with it,” and “no support” to take effect for future recommendations. Mr. Wilson seconded. In a hand vote, 13 were in favor and 4 opposed (note that three people had left the meeting and one member was not in the room).

This motion passed. Future recommendations will need 66% approval to pass.

RETREAT OUTCOMES REVIEW / FUTURE WORK PLAN

Paul Herman/Stan Hilkey/All

Mr. Herman discussed the top four priorities identified by Commissioners at the February retreat.

Behavioral health

- Diversion from the system for those with behavioral health issues.
- Jails with individuals in custody because of behavior due to acute and severe mental health issues.
- Competency evaluations and competency hearings.

Juvenile justice (this needs to be discussed further to identify the scope of work)

- Trifurcated system where youth can be in multiple services (“crossover kids”) and the difficulty in sharing information and offering continuity of care.
- Low risk juveniles that may not need to enter the system. This may, at least in part, have to do with the trifurcated system.

- Data sharing issues.

Housing

- DOC inmates paroling homeless (note: DOC releases 150 inmates each month who are paroled homeless)
- Affordable/available/safe housing for offenders
- Housing for human trafficked juveniles

Just this week Colorado received \$24M from the federal government for agencies that work with the homeless. If the Commission is looking at the housing need for criminal justice involved people, how does that compete with other agencies who are working with non-CJ populations?

Data sharing / municipal courts

- Municipal Court data collection and access

Because the Data Sharing Task Force is focusing on municipal courts it makes sense to combine these two topics into one.

Behavioral Health

Mr. Hilkey asked about the ongoing work at DHS regarding competency evaluations. A response was provided that the Joint Budget Committee is considering a bill regarding competency evaluations, more specifically surrounding the mechanics of these evaluations. Mr. Hilkey explained that, although Sheriff Pelle was not able to be present for the meeting today, he was passionate about this issue and thus Mr. Hilkey suggested that Sheriff Pelle become the chair of this CCJJ task force. Boulder County has made a lot of progress on diversion programs and Sheriff Pelle understands the challenges very well.

Mr. Garcia said that front-end diversion and acute in-custody care go together and he would like to be on this task force if it is created.

Mr. Wilson stated that Sheriff Pelle reported at the retreat that 40% of his jail detainees have an Axis I diagnosis and are in jail for low level crimes. Competency overlaps with issues concerning those who are in-custody and suffering from an acute mental illness, so it would be difficult to discuss them separately.

Ms. Smith stated that it is important to narrow the focus of the new groups, along with the names/titles of these task forces. Staff gets many inquiries from external stakeholders about who should attend these meetings. It would be useful for others to understand what the goal is with each of the task forces by fine-tuning the name of the task force.

Ms. Friesen mentioned that she would like this task force to also keep a focus on the juvenile population. The same problem exists at juvenile detention centers where juveniles are housed for mental health reasons.

Juvenile Justice

Mr. Herman stated there was a discussion at the retreat about the current trifurcated system of juvenile justice, and that this trifurcation was a problem. Ms. Williams attempted to explain trifurcation to commissioners. She described that youth are often in the child welfare system and the juvenile justice system. Some may be in the child welfare system and DYC, for example. They are often referred to as “crossover kids.” These kids are pushed back and forth between systems where they receive different services and are treated (parents as well) differently. They are often moved from system to system not because they are high risk but because they have high needs for services. People, even the courts, have a misunderstanding that the Division of Youth Corrections will provide services. Many of these youth are low risk but high need, therefore if more services can be provided in the community it would (hopefully) result in fewer youth going deeper into these systems.

Ms. Friesen added that, based on what is known about brain development, youth should be categorized based on research and programs that ensure they get the services they need.

Luis Guzman stated that he agrees with the discussion and that there are some terms, such as *continuum of care* and *continuity of care*, that are important. Continuity is especially important when transferring cases between systems. When kids leave a system there needs to be a certain level of data sharing to ensure the child is released with services. There have been internal meetings at DHS to discuss the TRAILS data system in an effort to examine the crossover youth population.

Ms. Friesen noted that TRAILS has a lot of great information from child welfare, Senate Bill 94 and Division of Youth Corrections, but not much for youth on probation. Those systems do not talk to each other and the result is that youth are continually getting reassessed.

Mr. Philp stated that Judicial will not partner with TRAILS because TRAILS does not meet Judicial’s security standards. Judicial understands this is expensive but it must be addressed before Judicial’s data system will work with the TRAILS system.

Mr. Garcia said that an effort needs to be made to ensure that there is no duplication of efforts regarding work of other groups that focus on juvenile issues. Also, the last juvenile justice task force had problems because membership got too big.

Mr. Hilkey mentioned that he spoke with Director Bicca and they agreed that Dr. Werthwein will serve as the chair of this group.

Housing

Mr. Herman reiterated that it is a well-known problem that many prisoners, and jail inmates, are released homeless. Mr. Philp noted that the issue is most problematic when it comes to the sex

offender population and housing restrictions with that group. It is not just about finding housing but finding affordable housing.

Mr. Hilkey (chair of the Re-Entry Task Force) stated that if the Commission determines housing should be an area of study for the Re-entry Task Force, it may be beneficial to have a co-chair from a housing agency.

Ms. Smith suggested that perhaps the Re-entry Task Force could finish up the conditions of supervision piece and then refocus on housing.

Mr. Mueller inquired as to whether this group would still look into the collateral consequences of conviction, as this was one of its original areas of focus. Mr. Hilkey replied that it is up to the Commission, but the group would like to finish what they are currently working on, including collateral consequences. Mr. Herman added that the conditions working group will be done in two months. Mark Evans and Jen Bradford are leading that group and they are very good about moving forward. Mr. Raemisch recommended Melissa Roberts for a Housing group.

Mr. Herman pointed out that the current discussions within the Re-entry Task Force have been about conditions of supervision, collateral consequences, and more recently, housing.

Mr. Herman suggested that, for the May Commission meeting, a panel could be convened to help further define the scope of work for these areas of study. By May the chairs and at the initial task force members will have been assigned. Moving forward there should be a concerted effort to ensure commissioners are clear about the scope of work of each of the task forces. The May meeting should help provide a baseline of information for both Commission members and task force members. Subsequently, efforts will be made to provide the Commission with ongoing information on substantive task force topics rather than quick report outs.

Mr. Hilkey stated that staff will send Commissioners an email with a request for each member's preference for task force membership.

Mr. Herman reminded the group that there were zero votes to prioritize Community Corrections at the retreat, but that there are still a couple of issues remaining. DCJ staff is considering some of the work from the Community Corrections Task Force that centered on high risk/high need cases, including a pilot project on this topic. Also, DCJ is working to develop an evaluation tool to audit programs based on criteria related to evidence-based practice. Ms. Smith added that there is currently a budget amendment under consideration by the Joint Budget Committee to move at least parts of the Senate Bill 15-007 forward. [S.B. 15-007 was based on work undertaken by the Community Corrections Task Force.]

Mr. Herman continued that the Community Corrections Task Force was also focusing on improving client outcomes, along with maximizing specialized beds and discussing ISPI (Intensive Supervision Program – Inmate Status).

Mr. Raemisch asked if there is any plan to look at the Results First findings from the Governor's Office on Community Corrections. Ms. Smith stated that there is a Results First report on the

Governor's Office web site, and DCJ is working with the Results First team at the Governor's Office to develop the pilot project mentioned previously.

Mr. Herman stated that a majority of the task force members feel the process of allowing people from the DOC to move to a Community Corrections facility as a transitional placement should continue. In regard to people who are still on inmate status but have completed community corrections, there has been conversation about finding a way to avoid this.

Mr. Herman stated that, in terms of the Community Corrections Task Force, there seems to be some traction behind getting rid of ISPI (Intensive Supervision Program, Inmate Status), and it should not be a long process for the group to develop a recommendation regarding ISPI and then end their monthly meetings. The task force could then go on hiatus as the pilot project is worked out and, if necessary, they could reconvene at a later date.

Mr. Hilkey suggested that this issue be added to the email calling for group participation to see what interest people have in this topic. Ms. Smith pointed out that Commission staff has the capacity to manage four subgroups along with the Commission. Currently there is Re-entry (including housing), Data (including municipal courts), Behavioral Health in Jails, and Crossover Youth (continuity of care).

In terms of the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee's recommendations, and the CDAC recommendation, Mr. Mueller said that if the focus was narrowed to the time of the parole period, there may be some area for consensus. Mr. Wilson said if another committee was created, he would like the people who voted against the recommendations today to serve on that group. Mr. Raemisch stated that there is a Reentry Task Force and there is good stakeholder representation. Parole is centered on successfully reentering someone back into the community so he suggests this issue be discussed in that task force, if at all.

Ms. Rodriguez asked for clarification on the focus of the Re-entry Task Force. Mr. Hilkey stated that it has existed since early summer with these areas of work: (1) probation/parole supervision conditions (which is still going on), (2) possible bias by race/gender on assessment instruments, (3) the definition(s) of recidivism, and (4) housing. Mr. Raemisch suggested that instead of creating a new task force, a subgroup could be created in Re-entry to address parole issues.

Mr. Hilkey said he is concerned that would make for too many groups since the Commission staff and members can manage four groups. Mr. Herman stated that another way to do this would be to develop a specific work plan and to keep it within the Re-entry Task Force.

Mr. Raemisch commented that he does not believe sending someone back to prison for 180 days does any good. This committee is supposed to consider the big picture. Ms. Rodriguez added that she wants this group to discuss treatment.

Mr. Hilkey explained that commissioners determined the topics for moving forward at the February retreat. He said it is important for the Commission to stick to the process determined at that time. Mr. Herman furthered this point by saying that, while people miss meetings such as the

retreat for good reason, it is very important to trust the process. And these are the issues that Commissioners identified at the retreat last month.

Mr. Hilkey stated that the Re-entry Task Force will explore creating a working group to consider some specific issues related to parole.

NEXT STEPS AND APRIL MEETING

Stan Hilkey/Doug Wilson

Mr. Hilkey informed Commissioners that there would not be a CCJJ meeting in April, but that the leadership committee will meet with all the chairs of the existing and newly created task forces to determine membership and charge for those groups. He asked Commissioners to send their preferences regarding task force participation as quickly as possible. He added that Commission Staff will send an email to this effect.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Hilkey thanked Commissioners for their time and asked the group for final comments. With no further business, Mr. Hilkey adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.