



## Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

# Minutes

October 14, 2016

480 South Allison Parkway  
Lakewood, CO 80226

### Commission Member Attendance

Stan Hilkey, Chair - ABSENT	Evelyn Leslie	Scott Turner
Doug Wilson, Vice-Chair	Beth McCann - ABSENT	Michael Vallejos - ABSENT
Jennifer Bradford	Joe Morales	Dave Weaver
John Cooke	Norm Mueller	Peter Weir - ABSENT
Kelly Friesen - ABSENT	Joe Pelle	Robert Werthwein
Charles Garcia	Rick Raemisch	Meg Williams
Mike Garcia	Rose Rodriguez (phone)	Dave Young - ABSENT
Jessica Jones	Lang Sias - ABSENT	Victims' Representative -VACANT
Bill Kilpatrick - ABSENT	Pat Steadman - ABSENT	Jeanne Smith, <i>Ex Officio</i> - ABSENT

### Substitutes:

### CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING REMARKS

#### Doug Wilson, Vice-chairman and State Public Defender

Doug Wilson, Vice-chairman of the Commission and State Public Defender called the meeting to order. He explained that he would chair the meeting in place of Commission Chairman Stan Hilkey who is attending the International Association of Chiefs of Police conference in San Diego. Mr. Wilson reported on the absentees and reviewed the agenda. He asked for any corrections, suggestions or additions to the September minutes and seeing none he called for a motion to approve them. Following a motion and a second the minutes were approved unanimously.

### COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS TASK FORCE UPDATE

#### Melissa Roberts, Division of Adult Parole

Mr. Wilson introduced the first segment of the agenda and noted that, in the absence of Community Corrections Task Force (CCTF) Chair Pete Weir, Melissa Roberts from the Division of Adult Parole would provide the Task Force update and present the preliminary recommendations coming from that group.

Ms. Roberts addressed Commissioners and directed them to handouts in their packets describing the three Community Corrections Task Force preliminary recommendations. She began a PowerPoint presentation describing the work of the Task Force and more specifically of the

Intensive Supervision Program – Inmate (ISP-I) Working Group. The full presentation can be found on the Commission website at [colorado.gov/ccjj](http://colorado.gov/ccjj). Presentation highlights are noted below.

Ms. Roberts explained that the ISP-I Working Group consisted of a thoughtful collaboration of representatives from many stakeholder agencies including community corrections facilities, the Parole Board, the Division of Adult Parole and the victims' community. She thanked everyone involved in the group for their dedication to the work. The Working Group was created in April 2016 and met a number of times through October, including a two-day retreat which was held in July. The Working Group presented its first round of preliminary recommendations to the full CCTF in September. At that time Task Force members returned the recommendations to the Working Group for more consideration. A second round of recommendations (the recommendations being presented today) were presented to and approved by the full Task Force at its meeting on October 6<sup>th</sup>. As background, the Community Corrections Task Force was given its final assignment at the Commission's March 2016 retreat. That assignment called for the CCTF to create a Working Group to address issues surrounding the ISP-I status of offenders who had successfully completed a community corrections program, yet had not been granted parole by the Parole Board. These individuals remain in the community as DOC inmates, often for years, and are required, by statute, to be on Intensive Supervision even if they have significantly reduced their risk level.

Ms. Roberts described in detail how ISP-I works, why it is a problem for the Department of Corrections and others, and the proposed recommendations to fix it. She began by describing the prison release processes.

### *PRESENTATION HIGHLIGHTS*

Ms. Roberts explained there are two paths to release from prison:

- One method of release is via the Parole Board. When someone reaches his or her Parole Eligibility Date (PED), the Parole Board makes a decision to release or not. When an individual reaches his or her Mandatory Parole Date (MRD) the Parole Board sets conditions of release and the individual is automatically paroled.
- The other release method involves the transitioning of an inmate from prison to a community corrections program. This is allowed based on statutorily defined TIME criteria: Those individuals sentenced for a Crime of Violence (COV) can be referred to a community corrections program six months prior to the PED. Non-COV individuals become eligible for transfer to community corrections program at 16 months prior to PED.
- Two things must occur for an inmate to be transferred to a community corrections facility:
  - A local community corrections board must accept the offender, and
  - A community corrections program must also accept the offender.

The ISP-I status is an issue/problem because:

- ISP-I represents a group of individuals that have been accepted by a community corrections program, successfully completed the program, now live independently in community and yet the Parole Board has not granted them parole. Thus they remain on “inmate status.”
- Because of statutory directives, these individuals are supervised at an intensive level of supervision, despite the fact that they have significantly reduced their risk.
- Reasons the Parole Board is reluctant to release these individuals include the severity of their crime and sometimes the amount of restitution owed.

The goals of the three preliminary recommendations are to:

- Better align the two release processes (Parole Board and Community Corrections) to eliminate ISP-I status,
- Modify the ISP statute to allow for individualization of supervision conditions based on a person’s risk and needs,
- Get the “right” person into community corrections at the “right” time rather than relying only on TIME criteria (number of months to PED), and
- Improve the communication between DOC, the Parole Board, and the local community corrections boards about the inmate’s “readiness” for the transfer.

Data Points:

- Approximately 3000 DOC Transition offenders terminate from community corrections each year.
- The average monthly ISP-I population is 350.
- There are 33 offenders who have been on ISP-I for 2 years or more.
- There is a chance those 33 offenders may never be paroled by the Parole Board – and those individuals are being supervised at an intensive level of supervision, as inmates, until they are paroled.
- Approximately 95% of these 33 people have served a sentence for a COV.
- The intensive level of supervision for years is not evidence-based.
- ISP-I individuals are seen every year by the Parole Board, and
- The CARAS and LSI are all tools used by the parole board.

Charles Garcia commented that he served on the Denver Community Corrections Board for seven years, and that it is his impression that boards are not educated about what can happen to a Transition Status offender after they successfully complete community corrections, if the Parole Board will not parole them (ISP-I). Ms. Roberts replied that she believes they are a little more educated than they used to be.

Data Points regarding the distinction in statute between COV and Non-COV offenders:

- A reasonably small percentage of offenders fall into the Crime of Violence (COVs) category. COVs constitute:
  - 2.4% of DOC admissions
  - 7.7% of DOC population
  - 1.7% of DOC releases

- COV crimes include offenses such as murder, kidnapping, aggravated assault, aggravated robbery.
- COV involves the use, attempted use or threatened use of physical force.
- COV is a sentencing enhancement option for certain violent crimes.

Ms. Roberts noted that the ISP-I Working Group originally created a much more robust series of recommendations for the Community Corrections Task Force that were incredibly detailed modifications of the current system. Ms. Roberts stated that she believes one of procedural reasons the Task Force felt it was not the right time to go down that path was due to some lack of confidence in the Parole Board actually following the decision making tool the way it was created, validated and intended for use. In general, the Parole Board releases approximately 25% of the people that come before them, and defers 75% of the cases from release, while the (the Parole Board Release Guidelines Instrument (PBRGI) recommends approximately 50% for release. Ms. Roberts cited DCJ's report on parole decisions making that found when the PBRGI recommends that the inmate's request for parole be deferred, the Parole Board agreed with that decision 93% of the time. However, when the PBRGI recommended release, the Parole Board agreed with that recommendation 43% of the time. Since the original recommendations relied on the Parole Board to make all community corrections pathway decisions, there was an expression of lack of confidence in the decision making process by the Board.

Ms. Roberts added that another thing both the Parole Board and the community corrections boards would like is better and more consistent information from the Department of Corrections. She added there is a significant reform of the offender case management system underway within DOC but until the system is fully implemented, the Department could not have honored the first round of original recommendations regarding ensuring the availability of relevant case-specific information.

Mr. Wilson described that during the work of the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee in 2015, the (then) Parole Board Chair Brandon Shaffer explained that he was using the PBRGI simply as a tie-breaking tool. He added as a point of edification that the Parole Board Release Guidelines Instrument was the result of recommendations originally passed by the Commission.

Parole Board Chair and Commissioner Joe Morales countered the information provided by Mr. Wilson and stated that the PBRGI is NOT being used solely as a tiebreaking mechanism. He stated that the information in the PBRGI is used as a guide. He added that the tool has not been revalidated in quite a while and he hopes changes will make it a better tool.

Meg Williams asked if the ISP-I Working Group looked at outcomes for offenders who go through the ISP-I program and whether they are a risk to the community? Kim English of the Office of Research and Statistics in the Division of Criminal Justice replied that people supervised under ISP-I have successfully completed community corrections and are likely to be lower risk, however, statute requires that they be supervised at the highest risk level. Ms. Williams asked why they are not being paroled if their risk has been mitigated. Ms. Roberts noted that people are more likely to violate in the first 18 months. She added these 33 people have been on ISP-I in the community for two years or more, and some of them much longer than

two years. She noted that additionally, once the Parole Board does parole an ISP-I status person, they still have a full five years of mandatory parole. She also clarified that the recommendations would not be retroactive.

Mr. Morales restated that many of the offenders in question have committed some heinous acts including murder and that they are high profile cases. Mr. Wilson pointed out that an offender has served the sentence imposed by the judge before being allowed to come before the Board. He continued by saying that when the Parole Board refuses to release people they are making their own decision that they believe someone did not do enough time, therefore overriding the sentence imposed by the court. Mr. Wilson stated the sentence has been served or they would not be eligible for parole. Mr. Morales countered that the Parole Board still considers the nature and level of the crime in its decision making. Mr. Wilson replied that the role of the Parole Board is to consider the current risk level of a person, not the nature of the crime.

Ms. Roberts presented three preliminary recommendations as follows (upon approval, the full text of the recommendations can be found on the Commission website, [colorado.gov/ccjj](http://colorado.gov/ccjj)):

#### **FY17-CC #01. Purpose of Community Corrections (Statutory)**

##### **Recommendation FY17-CC #01**

Codify the mission and purpose of Community Corrections in language similar to that of Parole as enacted by SB 16-1215.

##### **Discussion**

This action will provide legislative guidance for current and future Community Corrections boards and facilities/programs.

##### **Proposed Statutory Language**

The purposes of this article with respect to Community Corrections are to:

- (a) Further all purpose of sentencing and improve public safety by reducing the incidence of future crime through design and implementation of research-based policies, practices, programs and standards;
- (b) Prepare, select, and assist people who, after serving a statutorily defined period of incarceration, will be transitioned and returned to the community through supported partnerships with local community corrections boards;
- (c) Set individualized conditions of Community Corrections supervision and to provide services and support to assist people in community corrections in addressing identified risks and needs; and
- (d) Achieve a successful discharge from Community Corrections supervision through reduction of risks and needs and satisfactory compliance with conditions of placement.

**FY17-CC #02. New Community Corrections Reentry Referral Process (Statutory)****Recommendation FY17-CC #02**

Recommended process:

1. Crime of Violence (COV) offenders will be eligible for community corrections reentry placement upon acceptance by both a community corrections board and a community corrections program, and at their Parole Eligibility Date (PED). Eligibility for Non-COV offenders will remain the same under current statute.
2. The Department of Corrections (DOC) shall provide a community referral packet which shall include, but not be limited to: current validated actuarial offender risk and need information, projected release dates, prior supervision outcomes, institutional conduct, programming completed, verified re-entry plan, victim statement if Victim Rights Act (VRA), individualized recommendations concerning the appropriateness of placement in the community, and the Parole Board Action Form.
3. If a program/board accepts a COV offender, the offender will be seen by the Parole Board. If the Parole Board approves the offender for the Performance-based Parole Track, the Board will set conditions; the offender will then be transferred to the program and will be paroled upon successful completion of the program. If the Parole Board does not approve the offender for the Performance-based Parole Track, the offender will not be transferred to the program. Non-COV offenders who are accepted to community corrections will be placed without seeing the parole board and upon successful completion of the program will be paroled. The parole board will set conditions for Non-COV offenders upon successful completion of community corrections.
4. In addition to professional judgment and actuarial risk assessment tools, community corrections boards and facilities/programs shall, to the extent possible, utilize a structured, research-based decision making process.
5. Repeal the Statutory Definition of Intensive Supervision Program-Inmate: To repeal the minimum standards and criteria for the operation of Intensive Supervision Programs, specifically C.R.S. 17-27.5-102 Subsections 2, 3, 4.

***DISCUSSION POINTS***

Ms. Roberts clarified that the first point above is a change in that COV offenders would not be eligible for community corrections placement prior to the PED. Currently in statute they can be placed in community corrections six months prior to their PED. There was some concern expressed that COVs would stay in prison longer. Ms. Roberts reminded the Commissioners that while that is true, 1.7% of releasing inmates are COVs, a very small group. She also added that ,based on the work of the Mandatory Parole Subcommittee, we know that COV offenders serve 66% of their original sentence while Non-COV offenders serve 68% of their prison sentence (note that the COV sentences are much longer than non-COV sentences). The referral by DOC of Non-COV offenders in community corrections would remain the same at 16 months prior to PED.

Additionally under this recommendation, the Department of Corrections would provide a more detailed referral packet to community corrections boards and programs. One addition would be the Parole Board Action Form which would explain to community corrections boards why the Parole Board deferred someone.

Another change to the current process would be if a community corrections board and facility both accept a COV offender, that person would then automatically be seen by the Parole Board. If the Parole Board agrees to the placement it will be understood that if the person completes the community corrections program, they will be paroled. If the Parole Board will not guarantee someone's parole after successful completion of a community corrections program, that COV offender will NOT be released from DOC into the community corrections program.

For Non-COVs this will be an automatic process. If a board and facility accept someone into community corrections placement, he or she will be moved to the program, and when the program is successfully completed, the individual will be paroled.

Jessica Jones asked how many of the 350 people on ISP-I are COVs vs. Non-COVs.

Mr. Wilson summarized that this recommendation would result in an automatic benefit to the Non-COV population, but a potentially longer prison sentence for COVs. Ms. Roberts added that while there is definite resistance to a recommendation that could result in people spending more time in prison, one ongoing concern for everyone is how unclear the current process is to both victims and offenders. This process will be very clear for COVs.

Mr. Garcia reported that he feels the makeup of the Community Corrections Task Force consists primarily of people who work in and own community corrections facilities. He said he believes those who work in community corrections programs are the ones who have to suffer through the 'foolishness' of working with someone successfully for months, only to have Parole Board refuse to parole them. Ms. Roberts replied that she has not heard that specific concern before. She added that the issue around ISP-I was originally brought forward by the Department of Corrections. Ms. Roberts noted that she and Glenn Tapia presented preliminary recommendations to the Colorado District Attorney's Council a couple months ago and that many of the DA's in attendance were surprised when they learned that inmates are in the community.

Note that this recommendation is not retroactive and so it will not eliminate ISP-I. However, in the future, there would no longer be a ISP-I inmates who committed a Crime of Violence because that problem would be solved and they would be on parole.

The Department of Corrections is considering modifying the language related to Achievement Earned Time to fill the time gap between someone completing the program and reaching PED.

Mr. Wilson asked if this recommendation would have any impact or adverse effects on Senate Bill 16-180 involving juveniles. He explained that the bill requires DOC develop and implement a program for offenders who were sentenced to an adult prison for a felony offense committed

while the offender was less than 18 years of age, and who are determined appropriate. He added all of those affected would be COVs. Ms. Roberts replied that she is not aware of any impact but that she would look into the issue. Rick Raemisich agreed that he does not believe it will have any impact.

### **FY17-CC #03. Community Reentry Process Procedures (Policy)**

#### **Recommendation FY17-CC #03**

Recommended Timing of Community Reentry Process:

*Referral Criteria:* DOC will define “displayed acceptable institutional behavior” under C.R.S. 18-1.3.301 (2) (b) as the following:

- The offender has spent at least 6 months continuously incarcerated upon admission, regression or revocation
- The offender has a classification/institutional placement of medium or lower
- The offender has not received a Class I COPD in the last year
- The offender has not received a Class II COPD in the last 6 months

*Definition of Successful Community Corrections Completion:* The Division of Criminal Justice Office of Community Corrections defines successful completion of a Community Corrections program as having advanced through level four in the Progression Matrix or having advanced through the final phase/level of a program.

*Achievement Earned Time:* Inmates are eligible for Achievement Earned Time in accordance with C.R.S. 17-22.5-405 and DOC AR 550-12. DOC will communicate the Achievement Earned Time eligibility and process to all programs.

#### ***DISCUSSION POINTS***

Ms. Roberts explained that the current statutory language gives arbitrary timeframes for when someone has to be referred to community corrections. There is language that reads “the offender has displayed acceptable institutional behavior” and, in practice, this is always simply an automatic referral by DOC to a community corrections board. The goal of this recommendation is clarify and define the referral criteria and avoid referrals of individuals who are not ready for community corrections. Ms. Roberts emphasized that one of the intentions of the group was to create recommendations within the existing framework (e.g. the Progression Matrix and Parole Board decision making regarding COVs).

The final piece of this recommendation relates to DOC’s Achievement Earned Time. Currently this is not being used consistently across programs. The CCTF therefore recommends that DOC to provide training to community corrections programs to ensure inmates receive achievement earned time when appropriate.



**MENTAL HEALTH/JAILS TASK FORCE UPDATE****Joe Pelle, Boulder County Sheriff**

Mr. Wilson explained that this portion of the meeting would be led by Sheriff Pelle, the Chair of the Mental Health/Point of Contact through Jail Release Task Force, and Commission consultant Richard Stroker.

Mr. Stroker indicated that the Mental Health/Jails Task Force consists of highly productive and invested stakeholders who have consistently offered excellent perspectives. Five meetings of the Task Force have been held to date and the group has identified three priority work areas as follows:

1. Changing responses to behavioral health needs
2. Provision of mental health services in jail
3. Diversion within the criminal justice system

The Task Force will be studying these three work areas one at a time, starting with the Changing Responses to Behavioral Health Needs Working Group.

**Changing Responses to Behavioral Health Needs Working Group**

The purpose for this group is to identify opportunities early in the (pre-jail and jail) process to refer individuals to services in ways that avoid criminal justice processing. This Working Group has identified four important issues to address as follows via four Study Groups:

1. M1 cases (those with mental health holds<sup>1</sup>)
2. Efforts involving law enforcement
3. Joint efforts involving law enforcement and behavioral health
4. Community behavioral health options or system opportunities

Mr. Stroker pointed out that Mr. Wilson is leading the work of the **M1 Cases Study Group** and asked him to expand on that effort. Mr. Wilson explained that this group will be coming forward with three recommendations. The first recommendation pertains to the elimination of any legal reference that allows the use of jails or correctional facilities for the detention of M1s.

The next recommendation is about adding a third option to the Title 27 M1 process. Concerns about this process include the fact that it requires a designation of “imminent danger to self or others,” which typically results in a commitment to a locked facility. Mr. Wilson noted that currently in Colorado professionals wait until people are dangerous before actually referring them to treatment. This recommendation involves identifying another way to get treatment for people in an outpatient setting as opposed to going to jails. One option would be to provide support at the facility (jail) on an outpatient basis to evaluate and treat as opposed to an inpatient requirement.

The third recommendation involves an evaluation of the interpretation and enforcement of the Supreme Court’s 1999 Olmstead Decision at our state mental health institutes (CMHIFL and CMHIP). The purpose of this review and evaluation is to dually ensure that individuals with serious mental illness who are not appropriate for community level care are being served by our

---

<sup>1</sup> An individual can be held for 72 hours when he or she is a danger to self or others. This is an M1 hold.

institutes with a goal of discharge and community recovery, and that individuals being served by our institutes are consistently evaluated for readiness to return to the community.

Mr. Raemisch observed that when he first arrived in Colorado he learned that the mental health hospital can send someone who is too violent to be supervised to a DOC facility, without ever being convicted of a crime. DOC worked with other groups and the Legislature to ban that practice. The current practice in Colorado is for mentally ill people to be put in jails without having committed a crime.

#### *Remaining Study Groups*

Mr. Stroker explained that the second Study Group, **Efforts Involving Law Enforcement**, is reviewing law enforcement training opportunities. Sheriff Pelle is leading this group which is looking at specific types of mental health training.

The third Study Group, **Joint Efforts Involving Law Enforcement and Behavioral Health**, is looking at co-responder models that involve both law enforcement and mental health professionals working together to respond to situations involving mental illness.

The fourth Study Group, **Community Behavioral Health Options/Opportunities**, is looking at expanding opportunities/programs/resources to allow for non-criminal justice system placements.

Mr. Stroker summarized that the Task Force has been very productive and that they hope to have recommendations by the November or December Commission meeting

Mr. Werthwein asked if the group is considering juveniles in its discussions. Mr. Stroker replied that it had not, but he believe that if the Task Force can develop a blueprint for approaching some of these problems for adults, it could then be expanded for other populations and other types of issues.

#### **RE-ENTRY TASK FORCE UPDATE**

**Mark Evans, Public Defender's Office**

**Adam Zarrin, Governor's Office**

In the absence of Mr. Hilkey, Mr. Stroker began the update on the work of the Re-entry Task Force. He explained that the Task Force has established two working groups; the Collateral Consequences Working Group and the Housing Capacity Working Group. Mr. Stroker went on explained that Mark Evans from the Public Defender's Office would provide background on the Collateral Consequences Working Group and Adam Zarrin from the Governor's Office would discuss the work of the Housing Capacity Working Group.

Mark Evans introduced himself and explained that he is a member of the Re-entry Task Force and is coordinating the work of the Collateral Consequences Working Group. He recounted that the issue of collateral consequences was one of the topics Commissioners originally assigned to the Task Force when it was created in 2015. Then at the February 2016 retreat Commissioners

expanded the scope of work for the Task Force to include issues around housing for justice involved individuals re-entering the community.

Mr. Evans began a PowerPoint presentation (the full PowerPoint can be found on the Commission website, [colorado.gov/ccjj](http://colorado.gov/ccjj)) and explained that collateral consequences are the “other” impacts of a criminal conviction that go beyond the sentence imposed by the judge. It includes the mandatory disqualifications and discretionary penalties in the areas of employment, housing, and other liberties that continue beyond the completion of a sentence.

Mr. Evans listed the members of the Working Group and explained that the group was formed with the broad task of looking at the range of Colorado’s collateral consequences.

When the group started this project they wanted to ensure they were going about it in a principled way and with a clear vision. With that in mind the group established a set of guiding principles to lead them through the process. As part of the process, the group started by identifying how collateral consequences are most critically impacting the re-entry and reintegration prospects of individuals with a conviction.

The Working Group spent multiple meetings gathering information from a number of sources and received presentations from individuals and stakeholders working on various re-entry issues. Mr. Evans explained that currently there are no firm proposals for either the Re-entry Task Force or the Commission, but that through their fact-finding work the group has seven potential areas of reform including:

- Employment
- Housing
- Other liberties (including driver’s license access)
- Criminal records availability
- Orders of collateral relief
- Diversion program expansion, and
- Excessive fines, fees and surcharges

Mr. Mueller asked if there had been discussion about further expansion of petitions to seal criminal records. Mr. Evans replied that this is a topic of discussion.

Adam Zarrin introduced himself and explained that he works for the Governor’s Office as a policy advisor in the areas of criminal justice and corrections. He explained that the Housing Capacity Working Group was very recently established and they had their first meeting on October 4<sup>th</sup>. He noted that the group is small at this point and that they would welcome anyone else who may be interested in further exploring this issue.

Mr. Zarrin noted that the working group has identified initial areas of study, including:

- Increasing the number of permanent and supportive and transitional housing units for justice involved individuals
- Exploring the use of possible pilots to address specific populations and issues
- Educating housing authorities and others regarding issues around HUD restrictions and housing needs for justice involved individuals, and
- Exploring the use of possible pilots to address specific populations and issues

Mr. Zarrin shared that any recommendations that come forth may not necessarily be legislative in nature due to the fiscal situation in Colorado, but that the group should be able to create some type of process to effect change. One starting area is to ensure there is alignment of data and key terms. It might also be beneficial for the group to focus on key populations including the mentally ill and others.

Mr. Wilson explained that he is concerned about a bill that is coming forward from the Mentally Ill in the Criminal Justice System Task Force (MICJS) which he fears may result in people being subject to incarceration in order to receive housing assistance. Mr. Zarrin replied that the Working Group will be taking into consideration the work of other stakeholders. He also added that the Department of Local Affairs is having conversations about trying to increase the number of permanent supportive housing and transitional housing vouchers for the general population. The struggle is that there is not a pipeline of housing for those who are specifically justice involved.

### **JUVENILE CONTINUITY OF CARE TASK FORCE UPDATE**

**Robert Werthwein, Department of Human Services**

Mr. Werthwein, Chair of the Juvenile Continuity of Care Task Force, explained that the group did not meet in October due to schedule conflicts but that task force members had a homework assignment instead. Both Task Force members and non-members were asked to provide feedback regarding specific cross-over models and ideal components. The Task Force wants to ensure a process that does not rely on getting a court sentence to obtain treatment. He noted that during its next meeting the Task Force will agree on the elements of a model system for managing dual status youth (youth with experience in both child welfare and juvenile justice). The Task Force is scheduled for a nearly full-day meeting on November 7th.

### **NOVEMBER MEETING INFORMATION AND ADJOURNMENT**

**Doug Wilson, Vice-chairman and State Public Defender**

Mr. Wilson noted that Commissioners were provided a schedule for the 2017 Commission meetings. He added that the November meeting has been rescheduled from Friday, November 11<sup>th</sup> (Veteran's Day) to Thursday November 10<sup>th</sup>. He reminded Commissioners that from now on the meetings will begin at 1:00 pm with a scheduled end time of 3:30 pm.

Mr. Wilson thanked Commissioners for their time and asked the group for any final comments. With no further business, Mr. Wilson adjourned the meeting at 2:34 p.m.