



**Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice**

**Minutes**

November 9, 2017

Employee Relations Training Room  
 Lakewood Civic Center  
 480 South Allison Parkway, Lakewood, CO 80226

**Commission Member Attendance**

Stan Hilkey, Chair	Jessica Jones	Joe Salazar
Doug Wilson, Vice-Chair	Daniel Kagan - ABSENT	Lang Sias
Jennifer Bradford	Bill Kilpatrick	Scott Turner
John Cooke - ABSENT	Evelyn Leslie	Michael Vallejos
Valarie Finks	Joe Morales	Dave Weaver
Kelly Friesen	Norm Mueller	Peter Weir
Charles Garcia	Joe Pelle	Meg Williams – ABSENT
Mike Garcia	Rick Raemisch - ABSENT	Dave Young
Tony Gherardini	Rose Rodriguez – ABSENT	Joe Thome, <i>Ex Officio</i>

Substitutions: Susan White for Rick Raemisch

**CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING REMARKS**

**Stan Hilkey, Chair and Executive Director of the Department of Public Safety**

Mr. Stan Hilkey, Chair of the Commission and Executive Director of the Department of Public Safety, called the meeting to order at 1:37 pm. He thanked Commissioners for attending and asked them to introduce themselves. Mr. Hilkey reviewed the agenda and asked for any additions or corrections to the October minutes. Scott Turner moved to approve the minutes and Mike Garcia seconded the motion. Commissioners unanimously approved the minutes.

**2018 LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

**Gabby Reed, Department of Public Safety Legislative Liaison**

Mr. Hilkey introduced Gabby Reed, the Legislative Liaison for the Department of Public Safety, and noted that she would provide an update on the two criminal justice-related Legislative Interim Committees. Ms. Reed explained that both the Sentencing in the Criminal Justice System Interim Study Committee and the County Courthouse and County Jail Funding and Overcrowding Solutions Interim Study Committee have finalized their work and submitted their final bill proposals.

The Sentencing in the Criminal Justice System Interim Study Committee identified 19 concepts, drafted 16 bills and moved 5 bills forward. Ms. Reed directed Commissioners to a handout that summarized those bills as follows below, the full content of which can be found among the November meeting documents on the Commission website at [www.colorado.gov/ccjj](http://www.colorado.gov/ccjj).

- Bill #1 “Determinate Sentence for Indeterminate Offenses.” This bill gives the court discretion to sentence an indeterminate offense to either a determinate sentence or an indeterminate sentence.

- Bill #8 “Sentences for Habitual Criminals.” The bill changes the way habitual sentence works in Colorado repealing the provision that requires courts to sentence a person who has been convicted of three felonies within ten years to three times the maximum of the presumptive range.
- Bill #9 “Reauthorize the Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice.” This bill extends the repeal date for the Commission to July 1, 2028.
- Bill #12 “Lowering Mandatory Parole from 5 Years to 3 Years” This proposal lowers the length of mandatory parole for class 2 and 3 felonies from five years to three years.
- Bill #14 “Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice Sentencing Study” This bill directs the Commission to contract for a study of the most effective criminal sentencing practices available and calls for the Commission to establish an advisory committee to review that study and make recommendations to Colorado’s sentencing scheme.

The County Courthouse and County Jail Funding and Overcrowding Solutions Interim Study Committee moved the following 3 bills and one resolution forward:

- Bill #1 “Financial Assistance for County Jails and Courts.” This bill allows grants for up to 50% of a county’s annual approved debt service on any approved financing of construction or remodeling costs of jails and courthouses.
- Bill #4 “Increase Department of Corrections (DOC) Reimbursement to County Jails.” This proposal increases the rate that DOC pays to jails to approximately \$108.78 per day.
- Bill #5 “Court System for Remote Participation in Hearings.” This bill requires the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) to operate a program that allows court hearings to take place remotely.
- Bill #10 (Resolution) “Medicaid Eligibility Detailed Individuals” requests federal action on Medicaid policies pertaining to inmates.

Additionally, Ms. Reed reported that one of the bills from The Opioid and Other Substance Use Disorders Interim Study Committee addresses “Harm Reduction” and calls for the Commission to study criminal sentencing related to opioids and synthetic opioids, and to include its findings and any recommendations in the Fiscal Year 2018 annual report.

#### **SENATE BILL 17-207 / ROLLOUT UPDATE**

**Frank Cornelia, Colorado Behavioral Healthcare Council**  
**Camille Harding, Colorado Department of Human Services**

Mr. Hilkey introduced Frank Cornelia from the Colorado Behavioral Healthcare Council and Camille Harding of the Colorado Department of Human Services. Mr. Cornelia explained that the Colorado Behavioral Healthcare Council (CBHC) has been a membership association for community mental healthcare providers since 1967. Membership currently includes all of Colorado’s 17 Community Mental Health Centers, 5 Behavioral Health Organizations, 4 Managed Service Organizations and two specialty clinics. Ms. Harding introduced herself and explained that she represents the Office of Behavioral Health within the Department of Human Services and is the Division Director for Community Mental Health.

Mr. Cornelia reminded Commissioners of their work and recommendations last year that resulted in Senate Bill 17-207. The bill also included recommendation from the Mental Health Holds Task Force. Mr. Cornelia explained that he and Ms. Harding would provide a brief background on the original intent of the bill and an update on the status of the rollout. The full presentation can be found on the Commission website at [www.colorado.gov/ccjj](http://www.colorado.gov/ccjj). Discussion points following the presentation are noted below.

#### *DISCUSSION*

Mr. Hilkey asked Mr. Cornelia to describe how the mobile response transport would work. Mr. Cornelia replied that there are contract-based requirements for mobile services including one hour response times in urban areas and two hour response times in rural and frontier areas. A major portion of funding and enhancements are geared toward ensuring those requirements are met. Mr. Cornelia added that the secured pilot transports are intended to help alleviate the burden on law enforcement, particularly on the Western Slope, of being responsible for long transports for individuals in crisis. Sheriff Pelle added that the transportation piece is critical, particularly for outlying and remote areas, and that the initiative should solve a myriad of problems.

Ms. Harding added that the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion Program (LEAD) and the Co-responder Program were combined into one Request for Proposal (RFP) for \$5.3M. The RFP closed in early November and approximately \$2.9M is earmarked for co-response and \$2.3M is designated for LEAD. It is expected that by the end of November the awards will be made and communities will be designated to receive funding. It will likely take another 90 to 120 days for the contracts to be put in place, but discussions are underway about filling the gap before implementation with purchase orders for services to be established sooner. The University of Colorado will be responsible for the evaluation of the co-responder work.

#### **COMMISSION RENEWAL / RECOMMENDATION, DISCUSSION AND VOTE Stan Hilkey, Chair and Executive Director of the Department of Public Safety**

Mr. Hilkey stated that the next item on the agenda is a vote by Commissioners on a recommendation to continue the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice beyond the statutory termination date of June 30, 2018. He directed members' attention to recommendation FY18-CCJJ #01 in their packets as follows:

#### **Recommendation FY18-CCJJ #01**

**Continue the Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice beyond the statutory terminate date of June 30, 2018.**

The critical mission of the Commission – to study and make recommendations that ensure public safety, respect the rights of crime victims, and reduce recidivism, and that are evidence-based, cost-effective, and sensitive to disproportionate minority overrepresentation – requires ongoing effort. The need for collaboration among multidisciplinary stakeholders and subject matter experts to study complex issues and recommend improvements in the administration of justice has not diminished. C.R.S. 16-11.3-105 should be amended to remove the termination date.

#### *DISCUSSION*

Dave Young asked about the impact of the recommendation since the Sentencing in the Criminal Justice System Interim Study Committee already approved a bill reauthorizing the Commission. Mr. Hilkey replied that regardless of the vote today it appears unlikely the legislation would be withdrawn, however, he added there is an expectation by legislators and others to hear the will of the Commission.

Mr. Young reviewed the original mission of the Commission which includes a statement that the Commission shall make recommendations to enhance public safety. He went on to say that he does not believe all of the initiatives supported by the Commission do indeed enhance public safety. He pointed to a previous parole reform recommendation that was not approved by the Commission, but that resurfaced and is currently supported by the Sentencing in the Criminal Justice System Interim Study Committee. He furthered that it is his understanding the role of the Commission is to screen criminal justice legislation, but that role is moot if legislators override decisions made by the Commission. He added that he believes the Governor should veto any legislation that is not first approved by the Commission.

Mr. Young also commented on the voting threshold for recommendation approval and pointed out that previously there was a 75% approval threshold for a recommendation to pass the Commission, and that he does not believe the lowering of the approval rating to 66% is sufficient or acceptable. Mr. Young noted that he also does not approve of the choice Commissioners have when voting to elect a voting option of "I can live with it" rather than a simple approve/do not approve vote.

Mr. Young then pointed out that Doug Wilson holds the position of Commission Vice-chair, and that because Mr. Wilson is the State Public Defender, Mr. Young believes there could be an inherent conflict of interest for him when it comes to discussing issues of public safety. Mr. Young explained he believes this is because Mr. Wilson takes an oath to work in the best interest of his clients, which is the majority of criminal defendants prosecuted in Colorado. Mr. Young noted that it is also concerning to him that Mr. Wilson is the voice of the Commission at the legislature.

Mr. Young continued by noting that the Colorado District Attorneys' Council (CDAC) discussed the renewal of the Commission at their last meeting and that the members of CDAC agreed unanimously not to support renewal of the Commission. Mr. Young concluded that if the Commission is renewed he would like a review of the Commission and its mission statement.

Peter Weir expanded on the comments by Mr. Young and noted that his concern with the bill drawn up by the Sentencing in the Criminal Justice System Interim Study Committee is that it calls for a ten year reauthorization of the Commission. He noted that there will likely be two different governors during that timeframe and that there is no way to know what their position might be about Colorado having a criminal justice commission. Mr. Weir added that the district attorney community is also concerned about the lack of support from the governor. He said he believes the purpose of the Commission is to look at broad, criminal justice policy issues but that the work feels supplanted when groups such as the legislative interim committees are established to produce recommendations and bills on serious and complex issues over the course of a handful of meetings. Mr. Weir believes there is a disconnect when an interim committee will take a recommendation that the Commission did not approve and move it forward as a bill.

Mr. Weir added that the Commission has not produced any recommendations in regards to victims issues over the past handful of years but that there are a number of recommendations pertaining to criminal justice reform that are focused on cost savings. He believes the Commission needs to be careful about making public safety decisions when one of the paramount concerns in recommendations appears to be about the cost. Mr. Weir added that he agrees with Mr. Young that the Commission has strayed from the mission statement. The vision for the Commission was to bring expertise from a variety of perspectives to identify significant issue areas in our criminal and juvenile justice arenas, and then to set aside respective hats and try to determine how to improve the system. Mr. Weir said he believes the Commission has strayed from that charge and that the Commission has been used to promote specific agendas. He concluded that if the Commission is continued the group should take a step back and look at the mission statement and how business is conducted.

Representative Lang Sias noted that he has a great deal of respect for the Commission process and the members of the Commission. In response to some of Mr. Weir's concerns, Representative Sias noted that he believes it would be helpful if the Commission returned to a 75% threshold for approval votes, which he believes sends a stronger message when ideas and bills come out of the Commission. As for the efforts by the Commission to work with the legislative process and timeline, Representative Sias offered an idea that perhaps by a certain (predetermined) date every year, legislators would have the ability to present to the Commission with ideas for discussion and evaluation by the Commission during the interim period in the legislature. The Commission could then determine whether the proposed idea(s) would be considered or not. This could replace the practice of establishing legislative interim committees with a process whereby the Commission would address the issues and produce ideas for bills. Additionally, it could be established that any of the bills that came out of the Commission would not apply against a legislators' five bill limit. There is some frustration among legislators that the current process is not in sync with the legislative timeline.

Mr. Hilkey responded that the Commission is in a position to entertain any and all proposals about how best to address improvements to the work process and future endeavors. In response to Mr. Young's comments, Mr. Hilkey added that when he was appointed as Chair of the Commission, Mr. Wilson offered to step down as Vice-chair, but that he Mr. Hilkey asked him to stay in that role. Additionally, Mr. Wilson has offered in the past to let somebody else assume the role as Vice-chair. Mr. Hilkey pointed out that the change to the 75% voting threshold was determined by Commissioners and not the legislature, and that if it is the will of the Commission it can always be reversed. Additionally, during one-on-one conversations with Commissioners before this meeting, many other ideas were brought forward regarding improvements to the Commission process and that all of those can be entertained for implementation.

Valarie Finks said that she is concerned about Commission membership, specifically because she is the sole victims' representative on the group. She added a concern that, in looking at past recommendations, she noticed that few proposals pertaining to victims' issues have come out of the Commission. She believes there is also a lack of victim representation on the task forces. Mr. Hilkey reiterated that Ms. Fink's concerns represent the kinds of opportunities the Commission can address during the renewal process.

Scott Turner noted that he is concerned about the actual impact of the Commission and whether the work makes a difference. He added that the testimony by legislators in the interim committees supporting the Commission renewal focused more on the Commission's annual reports than actual changes in the system brought about by Commission work. He added that he questions the legislature's respect for the group because of the numerous recommendations and bill proposals that have come out of the Commission which then languish in the legislature. He is also frustrated that the legislative interim committee voted to renew the Commission before the Commission held its own vote on whether to renew, he thinks that exemplifies the lack of respect given to the Commission by the legislature.

Chief Bill Kilpatrick pointed out that he was a member when the Commission was first established in 2008 and that, not only does the group do very good work, but there is more work to be done and he would be very concerned if the Commission were to cease to exist. He added that he is a member of the Pretrial Release Task Force and the work that group is undertaking currently is critical.

Sheriff Joe Pelle directed members to a document listing Commission legislative accomplishments since 2013 and pointed out that he was involved with six of the recommendations that became law along with the committee work behind those efforts, and that he is very proud of the work. He added the current work on mental health issues in the justice system is work that will take years, money, policy and legislation to solve. Giving up on that work now would be an incredible waste of time and energy, and (he said) quite frankly an insult to the brilliant people currently working on that Task Force. Sheriff Pelle

added the group is the strongest, smartest, most effective task force he has ever been associated with and that the group deserves the continued support by the state and the Commission.

Norm Mueller shared that he could not disagree more with Mr. Weir, Mr. Young and Mr. Turner. Mr. Mueller recounted that he was cynical when the Commission was first formed in 2008 and was concerned that it was unbalanced and over-stacked with representatives from law enforcement, district attorneys and probation. That all changed when Mr. Mueller worked on a Task Force chaired by Sheriff Robinson and he saw people take off their hats and work together for the greater good. He added that there is often broad bipartisan support in the legislature for Commission recommendations. He pointed out that the highly effective, professional Mental Health/Jails Task Force was formed when Sheriff Pelle raised concerns about the issue, and that Task Force members contribute a significant amount of work. He added that this demonstrates that every Commissioner has the opportunity to bring forth issues for the group to address.

Judge Vallejos stated that he was surprised and discouraged to hear the comments about the perceived opinion of the legislature toward the Commission, and that he had not understood that to be the case. He added that if it is true, he finds it unfair as the Commission produces extremely good work, and the work that comes from the Commission is highly respected and carries credibility. The decisions made in the Commission are not political and not knee-jerk, but rather thoughtful and evidence-based. The credibility comes from the very make-up of the group. The work is good and should continue and if there is room for improvement in the future the Commission is amenable to that as well.

Charles Garcia noted that Mr. Weir was the Executive Director of the Department of Public Safety when the Commission was created and was very involved with the make-up of the Commission, including appointing the former State Public Defender as Vice-chair. As with any other Commission or Board there is always room for improvement, but that does not mean the Commission should cease to exist. Mr. Garcia added that he strongly disagrees with the portrayal that legislatures do not respect the work of the Commission. He believes the group does tremendous work and will continue to do so.

Representative Salazar said that he believes everyone on the Commission wants to work for a better, more effective, criminal justice system. He noted that one of the problems with legislative support for Commission recommendations is often due to the nature of the topic itself. He explained that he attempted to find a co-sponsor last year to work with him in supporting one of the Commission recommendations on a sex offender issue but that legislators often shy away from the tougher issues, not because the recommendations are not well grounded or evidence-based, it is often simply political. Speaking as a legislator, Mr. Salazar pointed out that by and large the legislature has a tremendous amount of respect for the Commission.

Mr. Salazar shared that he believes the Commission serves a very good purpose and that the membership composition provides solid representation of all stakeholder groups. Mr. Salazar expressed frustration around the push for a 75% voting threshold, in that it gives any number of parties in the Commission the ability to start and stop a discussion, which the General Assembly would otherwise benefit from hearing. The 75% threshold serves as a weapon against legislation that is desperately needed in the state. Additionally, while the Commission as a whole appears interested in tackling some of the harder issues there are some special interest groups within the Commission who resist. He pointed to the issue of mandatory minimums and the fact that the legislature would welcome recommendations on the topic, but that there appears to be ongoing resistance by a few stakeholders in the Commission to address the issue. The state is dealing with very serious issues in regards to the criminal justice system and criminal justice spending, and the Commission serves a critical voice. Representative Salazar concluded by saying that he will be voting to approve the renewal of the Commission and hopes the group can work together in the future to address areas that may need improvement.

Mr. Hilkey asked for a motion to approve recommendation FY18-CCJJ #01. Charles Garcia moved to accept the recommendation as written and Evelyn Leslie seconded the motion.

The process for voting on a final recommendation was explained. To pass, a Commission recommendation requires approval by 66% of the members, combining the A and B votes of:

A = I support it

B = I can live with it

C = I do not support it

***Final Vote: FY18-CCJJ #01***

Continue the Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice beyond the statutory terminate date of June 30, 2018.

- A: 16
- B: 1
- C: 4

***FY18-CCJJ #01 was APPROVED with an 81% approval rating.***

**TASK FORCE UPDATE**

**Richard Stroker, Commission Consultant**

Commission consultant Richard Stroker offered a synopsis of the work underway in the two active task forces, as follows:

➤ **Mental Health/Jails Task Force**

The first effort of this Task Force resulted in the passage of Senate Bill 17-207. The next area of focus centers on the early diversion of individuals from the criminal justice system who have been arrested and appear to exhibit specific mental illness or mental health concerns. The Task Force has spent a number of months identifying specific ways to improve existing approaches to the management of this population with an emphasis on shifting appropriate cases out of the criminal justice system and into the behavioral healthcare system. A preliminary recommendation on this issue will be presented to the Commission at its December meeting.

➤ **Pretrial Release Task Force**

The Pretrial Release Task Force was established in June and has held monthly meetings since that time. The group is still in the information-gathering stage and the early stages of work group activities, and is moving forward with a good deal of enthusiasm. Four work groups will be identifying specific issue areas and developing recommendations for Task Force consideration.

**COMMISSION FUTURE WORK / POTENTIAL NEW TASK FORCE AREAS**

**Kelly Friesen, Grand County Juvenile Justice Services**

**Jennifer Bradford, Metropolitan State University**

**Peg Flick, Division of Criminal Justice**

**Kevin Ford, Division of Criminal Justice**

Mr. Hilkey explained that the Commission currently has the capacity to undertake the study of an additional work area by creating an additional task force. He added that a request was made at the October meeting for more information about each of the three areas under consideration for task force

creation. In response to that request three presentations have been created by Commissioners Kelly Friesen and Jennifer Bradford, and Commission staff Peg Flick and Kevin Ford.

**Age of Delinquency.** Kelly Friesen addressed the Commission and provided some historical background about the age of delinquency issue. The ‘age of delinquency’ refers to youth in the juvenile justice system in Colorado who are between the ages of 10 and 17. The age of delinquency was established and placed in the Children’s Code in 1967. Ms. Friesen pointed out that when the age range was established 50-years ago, there was little research regarding issues of childhood brain development, brain processing and decision making. She added that a number of states have addressed this issue in recent years and that some states have moved up both the bottom and top ends of the age range, with some progressive states moving the top end to as high as 21 years of age. Ms. Friesen concluded that it might be an opportune time, after 50 years, to revisit this topic and consider issues such as cognitive development, screening and assessment tools, and evidence-based practices as these relate to the age of delinquency.

Jennifer Bradford joined Ms. Friesen in the conversation and directed Commissioners to a handout entitled Age of Delinquency Literature Review. Ms. Bradford explained that there is a significant amount of neuroscience research on brain development, and she proceeded to highlight outcomes from six research publications. The full content of the handout can be found on the Commission website at [www.colorado.gov/ccjj](http://www.colorado.gov/ccjj). As part of her presentation, Ms. Bradford also described a few court cases, including a Supreme Court decision in 2005 that acknowledged that neuroscience, brain behavior and cognition is something that should be a mitigating factor in regards to delinquency. At the conclusion of her presentation Ms. Bradford offered that with multiple factors in mind there is enough support to indicate this is an issue that should be examined more closely with regards to the Children’s Code and the criminal and juvenile justice systems in Colorado.

#### *DISCUSSION*

Mr. Weir commented that he believes this topic is being presented to Commissioners with a biased agenda and predetermined conclusions. He went on to clarify that the juvenile justice system is not the criminal justice system and that it is already designed to provide services to help a child stay out of the criminal justice system. He said he believes the presentation implies an underlying assumption that there is a problem with being involved in the juvenile justice system, when the juvenile justice system is actually in place to assist children. He noted that in Jefferson County the filing of juvenile cases is 1/3 of what it was two years ago due in part to special programs focused on juveniles. Before discussing the age of delinquency specifically, he believes there needs to be an honest assessment of what is taking place in the juvenile system currently, ongoing practices, and services that are provided. He believes the Commission’s resources would be better spent by focusing on a broader spectrum of juvenile issues rather than just the specific age of detention issue.

Ms. Friesen agreed with Mr. Weir that there is a lot of good work taking place in the 1<sup>st</sup> Judicial District, but that this is not the norm across the state, and that there are not a lot of age appropriate services for 10 and 11 year old youth. Ms. Friesen also reminded Commissioners that the juvenile system feeds the adult system and work that goes into juvenile issues helps the entire justice system.

Tony Gherardini noted that there should be some clarity around whether the group is discussing adjudication and youth services as they exist now versus the issue of youths being tried in court as adults. He pointed out that the Department of Human Services was instrumental in passing legislation during the 2017 session that would eliminate the ability for 10-12 year olds to be detained for anything short of violent crimes or felonies. He agreed with the importance of studying the age of delinquency.

Mr. Wilson responded to Mr. Weir’s comments and noted that he did not hear an agenda in the presentation. He clarified that this was simply a follow-up discussion to an item identified by the



Commission at its February retreat. Mr. Wilson went on to say that he believes this is an area worthy of future study and that the Commission has the capacity to add this work.

**Department of Corrections Population Drivers/Increase in Felony Findings.** Peg Flick reminded Commissioners that during the October meeting there was a discussion about the fact that district court filings were increasing. Additionally, at the August meeting there was a discussion about what was driving the Department of Corrections inmate population. Ms. Flick presented an exploratory analysis on arrests and district court filings to Commissioners, the full content of which can be found among the November meeting documents on the Commission website at [colorado.gov/ccjj](http://colorado.gov/ccjj)

#### *DISCUSSION*

There was no discussion at the conclusion of the presentation.

**Sentencing Clarification.** Kevin Ford explained that issues pertaining to ‘sentencing clarification’ have been raised on and off throughout the Commission’s history. He added that he was asked to compile a review of areas that were explored in the past along with outcomes from the interim sentencing committee and other interest areas identified at the February retreat. There are numerous possibilities for potential study areas under the broad umbrella of sentencing clarification. Dr. Ford directed Commissioners to two handouts entitled: Topics and Trends, and Legislative Council-Overview of Colorado Sentencing Scheme. He clarified that there is no particular agenda in the documents but rather just possible topics that could be the subject of a sentencing clarification group. Dr. Ford reviewed the handouts, the full content of which can be found among the November meeting documents on the Commission website at [colorado.gov/ccjj](http://colorado.gov/ccjj)

#### *DISCUSSION*

There was no discussion at the conclusion of the presentation.

### **COMMISSION FUTURE WORK / DISCUSSION AND VOTE**

#### **Richard Stroker, Commission Consultant**

Mr. Stroker explained that in light of the information presented today and in light of the fact that these are three areas that have been brought up at either the Commission retreat or in recent Commission meetings – it is time to decide which of these areas should be the focus of the next task force. He explained that the goal in providing information on the three topic areas was to give the sense of potential interest areas without identifying specific outcomes. He summarized that the three areas of interest are the age of delinquency, population drivers at the Department of Corrections and increased felony filings, and sentencing clarification. He noted that there is the capacity now to take on one new topic area and that if the Mental Health/Jails Task Force concludes its work as predicted, there could be an opportunity for the creation of another group by summer including any possible study areas that might be given to the Commission from the legislature.

In regards to the issue of increased felony filings, Commissioners discussed the possibility of combining efforts with work currently underway by the Colorado District Attorneys’ Council which is studying the same issue. It was determined that Commission staff could assist in that endeavor with CDAC without creating a specific task force. Sheriff Pelle said that the huge increase in felony filings around the state is going to impact District Attorney’s offices, prisons, jails, and the entire system in a short period of time.

Mr. Stroker then asked Commissioners to participate in a dot-voting exercise and to cast their vote for one interest area only. At the conclusion of the exercise it was determined that a task force would be created

to study the issue of age of delinquency. Mr. Hilkey concluded that Commission leadership would meet over the next month to characterize the work and begin the process of establishing the group.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Hilkey thanked Commissioners for their time and asked the group for any final comments. He pointed out that, after December, the Commission will hold its meetings in a new location at the Jefferson County Department of Human Services. He added that the next meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 8<sup>th</sup>. With no further business, Mr. Hilkey adjourned the meeting at 3:57 p.m.

Starting January 2018, the Commission meeting location will be:  
Jefferson County Dept. of Human Services  
900 Jefferson County Pkwy, Golden, CO 80401