
[Meeting Minutes – May 28, 2021](#)

Council Member Attendance

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|--|
| Allison George | Glenn Tapia | |
| Jenny Wood | Tim Hand | |
| Jason Talley | Chad Dilworth | |
| Jason Shankle | Hassan Latif | |
| Judge Bland | | |
| John Draxler | | |
| Bill Cecil1 | | |

Welcome and Introductions

Approval of the Minutes from the March 26, 2021 Meeting :


Ms. Bacchi did not have the minutes ready for the Council's review today. They will be reviewed and voted on by email or at a future meeting.

Community Corrections Standards Review

When the Community Corrections Standards were revised in 2017, they were done so with a promise to review them after a few years to see if they were accomplishing the intended goals for community corrections. The OCC has developed two plans in which to start this review process which they presented at the meeting today. Proposal 1 was presented by Chrystal Owin and Proposal 2 was presented by Lydia Brogren. Ms. Owin noted that these were developed by the OCC team in brainstorming sessions and welcomed any feedback the Council might have. The presentation is included with these minutes.


OCC Proposed Framework for Standards Review:

- Proposal 1:
 - Proposal 1 is targeted to all stakeholders via email, the OCC website, the OCC newsletter, interagency meetings and partner agencies, and would include a survey for each section of the standards (4 separate surveys). Each survey will be open for two weeks with a link to the current standards document. The survey would include the following choices for each standard:
 - Revise - If the respondent chooses Revise they are asked to provide alternate language.



Governor's Community Corrections Advisory Council
Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Community Corrections
700 Kipling St, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80215

- Remove – If the respondent chooses Remove, they are then asked to explain why they want it removed.
- If neither choice is made by the respondent, then by default, the choice is to leave the standard as it is currently written.
- There will be section on each survey asking the respondent to tell us about themselves so we can see who we are reaching.
- The respondent will also be asked to include any standards they believe need to be added in the section that is being reviewed.
- The respondent will be asked if they would like to participate on a subcommittee regarding possible revisions to each section of the Standards.
- The surveys will be disseminated in a variety of ways to make sure to they are reaching as many stakeholders and partners as possible.
- The estimated time for this project would be 12 weeks.
- The OCC will also explore other avenues for interested parties to submit feedback regarding the standards in an effort to avoid any barriers that might be created by offering the survey only.
- Once the data from the survey is analyzed, the OCC would convene 4 diverse working groups, one for each section of the standards. If a particular stakeholder group seems to be under-represented in any of the working groups, the OCC would directly solicit participation from that stakeholder group.
- The working groups would structure the review focused on the results of the survey responses and trends and any non-negotiables. The working group would present their outcomes to the Advisory Council for Discussion and final recommendation.
- Proposal 2:
 - The OCC would solicit public comment from all stakeholders around the state to include program staff, board staff/members, referring/supervising agencies, community-based partners/organizations, victims' advocates/groups, client advocacy groups, SOMB/DVOMB, clients, client's families/support systems, GAC, OCC staff and community members. This would be via email, the OCC website, the OCC newsletter, interagency meetings and partner agencies.
 - There would be 4 Public Comment periods, one for each section of the Standards (as noted in Proposal 1). Deadlines would be determined as to the length of each period (could possibly two weeks as noted in proposal 1).
 - Stakeholders would send comments to an identified email and/or contact person within the OCC. OCC staff would collect and track the comments submitted during each period using word/excel.



Governor's Community Corrections Advisory Council
Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Community Corrections
700 Kipling St, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80215

- Once the deadline for each period expires, the comments would then be reviewed with the GAC for discussion and recommendation. He standards would then be updated and the results of those revisions would be posted to the OCC website.
- The next Public comment period would then be opened up and the process would be repeated.

- Council Response

Mr. Draxler prefers 1st option and believes it would streamline the process. Mr. Tapia also prefers structure of option 1. He suggests not include any standards in the surveys that are non-negotiables for the OCC, as doing so may hinder the collaborative intent of the survey process. In response to this, Ms. Owin proposed to make non-negotiables clear and upfront and possibly just ask for revisions in those cases where removal is not an option.

Mr. Talley expressed concerns for the timeline for Proposal 2 as those reviews are dependent on the review by the GAC. Ms. Brogren and Ms. Owin advised that there could be changes made to the process to keep the timeline within the same 12-week period as proposal 1.

Mr. Cecil questioned the UA testing and how necessary is it to be done as frequently as it is. Mr. Draxler described some of the difficult discussions from the 2017 revisions. Mr. Cecil noted that the standard should be reviewed to consider changes in marijuana laws and the rising use of CBD for medicinal purposes.

Ms. Ruske reminded the Council that the UA standard has already been revised and the implementation was put on hold due to Covid. OCC staff provided a presentation at the last GAC meeting regarding this standard and stakeholders have been advised that the revised standard will go into effect on July 1 2021. This gives providers time to request a waiver if they are not quite ready to implement it at the beginning of the fiscal year.

She also reminded the GAC that the by-laws allow them to convene subcommittees at will. She explained that if they wanted one to work on the standards revisions specifically, they could convene one.

Ms. Ruske complemented Ms. Owin and Ms. Brogren on their presentation of the standards review proposals and advised that the OCC as a whole is working to engage and receive feedback from a broader spectrum of the community and stakeholders we partner with every day. Mr. Cecil advised that Second Chance Center may be able to provide access to clients involved in the criminal justice system as part of the feedback loop for our office.

PBC Consultant Presentation

Mr. Brian Pool, the consultant hired to assist the OCC with the RFI for PBC, introduced himself and then presented an update on this project for the council. The presentation is included with these minutes.

The RFI discussed in this presentation is the Request for Information for that JBC that is due on January 3, 2022. Mr. Pool recognized the stakeholders served by community corrections and the OCC. Mr. Hand asked that the Parole Board and local law enforcement be added to the stakeholder list.

He then provided a Project Road Map to show the council what the different steps are as this project moves forward.

Mr. Pool guided the GAC through a Vision Exercise. Below are some comments from council members as part of the exercise.

- What do you hope stakeholders say about the CC system?
 - Mr. Draxler: CC has a place in CO and do a fairly good job. Maybe concerned about PBC not being funded by the legislature.
 - Mr. Hand: Clients and the Public expectations: Quality level of service to those we serve- Directed around outcomes-Confusion about CC in regard to broader stakeholder group.
 - Mr. Tapia: No gaps between the paper, performance, and practices.
- What do clients and the public expect to get from the system?
 - Better outcomes
 - Performance Enhancement
 - Confidence and trust in the CC system
 - Hassan Latif:
 - Clients: They want to find a way to transition quicker to be supported more while they are in CC. Most clients feel as though there are too many barriers to their progression that they see as burdensome and unnecessary i.e. Not needing to start over in CC when they have already received programming in DOC. Clients would like to see their work acknowledged prior to arriving at CC.
 - Would hope that people would say they felt respected, supported, encouraged, etc.
 - Let's do less of defending our own careers and our own positions and programs. Let's look for better practices for the field at large. No one should be satisfied with how the community corrections system has been operating.
 - Bill Cecil: The people that deal with the clients that create a positive or negative impact for them.

- The hope that clients want to go to CC rather than have to go to CC.
- Chad Dilworth: With the wide variety of positive and negative outcomes, we need to incentivize those that are working well and take a closer look at those that are not.
- Jason Shankle: There needs to be a culture competency in terms of employee evaluations. Just as much as we focus on clients, we also need to consider staff and overall cultural competency towards others.


DOCT Community Corrections Termination Process Improvements

Mr. Hand described a concerning situation that has come up recently where county sheriffs will not allow transition clients into their jails. There have been a couple of instances where parole officers needed to remove one of their clients from a facility due to safety issues and that move was delayed because the jail would not accept that transition client into their facility. Mr. Hand, Ms. Owin and others have been working on a work group to address these concerns and they have come up with a plan to help with this issue. The administrative review process was identified as a place where the process can be changed to be consistent and thoughtful between both probation/diversion and transition clients. Mr. Johnson from the Division of Adult Parole is also part of this work group. This process maps out consistent steps and it is transparent. Mr. Dilworth asked if the parole board can get access to this information as it would be helpful. Ms. Ruske commented that this improved communication is going to benefit clients as well.

Standing Items

Updates

- Legislative Updates
 - House Bill 21-1097 is the creation of behavioral health administration and was passed and signed into law by the Governor. The consulting group working on this has continued to reach out to stakeholders through this process. Mr. Tapia has been working on a smaller work group for this and described details that have been topics of conversation regarding the criminal justice system and funds.
 - Mr. Tapia and Ms. Wood thought it would be beneficial to the GAC to have someone from her office come review the 2-22 initiative. This initiative focuses on clinician credentialing and could play an important role in the treatment of criminal justice-involved individuals.
 - Senate Bill 21-138 focuses on traumatic brain injury (TBI) and how to incorporate TBI practice and screening into the criminal justice system. The bill has not yet passed or been signed but Community Corrections is a required partner if it passes.



Governor's Community Corrections Advisory Council
Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Community Corrections
700 Kipling St, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80215

- Mr. Tapia asked if the OCC was monitoring the Sex Offender management Board (SOMB) Sunset Bill with regard to community corrections specifically and Ms. Ruske affirmed that we are watching for any details that would impact our system.

- Budget Updates

Ms. Ruske advised that after April's billing, we are projected to return approximately 18 million dollars to the state in placement funds. Despite this there was a slight increase in placements/average daily population (ADP) in April. We are also projecting an increase in May and June as well that will bring that placement fund reversion down slightly as courts move to fill their dockets. There are more community corrections referrals coming from the diversion side. DOC placements are lower, which in turn, is making community corrections referrals low. The OCC continues to monitor that situation with DOC.

Mr. Cecil asked if there were any concerns about the closing of community corrections facilities in the Denver area, to which Ms. Ruske responded with a couple of details:


- Denver received approval from city council for 2-year extension with CoreCivic,
- Denver has purchased Tooley Hall for use as a female facility in the future.

While this positive news does not diminish concerns about low numbers across the state impacting our providers, we remain hopeful for an increase in census as courts begin to get back to normal.

Mr. Tapia commented about hearing that ACRC was potentially closing. He worries in the future about filling bed space and proposed an idea about allowing high risk misdemeanor clients into community corrections. This effort would provide high risk misdemeanor clients access to the services in community corrections that they may benefit from moving forward.

He added that reimagining what the target population looks like for community corrections because misdemeanants may benefit from community corrections, but are unable to because they are on a misdemeanor case. Mr. Draxler agreed that there is a portion of those that are convicted of misdemeanors could really benefit from the services provided in community corrections. Mr. Hand asked if there might be a particular misdemeanor case that would benefit the most? Mr. Tapia commented that there is no relationship between type of crime and risk/need profile, that this conversation shouldn't be based on the crime, but based on the person. Mr. Hand proposed setting up a small work group to discuss this topic. Ms. George also offered to be on the committee. Ms. Ruske asked if the GAC would like to have a presentation on the history of community corrections and how it became felony only prior to setting up the work group. There were several Council members that want to get this conversation started as the need is present. Mr. Talley also noted that this idea would be helpful to rural communities.

Ms. Ruske noted that we need to be cautious and not make the focus of community corrections so narrow as to exclude those clients Glenn started the conversation about. Mr. Hand took the names of volunteers from the council in attendance and it was noted that Ms. Bacchi would send out a solicitation to see who else from the council might be interested in joining the work group.



Governor's Community Corrections Advisory Council
Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Community Corrections
700 Kipling St, Suite 1000
Denver, Colorado 80215

- o Volunteers for the working group to discuss expanding community corrections population: Tim Hand, Glenn Tapia, Alison George, John Draxler, Chad Dilworth, Jason Talley.

The long bill was signed by the Governor. During figure setting, there was a statewide common policy provide rate increase of 2.5%. This increases the community corrections budget lines by 2.5%. Our budget analyst made an adjustment to the residential placement line to keep it the same, meaning that there will be per diem rate increase but the number of beds will slightly decrease to cover the rate increase. Because the bed utilization is down due to the pandemic, the slight decrease in the number of beds is not a worry at this time.

The other item that resulted from the long bill was the Request for Information (RFI) for Performance-Based Contracting (PBC). The RFI asks for specific details about the PBC plan and is due to the JBC on January 3, 2022. More details are available at the OCC PBC webpage: <https://dcj.colorado.gov/performance-based-contracting> .

Mr. Draxler asked about the CBT pilot program to which Ms. Ruske gave a brief update about the history of the program and where it stands now. Mr. Draxler asked if there would be interest from the GAC to have Greg Mauro from the Denver board come speak about the pilot program with positive responses from several council members. The OCC will reach out to Mr. Mauro and ask him to come present to the Council at a future meeting.

Action Items:

- No updates on action items that were previously standing.
- Send out Standard Revision to council
- Send out UA PowerPoint to council
- Presentation on Initiative 2-22
- Working group for target population in Community Corrections
- Greg Mauro: Present successes and struggles of CBT program
- Send out the RFI language and Mr. Pool's presentation
- EOMIS – New system status at DOC.

Announcements:

Hassan Latif advised the GAC that Second Chance Center has been running vaccination clinics to help get criminal justice involved clients and their families vaccinated. See the Second Chance Facebook page for more information.

Adjournment:

Next meeting – Friday, July 23, 2021, Virtual Start at 12:00 pm