Community Corrections Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes: 11/15/2019

Date/Time: November 15, 2019, 5:30 p.m.-7:30 p.m.
Meeting Location: Wellington Webb Building, 201 West Colfax Ave Conf Room 4F6
Facilitator: Johanna Leal
Present Advisory Group Members:
Greg Mauro, Mike Anderson, Hon. Candi CdeBaca, David Johnson, Dianne Tramutola Lawson,
Jane Prancan, Mannie Rodriguez, Joe Thome

1. General
   a. Minutes Reviewed and Accepted
   b. Public Feedback Review
      i. Shared feedback received from community
      ii. Response to prior questions (See Attachment 1)

2. Subcommittee Reports
   a. Standards Committee
      i. General
         1. Hassan Has met with DCJ
         2. Next meeting on 11/18/2019
      ii. Update on Participation: Subcommittee Members include: Rachael Lehman, Valarie Schamper, Carlos, Esther Smith, Joe Thome, Hassan Latif.
      iii. Main Goal/Focus of Group
         1. To understand the fiscal and programmatic impact of the Denver Criminal Justice Office of Community Corrections standards on the operation of Community Corrections facilities/programs in Denver.
      iv. Tasks Prioritized
         1. Developing greater understanding of the waiver process.
         2. Identifying standards that are eligible for waiver based on “Denver Centric Issues”
         3. Identify which statutory baselines preclude modification of standard.
         4. Identify which changes might require additional financial support from the city to enact.
         5. Identify the impact that the 2017 DCJ Standards have on current Denver providers.
         6. Identify the impact that the 2017 DCJ Standards have on influencing the decision-making process for new programs to enter the market.
         7. Understand the impact that substantial use of waivers may have on performance-based contracting.
      v. How next steps align with the goal of the committee to provide recommendations
b. Statutes Committee
   i. Update on Participation: Jane Prancan, Mike Anderson, Dianne Tramutola Lawson, David Johnson, Katie Ruske, Karen Brody, Chris Morley, and Taj Ashaheed.
   ii. Main Goal/Focus of Group: To review each of the statutes which governs the operation of community corrections.
   iii. Tasks Prioritized
        1. Provided handouts to group with list of relevant statutes with a bullet summary of the key themes of the sections.
        2. Developing a working understanding regarding the interplay between state agencies, local governments, boards and stakeholders.
   iv. How next steps align with goal of the committee to provide recommendations
        1. Developing an understanding of how changing service provision at the statutory level impacts not only this district, but other districts as well
        2. Understanding the interplay between funding and local authority. (e.g. expansion of services is possible under current model but may not be funded by the state.)
        3. There may be an opportunity for this group to advocate for extending back the eligibility for ISP.

c. Complaints Committee
   i. Update on Participation: Greg Mauro (Denver Community Corrections Director), Crystal Owin (Colorado Division of Criminal Justice), Amy Kafuuma (Above Waters), Whitney Leeds (Above Waters), Janet van der Laak (Above Waters), Jaime Ray - Second Chance Center, Jennifer Kaufman (Denver Community Corrections Board Staff)
   ii. Main Goal/Focus of Group
        1. To create recommendations for a transparent and effective complaint response process which addresses the concerns of all stakeholders.
   iii. Tasks Prioritized
        1. Review of survey data provided by Above Waters Project
        2. Reviewed state and local level grievance process.
        3. Identification of barrier to reporting
        4. Explored new methods including 3rd party reporting mechanism
        5. Explored improved methods of communication to residents regarding reporting
   iv. How next steps align with goal of the committee to provide recommendations
        1. Committed to study the opportunities for clients and families to have better process to file a grievance, complaint or feedback.
        2. Continue to identify what currently exists and how to improve.

d. Gender Specific Committee
   i. Update on Participation: Michelle Sykes, Jaime Torres, Lisa Calderon, Pam Clifton, Kerrie Landell, Stephanie Robertson
   ii. Main Goal/Focus of Group:
1. To identify gender responsive and trauma informed care practices could improve women’s experiences in community corrections.

iii. Tasks Prioritized
1. Focus group scheduled for 11/16/2019 to hear from women with lived experience in community corrections.

iv. How next steps align with goal of the committee to provide recommendations
1. Continue to provide opportunities for women with lived experience (both as residents and service providers) to have a role in assisting the subcommittee to create meaningful change.
2. Continue to reduce barriers in participation in the change making process.

e. Zoning
i. Update on Participation: Thomas Hernandez-Tribe Recovery Homes, Above Waters Project, Jamie Torres, Candi CdeBaca, Dr. Lehman, Independence house.

ii. Tasks Prioritized:
1. Explored the recovery act
2. Explored use of master leases instead of substance use disorder treatment specific permit for zoning.
3. Understanding interplay between zoning requirements and other regulations such as Ord. 565.

iii. How next steps align with goal of the committee to provide recommendations
1. Exploring how to integrate the needs of Community corrections within the broader conversation about group living.
2. Identifying stakeholders from group living conversations to bring to the subcommittee groups.
3. Assuring that community neighborhood organizations are included in the conversation.

3. Other General comments
   a. There is a need to acknowledge that statutes and standards account for only a portion of the rules to which community corrections facilities must adhere. Other considerations include: Case Law, state standards are required by statute, ACA, public health regulations, municipal rule and law, life/safety, treatment standards for special populations, office of behavioral health regulations.
   b. Auditing process of facilities needs to be focused on continuous quality improvement and should be less punitive in nature. Technical as stance and partnership are strategies which drive quality improvement.
Question/Statement:
Is there a committee work toward community partners, recovery homes and alternative housing for placement?
Response:
Zoning Subcommittee will address this concern.

Question/Statement:
Is these number of 500 beds reflect the city and county jail beds in community corrections? Some never get a doc number.
Response:
500 beds includes both DOC and Diversion populations.

Question/Statement:
I believe zoning issues need to be reworked to fit our current resources, partners and organizations. Really look at issues like ordinance 565 make it work. Fix what’s broken.
Response:
There is a zoning specific subcommittee of this group. Ordinance 565 will be discussed in a future meeting.

Question/Statement:
What was your process for shutting down solitary confinement? Why can’t the same be done here? You agreed solitary didn’t work as this community correction-great change begins with small choices.

DOC rep Response:
This was a 6 to 7-year process. Changes occurred incrementally over time as alternative environments were developed. There are still units that are higher security, but they provide more time out and more human contact.

Question/Statement:
How do we find an option for those that are attempting to find a place to live with a felony conviction? It’s hard to find a place so how can it become easier.
Response:
Group discussion: Background checks were identified as a primary barrier with possibility of exploring “check the box” equivalent changes to housing, ¾ house options, exploring what was done in the past. Community corrections use permits are still required for ¾ houses due to definitions.

Question/Statement:
Which community house you have now is the most successful? When do we get to speak on our thoughts on this. I can tell you from experiences of the time spent in prison.
Response:
Defining success is important, as that changes what measures are used to compare facilities. Looking at termination statistics from years to year, Fillmore tends to have higher successful terminations. The annual report is available online.

**Question/Statement:**
Education is the key, it has to start in prison. If you educate in prison, and create a reasonable halfway house, you can have more success. Don’t treat halfway house rules as DOC rules, they don’t work. Community is not prison, change the perception change the outlook.

**Response:**

**Group Discussion:**
- Power of language: committee considers the language “inmate”, “resident”, “client” may have different meetings.
- Important to differentiate Statutes, Standards, Program rules. Many stakeholders have difficulty differentiating at a practical level.
- Impact on activities of modern daily life should be considered (cell phones, driving privileges, limited housing resources, employment barriers)