

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP**

**MONDAY, AUGUST 31, 2009 11:30 A.M.
ADMINISTRATION CONFERENCE ROOM
2ND FLOOR CITY HALL
250 N. 5TH STREET**

1. **Review of Emergency Medical Services Council (EMS)** [*Attach W-1*](#)
2. **Review of Methamphetamine Task Force** [*Attach W-2*](#)
3. **Review of 5-2-1 Drainage Authority** [*Attach W-3*](#)
4. **Review of Criminal Justice Leadership 21st Judicial** [*Attach W-4*](#)
5. **Grand Valley Transit – Funding and Extended Hours**
6. **Adjourn**

EMS Advisory Council

Emergency Medical Services (Advisory) Council

Established:

Established in November, 2004 by County Resolution effective January, 2005

Mission/Purpose:

The Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Council of Mesa County shall serve as an advisory body to the Board of County Commissioners concerning the development, operation, and evaluation of the county Emergency Medical System as set forth in the Mesa County Emergency Medical Services Resolution No. MCM 2004-220. The EMS Council shall advise the Board and the Director of Emergency Management in all matters relating to the Resolution, to matters relating to prehospital emergency medical services, and will provide consultation or make recommendations as may be requested by the Board or Director. The Council's activities shall include:

DUTIES

- a) Advise the Board on all matters relating to the Mesa County Emergency Medical Services System;
- b) Make recommendations concerning development and implementation of countywide emergency medical services;
- c) Identify and make recommendations concerning countywide emergency medical needs;
- d) Review and approve new rules and modifications to rules pertaining to EMS prior to adoption of such rules or modifications by the Board.
- e) Seek advice and counsel, up to and including the establishment of special ad hoc committees with other individuals, groups, organizations or associations when in the judgment of the council such is advisable to obtain necessary expertise for the purpose of meeting the council's responsibilities under the Mesa County EMS Resolution and as identified in the bylaws. The Council is authorized to establish special committees for the functions described in this paragraph (e);
- f) Review and make recommendations to the Department of Emergency Management and the Board regarding the amount, allocation, and expenditure of funds for the development, implementation, and maintenance of the countywide emergency medical system.
- g) Engaging in long term planning and coordinating public education and injury prevention activities as they relate to emergency medical services.
- h) Developing and implementing a mutual aid plan to ensure the availability of ambulance service throughout the County.
- i) Coordinating with the Regional Emergency Medical and Trauma Advisory Council through the Director of Emergency Management.
- j) Prioritizing potential grant requests, assisting with planning and reporting requirements, and participating in other coordinating activities to most appropriately meet the needs of the citizens of Mesa County.

Membership/Terms:

Eleven members, appointed by the Mesa County Commissioners, are as follows: representatives from a licensed commercial ambulance service provider, a governmental agency that is a licensed services provider, a fire agency serving primarily a rural area, from Mesa County government, from a city/town in Mesa County, the communication center, a citizen, an advanced life support tech, a basic life support tech, a person with patient care privileges from a Mesa County hospital and the County EMS Medical Director. At least one Grand Junction City Councilmember shall represent Grand Junction. Terms are for three years.

Meetings:

Meets the 4th Monday of the month at 3:00 p.m. in County Administration at the Old Courthouse.

Attachments:

By-laws

MESA COUNTY EMS COUNCIL BYLAWS

I. PURPOSE

The Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Council of Mesa County shall serve as an advisory body to the Board of County Commissioners concerning the development, operation, and evaluation of the county Emergency Medical System as set forth in the Mesa County Emergency Medical Services Resolution No. MCM 2004-220. The EMS Council shall advise the Board and the Director of Emergency Management in all matters relating to the Resolution, to matters relating to prehospital emergency medical services, and will provide consultation or make recommendations as may be requested by the Board or Director. The Council's activities shall include:

II. DUTIES

- k) Advise the Board on all matters relating to the Mesa County Emergency Medical Services System;
- l) Make recommendations concerning development and implementation of countywide emergency medical services;
- m) Identify and make recommendations concerning countywide emergency medical needs;
- n) Review and approve new rules and modifications to rules pertaining to EMS prior to adoption of such rules or modifications by the Board.
- o) Seek advice and counsel, up to and including the establishment of special ad hoc committees with other individuals, groups, organizations or associations when in the judgment of the council such is advisable to obtain necessary expertise for the purpose of meeting the council's responsibilities under the Mesa County EMS Resolution and as identified in the bylaws. The Council is authorized to establish special committees for the functions described in this paragraph (e);
- p) Review and make recommendations to the Department of Emergency Management and the Board regarding the amount, allocation, and expenditure of funds for the development, implementation, and maintenance of the countywide emergency medical system.
- q) Engaging in long term planning and coordinating public education and injury prevention activities as they relate to emergency medical services.
- r) Developing and implementing a mutual aid plan to ensure the availability of ambulance service throughout the County.
- s) Coordinating with the Regional Emergency Medical and Trauma Advisory Council through the Director of Emergency Management.
- t) Prioritizing potential grant requests, assisting with planning and reporting requirements, and participating in other coordinating activities to most appropriately meet the needs of the citizens of Mesa County.

III. MEMBERSHIP

The EMS Council shall be composed of eleven members as follows:

- a) One representative of a commercial ambulance service that is licensed as an Ambulance Services Provider, if there is such a provider;
- b) One representative from a governmental agency that is licensed as an Ambulance Services Provider, if there is such an agency;
- c) One representative from a fire agency serving, primarily a rural area;
- d) One person with patient care privileges from a hospital within Mesa County;
- e) The Emergency Medical Services Medical Director;

- f) One representative from Mesa County government;
- g) One Advanced Life Support Emergency Medical Technician providing prehospital emergency medical care in Mesa County at the time of his/her appointment;
- h) One Basic Life Support Emergency Medical Technician providing prehospital emergency medical care in Mesa County at the time of his/her appointment;
- i) One representative of a city/town in Mesa County;
- j) One citizen representative;
- k) One representative of the Grand Junction Regional Communication Center.

IV. SELECTION PROCESS

At least one EMS Council member shall represent the city of Grand Junction. No more than three of the EMS Council members shall be from one agency. The Board will attempt, when possible to select representatives from all of the Ambulance Service Areas.

Annually – In January the Administrative Staff will advertise any anticipated board vacancies for the year and solicit letters of interest along with resumes.

Reappointments/New Appointments – Approximately three months prior to any term expiration, the Administrative Staff will send a letter to any individual whose term is expiring, soliciting a letter of interest in being reappointed. Response is requested within two weeks.

In addition, the Administrative Staff will advertise the opening approximately two months prior to expiration. The deadline for receipt of applications will be approximately one month prior to expiration of the term.

When a large volume of applications/resumes are received for a particular opening on a board, the Board of County Commissioners will review them in order to reduce them down to approximately six for interviews.

Approximately one month prior to the expiration date, a date is set for interviews. Applicants are scheduled for an interview – this may include existing members whose terms are expiring.

By majority vote of the Board of County Commissioners, a recommendation for reappointment/appointment will be made at Public Hearing.

Exceptions:

For those boards that do not require interviews based upon statutes, resolutions, and/or bylaws approved by the BOCC (i.e. Community Corrections Board), the Board of Commissioners will make appointments based on the material submitted by the applicants.

Following Public Hearing:

Administrative Staff will notify the appointee in writing the day appointment is made. Attached to their letter is a copy of the **Resolution Adopting Guidelines For Commissioner-Appointed Board Members.**

Unsuccessful candidates are notified in writing the day the appointment is made. Their letters of interest/resumes will be kept on file for future openings.

V. TERMS

Except for the first appointments to the EMS Council, the Board shall appoint representatives to a term of three years. Terms will be staggered to ensure that the terms of no more than four representatives expire in the same year. The Board may revoke an appointment at any time.

Vacancies on the EMS Council will be filled by the Board as soon as possible. Members appointed to fill a term which was vacated before the terms normal expiration date will fill out the remainder of that term.

Council members anniversary dates for their terms will be counted from the date that the Board approved the member's appointment. So, the the council members' "anniversary dates" for their terms will vary.

Any member may resign from his/her position on the EMS Council by submitting a written statement to the Board indicating their intent to resign.

If, before the expiration of his/her term, a member ceases to retain the status that qualified him/her for appointment to the EMS Council or resigns from his/her position, his/her membership will end, and there shall be a vacancy on the EMS Council to be filled by Board appointment as stated in the Resolution.

VI. OFFICERS AND DUTIES

Elected officers of the EMS Council shall be the Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, and Secretary.

- a. These officers shall be elected from among the voting members of the Council.
- b. The officers shall be elected by a majority vote of the ballots cast for their office
- c. Terms of the officers shall be one year commencing at the close of the meeting at which they were elected. Officers shall not serve more than three consecutive terms in one office.
- d. Nominations will be solicited and the first officers elected at the March 2005 meeting of the EMS Council. Beginning in the year 2006, nominations will be solicited at the February meeting and published in the minutes. The election of officers shall be carried out at the next regularly scheduled meeting. Terms shall commence with the meeting at which the officers are elected.
- e. No elected officer shall hold more than one office at a time.
- f. An officer may be removed from office:
 - (i) At any time for cause the Council may deem sufficient, by a vote of three-fourth of the entire voting membership. This vote shall take place at a meeting called for that purpose;

- (ii) Written notice giving time, place and purpose of this meeting shall be mailed to each member of the Council at least ten (10) working days prior to the meeting;
- (iii) If an officer is removed at such meeting, an election for a successor shall take place at the same meeting without previous notice of the election.
- g. Any officer may resign at any time upon giving written notice to the EMS Council. In the case of a vacancy in one or more offices, there shall be a special election to fill vacant positions at the next regular meeting.
- h. A vacancy in office shall exist in the event of an officer's ineligibility to hold office, death, resignation, or two unexcused absences.

Duties of the Chairperson shall be to:

- a. Preside at all meetings of the EMS Council.
- b. Observe and enforce the bylaws of the Council.
- c. Appoint all council members to Council committees immediately following, as practicable, the election of officers and establishment of committees, subject to confirmation by a majority vote of the council.
- d. Perform all such other duties incident to the office as provided by these bylaws and by the parliamentary authority.

Duties of the Vice Chair shall be to:

- a. Exercise the functions of the Chairperson in the absence, during the absence, or during the inability of the Chairperson to perform, or upon the Chairperson's request.
- b. Perform other duties the chairperson may prescribe.

Duties of the Secretary shall be to:

- a. Monitor attendance, rule and report on unexcused absences.
- b. Notify all Council members and announce to the public in a manner prescribed by the Council, the time and place of Council meetings and meetings of the Council's committees and task forces at least ten working days prior to such meetings and cancellations of such.
- c. Record, maintain, and distribute accurate minutes of all Council meetings.
- d. Make minutes available to the public through the Department of Emergency Management.
- e. Distribute to Council members the minutes of the previous meeting, the agenda of any Council meetings and any supplemental materials approved by the Chairperson pertaining to such meetings at least ten working days prior to such meetings.
- f. Maintain accurate and up-to-date lists of members of the Council, all Council Committees, ad hoc committees, and task forces.
- g. Perform such other administrative duties as requested by the Chairperson.

VII. MEETINGS

The regular meetings of the EMS Council shall be held on a monthly basis at a consistent hour, day and place. The Chair may call special meetings, or a majority of the

Council may request a special meeting, at any time on three days' prior notice by mail, or, in the case of an emergency, on twenty-four hours' notice by telephone or e-mail. All meetings of the EMS Council are open to the public and shall be noticed in accordance with the Colorado Open Meetings Law. Public notice of the meetings will be posted in at least two public places: one being the notice area at the Mesa County Courthouse and one being the notice area at Grand Junction City Hall. The Secretary shall send out notice of all meetings at least ten working days prior to the meetings to all board members and to any other citizens who advise the secretary in writing that they wish to be placed on the notice mailing list.

A quorum shall be a simple majority (51%) of the current appointed membership. A majority vote at a meeting where a quorum is present is required for action by the EMS Council.

VIII. ATTENDANCE

Members are expected to attend all regular meetings of the EMS Council. If unable to attend a given meeting, the member shall give advance notice to the Council Chair.

After two (2) consecutive unexcused absences, the member shall be advised by letter from the Board of the need for his/her presence. If there is no response to the letter within 30 days, the member shall be deemed to have relinquished his/her membership on the Council. Any member who is absent from four (4) meetings in any 12-month period shall be subjected to attendance review by the Chair and Vice Chair, to decide if relinquishment is appropriate. Appeals may be heard at the discretion and convenience of the Chair and Vice Chair.

IX. COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

Committees of the Council shall be established annually by majority vote following the election of officers;

- a) Committee membership shall be council members appointed by the Chairperson of the Council as described in the duties of the Chairperson in Section VI. Officers and Duties.
- b) Committees of the Council shall consist of not less than 3 voting members and no more than 5 voting members;
- c) Committees of the Council shall consist of an odd number of council members;
- d) Members of the committees shall elect a Chairperson from among its members at the first meeting of the committee;
- e) In the absence of the Chairperson at any meeting in which a quorum is present, the members present shall elect a chair to serve for that meeting only;
- f) A quorum is defined as a majority of the members;
- g) An established committee may be dissolved by a majority vote of the council;

Ad hoc committees and task forces with other individuals, groups, organizations or associations shall be established by a majority vote at any meeting of the Council:

- a) Membership shall be prescribed by majority vote of the council;
- b) Council Chairperson shall appoint the chairpersons of ad hoc committees and task forces; that chairperson shall come from council membership;
- c) An up-to-date list of members of each ad hoc committee or task force shall be maintained by the Chairperson, and shall be remitted to the Secretary of the Council.

Meetings of the Council Committees and any ad hoc committee or task force shall be open to the public with the exception of the Continuous Quality Review Committee per CRS 24-6, Part 4, and shall hear testimony from the public in attendance in a manner as prescribed by the committee;

- a) Meetings shall be at the call of the Chairperson of the committee or task force.
- b) Meetings shall be announced at least ten working days prior to the meeting date in a manner as prescribed by the Council.
- c) A majority of the current membership of Council committees or of any ad hoc committee or task force shall constitute a quorum.
- d) No proxy or absentee voting shall be allowed for any member of a committee or task force; however, a committee member may participate by teleconference.
- e) In the absence of the committee or task force chairperson, the members shall elect a chairperson who shall serve for that meeting only.
- f) Meetings of Council committees, ad hoc committees, and task forces shall be conducted in the manner as prescribed in the parliamentary authority.
- g) Minutes of all committee meetings shall be made, copies of which shall be remitted to the Secretary of the Council.

Recommendations of council committees, ad hoc committees and task forces to the Council shall have been adopted by consensus of those present at the meeting. Should consensus not be attainable, then the recommendation shall be by majority vote of the respective committee or task force members at a meeting. Reports to the council shall include summary of public testimony heard in developing the committee recommendation.

X. AMENDMENTS

A two-thirds vote of current membership may amend these bylaws at any regularly scheduled meeting of the EMS Council, provided copies of the proposed amendments are sent to all members of the EMS Council at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting at which action is to be taken. The amended bylaws become effective immediately.

XI. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

The meetings of the EMS Council shall be conducted in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order, newly revised*.

XII. CERTIFICATE OF THE CHAIR

The undersigned, Chair of the EMS Council, does hereby certify that the above and the foregoing Bylaws, consisting of seven (7) pages, were duly adopted by at least two-thirds (2/3) of the members of said council on _____, and that they now constitute said Bylaws.

Chair

Meth Task Force

Mesa County Methamphetamine Task Force

Established:

The Mesa County Meth Task Force (MTF), with the fiscal agent of Mesa County Partners, Inc. has been in existence since 2005.

Mission/Purpose:

The Mesa County Methamphetamine Task Force (MTF) exists to implement the best practices of prevention, law enforcement and treatment leading to maximal reductions of this addiction, and its resultant destructive consequences.

Purpose

The Mesa County Methamphetamine Task Force's vision embraces premier science based strategies driving best practices in the prevention, intervention and treatment of methamphetamine addiction, and its injurious effects, in their community. Their resolve is to actualize these strategies through sustained focus on this singular problem.

Functions

Approach 1: Make Product as Difficult to Sell as Possible

Goal 1: Increase Arrests of Local Dealers

Objective 1: Increase arrests of drug offenders

- Strategy 1.1: Prioritize the most dangerous threats with a focus on dismantling drug trafficking organizations. Attention and resources will be focused on quality in addition to quantity of arrests.
- Strategy 1.2: Target local organizations operating in Mesa County.
- Strategy 1.3: Focus efforts on street level drug offenders and drug related crimes.

Goal 2: Target Supply coming into Mesa County

Objective 1: Optimize information gathering and sharing to most effectively address meth related activity.

- Strategy 1.1: Pursue regional efforts to gather and share information regarding offenders, including participation in the statewide Coplink.

Approach 2: Make product as difficult to produce as possible

Goal 1: Continue to evaluate the need for preventing access to pseudoephedrine; continue general tracking taking action as appropriate

Objective 1: Research tracking tools available to pharmacies and determine if more work needs to be done in this area.

Approach 3: Standard Prevention program to influence individual attitudes, values, and skills

Goal 1: Identify and implement science-based prevention programs appropriate for specific needs in Mesa County

Objective 1: Identify and implement appropriate prevention strategies for high risk youth (0-18) populations.

- Strategy 2.1: Develop a Prevention Package of services for high risk children and youth.
- Strategy 2.2: Secure funding to ensure that the Prevention Package of services is available to all youth involved in the Child Welfare or Juvenile Justice systems, and all youth whose parents are incarcerated.

Approach 4: Ensure the needs of Drug Endangered Children are met

Goal 1: Ensure all children involved in meth environments are identified by all agencies and information is appropriately shared.

Objective 1: Ensure all children involved in meth environments are identified by all agencies and information is appropriately shared.

- Strategy 1.1: Evaluate the effectiveness of MOU, ensuring that all youth (0-18) are included. This should include work on a computer tracking system.
 - Continue coordination with Colorado Alliance for Drug Endangered Children and National Alliance for Drug Endangered Children for a computer notification and tracking system to be shared by law enforcement and human services.
- Strategy 1.2: Implement an on-ongoing training program for LE & DHS (0-18) on this MOU.
- Strategy 1.3: Identify and engage all stakeholders to ensure they identify and report drug endangered children and that they become actively involved in community education efforts.

Approach 5: Ensure adequate treatment is available

Goal 1: Create and/or increase capacity for effective treatment for all users.

Objective 1: To Increase accessibility for effective, culturally appropriate, evidence based treatment for all adolescent and adult users in Mesa County.

- Strategy 1.1: Evaluate treatment in Mesa County available to adolescents & adults.
 - Encourage treatment providers to include their data in the InfoLine 211 system.
 - Collaborate with youth serving agencies, including health care providers, to ensure that substance abuse services are available for youth.
 - Collaborate with youth serving agencies, including health care providers, to collect data on accessibility and effectiveness of evidence based treatment. (Track how many youth are being served, what level of needs are they seeing, where are they going?, where were they assessed to go?, how many youth are being turned away)
 - Identify funding opportunities to address gaps in access to treatment for youth. Work with community partners to generate a scholarship fund to encourage willing low-income, in-school, underage persons to seek treatment with providers through other grant funding and donations.
- Strategy 1.2: Define & evaluate best practice for treatment of juveniles and their families, including those with special needs
- Strategy 1.3: Develop the capacity for treatment, identifying gaps to meet the needs of juveniles and their families
 - Assist in identifying appropriate training for human service & health care professionals regarding substance abuse treatment.
- Coordinate efforts of treatment providers in the community

- Work with ADAD certified agencies to assure continuity of services in Mesa County.

Objective 2: Improve holistic after care support for recovering users.

- Strategy 2.1: Implement an Adult Mentoring program to assist adult recovering users.
- Strategy 2.2: Identify and support mentoring models for adolescent recovering users.
- Strategy 2.3: Identify and support recovery friendly organizations to address barriers to successful transition back into the community post treatment (e.g. housing and employment) for both adolescent and adults.

Objective 3: Ensure support systems are available for family members of meth users

- Strategy 3.1: Expand the capacity for support groups for family members
- Strategy 3.2: Develop a system to keep information regarding services in the community current.

Approach 6: Community Education/Public Relations

Goal 1: Ensure that Mesa County is educated about methamphetamine and its impacts, and methods of prevention

Objective 1: Develop an educational public awareness campaign that explains:

- How to identify meth use, distribution, manufacturing, and how to intervene
- How to identify Drug Endangered Children and the connection to abuse and neglect and how to intervene.
- What individuals can do to prevent meth use.
- How to identify the best practices in treatment for meth and current treatment available in Mesa County – using the message of hope.

Membership/Terms:

Key stakeholders have been instrumental in the creation and sustainability of the task force. They include Build A Generation, City of Grand Junction, Grand Junction Police Department, Colorado West Regional Mental Health, Drug Enforcement Administration, Western Colorado Drug Task Force and other local law enforcement, Grand Junction Housing Authority, Grand Mesa Youth Services Center, Hilltop Community Resources, Mesa County, Mesa County Criminal Justice Services, Mesa County Department of Human Services, District Attorney's Office, the Mesa County Health Department, Mesa State College, Partners, Probation, School District # 51, and St. Mary's Hospital. Many of these have representatives on the board.

The membership organization is composed of over 400 members representing 62 organizations to include non-profit entities, government agencies, counselors, businesses, and individuals interested in eradicating our community of meth.

Meetings:

The Executive Committee meets the first Thursday of each month with the times of the meetings varying. Each week the Coordinator sends an email to the Meth Task Force with information about upcoming committee meetings, training opportunities, and current literature.

Attachments: There are no bylaws.

5-2-1

5-2-1 Drainage Authority

Established:

The 5-2-1 DA was formed in June 2004 by an IGA between the City of Grand Junction, the City of Fruita, the Town of Palisade, Mesa County, and the Grand Valley Drainage District. The 5-2-1 DA is responsible for Stormwater Services within its service area.

Mission/Purpose:

The 5-2-1 DA was formed in order to protect people and property from flooding, to comply with federal environmental regulations regarding water quality, and to provide a funding mechanism so that the stormwater services can be performed.

Purpose

Beginning in 2008, the 5-2-1 DA provided stormwater management services and is responsible for NPDES compliance in the areas it serves within Mesa County. The 5-2-1 DA complies with NPDES and other environmental regulations and informs the public about stormwater quality and projects. Routine operations and maintenance currently will be performed by that entity in whose boundary the needed maintenance is identified. The City of Grand Junction will continue to operate and maintain their facilities. Similarly, Mesa County will continue to operate and maintain their storm drain systems. The extensive system of open and piped drains of the Grand Valley Drainage District will remain their responsibility.

Functions

Stormwater Management is the process of public education coupled with understanding, analyzing, planning for, and controlling stormwater. Stormwater management plays a critical role in controlling flooding, enhancing safety, protecting the environment, and meeting requirements of federal environmental regulations. Stormwater should be managed for the common good, as runoff neither follows subdivision boundaries nor respects municipal boundaries.

A major purpose of the 5-2-1 DA is to address the multi-jurisdictional problems of stormwater management. Runoff from public lands such as the Colorado National Monument might cross private and public properties in the County, the City, under a state highway, and back into the County before entering the Colorado River at a point that happens to be in the City.

The 5-2-1 DA intends to manage stormwater to protect people and property from flooding and to comply with new environmental regulations. Due to the scope and variety of needs, it will be challenging to fulfill these objectives. Many existing facilities are aging, rusting or in need of repair and maintenance. The 5-2-1 DA also needs to construct new facilities to adequately address stormwater management in not only developing areas, but in all areas of the valley, including agricultural. Work on stormwater facilities is needed in all areas of the Grand Valley to varying degrees. Some facilities have reached their service life; a maintenance effort is not enough, replacement is necessary. Other facilities have become overgrown or eroded to a point

where maintenance is needed. Lastly, facilities are not adequate or even in existence. Often major capital construction is needed to correct deficiencies.

Membership/Terms:

The 5-2-1 DA is governed by a Board of Directors. Five Board members are appointed individually, one each by: Grand Junction City Council, Fruita City Council, Palisade Town Board, Mesa County Board of Commissioners, and the Grand Valley Drainage District Board of Directors. Terms are for four years.

Meetings:

Meetings are held in the Mesa County Courthouse Annex at 544 Rood Avenue, Grand Junction, Colorado, Training Room B, the fourth Wednesday of each month beginning at 3:00 p.m. unless otherwise noted.

Attachments:

By-laws

**BY-LAWS
OF THE
5-2-1 DRAINAGE AUTHORITY**

Section 1. Authority. The 5-2-1 Drainage Authority is a separate governmental entity a political subdivision and public corporation of the State of Colorado possessing those powers which are specifically authorized by, and compliant with, C.R.S. Section § 29-1-204.2 et seq.

Section 2. Purpose. It is hereby declared that these by-laws, adopted in accordance with C.R.S. § 29-1-204.2(3), will serve a public purpose and are adopted to facilitate the conduct of the business, objects, and affairs of the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority and of the Board of Directors.

Section 3. Policies of the Board. It shall be the policy of the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority Board of Directors, consistent with the availability of revenues, personnel and equipment, to use its best efforts to provide and develop drainage structures and facilities in whole or part for the benefit of the inhabitants within the areas served by the Contracting Parties. It is also the policy of the Board of Directors to manage storm water drainage to reduce or eliminate damage to existing or proposed facilities, and for the management of storm water quality pursuant to Colorado Discharge Permit System under Division Regulation No. 61 within Contracting Parties respective jurisdictions.

Section 4. Board of Directors. All powers, privileges and duties vested in, or imposed upon the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority (hereinafter referred to as "Authority") by law shall be exercised and performed by and through the Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as "Board") whether set forth specifically or impliedly in these by-laws.

Section 5. Office.

- a. Business Office. The principal business office of the Authority shall be at 722 23 Road in Grand Junction, Colorado, unless otherwise designated by the Board.
- b. Establishing Other Offices and Relocation. The Board, by resolution, may from time to time, designate, locate and relocate its executive and business office and such other offices as, in its judgment, are necessary to conduct the business of the Authority.

Section 6. Meetings.

- a. Regular Meetings. In addition to the annual meeting referenced in the Intergovernmental Agreement forming the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority regular meetings of the Board shall be held at a time and place to be determined by the Board.

- b. Meeting Public. All meetings of the Board, other than those held in executive session, shall be open to the public. The Board, upon the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the quorum present, may hold an executive session only at a regular or special meeting and for the sole purpose of considering any of the following matters: (i) the purchase, acquisition, lease, transfer or sale of any real, personal, or other property interest; except that no executive session shall be held for the purpose of concealing the fact that a member of the Board has a personal interest in such purchase, acquisition, lease, transfer or sale; (ii) conferences with an attorney for the Authority for the purposes of receiving legal advice on specific legal questions; (iii) matters required to be kept confidential by federal or state law or rules and regulations; (iv) specialized details of security arrangements or investigations; (v) determining positions relative to matters that may be subject to negotiations, developing strategy for negotiations, and instructing negotiators; (vi) personnel matters except if the employee who is the subject of the session has requested an open meeting, or, if the personnel matter involves more than one employee, and all of the employees have requested an open meeting; (vii) consideration of any documents protected by the mandatory non-disclosure provisions of Part 2 of Article 72 of Title 24 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, commonly known as the "Open Records Act"; except that no adoption of any proposed policy, position, resolution, rule, regulations, or formal action shall occur at any executive session which is not open to the public.
- c. Notice of Meetings. Notice of the time and place for all regular meetings shall be posted in at least three public places within the boundaries of the Authority; said three public places are to be established by annual resolution of the Board, and, in addition, one such notice shall be posted in the office of the Mesa County Clerk and Recorder. Such notices shall remain posted and shall be changed in the event that the time or place of such regular meetings is changed.
- d. Special Meetings. Special meetings may be called by the Chairman or any two (2) Directors by informing the other Directors in writing not less than two (2) or more than thirty (30) days before the date, time, and place of such special meeting, and the purpose for which such meeting is called, and by posting notice of such special meeting 24 hours prior to such meeting at the locations established in 6.c. above. Attendance of a director at any meeting of the Board shall constitute a waiver by such director of notice of such meeting except when such director attends such meeting for the express purpose of objecting to the transaction of any business because the meeting is not lawfully called or convened.

Section 7. Conduct of Business.

- a. Quorum. All official business of the Board shall be transacted at a regular or special meeting at which a quorum is present. A majority of the number of directors then in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business except that a full Board must be in office and present at a properly convened meeting to consider initiating condemnation proceedings or to institute or raise rates and/or fees.
- b. Vote Requirements. There is a duty to vote; absent conflict of interest issues (Section 11, herein) each Director shall cast a vote on each question to come before the Board. Any action of the Board shall require the affirmative vote of a majority of the Directors present and voting. When special or emergency circumstances affecting the affairs of the Authority and the health and safety of Authority residents so dictate, then those Directors available at the time may undertake whatever action is considered necessary and may so instruct the Authority's employees. All such actions shall be placed on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled meeting and actions taken need ratification by a majority of the Board present at that next meeting. For actions of condemnation and institution or raise of rates and/or fees a super majority of at least seventy-five (75) percent of the full Board is required.
- c. Order of Business. The business of all regular meetings of the Board will be conducted according to the order adopted by the Board.
- d. Resolution and Orders. Each and every action of the Board necessary for the governing and management of the affairs of the Authority, for the execution of the powers vested in the Authority, and for carrying into effect the provisions of Article 1 of Title 29, C.R.S., as amended, shall be taken by the passage of motions, orders or resolutions.
- e. Minutes Book. Within a reasonable time after passage, all orders, resolutions and motions and all minutes of Board meetings shall be recorded in a book kept for that purpose and shall be attested by the secretary.

Section 8. Directors, Officers and Personnel.

- a. Director Qualifications and Terms: Surety Bond. The number of Directors shall be five, each of whom shall be appointed, one apiece by the governing body of each of the Contracting Parties. Each director shall serve at the pleasure of the governing body of the Contracting Party by whom that director was appointed. The initial terms of each Director shall be determined by lot with two (2) of the five (5) initial directors serving a two (2) year term and the three (3) of initial five (5) serving a four (4) year term. Each successive appointment shall be for a four (4) year term and all appointees may serve for successive terms.

- b. Oath of Office. Each member of the Board, before assuming the responsibilities of the office, but in no event later than 30 days after appointment except for good cause shown, shall take and subscribe an oath of office in the following form, and such oath of office shall be filed with the Clerk of the Mesa County District Court and with the Division of Local Government in the Colorado Department of Local Affairs:

OATH OF OFFICE OF DIRECTOR

STATE OF COLORADO)
)
COUNTY OF MESA)

I, _____, will faithfully support the Constitutions of the United States and of the State of Colorado, and the laws made pursuant thereto, and will faithfully perform the duties of office of Director of the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority, upon which I am about to enter.

_____ Signature

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 20_____.

County Clerk, District Court Clerk,
Chairman of the Board of Directors,
or Notary

- c. Election of Officers. After taking oath and filing bonds, the Board shall elect one of its members as Chairman of the Board and President of the Authority, one of its members as a Treasurer of the Board and Authority, and a Secretary who may be a member of the Board. The Secretary and Treasurer may be one person, but, if such is the case, shall be a member of the Board. The Board may also elect one of its members as Vice Chairman of the Board and Vice President of the Authority. The officers shall be elected by a majority of the Directors voting at said elections. Each officer so elected shall serve for a term of one year, which term shall expire upon the election of their successor or upon their reelection to that office. Vacancies of an officer should be filled by a majority vote of the Board at the next regular meeting

- d. Vacancies. Any vacancy on the Board shall be filled by appointment by the appropriate Contracting Party.
- e. President and Chairman. The president shall be the chairman of the Board and shall preside at all meetings; and shall also be the chief executive officer of the Authority. Except as otherwise authorized, the president shall sign all contracts, deeds, notes, debentures, warrants and other instruments on behalf of the Authority.
- f. Vice President and Vice Chairman. The vice president shall be the vice chairman of the Board and shall preside at all meetings in the absence of the chairman of the Board. Except as otherwise authorized, the vice president shall sign all contracts, deed, notes, debentures, warrants, and other instruments on behalf of the Authority in the absence of the president.
- g. Secretary. The secretary shall keep, or cause to be kept through a Recording Secretary, who may be appointed, in a well bound book, a record of all Authority proceedings, minutes of all meetings, certificates, contracts, bonds, given by employees, and all corporate acts which shall be open to inspection of all electors, as well as to all other interested parties. The secretary shall keep, or cause to be kept through a Recording Secretary, who may be appointed, all other records of the Authority; may act as secretary at meetings of the Board and record all votes, or cause all votes to be recorded; shall maintain a record of the proceedings of the Board in a minutes book, or cause the same to be maintained, which shall be an official record of the Board; and shall perform all other duties incident to that office. The secretary shall be custodian of the seal of the Authority and shall have the power to affix such seal to and attest all contracts and instruments authorized to be executed by the Board.
- h. Assistant Secretaries. All Directors not elected Secretary within the Authority may by affirmative vote be declared Assistant Secretaries to in the absence of the Secretary affix the Authority's seal to and attest all contracts and instruments to be executed by the Board.
- i. Treasurer. The treasurer shall keep, or cause to be kept, strict and accurate accounts of all money received by and disbursed for and on behalf of the Authority in permanent records. The treasurer shall file with the Clerk of the Mesa County District Court, at the expense of the Authority, a corporate fidelity bond in an amount determined by the Board of not less than \$5,000.00, conditioned on the faithful performance of the duties of the office.

- j. Compensation. Directors may receive compensation as prescribed by statute. No Director shall receive compensation as an employee of the Authority. No Board Member individually shall be a party in interest to any contract or transaction with the Authority. Reimbursement of actual expenses for Directors shall not be considered compensation.
- k. Additional Duties. The officers of the Board shall perform such other duties and functions as may from time to time be required by the Board, by the by-laws or rules and regulation of the Authority, or by special exigencies, which shall later be ratified by the Board.
- l. Manager. The Board may appoint a manager to serve for such term and upon such conditions, including salary, as the Board may establish. The manager shall have general supervision over the administration of the affairs, employees and business of the Authority and shall be charged with the hiring and discharging of employees and the management of Authority's properties. The manager shall have the care and custody of management of Authority's properties. The manager shall have the care and custody of all funds of the Authority in such banks or savings and loan associations as the Authority may select. The manager should approve all vouchers, orders, and checks for payment. The manager shall keep, or cause to be kept, regular books of account of all Authority transactions and shall obtain, at the Authority's expense, such bond for the faithful performance of the manager's duties as the Board may designate.
- m. Personnel Selection and Tenure. The selection of agents, employees, engineers, accountants, special consultants and attorneys of the Authority by the Board will be based upon the relative qualifications and capabilities of the applicants and shall not be based on political services or affiliations. Agents and employees shall hold their offices at the pleasure of the Board. Contracts for professional services of engineers, accountants, and special consultants and attorneys may be entered into on such terms and conditions as may seem reasonable and proper to the Board.

Section 9. Financial Administration.

- a. Fiscal Year. The fiscal year of the Authority shall commence on January 1 of each year and end on December 31.
- b. Budget Committee. The Board shall organize a Budget Committee. The Budget Committee is composed of the Treasurer, a member of the Board appointed by the President, the Manager and up to two (2) residents within the boundary of the Authority appointed by the Board, which shall be responsible for the preparation of the annual budget of the Authority and other matters as may be assigned to it by the Board.

- c. Budget. Each year, the Authority shall adopt an annual budget. By September 1st of each year the Board of Directors shall designate or appoint a person to prepare the budget and submit the same to the Board by October 15th of each year pursuant to C.R.S 29-1-108. Such budget shall present a complete financial plan for the Authority and shall set forth the following: (i) all proposed expenditures for administration, operations, maintenance, debt service, and capital projects to be undertaken or executed by any spending agency during the budget year; (ii) anticipated revenues for the budget year; (iii) estimated beginning and ending fund balances; (iv) the corresponding actual figures for the prior fiscal year and estimated figures projected through the end of the current fiscal year, including disclosure of all beginning and ending fund balances, consistent with the basis of accounting used to prepare the budget; (v) a written budget message describing the important features of the proposed budget, including a statement of the budgetary basis of accounting used and a description of the services to be delivered during the budget year; and (vi) explanatory schedules or statements classifying the expenditures by object and the revenue by source. No budget adopted shall provide for expenditures in excess of available revenues and beginning fund balances. The requirements and procedures set forth in this Section 9 are intended to comply with C.R.S. § 29-1-103, as amended. If that statute is amended or repealed, this Section 9 shall, if necessary, be amended accordingly.
- d. Notice of Budget. Upon receipt of such proposed budget, the Board shall, pursuant to C.R.S. § 29-1-106, as amended, cause to be published a notice containing the following information; the date and time of the hearing at which the adoption of the proposed budget will be considered; a statement that the proposed budget is open for inspection by the public at the Authority office; and statement that any interested elector of the Authority may inspect the proposed budget and file or register any objections thereto at any time prior to its final adoption.
- e. Adoption of Budget. The Board shall hold a hearing to consider the adoption of the proposed budget pursuant to C.R.S. § 29-1-108 as amended, at which time objections shall be considered. On the day set for consideration of such proposed budget, the Board shall review the proposed budget and revise, alter, increase or decrease the items as it deems necessary in view of the needs of the Authority and the anticipated revenue of the Authority. The Board shall provide for sufficient revenues to finance budget expenditures. Adoption of the proposed budget shall be effective only upon the affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Board. Changes to the adopted budget or appropriation shall be made in accordance with the provisions of C.R.S. § 29-1-109, as amended.
- f. Filing of Budget. No later than 30 days following the beginning of the fiscal year of the budget adopted, the Board shall cause a certified copy of such budget to be filed with the Division of Local Government in the Department of Local Affairs.

- g. Appropriating Resolution.
- (1) The Board shall enact a resolution adopting the budget and making appropriations of the budget year, pursuant to C.R.S. § 29-1-108(2). The amounts appropriated thereunder shall not exceed the amounts fixed therefor in the budget adopted pursuant to Section 9.e.
 - (2) The income of the Authority, as estimated in the budget and as provided for in the adoption resolution and other revenue and borrowing resolutions, shall be allocated in the amounts and according to the funds specified in the budget for the purpose of meeting the expenditures authorized by the appropriation resolution.
 - (3) The Board may make an appropriation to and for a contingent fund to be used in cases of emergency or other unforeseen contingencies.
- h. No Contract to Exceed Appropriation. During the fiscal year, neither the Board, nor any officer, nor any employee or agent of the Authority shall expend or contract to expend any money, or incur any liability, or enter into any contract with, by its terms, involves the expenditures of money in excess of the amounts appropriated. Any contract, verbal or written, contrary to the terms of this sub-section, shall be void *ab initio*, and no Authority funds shall be expended in payment of such contracts, except as provided in the following sub-section. Multiple year contracts may be entered into where allowed by law or if subject to annual appropriation.
- i. Contingencies. In cases of emergency caused by a natural disaster, public enemy, or some contingency which could not reasonably have been foreseen at the time of the adoption of the budget, the Board may authorize the expenditure of funds in excess of the budget by the resolution duly adopted by a majority vote of the entire membership of the Board at a public meeting. Such resolution shall set forth in full the facts concerning the emergency and shall be documented in detail in the minutes of the meeting of the Board at which such resolution was adopted. A certified copy of such resolution shall be filed with the Division of Local Government in the Department of Local Affairs.
- j. Payment of Contingencies. In case of an emergency and the passage of a resolution authorizing additional expenditures in excess of the appropriation as provided in these by-laws, and if there is money available for such excess expenditure in some other fund which will not be needed for expenditures during the balance of the fiscal year, the Board shall transfer the available money from such fund to the fund from which the excess expenditures are to be paid.

k. Annual Audit.

- (1) Pursuant to C.R.S. § 29-1-603, as amended, the Board shall cause to be made an annual audit of the financial statements of the Authority for each fiscal year. Such audit shall be made as of the end of the fiscal year of the Authority. The audit report shall be submitted to the Authority within six (6) months of the close of each fiscal year. The audit shall be conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by a Certified Public Accountant licensed to practice in Colorado as an individual, partnership, or professional corporation pursuant to Article II of Title 12, C.R.S., but in no event shall such auditor audit the records, books, or accounts which they have maintained.
- (2) A copy of the audit report shall be maintained in the Authority office as a public record for a public inspection at all reasonable times.
- (3) The treasurer shall forward, or cause to be forwarded, a copy of the audit report to the State Auditor or other relevant state official, pursuant to statutory requirements, within thirty days following receipt of the audit.

Section 10. Corporate Seal. The Board shall adopt a seal of the Authority. The seal of the Authority shall be a circle containing the name of the Authority and shall be used on all documents and in such manner as seals generally are used by public and private corporations. The secretary shall have custody of the seal and shall be responsible for its safe keeping and care.

Section 11. Conflict of Interest. Any Director who is present at a meeting at which is discussed any matter in which the Director has, directly or indirectly, a private pecuniary or property interest shall disclose such interest to the Board. Unless such Director has given seventy-two (72) hours actual advance written notice to the Colorado Secretary of State and to the Board, in accordance with all statutory requirements, such Director shall refrain from advocating for or against the matter and shall disqualify himself from voting on such matter.

Section 12. Indemnification of Directors and Employees. The Authority shall defend, hold harmless and indemnify any Director, officer, agent or employee against any tort or liability, claim or demand, whether groundless or otherwise, arising out of any alleged act or omission occurring during the performance of duty. The Authority may compromise and settle any such claim or suit and/or pay the amount of any settlement or judgment.

- a. For the purposes of this Section 12 only, the following definitions shall apply.
 - (1) "Employee" means a director, officer, employee or servant (hereinafter collectively referred to as "employee") of the Authority, whether or not compensated or appointed. The term "employee" specifically excludes any person or organization

contracting to perform services or acting for the Authority as an independent contractor.

- (2) "Performance of Duty" shall be interpreted as broadly as possible to include any situation in which an Authority employee could conceivably be deemed to be acting within the scope of employment. It shall specifically extend to all employees who are providing service on a voluntary basis or otherwise to any private, corporate, or governmental party other than the Authority, when doing so with the appropriate consent and authorization from the Authority. The term "performance of duty" shall not include any act or omission constituting deliberate and intentional tortuous or criminal conduct, or malfeasance in office, or willful or wanton neglect of duty.
- b. The Authority reserves the right to designate the attorney appointed to defend any employee in any tort or liability action instituted pursuant to this Section 12.
- c. The Authority agrees to indemnify any employee up to, but not to exceed, the amount of \$140,000 for any injury to one person in any single occurrence with an aggregate limit of \$400,000 for any injury to two or more persons in any single occurrence, or in the maximum amounts otherwise specified under the Colorado Governmental Immunity Act (Article 10 of title 24, C.R.S., as amended). The Authority specifically reserves any defenses which are made available to the Authority or its employees by said Governmental Immunity Act.
- d. All claims to be paid pursuant to this Section 12 shall be paid by the Authority or its insurer. Any judgment or settlement of a claim against the Authority shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of said Governmental Immunity Act.
- e. No defense or indemnification shall be provided by the Authority to any employee in any of the following circumstances.
 - (1) If the employee willingly and knowingly fails to notify the Authority within a reasonable time of any incident or occurrence which he might reasonably expect to result in a claim of tort liability against him or the Authority.
 - (2) If any employee fails to notify the Authority of any notice of claim or summons and complaint served upon him commencing a suit for damages reimbursable pursuant to this Section 12; such notice shall be given to the Authority within fifteen business days of its service upon the employee.
 - (3) If an employee fails to exercise reasonable efforts to notify the Authority of any claim which is informally asserted against him for damages reimbursable pursuant to this Section 12.
 - (4) If an employee refuses to cooperate with an investigation or defense of any lawsuit by the Authority, or its insurer, or by any private attorney employed by the Authority

to furnish the defense to said employee, or any private investigator hired by the Authority to investigate such tort or liability claim.

- f. If the Authority or the employee against whom a claim reimbursable hereunder is asserted has any other valid insurance, bond or indemnification plan available covering the loss or damage alleged against him. Such insurance, bond, or other plan will be first applied to the payment of any claim. In such event, the obligation of the Authority to indemnify and hold harmless the employee shall exist only for liability incurred in excess of such other coverage.
- g. In the event of any payment made pursuant to this Section 12, the Authority shall be subrogated to all of the employee's rights of recovery therefor against any person or organization, and the employee shall execute and deliver instruments and papers and do whatever else is necessary to secure such rights of subrogation. The employee shall do nothing to prejudice such rights.
- h. No assignments of indemnification shall be permitted without the written consent of the Authority, signed by the President, and no such assignment shall bind the Authority unless such written consent is given prior to assignment. If, however, the employee shall die, the benefits of this Section 12 shall be available to, and apply fully to, the employee's legal representative, but only while acting within the scope of his duties as such.
- i. Any defense and indemnification available to an employee under this Section 12 shall continue to be available after the termination of his employment, office or tenure if the act or omission causing such liability occurred during the course of his duties while an employee of the Authority. Such defense and indemnification shall not be available to a former employee, however, in the event that the tort or liability claim against him is asserted as a counterclaim or set-off in any suit brought by the employee, except the extent that the liability of such employee may exceed the amount of his own claim or suit.
- j. The provisions of this Section 12 shall be subject to and, to the extent of any inconsistency therewith, shall be modified by said Governmental Immunity Act

Section 13. Insurance. The Board shall select and secure Errors and Omissions (E & O) insurance and general liability insurance in a limit no less than one million dollars per occurrence and two million dollars in the aggregate to be on a comprehensive general liability form. The Board shall select and secure Worker's Compensation Insurance in accordance with Colorado State Worker's Compensation Act.

Section 14. Bidding and Contracting Procedures. This section will stand in effect until the Authority adopts a purchasing manual. Except in cases in which the Authority will receive aid from a governmental agency or purchase through a state purchasing program, a notice

shall be published for bids on all construction contracts for work or material, or both, involving an expense of \$25,000 or more. The Authority may reject any and all bids, and if it appears that the Authority can perform the work or secure material for less than the lowest bid, it may proceed to do so.

A Notice or Invitation to bid shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation within the Authority boundaries once per week for three consecutive weeks. The Notice will request sealed proposals for the construction to be done, or for the materials needed. The specifics of the contract will be stated; where and when the plans and specifications may be examined; and the time and place the sealed proposals will be opened and publicly read.

The Board retains the right, in its sole discretion, to reject any or all proposals; determine the proposal and subcontractors that will serve the best interests of the Authority; and determine the proposal and subcontractor which is most responsible to perform the work.

When required, bids must be accompanied by an acceptable bidder's bond, or a certified check payable to the Authority, in an amount equal to 5% of the bid. If, within the time designated in the Notice of Award, the Contract is not executed, and, if required, Payment and Performance Bonds and Certificates of Insurance are not provided, the Authority shall keep the bid bond as liquidated damages, and assess such other damages as the Authority may determine.

Pursuant to C.R.S. § 38-26-105 and 106, as amended, every contractor who is awarded any contract for more than \$50,000 for the construction, erection, repair, maintenance, or improvement of any public work or facility for the Authority, before entering upon the performance of any such work included in said contract, shall duly execute, deliver to, and file with the Board a good and sufficient bond, or other acceptable surety, approved by the Board in a penal sum not less than one-half of the total amount payable by the terms of the contract. Such bond shall satisfy the requirements of C.R.S. § 38-26-105 and 106, as amended.

The retained percentage to be withheld on periodic payments to the contractor shall be 10%. This retained percentage shall apply to the cost of such major equipment and materials, which are suitably located either at or near the site. In the event that satisfactory progress is being made as construction is being completed, the retained percentage may be reduced with concurrence of the Board.


Section 15. Powers of the Board of Directors. Without restricting the general powers conferred by law, it is hereby expressly declared that the Board shall have the following powers and duties:

- a. To determine and designate, except as otherwise provided by law or these by-laws, who shall be authorized to make purchases, negotiate leases for office space, and sign receipts, endorsements, checks, releases, and other documents.
- b. To create standing or special committees and to delegate such power and authority thereto as the Board deems necessary and proper for the performance of such committee's functions and obligations.
- c. To prepare financial reports, other than the statutory audit, covering each year's fiscal activities; and said report, if requested, shall be submitted to the Board and made available for inspection by the public.

Section 16. Modification of By-Laws. These by-laws may be altered, amended or repealed at any regular meeting or at any special meeting of the Board called for that purpose.

ADOPTED this 27th day of October, 2004, by the Board of Directors of the 5-2-1 Drainage Authority.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 28, 2004.



Chairman of the Board

Attest: 

Secretary of the Board

21st Judicial

Criminal Justice Leadership - 21st Judicial District

Established:

Formally established in May, 2009 as the Mesa County Criminal Justice Advisory Board. Renaming took place in June, 2009.

Mission/Purpose:

This group is committed to building the best criminal justice system in Mesa County to reduce recidivism and to use resources most wisely. The Board is a representative group that is flexible and able to respond to issues of immediate, future and ongoing concern. The Board values evidence-based programs, data driven results, strategic planning, and collaborative decision-making. The Board serves as a forum to gain and share information across agencies; as a forum to influence thoughts and decisions; and as a forum to provide public awareness and education on criminal justice system initiatives and activities.

The Board has identified a number of immediate activities, ongoing activities and long term activities and those are identified in the Board's **REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT OF A STRATEGIC PLAN - Final Report** provided herein.

Membership/Terms:

Level One members:

- Mesa County Sheriff
- District Court Administrator
 - District and County Judge representative would be ideal
- Criminal Justice Services Division (CJSD) Director
- Chief Probation Officer
- Police Chiefs
 - Grand Junction
 - Fruita
 - Palisade
- Department Of Corrections (DOC) – Parole
- District Attorney
- Public Defender/Criminal Defense Bar
- Division of Youth Corrections (DYC) (Senate Bill 94 and Parole) Representative
- County Commissioner
- Grand Junction City Council Member
- County Administrator

Level Two members are brought in on an ad hoc basis to serve on different committees established.

There are no set terms.

Meetings:

Meetings are the third Thursday of each month, from 11:30 to 1:30. Meetings are held in the Mesa county Sheriff's Office Training Room at 215 Rice Street.

Other information:

The duties carried out by the former Offender Management Group have now been incorporated into the duties of this newly formed group. There are no bylaws but much of the elements found in bylaws are addressed in the **REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT OF A STRATEGIC PLAN - Final Report** document provided.

At the June 18, 2009 meeting, the group finalized the name to be Criminal Justice Leadership Group – 21st Judicial District

Attachments:

There are no by-laws but the report mentioned above is provided.



**MESA COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE
ADVISORY BOARD**

**REVIEW AND
DEVELOPMENT OF A
STRATEGIC PLAN**

Final Report

May 2009

**Suzanne K. Tallarico
Project Director**

**Daniel J. Hall, Vice President
Court Consulting Services
707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2900
Denver, Colorado 80202**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	i
Introduction/Background	1
Need for Assistance	3
I. Review of Materials and Discussion on Evidence Based Practices.....	4
II. On-site Interviews.....	10
III. On-site Strategic Planning Retreat	13
IV. Conclusion.....	23

Acknowledgements

Whenever an organization embarks on the specter of strategic planning, images come to mind that excite, concern or bore members of that organization. I suspect that all of these emotions, and likely others, were present among the participants in the Criminal Justice Advisory Board planning retreat held on April 7, 2009. To their credit, however, all of the participants actively engaged in the process and offered their honest opinions and feelings about issues that were raised during the process.

As a result of this group's hard work and commitment to the criminal justice system and the Mesa County community, the work completed during this strategic planning session was thoughtful and thorough.

I would personally like to thank Jon Peacock and Dennis Berry for their assistance in the planning process. I would also like to thank all of the people who made their time available for interviews prior to the retreat session. Finally, I am excited for the new criminal justice community in Mesa County to embark on a new direction and will look forward to hearing of their progress toward building a system that is rooted in evidence based practices.

Introduction/Background

Colorado's 21st Judicial District is in a unique position in the state. The judicial district is made up of a single county, which makes developing and coordinating programs and services easier than in those judicial districts made up of multiple counties, in which the coordination of multiple boards of county commissioners, sheriffs, district attorneys, courts, etc. is required. Historically, this geographical definition has likely been one large factor that has contributed to the successes the 21st Judicial District has enjoyed in working together successfully on collaborative efforts within the criminal justice system.

In Colorado, the term *Community Corrections* (note the capitalization) refers to "a community-based program that provides residential and/or non-residential accommodations and supervision for felony offenders, and provides programs and services to aid in the reintegration of the offender into the community" (Division of Criminal Justice, 2007, p. 38). In Mesa County, the Community Corrections Program is a County-run and is administered by the Criminal Justices Services Department (CJSD). In addition to CJSD, a multitude of additional *community-based* correctional programs and services exist, including State Probation (for adults and juveniles), State Parole (for adults and youth), the Sheriff's Work Release Program, and many other programs and services too numerous to identify. Nationally, it is not uncommon to refer to offender supervision and intervention programs collectively as "community-based" corrections or simply as "community corrections." Given that Colorado's residential community programs are referred to as *Community Corrections*, the distinction between the two is often missed.

The Mesa County Community Corrections Board (CCB) has been in existence since 1977. In Colorado, each county that maintains a Community Correctional Program must have a Community Corrections Board, which is "a governing authority that has the authority to enter into contracts, establish programs, accept or reject offenders for placement and establish and enforce standards" (Division of Criminal Justice, 2007, p. 38). The purview of a Community Corrections Board in Colorado is that of the *Community Corrections Program*, and not the broader community-based correctional systems within a county.

In the early 1990s, in an effort to address broader criminal justice issues in Mesa County, the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners established a Criminal Justice Advisory Board (CJAB) to provide "citizen input to the County Commissioners on criminal justice issues" (Memo from Dennis Berry dated January 8, 1991)." The idea was that, since the CCB, which already existed, included the key criminal justice leaders and citizen representatives in Mesa County, this Board could and should act as an advisory group on broader criminal justice

issues in the County. At the time the CJAB was established, the County was in a crisis situation, specifically related to a lack of secure detention beds in which to house adult offenders being detained or having been sentenced to serve a term in the jail. The original design of the joint CCB/CJAB was to

...oversee the county's existing programs, such as the Community Corrections Program and the Juvenile Review Program ... (and) also take an active role in the detention facility population management, the judicial offender processing system (probation), law enforcement arrest practices, the interagency information/data systems, the various community based alternative sentencing programs, etc.

Having this existing Board take on a broader role would alleviate the existence or appointment of other boards. Having one board with all the appropriate people on it, would help avoid overlapping responsibilities and working for contradictory purposes. It would help in establishing some consistent, long term goals and objectives for the criminal justice system in Mesa County while providing the citizens with an avenue for input and feedback about how the system is doing" (memo from Dennis Berry, dated January 8, 1991).

The joint CCB/CJAB was established in the early 1990s, but was officially referred to as the *Community Corrections Board* in the by-laws from its inception. In the draft by-laws dated February, 2009, the by-laws refer to this body as *The Community Corrections/Criminal Justice Advisory Board of Mesa County, Colorado*. It appears that the by-laws were originally drafted in 1993 and have been revised twice; once in 1994 and again in February, 2009. The earlier by-laws identified five purpose areas of the Board, as follow:

1. To establish priorities, standards, long-range plans and financial support for a variety of correctional services, juvenile and adult, that will work toward the well-being of the citizens of Mesa County.
2. To give attention to but no be limited to such areas of corrections as: Detention, Drug and Alcohol Abuse, Evaluation and Diagnosis, Medical Needs, Crisis Intervention, Shelter Care, Education, Employment, Probation, parole and others as the needs arise.
3. To assist in the continuation and improvement of those correctional services now provided in this community such as the Work Release Program.
4. To provide services in correctional matters for local, regional, State and Federal interests.
5. To administer funds authorized by the Division of Criminal Justice pursuant to CRS 127-27-107. Specifically these funds may be applied for support functions authorized in CRS 17-27-103 to supplement program expenses or support direct or indirect costs of involvement in Community Corrections.

The purposes were revised in the February, 2009 draft by-laws to include both a revision of language for items 1-5 as well as the addition of two other purposes, namely:

6. To serve in a planning and coordinating capacity by advising the Board of County Commissioners and consulting with officials of state criminal justice agencies to improve local community corrections services. In addition, the CCB shall act as the Criminal Justice Advisory Board for the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners regarding a wide range of criminal justice issues within Mesa County. Responsibilities include but are not limited to; research, collating and reporting factual information, and providing recommendations to the Mesa County Board of Commissioners.
7. In accordance with Colorado Revised Statutes, the CCB will assure the operation of community corrections programs within Mesa County are performed in a manner that maintains public safety as their highest priority and minimizes risk to the community.

Despite the recent effort to clarify the distinction between CCB and CJAB, in practice, the CCB/CJAB currently exists as a single body, with the primary focus on the Community Corrections Program, CJSD. The Board operates out of the CJSD, and receives administrative support by the CJSD, the meetings are held at CJSD, and the majority of the issues discussed revolve around CJSD concerns.

Need for Assistance

Mesa County has a long history of collaboration and forward thinking in generating solutions to the County's community-based criminal justice needs, inside and outside of the CCB or CJAB. Many of the County's community-based alternative sentencing programs are held in high regard within the County and across the state, and many have served as prototypes for other counties in Colorado to emulate.

In recent years the local criminal justice system has experienced less collaboration among agencies and increasing misunderstanding about how alternative programs should be used and which offenders are most appropriate for each program based upon current evidence based practices. There are numerous factors that have led to these conditions including: new leaders in key agencies; implementation of several new alternative programs; breakdowns in communication between agencies; and expanding information on evidence based practices (EBP) across the different correctional entities.

In order for the criminal justice system in the 21st Judicial District to function efficiently and effectively, it was the belief of the County Administrator that intervention was needed to remove barriers and integrate evidence based practices across criminal justice system agencies, but especially across the multiple alternative sentencing programs.

To this end, the Mesa County Commissioners requested that the criminal justice leaders in Mesa County come together for a strategic planning session to work toward system improvements. Specifically, the goal of the planning session was to generate a plan that would allow the board to develop an understanding of the County's community based alternative sentencing programs and to assess whether the programs currently in place are in line with twenty-first century knowledge and thinking regarding the best use of limited County funding to the greatest outcomes for those the programs serve.

The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) was contracted to provide these strategic planning services. Together, the NCSC consultant, Suzanne Tallarico and the County Administrator's Office developed a plan to conduct the work, which included (1) a review of relevant materials prior to embarking on the work; (2) an initial site visit to conduct interviews with key criminal decision makers; (3) an on-site strategic planning session to determine the goals and plans for the CJAB; and (4) a written report of findings, including a record of the strategic planning session and a set of action plans for the work of the Board.

I. Review of Materials and Discussion on Evidence Based Practices

Mesa County Specific Background Material

The NCSC consultant was provided with a comprehensive packet of information ranging from presentations on Evidence Based Practice that had been delivered locally, to written articles on that topic, as well as a number of local reports, documents and meeting minutes, including a recent independent review of the CJSD. All of the materials helped to provide familiarity with the issues of concern and interest of the key criminal justice leaders in the County.

Of particular interest was a report developed by Amanda Bailey and Kimberly Bullen in 2008. This report comprises a review of the Mesa County CJSD, specifically responding to concerns about some practices raised by the Chief Judge of the 21st Judicial District (Mesa County). This report identified a number of concerns that were raised and provided reasonable recommendations for most of the issues addressed. Directly related to the issues needing to be addressed in the strategic planning process are sections on communication and evidence based practices. Specifically, the report included the following recommendations:

The players in the criminal justice system should meet with open minds and develop plans for systematic and effective communications between themselves in order to improve the system and enhance its credibility in the community..." (Baily, A. and Bullen, K, 2008, p. 25), and

Community Corrections should continue to use EBP principles in its on-site and outside provider services. Monitoring of this use should occur. EBP principles should be extended to other CJSD programs" (Bailey, A. and Bullen, K., 2008, p. 28).

The highlighted recommendations made in this report on CJSD embody key concerns raised when citing the need for this assistance. Additional background material that provided helpful insight were copies of presentations and reports provided to various criminal justice systems leaders in Mesa County regarding the implementation and use of EBP.

Evidence Based Practices in Correctional Settings

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) has recently produced a series of papers outlining the evidence-based practices associated with successful community supervision of youth and adults in the criminal justice system. Specifically, the evidence-based practices outlined in these documents relate to assessment and supervision techniques and practices that relate to reduced offender risk and recidivism. This section of the report will focus on these identified best practices to assist the Board in assessing Mesa County's community-based correctional system in developing a baseline assessment of where the County's programs fall within the evidence based continuum.

The conventional approach to supervision in this country emphasizes individual accountability from offenders and their supervising officers without consistently providing either with the skills, tools, and resources that science indicates are necessary to accomplish risk and recidivism reduction. Despite the evidence that indicates otherwise, officers continue to be trained and expected to meet minimal contact standards which stress rates of contacts and largely ignore the opportunities these contacts have for effectively reinforcing behavioral change. Officers and offenders are not so much clearly directed what to do, as what not to do." (*Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: The Principles of Effective Intervention*, 4/30/2004, page 1.)

The NIC provides an integrated model, which incorporates eight evidence-based principles of effective supervision, organizational development, and collaboration based on research findings to suggest the most promising and effective practices to managing community-based offenders. *Evidence-based practice implies that (1) there is a definable outcome(s); (2) the outcome and the practice are measurable; and (3) the outcome is defined according to practical realities (recidivism, victim satisfaction, etc.).*¹

¹ The eight evidence-based principles are taken from Clawson, E., Bogue, B. and Joplin, L. (2005).

Principle 1: Assess Actuarial Risk/Needs. Effective supervision practices begin with a reliable and valid assessment. Assessment is the cornerstone to implementing many of the evidence-based principles described in this document. Good offender assessments help supervising officers and case managers determine appropriate supervision levels and, through the identification of an offender's strengths and weaknesses, help to develop the most appropriate supervision strategies.

Offender assessment is most reliable when officers, case managers and administrative staff are formally trained to use assessment instruments, including using the most effective methods of obtaining data (interview, official records, collateral verification), using correct scoring procedures and minimizing the use of overrides, and using the assessment information to develop case plans and inform case decisions throughout the supervision process. It is also critical for pre-sentence decision makers, such as prosecutors and judges to understand the assessment tools being used and how to interpret the information so they can make informed decisions that are in line with supervision and case management strategies that are based in good assessment and directed services designed to achieve specific outcomes.

Offender assessment is an ongoing function of supervision and is done on both a formal and informal basis. Formal assessments and reassessments are conducted according to established protocol of the specific assessment instrument used in a jurisdiction. Informal assessment consists of gathering and documenting case information obtained through face-to-face contacts, observations, collateral contacts, and other information learned about the offender. Both the formal and informal assessment information should reinforce each other and both should be used to determine supervision and case management strategies. (See Andrews, et al, 1990; Andrews & Bonta, 1998; Gendreau, et al, 1996; Kropp, et al, 1995; Clements, 1996.)

Principle 2: Enhance Intrinsic Motivation. Simply becoming involved in the juvenile and/or criminal justice system does not mean that individuals will feel the need to make the necessary changes in their lives to lead them down a pro-social path. Sometimes such involvement does create a turning point for a person, however, this cannot simply be assumed. Behavioral change is a dynamic experience, which ebbs and flows, and can be positively influenced by judges, case managers, probation officers and other providers if approached appropriately. Long term behavioral change only occurs when the person making the change has an intrinsic desire to do so. That is, the individual must want to make the changes that are necessary to keep them from further penetrating the justice system.

Research indicates (Miller & Rollnick, 2002; Miller & Mount, 2001; Harper & Hardy, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000) that the use of motivational interviewing techniques, rather than fear, intimidation, or persuasion, can effectively be used to enhance an individual's motivation to embark on and maintain positive behavioral changes.

Principle 3: Target Interventions. The third evidence-based principle focuses on targeting services and interventions toward those who will receive the greatest benefit. Of course, all treatment services to which juvenile and adult offenders are referred should show proven effectiveness with criminal justice populations, such as cognitive-behavioral methodologies (when the programs are rigorously adhered to).

- ***Risk Principle: Prioritize supervision and treatment resources for higher risk offenders.***
The research on the risk principle is quite compelling in terms of showing that the most effective use of limited correctional resources is to focus on the needs of high risk offenders. In fact, research indicates that focusing supervision and treatment resources in lower risk offenders produces little, if any, positive effect on recidivism rates: if left alone, they would do just as well as when managed similar to their higher risk counterparts. Directing fewer resources to this population is a wiser use of resources. (See Gendreau & Groggin, 1997; Andrews & Bonta, 1998; Harland, 1996; Sherman, et al, 1998; McGuire, 2001, 2002.)
- ***Need Principle: Target intervention to criminogenic needs.***
Many individuals within the juvenile and adult correctional system have a range of needs to be addressed. The need principle stresses that focusing on the needs that relate most closely to illegal or criminal behavior will result in the greatest reductions of recidivism. Examples of criminogenic needs include, but are not limited to, substance abuse, conduct disorder, delinquent/criminal peers, lack of impulse control, and dysfunctional families. To most effectively impact illegal behavior, criminogenic needs should be addressed according to the most significant needs, as indicated by an actuarial assessment. (See Andrews and Bonta, 1998; Elliott, 2001, Harland, 1996.)
- ***Responsivity Principle: Be responsive to temperament, learning style, motivations, culture, and gender when assigning programs.***
Encouraging an offender to engage in positive behavioral changes goes beyond identifying his or her needs and requires addressing *who they are*. Addressing the responsivity principle requires that officers and case managers pay attention to an individual's characteristics and matches them appropriately to treatment services. Care should be taken to address such characteristics as culture, gender, motivational stages, developmental stages and learning styles. If resources are limited, research indicates that *no services are better than services that do not meet the needs of the client*. (See Miller and Rollnick, 1991; Gordon, 1970, Williams, et al, 1995).
- ***Dosage: Structure 40-70 percent of high-risk offenders' time for 3-9 months.***
Unstructured time can be a terrible burden to a person trying to change behaviors. Higher risk offenders need more initial structure than their lower risk counterparts, and the goal should be to decrease the official structure over time, so the offender

can eventually maintain positive control over his/her own life. The initial three to nine months of supervision for higher risk offenders should include a plan to structure 40 percent-70 percent of their free time. This can be accomplished by devising a clear case plan with expectations of each offender. The offender can be held accountable by keeping daily journals proving compliance with the plan. Research indicates that the lack of such a coordinated plan can result in negative effects on offender behavior. (See Palmer, 1995; Gendreau & Groggin, 1995; Steadman, 1995; Silverman, et al, 2000.)

- **Treatment: Integrate treatment into the full sentence/sanction requirements.** The delivery of targeted and timely treatment has a strong effect on behavioral change. The use of cognitive-behavioral treatment for offenders has been shown to be effective in many studies. Once again, the effectiveness of these treatment interventions has been proven with higher risk offenders rather than lower risk offenders. When possible, lower risk offenders should be diverted from the criminal justice system, under which circumstances they will most likely not return. (See Palmer, 1995; Clear, 1981; Taxman & Byrne, 2001; Currie, 1998; Petersilia, 1997, 2002; Andrews & Bonta, 1998.)

Principle 4: Skill Train with Directed Practice (use Cognitive Behavioral treatment methods). Several research studies have shown that the delivery of evidence-based programming that emphasize the development of cognitive skills are related to decreased recidivism (Mihalic, et al, 2001; Satchel, 2001; Miller & Rollnick, 2002; Lipsey, 1993; McGuire, 2001, 2002; Aos, 2002.) Research indicates that fidelity to the program model and matching the program age, gender, and ethnicity differences are critical to the integration of information and skills. The effective use of such programs, however, is dependent upon the quality of training of those delivering the program and the degree to which the skills being taught are also being modeled by the program facilitators.

Principle 5: Increase Positive Reinforcement. While the criminal and juvenile justice systems are notorious for using punishment models and focusing primarily on negative behavior, correctional and behavioral change research indicates that positive reinforcement is much more likely than negative reinforcement to lead to sustained positive changes in behavior. In fact, research indicates that human beings need four positive responses to behavior to each single negative response to a behavior. Positive reinforcement should be real and meaningful, as opposed to contrived.

Principle 6: Engage Ongoing Support in Natural Communities. Personal behavioral change is more likely to be maintained long term when those behavioral changes are supported by people around us. Research indicates that working with people in an offender's immediate environment, such as a parent, spouse, sibling, teacher, minister, neighbor, aunt or uncle, or pro-social peer to support and reinforce positive behavioral changes can have a significant

impact on the offender's ability to sustain those changes over time. Additionally, recent research indicates that systems and programs that improve ties between an offender and the community, such as restorative justice practices, positively impact behavioral changes. (See Arzin & Besalel, 1980; Emrick et al, 1993; Higgins & Silverman, 1999; Meyers & Smith, 1997; Wallace, 1989; Project MATCH Research Group, 1997; Bonta et al, 2002; O'Connor & Perryclear, 2003; Ricks, 1974; Clear & Sumter, 2003; Meyers et al, 2002.)

Principle 7: Measure Relevant Processes/Practices. Evidence-based practices are founded on sound measurement of practices and outcomes. Measuring what is happening is the key to understanding what works and how well. It is imperative that changes in cognitive and skill development and offender recidivism get measured routinely if offender outcomes are expected to improve. Additionally, measuring staff performance is an important way to ensure that work is completed in the expected manner and that fidelity to program models are maintained. When staff are held accountable for meaningful measures of performance, they are more likely to engage in those activities as well as to record them. When those performance measures are based on evidence-based practices, desired outcomes are likely to improve. (See Henggeler et al, 1997; Milhalic & Irwin, 2003; Meyers et al, 1995; Azrin, 1982; Meyers, 2002; Hanson & Harris, 1998; Waltz et al, 1993; Hogue et al, 1998; Miller & Mount, 2001; Gendreau et al, 1996; Dilulio, 1993.)

Principle 8: Provide Measurement Feedback. Once a system to measure performance has been designed and implemented, it is important to provide regular feedback to program staff and the community regarding that performance. Providing feedback to the offenders under supervision will also enhance performance and outcomes, as will the provision of performance data to staff. Monitoring the delivery of services within an organization helps build accountability and maintain integrity to the agency's mission. Also, sharing this information with criminal justice system partners can aid in the understanding and the improvement of all programs. Conducting performance audits and case reviews that focus on improving outcomes help to keep agencies focused on the ultimate goals of the organization. What gets measured gets done, and what gets done should be the most important work. These should all be related and all juvenile court staff should understand what they, collectively, are expected to accomplish. Reporting how the community correctional system is faring will likely increase the public's confidence in the community correctional system in Mesa County. (See Project Match Research Group, 1997; Agostinelli et al, 1995; Alvero et al, 2001; Baer et al, 1992; Decker, 1983; Luderman, 1991; Zemke, 2001; Elliott, 1980.)

All systems are not perfect and implementing changes in a system is a difficult task. If the Mesa County Board is serious about building a community-based correctional system that is evidence-based, care should be taken to develop a comprehensive plan, which includes a developmental and implementation strategy for individual officers/case managers, treatment programs and correctional agencies that is based in the evidence based components described above, including the measurement and feedback loop.

II. On-site interviews

Ms. Tallarico conducted on-site interviews in Grand Junction between March 9 through 11, 2009. Ten individuals were interviewed on site, and an additional seven key players were interviewed by telephone after that site visit and prior to the on-site retreat. Key themes identified from these interviews are described below.

History of Impressive Work and Collaboration

Mesa County criminal justice leaders have a long history of working together to develop solutions for local problems within the criminal justice system. Mesa County criminal justice leaders are progressive in their thinking. They have a history of working to improve programs based on the best research available to meet their needs. For example, collaborative efforts within the local criminal justice system have recently resulted in the development of a state-of-the-art methamphetamine treatment program in lieu of building a new pod for the County jail. A collaborative group, known as the Offender Management Task Force, was also established to develop arrest guidelines for law enforcement agencies within the County as well as respond to other issues of concern regarding the Mesa County jail population.

Mesa County criminal justice leaders are professional, dedicated and enthusiastic about providing the best services to the community that they can. By and large, all of those interviewed were interested and enthusiastic about engaging in the evidence based practices in all of their areas of specialty. Criminal justice leaders in Mesa County are interested in "doing things better."

Loss of Original Concept of CJAB as a Broader Criminal Justice Problem Solving Board

The CJAB was originally set up to discuss and develop solutions for criminal justice issues such as those addressed by the Methamphetamine Task Force² and the Offender Management Task Force. Over the past few years, however, the resolution of many issues has come outside of the CJAB. The Criminal Justice Advisory Board has stopped addressing such issues as a Board, and ad hoc groups have been created in their stead. The original idea of limiting meetings, by creating a broad-based group of the key participants has not been the practice. Creating collaborative problem-solving work groups outside of the Board has resulted in some level of dissention and obsolescence of the CJAB. Members have stopped attending meetings on a regular basis, and key partners are often not present to engage in important conversations.

The CJAB agenda is supposed to be set by the CCB Executive Committee, however, in practice the CJAB agenda appears to be developed by CJSD management. Since the agenda appears to be set by CJSD and the administrative work is undertaken by CJSD staff, many CJAB members who have not been participants since the Board's inception have been left with the impression that CJABs main concerns are about CJSD. This transition from broader community-based correctional concerns to a focus on CJSD has led to an unclear understanding and mission of the CJAB by many of its members.

System-based Knowledge Gaps

Despite the CJAB's makeup of criminal justice leaders in Mesa County, a basic understanding of the roles, focus, work and limitations of each of the criminal justice agencies mission and day-to-day work is lacking among many. In fact, there are programs currently in place in Mesa County, of which some criminal justice leaders are unaware. For example, the Probation Department runs a program for adult offenders convicted of DUIs. When this fact was shared, people were excited to learn that such a program existed. If everyone had a common understanding of all programs available and the types of services provided, sentencing options could be more focused and used more effectively by everyone. Such understanding of agencies across the system is necessary if the Board is intended to function as a collaborative and advisory entity.

² The Methamphetamine Task Force is typically referred to as the "Meth Task Force." Methamphetamine is a prominent drug in many rural communities, which is relatively easy to manufacture. The methamphetamine manufacturing process, however, is very toxic and the drug itself is extremely addictive. For more information on the Meth Task Force, go to www.methfree.mesascounty.us.

Criminal Justice Agency Stresses are a System Concern

The criminal system is a fluid system. Sometimes one part of the system will be stressed, while another is experiencing some relief. For example, at times the Community Corrections program, CJSD, is backlogged and defendants awaiting placement are required to report through a day reporting system. This leaves them in the community under very little supervision at a vulnerable period of their correctional supervision. Shared knowledge of such stresses could be shared with this Board and short-term solutions could be arrived at, while longer-term solutions could be discussed as well. Having a forum to share this type of information on an ongoing basis, could help make better use of all elements of the criminal justice system in the County.

Lack of Communication between Criminal Justice Agencies

Concerns regarding lack of communication between criminal justice agencies were raised by several interviewees. People indicated that lack of an ongoing presence at CJAB meetings leads to a lack of understanding of what each of the components of the system is trying to achieve. When members are regularly present, questions can be raised and issues discussed; when all members are not present, a lack of information gets filled with beliefs and innuendo, rather than fact. This kind of "gap filling" has led to some loss of trust between the criminal justice leaders. Some interviewees speculated that turnover in leadership positions has contributed to the loss of communication and trust previously described. While some CJAB members have been present since the Board's inception, others have more recently come into leadership positions. There has not been a strong orientation for new CJAB members, so the focus and original intent of the Board has been lost.

Programming Gaps

While the criminal justice community has worked hard to provide appropriate programming for most people, some offenders still fall through the cracks. Good programs are needed to identify and treat specific populations, such as those with mental health problems, developmentally and otherwise disabled persons, and women and girls. Further, some people are concerned whether the current treatment options and practices are focusing more energy than necessary on low risk offenders.

To summarize the key interview findings, there are many positive things going on the Mesa County with the criminal justice system and its leadership community. It appears, however, that as a CJAB, they have lost focus, and in some cases, some participants may

never have understood the long-standing focus or original intentions of this board. As a result of this lack of understanding, some participants have not prioritized this group or used it in its true capacity to be a system-building advisory or sounding board. There is no true “orientation” to new participants in the CJAB, and, since it is administered through CJSD, the misconception that this is a community-corrections only focused board has been perpetuated.

Trust among some of the key criminal justice players in Mesa County has been damaged. Some people indicated they believe that the focus on a County-wide “system” has been lost, leaving people to focus much more on their parochial interests, which erodes the “we’re in this together” mentality.

While the initial focus of the request for assistance was described as helping the CJAB work together to develop and implement evidence based practices across the County's community-based corrections system, it became quite clear that the CJAB needed to be re-organized and reassessed before any system planning could successfully be undertaken. To this end, the one-day strategic planning retreat focused energy on developing a vision and mission in the morning and focused efforts on the development of a substantive plan for movement toward the development and implementation of an evidence based system across the criminal justice system in the 21st Judicial District.³

In terms of long term strategic planning, working toward the development of a community-based correctional system that is based on evidence based practices (EBP) was determined to be the driver needed to solve the other issues that have contributed to the eroding support and participation in CJAB.

III. On-Site Strategic Planning Retreat

On April 7, 2009 NCSC Principal Court Management Consultant Suzanne Tallarico facilitated a 6-hour planning retreat with the 21st Judicial Districts' key criminal justice leaders to discuss the work of the County's Criminal Justice Advisory Board. Recognizing that the work that has been done by Mesa County criminal justice leaders in the past will be moved forward by strong leadership and synergy among these criminal justice leaders, the facilitation was designed to reconnect CJAB members with the origins and original focus of CJAB from the early days and to help them reach a decision regarding the future of that Board.

³ Although the contract language was not specifically changed to reflect the revised focus of the strategic planning retreat, verbal authorization to proceed with this agenda was provided by Jon Peacock. A presentation to the Board of Community Corrections confirmed the need to focus on the role of the Board, since even they did not understand that the CCB and CJAB were two separate Boards.

Based upon a verbal report on the interview findings presented by Ms. Tallarico, the participants engaged in focused discussions of four primary issues:

1. *What are the concerns with CJAB as it exists?*
2. *What should CJAB's purpose be?*
3. *What is the mission of an interagency board?*
4. *What should the structure of the new board be?*
5. *What should the short-term, ongoing and long-term focus of the Board?*

The Role and Definition of the Board

Through a focused plenary discussion, the participants developed a basic outline of a mission for the *new Board*. The mission is designed to reflect purview and interest over the broad criminal justice system in Mesa County, as well as the ancillary services that engage with the criminal justice system, such as treatment programs.

Mission: The Mesa County [CJAB⁴] is committed to building the best criminal justice system in Mesa County to reduce recidivism and to use resources most wisely. The Board is a representative group that is flexible and able to respond to issues of immediate, future and ongoing concern. The Board values evidence-based programs, data driven results, strategic planning, and collaborative decision-making. The Board serves:

- *As a forum to gain and share information across agencies*
- *As a forum to influence thoughts and decisions*
- *As a forum to provide public awareness and education on criminal justice system initiatives and activities.*

Board Membership

Membership on the Board was discussed at length during the strategic planning retreat. During the interviews, several people raised the question of whether all of the right people were included in the current CJAB. After an attempt to identify *Level One*, or "must have" positions⁵ and *Level Two*, or "necessary for some conversations/initiatives" positions, the Board settled on only specifying the Level One positions, and asking for Level Two participation on an ad-hoc

⁴ The *Board* is not satisfied with the "Criminal Justice Advisory Board" name, and did not definitively arrive at one during this strategic planning session. They will attempt to arrive at a name during the May 21, 2009 meeting of the board with its new mission. Throughout this document, they will be referred to as the *Board*.

⁵ It is important to the Board that positions, rather than individuals be identified for inclusion in the new Board, because it is the role the person plays in the system, and not the personality of the individual that should be identified for inclusion in the Board.

basis⁶. Also, since the Board should address issues of both adult and juvenile correctional concerns in the County, an effort was made to identify key positions that can address both concerns. The identified membership positions include the following:

- Mesa County Sheriff
- District Court Administrator
 - District and County Judge representative would be ideal
- Criminal Justice Services Division (CJSD) Director
- Chief Probation Officer
- Police Chiefs
 - Grand Junction
 - Fruita
 - Palisade
- Department Of Corrections (DOC) – Parole
- District Attorney
- Public Defender/Criminal Defense Bar
- Division of Youth Corrections (DYC) (Senate Bill 94 and Parole) Representative
- County Commissioner
- Grand Junction City Council Member
- County Administrator

Board Definition, Structure and Meeting Schedule

The Board will continue to meet at the time that CJAB met, the third Thursday of each month from 11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.. The first meeting of new Board is May 21, 11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.. The meeting will be held at the Sheriff's Department and he will provide lunch. The meeting location will rotate and lunch will be purchased by the meeting host.

- ***Leadership:*** The strategic planning group identified Bill Gardner, Grand Junction Police Chief, as the first Chair of the new Board. He accepted this position for the first year, with assistance from District Court Administrator, Judy Vanderleest. Jon Peacock, County Administrator, offered Kimberly Bullen's assistance as temporary staff to the board.
- ***Agenda Building:*** on a regular basis, the agenda should be built around standard items, such as those described below. The Chair will call for agenda items from Board members two weeks prior to the meeting. An example of standard agenda items:
 - Standard Agenda Items: community-based correctional population counts, etc.
 - New Agenda Items: those issues of immediate concern from members (system crowding, program overloads, treatment program concerns, etc.).

⁶ Recognizing the fact that other criminal justice and related agencies have a stake in the work of the Board and will sometimes be important partners in the work of the Board, some of those entities identified as Level Two participants include: school district representatives, non-profit organizations, Mesa County Partners, Hilltop House, Colorado West, victim representatives, and other community members. This list will be developed over time, and as the need arises to include additional subject matter experts and interested parties.

- Roundtable Discussion: what's happening in a nutshell in each agency.
- Long Term Issues: system mapping progress.
- Evidence based practice assessment and research.

Immediate Action Items to be Addressed Regarding the Board

A number of issues related to the Board were left unresolved at the retreat, so the group could move on to larger strategic planning issues. These issues should be placed on the agenda of one of the first meetings of the new Board.

- **Action Item A: Agree on a name for the Board.**⁷
Responsible Party: Full Board.
Timeline: Completed at May 21, 2009 meeting.
- **Action Item B: Agree on the advisory nature of the board.** Some of those present at the retreat believed that defining this Board's advisory role to the County Commissioners was no longer appropriate. While the criminal justice agencies represented exist in Mesa County State, some of them take their statutory direction from state entities, others take direction from the County, still others take their direction from the voting constituents in the County, and others are direct employees of Grand Junction or other cities within the County. Any or all of these entities could be at odds at one time or another, so making this Board advisory to any one of those governmental entities could be problematic. This important discussion will also need to be taken up by the Board at an early meeting, and built into the description of the Board in its defining materials.
Responsible Party: Full Board.
Timeline: Completed at May 21, 2009 meeting.
- **Action Item C: Look into potential grant-funding to support administrative and research support for the board.**
Responsible Party: Susan Gilbert.
Timeline: Report on the progress at June 18, 2009 meeting.
- **Action Item D: Formally separate CJAB and CCB with the Board of County Commissioners.**
Responsible Party: Jon Peacock.
Timeline: Report on the progress at the May 21, 2009 meeting

Strategic Plan for Board Activities

Once decisions had been made regarding the presence, membership and structure of the Board, the group moved on to a discussion of the work to be done by the Board. Strategic planning has been defined as: "A systematic, interactive process for thinking through and

⁷ Several names were suggested, but none hit the mark for the entire body present. Suggested names include: 21ST Judicial District Criminal Justice Coalition, 21ST Judicial District Criminal Justice Partnership, 21ST Judicial District Criminal Justice DSI (Driver, Solver, Informer), 21ST Judicial District Criminal Justice Leadership Commission.

creating an organization's best possible future."⁸ In a nutshell, a strategic plan is an agreed upon long-term agenda. It is an essential element to provide clarity of directions for any organization. Over the past two decades, strategic planning has become a fundamental component of criminal justice systems throughout the United States and around the world.

Agreeing that the Board is keenly interested in building a community-based corrections system on evidence based practices; the reality is that there are also immediate concerns that must be addressed in the short term even while efforts to develop an ideal system in the future are under way. To this end, retreat participants identified immediate, ongoing and long-term initiatives that should be addressed by the Board. Since the criminal justice system is a *living organism*, the immediate and ongoing issues should be redefined on a regular basis at Board meetings. The long term issues should be discussed in terms of progress, monthly, and reviewed at least annually to determine whether the Board is staying on track with the plan. If adjustments need to be made to the plan, they should be actively discussed and decided on by the Board.

Immediate Activities

The Board needs to address the shortfall in jail beds and the issue of jail crowding, including waiting lists for the work release program. As a Board, they believed they could arrive at some action plans to move people around the system to alleviate the stress on the Mesa County jail. The questions below could help the Board arrive at decisions and help to identify gaps and services needed to build a smoothly functioning offender management system in the community.

- What is the current offender population and how can we alleviate the stress on the jail?
- What is the best use of resources and what are our capacity concerns?
- What can be done immediately to alleviate strain on the jail population?
- How can we move people into CJSD, day reporting, probation or other placement alternatives to alleviate system crowding?
- Do we need additional alternatives for community placement?
- Are there funding sources available to help alleviate our immediate concerns?

Ongoing Activities

There are issues of concern that should be addressed at every meeting of the Board. Included in these are population sizes that stress the entire criminal justice system, such as: the

⁸ B. Wagenknecht-Ivey, *An Approach to Long Range Strategic Planning for the Courts*, 2-19 (Denver, CO: Center for Public Policy Studies, 1992); Carter, M., *Responding to Parole & Probation Violations: A Handbook to Guide Local Policy Development*, (Silver Spring, MD: Center for Effective Public Policy, 2001).

jail population, day reporting population, Community Corrections residential population and waiting list, work release population and waiting list, probation ISP population and other issues that pose ongoing concerns to the Board. *The standing items that should be addressed at each meeting should be discussed at the May 21, 2009 meeting. Once established, these items should be placed on the agenda for discussion each month.*

Long Term Activities

The retreat committee agreed that the Board should work toward implementing evidence based practices in community based correctional agencies, which includes the assessment, supervision and programs within the community-based agencies as well as external treatment programs. To work toward this goal, the Board needs to have a consistent understanding of how the community based correctional agencies operate including their assessment, supervision and treatment practices and programs; a consistent understanding of external treatment programs available in the community, including which populations are served by the programs; and a consistent understanding of the gaps in current services that prevent the community-based correctional agencies from providing supervision and treatment services to all offenders under their jurisdiction. Armed with this information, the Board can make informed decisions regarding the strategies necessary to improve the community based correctional system programming and options to be evidence based, able to address the driving treatment needs, and delivered to the appropriate offenders.

The retreat committee identified four priority goals on which this portion of the strategic plan is based. The following pages outline the specific goals and the tasks identified to achieve those goals.

- Goal 1** Describe the current community-based programs, including the populations served and programs currently available.
- Goal 2** Assess the current community based correctional system in Mesa County for adherence to evidence based practices in the areas of assessment, supervision and treatment delivery.
- Goal 3** Identify system gaps in assessment, supervision and treatment services for Mesa County community-based offenders under supervision.
- Goal 4** Develop a plan to improve community assessment, supervision and treatment services to offenders under supervision in Mesa County community-based correctional agencies.

Goal 1 Describe the current community-based programs, including the populations served and programs currently available

The development of a service delivery assessment map provides important baseline information that will be critical to the Board in determining how to prioritize the revision of current programs and the development of new programs to create a system of alternative sentencing options that meets the needs of the offenders and the supervision agencies within Mesa County. The service delivery assessment mapping information can help the Board formulate questions about the current programming options and arrive at answers. Solid system data, derived through the mapping process, can help the Board make informed decisions about how to revise current programs to make them evidence based, as well as which programs need to be added to the available options to fill gaps in services.

The service delivery assessment map, or flowchart of available programs, is the most effective method for gaining a shared understanding of a *system's* programming capacity and components. The map documents the details about the community-based programs, including how offenders are assessed, supervised and placed in each program. Additionally, since the Board is specifically committed to building a system in which alternative sentencing programs are evidence based, each program included in the service delivery assessment map will be assessed through the lens of evidence based practice criteria.

- **Action Item A:** *Document the offender population served by each of the community-based correctional agencies in Mesa County.* A critical piece of information necessary in understanding the programming needs of a system is to first understand the offender population. For this exercise, each community based program currently serving offenders in Mesa County (jail, work release, probation and CJSD) will need to develop a set of data describing their population. Given the fluid nature of the populations in each of these systems, developing a description of a "snapshot" of a population is probably the most reasonable approach. Examples of data that should be captured in this phase include the following:
 - Age range distribution
 - Gender distribution
 - Primary language
 - Assessment information (scoring category on the LSI), etc.
 - Criminogenic needs information

Responsible Party: Sheriff Hilkeyy, Susan Gilbert, Dennis Berry.

Timeline:

- **Action Item B:** *Document the existing programs that exist in Mesa County for community-based sentenced offenders.* Each community based program currently serving offenders in Mesa County (jail, work release, probation and CJSD) will need to generate a list of all programs available for offenders in their agency. This list should include the criteria and process (including who decides placement) for placement in the program, as well as a list of which type of offender the program serves. Examples of data that should be captured in this phase include the following:

- Program title
- Primary service (e.g., chemical dependency, alcohol abuse, anger management, sex offender treatment, etc.)
- Secondary service (e.g., family support services, life skills, etc.)
- Other services (if applicable)
- Program purpose: brief description of the main objective of the program.
- Brief program description:
 - Service provider
 - Program capacity
 - Program duration
 - Program goals
- Target population (include gender, age and language limitations or specifications, if appropriate)
- Approximate number of offenders served annually

Responsible Party: Sheriff Hilkey, Susan Gilbert, Dennis Berry.

Timeline:

Goal 2: Assess the current community based correctional system in Mesa County for adherence to evidence based practices in the areas of assessment, case planning, supervision and treatment delivery

- **Action Item A:** *Using the practice areas identified below, review each community-correctional based agencies' practices through an evidence based lens.*
Responsible Party: Sheriff Hilkey, Susan Gilbert, Dennis Berry.
Timeline:

Assessing Mesa County's Practice: Assessment

- Which assessment instruments are being used with which offenders?
- Do the assessment instruments have the ability to determine both risk and need?
- Are there secondary screening and assessment instruments (mental health, sex offender assessment, domestic violence assessment, substance abuse assessment) being used to identify risk and/or need information that is not addressed through the use of a generalized assessment tool?
- Are assessments ongoing?
- Do assessments drive supervision and case management plans?
- Have all of the relevant decision-makers been trained in the administration and use of the assessment instruments that are used in Mesa County?
- Is there a quality assurance process to determine whether assessment instruments are correctly used and the information is appropriately used to drive treatment and supervision decisions?

Assessing Mesa County's Practice: Motivational Interviewing

- Are motivational interviewing techniques being used by case managers, probation officers, treatment providers and others in the system to relate to offenders in interpersonally sensitive and constructive ways to enhance intrinsic motivation to change?

Have *all* criminal justice system participants (prosecutors, judges, probation officers and managers, community corrections case workers and managers, treatment providers) been trained in the use of motivational interviewing? Are motivational interviewing techniques used as a standard way of interacting with offenders in Mesa County?

Assessing Mesa County's Practice: Targeted Interventions

- Are the majority of treatment and supervision services directed toward the highest risk population?
- Are interventions targeted to the driving criminogenic needs?
- Are issues of responsivity considered and/or addressed when making treatment decisions?
- Are there available programs to meet the varying needs (criminogenic as well as cultural, learning styles and gender) of the offender population in Mesa County?
- Are treatment dosages monitored, appropriate and based on the individuals needs?
- Are treatment interventions cognitive-behavioral?
- Is treatment readily available for offenders when most appropriate (based on their readiness to change, risk and needs)?
- Are case plans developed for all offenders (or at least those who are high risk), and do these case plans drive supervision practices and treatment decisions?

Assessing Mesa County's Practice: Skill Training

- Are all supervising probation officers and case management staff trained in the use of cognitive-behavioral approaches to treatment?
- Do supervising officers and case managers understand antisocial thinking, social learning and appropriate communication techniques?
- Are these skills and methods of interacting with offenders used by *all* staff and (as well as prosecutors and judges) who engage with offenders?

Assessing Mesa County's Practice: Positive Reinforcement

- Are supervising officers and case managers trained to learn to identify positive behaviors and to consistently provide feedback to offenders regarding these behaviors?
- Do supervising officers and case managers look for and reinforce strengths among offenders on their caseload?
- Do offender supervision agencies and programs in Mesa County have identified positive reinforcement strategies to use with offenders under supervision?
- If so, do the positive reinforcements being used outnumber the punishments or negative sanctions used with offenders?
- Do supervising officers and case managers use positive reinforcements with offenders on their caseload?

Assessing Mesa County's Practice: Support in Natural Communities

- Do supervising officers and case managers engage with offender's natural support systems to use them in the offender management process?
- Do supervising officers and case managers identify or help the offender to develop positive relationships within the community?
- Are local programs that could provide positive support systems identified and used in the community supervision process?
- Do supervising officers and case managers collaborate between and among local law enforcement, courts, social services, schools, and other agencies are to enhance community supervision?
- Are restorative justice programs in place, where appropriate, to increase an offender's ties to the community (processes such as community accountability boards, offender accountability conferences, restitution funds, meaningful community service, mentoring, and victim/offender mediation)?

Assessing Mesa County's Practice: Providing Measurement Feedback

- Are performance measures for staff, treatment and supervision programs identified and regularly measured?
- Is performance assessment data made available to program staff and used to continually improve the system?
- Is there a process, in the County, to use assessment data in a feedback process to improve the system as a whole?
- When program or staff performance data is collected, is that data provide to stakeholders to review, assess and make recommendations for change or improvement, if necessary?

Goal 3: Identify system gaps in assessment, supervision and treatment services for Mesa County community-based offenders under supervision

After the description of the community-based correctional populations and services have been developed and assessed through and EBP lens, the Board members can review this information to determine where gaps in services are.

- **Action Item A:** Using the information obtained from the Action Items in Goals 1 through 3, determine where gaps exist in each community-based agency.
Responsible Party: Sheriff Hilkey, Susan Gilbert, Dennis Berry.
Advisory Parties: Board.
Timeline:
- **Action Item B:** Prioritize the severity of the gaps in services (assessment, case planning/supervision and treatment/programs). Specific question to address at this phase include:
 - Are we properly assessing all offenders to obtain the relevant information to direct services to the correct risk and needs levels?

- Are there certain categories of offenders for whom programming options do not meet their primary criminogenic needs?
- Are there categories of offenders for whom programs are not available (women, young teens, certain ethnic groups)?

Responsible Party: Sheriff Hilkey, Susan Gilbert, Dennis Berry.

Advisory Parties: Board.

Timeline:

Goal 4: Develop a plan to improve community assessment, supervision and treatment services to offenders under supervision in Mesa County community-based correctional agencies

- **Action Item A: Develop a system from which to prioritize the gaps in services.**

The Board will need to decide how they want to prioritize new programs for development and implementation. Is the priority based on the number of people currently un-served? How about the cost of developing certain programs? What about the risk posed by those currently un-served? The prioritization system is based on the values of the Board and the community the Board represents.

Responsible Party: Sheriff Hilkey, Susan Gilbert, Dennis Berry.

Advisory Parties: Board.

Timeline:

- **Action Item B: Prioritize the gaps in services.**

Responsible Party: Sheriff Hilkey, Susan Gilbert, Dennis Berry.

Advisory Parties: Board.

Timeline:

- **Action Item C: Develop a plan to address gaps in services**

Responsible Party: Sheriff Hilkey, Susan Gilbert, Dennis Berry.

Advisory Parties: Board.

Timeline:

IV. Conclusion

With the creation of a vision and the development of a strategic plan for achieving that vision, the Board has embarked on a journey toward excellence. The criminal justice leaders in this community have already accomplished incredible successes. They still face significant though not unusual or insurmountable challenges in the future. The strategies and actions already identified provide the roadmap; the commitment, energy, and competence demonstrated during the workshop constitute the fuel necessary to secure the resources and make the changes necessary to reach the vision's ultimate goal of improving the criminal justice system in Mesa County through the use of thoughtful and evidence based systems.

Through the development of a system assessment map, Board members gain a clearer understanding of how each system works, what programs they offer, and where gaps exist. As

presented here, the system assessment map begins with the community-based correctional agencies. If the Board would like to expand evidence practices beyond supervision and treatment practices, the Board could engage in the mapping and assessment exercises for all of the criminal justice agencies, from arrest to post release. Since the mission of the Board is to be evidence based, once the system map has been developed, each component of the system map should be assessed to determine (1) whether it is evidence based, (2) whether it is consistent with the goal of recidivism reduction, (3) where gaps exist (and to identify what needs to develop to fill the gaps), and (4) to identify and develop solutions to the barriers that exist in building a comprehensive criminal justice system.

Success in a collaborative venture requires continual planning and evaluation. Strategic planning through committees or bi-annual retreat is essential for success. A strategic plan assists in providing a timeline and a sense of direction. And, in order to remain productive, boards need to see what they have accomplished. Annual or semi-annual reviews of the strategic plan and identification of the goals, strategies and objectives that have been accomplished provide board members with a sense of achievement. Because any collaborative efforts employ volunteers, it is very important to acknowledge and reaffirm the value and purpose of their efforts.

Appendix A

Key Criminal Justice Leaders Interviewed

Dennis Berry, Executive Director, Criminal Justice Services Division
Hon. David Bottger, Chief Judge, 21st Judicial District
Kimberly Bullen, Senior Management Analyst, Mesa County Administrator's Office
Bill Gardner, Chief of Police, Grand Junction Police Department
Susan Gilbert, Chief Probation Officer, 21st Judicial District
Pete Hautzinger, District Attorney
Joe Higgins, Executive Director, Mesa County Partners
Stan Hilkeyy, Mesa County Sheriff
Hon. Gretchen Larson, County Court, Criminal Docket
Craig Meis, County Commissioner
Jon Peacock, County Administrator
Diann Rice, Board Member
Hon. Valerie Robison, District Court, Criminal Docket
Janet Rowland, County Commissioner
Dan Rubenstein, Chief Deputy District Attorney
Judy Vanderleest, District Court Administrator
Sharon Walker, Community Corrections Board Chair

References

- Agostinelli, G., Brown, J.M. and Miller, W.R. (1995). Effects of normative feedback on consumption among heavy drinking college students. *Journal of Drug Education*, 25:31-40.
- Alvero, A.M., Bucklin, B.R., & Austin, J. (2001). An objective review of the effectiveness and essential characteristics of performance feedback in organizational settings. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 21(1): 3-29.
- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J. and Hoge, R. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17:19-52.
- Andrews, D.A. (1989). Personality and crime: knowledge destruction and construction in criminology. *Justice Quarterly*, 6:291-309.
- Andrews, D.A. and Bonta, J. (1998). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Aos, S. (1998). *Watching the bottom line: cost-effective interventions for reducing crime in Washington*. Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Olympia, WA.
- Arzin, N.H. and Besalel, V.A. (1980). *Job club counselor's manual*. Austin, TX, Pro-Ed.
- Bailey, A. and Bullen, K. (2008). Mesa County criminal justice services independent review. Mesa County Administrator's Office.
- Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K, Joplin, Lore, Keiser, G., Wasson, B., Woodward, W. (2004). Implementing evidence-based practice in community corrections: the principles of effective intervention.
- Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K, Joplin, Lore, Wasson, B., Woodward, W. (2005). Implementing effective correctional management of offenders in the community Implementation checklist, *Crime and Justice Institute*.
- Clawson, E, Bogue, B, and Joplin, L. Implementing evidence-based practices in corrections, 1/17/2005.
- Clear, T.R. (1981). Objectives-based case planning. NIC Monograph, Washington, D.C..
- Clements, C.B. (1996). Offender classification, two decades of progress. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 23:121-143.
- Currie, E. (1998). *Crime and punishment in America*. New York, NY: Metropolitan Books.
- Dilulio, J.J. (1993). Performance measures for the criminal justice system. U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, D.C.
- Colorado Division of Criminal Justice (2007). Colorado community corrections standards.

Elliott, D., Hatot, N.J., Sirovatka, M.J., and Potter, B.B. (2001). Youth violence: a report of the Surgeon General.

Emerick, C.D, Tonigang, J.S., Montgomery, H. and Little, L. (1993). Alcoholics anonymous: opportunities and alternatives, edited by B.S. McGrady and W.R. Miller. New Brunswick, NJ.

Gendreau, P. and Groggin, C. (1995). *Principles of effective correctional programming with officers*. Center for Criminal Justice Studies and Department of Psychology University of New Brunswick, New Brunswick, Canada.

Gendreau, P. and Groggin, C. (1997). Correctional treatment: accomplishments and realities. Correctional Counseling and Rehabilitation, P.VanVoorhis, M. Braswell and D. Lester, eds., Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Gendreau, P., Little, T., and Goggin, C., (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: what works! *Criminology*, 34:575-607.

Gordon, T. (1970). *Parent effectiveness training*, New York: NY, Wyden Publishing.

Hayes, A.E. (2001). Providing Strategic Direction Through Community Criminal Justice Boards, *Topics in Community Corrections*, pp. 18-21.

Henggeler, S.W., Melton, G.B., Brondino, M.J., Scherer, D.G. and Hanley, J.H. (1997). Multisystemic therapy with violent and chronic juvenile offenders and their families: the role of treatment fidelity in successful dissemination. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65:000-0013.

Hanson, R.K. Harris, A. (1998). Triggers of sexual offense recidivism. *Research Summary: Corrections Research and Development*, 3(4):1-2.

Harland, A.T. (1996). Choosing correctional options that work: defining the demand and evaluating the supply. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Harper, R. and Hardy, S. (2000). An evaluation of motivational interviewing as a method of intervention with clients in a probation setting. *British Journal of Social Work*, 30:393-400.

Higgins, S.T and Silverman, K. (1999). *Motivating behavior change among illicit-drug abusers: research on contingency management interventions*. Washington, D.C. American Psychological Association.

Hogue, A., Liddle, H.A., Rowe, C., Turner, R.M., Dakof, G.A and Lapann, K. (1998). Treatment adherence and differentiation in individual versus family therapy for adolescent substance abuse. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 45:104-114.

Kropp, P., Hart, S., Webster, C., and Eaves, D. (1995). Manual for the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide.

Meyers, R.J and Smith, J.E. (1995). Clinical Guide to Alcohol Treatment: The Community Reinforcement Approach. New York: NY, Guilford Press.

Meyers, R.J. and Smith, J.E. (1997). Getting of the fence: procedures to engage treatment-resistant drinkers. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 14:467-472.

Meyers, R.J., Miller, W.R., Smith, J.E. and Tonnigan, (2002). A randomized trial of two methods for engaging treatment-refusing drug users through concerned significant others. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 70(5): 1182-1185.

Milhalic, S. and Irwin, K. (2003). Blueprints for violence prevention: from research to real world settings – factors influencing the successful replication of model programs. Boulder, CO, Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.

Miller, W. and Rollnick, S. (2002). *Motivational interviewing: preparing people for change*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Miller, W. and Mount, K.A. (2001). A small study of training in motivational interviewing: does one workshop change clinician and client behavior? Albuquerque, NM.

O'leary, V. and Clear, T. Community corrections approaches in the 21st century (1997). The National Institute of Corrections.

Palmer, T. (1995). Programmatic and non-programmatic aspects of successful intervention: new directions for research. *Crime and Delinquency*, 41(1):100-131.

Petersilia, J. (1997). Probation in the United States: Practices and Challenges. *National Institute of Justice Journal*: 2-8.

Petersilia, J., (2005). Strategic Reform: Implementing Evidence-Based Programs for California Offenders, powepoint presentation from the Center for Evidence Based Corrections, University of California-Irvine.

Project Match Research Group (1997). Therapist effects in three treatments for alcohol problems. *Psychotherapy Research*, 8(4):455-474.

Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55:68-78.

Sherman, L.W., Gottfredson, D.C., Mackenzie, D.L., Eck, J., Reuter, P. and Bushway, S.D. (1998). Preventing crime: what works, what doesn't, what's promising. National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Higgins & Silverman, 1999; Meyers & Smith, 1997; Wallace, 1989; Project MATCH Research Group, 1997; Bonta et al, 2002; O'Connor & Perryclear, 2003; Ricks, 1974; Clear & Sumter, 2003; Meyers et al, 2002

Miller, W. and Rollnick, S. (2002). *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing people for change*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Mihalic, et al, 2001; Satchel, 2001; Miller & Rollnick, 2002; Lipsey, 1993; McGuire, 2001, 2002

Maple, J. (1999). *Crime Fighter*. New York, NY: Doubleday Publishing.

McDonald, C. (2003) Forward via the Past? Evidence-Based Practice as Strategy in Social Work, *The Drawing Board: An Australian Review of Public Affairs*. March. Vol. 3(3): 123-142, or <http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/drawingboard/journal/0303/mcdonald.pdf>.

McGuire, J. (2001). What works in correctional intervention? Evidence and practical implications. Pp. 25-43 in *Offender rehabilitation in practice: Implementing and evaluating effective programs.*, edited by D.F Gary Bernfeld, Alan Leschied. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, LTD.

McGuire, J. (2002). Evidence-based programming today. Paper presented International Community Corrections Association conference, Boston, MA, November, 2002.

Miller, 1988; Project Match Research Group, 1997; Agostinelli et al, 1995; Alvero et al, 2001; Baer et al, 1992; Decker, 1983; Luderman, 1991; Miller, 1995; Zemke, 2001; Elliott, 1980

Taxman, F. and Byrne, J. (2001). Fixing broken windows probation together. *Perspectives*, Spring: 23-29.

Thompson, K. (1999). An evaluation of the keys to innervations program in North Dakota: A report submitted to the State Court Administrator, North Dakota Supreme Court, North Dakota State University.

Wagenknecht-Ivey, B. *An Approach to Long Range Strategic Planning for the Courts*, 2-19 (Denver, CO: Center for Public Policy Studies, 1992); Carter, M., *Responding to Parole & Probation Violations: A Handbook to Guide Local Policy Development*, (Silver Spring, MD: Center for Effective Public Policy, 2001).

Waltz, J., Addis, M.E., Koerner, K. and Jacobson, N.S. (1993). Testing the integrity of a psychotherapy protocol: Adherence and competence ratings. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61: 620-630.

Warren, R.K. (2007). Evidence-Based Practice to Reduce Recidivism: Implications for State Judiciaries. Paper prepared for the Crime and Justice Institute, National Institute of Corrections and National Center for State Courts.

Williams, K.R., Elliott, D. and Guerra, N.G. (1999). The DART model: linking development and risk together. The Center for the Study of Prevention and Violence, Boulder, CO.