

**Final**  
**STAFF SUMMARY OF MEETING**  
**JUVENILE DEFENSE ATTORNEY**

Date: 08/05/2013

Time: **09:03 AM to 03:56 PM**

Place: HCR 0112

This Meeting was called to order by  
Representative Levy

This Report was prepared by  
Hillary Smith

ATTENDANCE

Brant	X
Brodhead	X
Brown	X
Dvorchak	X
Giron	E
Harvey	X
Jessel	*
Koppes Conway	E
Labuda	E
Lee	X
Lilgerose	X
Marble	X
Martin	X
Navarro	X
Smith	X
Ulibarri	X
Weinerman	X
Wright	X
Guzman	X
Levy	X

X = Present, E = Excused, A = Absent, \* = Present after roll call

Bills Addressed:	Action Taken:
Opening Comments	Committee Discussion Only
Overview of State Law	Witness Testimony and/or Committee Discussion Only
Phases of a Juvenile Case	Witness Testimony and/or Committee Discussion Only
Role of State Agencies	Witness Testimony and/or Committee Discussion Only
Professionalism Standards for Juvenile Defense Attorneys	Witness Testimony and/or Committee Discussion Only
Public Testimony	Witness Testimony and/or Committee Discussion Only
Other Business	Committee Discussion Only

**09:05 AM -- Opening Comments**

Representative Levy, chair, called the meeting to order. Ms. Benita Martin, who was not present at the first meeting, introduced herself and explained her background. She is the director of the juvenile diversion program in the Denver District Attorney's Office. Representative Levy explained that Ms. Martin is the designee of several victims' organizations. Ms. Linda Weinerman, the Executive Director of the Office of the Child's Representative, introduced herself to the committee and explained her office's work.

**09:07 AM**

Representative Levy spoke about a subcommittee concerning records expungement. She asked for volunteers to serve on the subcommittee. Ms. Dvorchak volunteered to serve. Ms. Brown spoke about someone in the Office of the State Public Defender who may be interested in serving. Ms. Martin also volunteered to serve.

**09:11 AM**

Representative Levy asked for feedback concerning the first meeting of the committee and ideas for presentations at future meetings. She expressed interest in learning about the difficulties of finding counsel in rural areas. She discussed the potential of using the Office of the Alternate Defense Counsel to find attorneys with an interest in specializing in juvenile defense counsel. She also explained that the committee would be exploring when and how waivers of counsel occur.

**09:14 AM**

Senator Harvey responded to Representative Levy's comments. He spoke about the importance of examining the costs of various reforms. Senator Marble discussed the number of attorney hours spent on travel in rural areas. She raised the possibility of using video conferences to conduct these hearings.

**09:16 AM**

Judge Smith offered to make himself available to discuss video hearings. He spoke about his experience in rural court work.

**09:19 AM**

Senator Guzman shared additional comments concerning assistance to rural areas. She expressed interest in learning more about the process of learning whether a family is indigent.

**09:19 AM -- Overview of State Law Concerning Indigency Guidelines and the Appointment of Counsel**

Mr. Dave DeNovellis, representing Legislative Council Staff, provided an overview to the committee concerning the statutory responsibilities of the Office of the State Public Defender (OSPD). He distributed a memorandum to the committee (Attachment A). He discussed a Chief Justice Directive concerning indigency guidelines.

**09:24 AM**

Mr. Richard Sweetman, representing the Office of Legislative Legal Services, introduced himself and provided an overview of case law concerning the appointment of counsel and the role of the OSPD. He distributed a memorandum to the committee (Attachment B). He walked the committee through the memorandum, including an explanation of five United States Supreme Court decisions particularly relevant to the work of the committee.

"

**09:28 AM**

Senator Marble asked for additional information concerning *In re Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967). Representative Levy asked about the distinction between a waiver of counsel and parental refusal of counsel. She asked what sort of inquiry the court has to make in a situation in which a parent refuses counsel. Representative Levy asked if any case law specifies at what phase the right of counsel attaches.

**09:31 AM**

Senator Guzman asked for information concerning when parents refuse counsel. Mr. Sweetman responded to her questions.

**09:34 AM -- Phases of a Juvenile Case**

Ms. Sarah Ericson, representing the 18th Judicial District Attorney's Office, began with an overview of how the juvenile office in Douglas County handles the intake of a case. She spoke about the standards that district attorneys must meet in order to determine whether to file charges. She discussed the factors that district attorneys take into account when determining whether to file charges. She said that almost half of the cases that are brought to Douglas County are sent to diversion proceedings, rather than to court. Ms. Ericson said that Douglas County prefers to bring children into court via a summons mailed to the family, rather than through the detention process. She spoke about differences between various jurisdictions.

**09:39 AM**

Ms. Ericson continued her presentation by discussing the number of warrants issued in Douglas County. She noted that a warrant does not mean that a juvenile will be arrested. She discussed the advisement provided to a juvenile after he or she comes to court on a summons. She discussed other paperwork that must happen at the initial appearance, including filing a mandatory protection order. She spoke about conversations that the court may have with families and children at the initial appearance. She noted that Douglas County tends to see more guardians ad litem (GALs) than attorneys. She provided possible reasons for this situation.

**09:43 AM**

Ms. Michelle Brinegar, representing the 8th Judicial District Attorney's Office, provided an overview of the phases of a juvenile case from her office's perspective. She said that the juvenile division in her office is a specialty court, and she described how attorneys serve in that office. She stated that juveniles generally come to her office through a formal arrest. For a misdemeanor offense, the officer writes a ticket that is then sent to the district attorney's office. She described the factors that go into the district attorney's decision of whether to file a case. Ms. Brinegar spoke about the use of diversion programs, which she said tend to be treatment-based. She said that diversion is the best way to handle a majority of juvenile cases.

**09:47 AM**

Ms. Brinegar stated that if an officer wants to file a felony charge, the officer must review the case with a deputy district attorney. If felony charges are filed, the office sends a letter to the juvenile and their parents with information about the court date. She said that there is generally no need for an arrest warrant or bond. She spoke about the conversations that the district attorney has with a juvenile on his or her court date. Ms. Brinegar said that her office does not make different plea offers depending on whether a juvenile has or does not have an attorney. She spoke about the advisements the judge provides to a juvenile on his or her court case. She said that the majority of the time, a GAL is appointed before defense counsel is appointed. She said that in reality, GALs operate very much like defense attorneys. She stated that it can be frustrating for a family when a case slows down or requires multiple court dates after an attorney is appointed. She said that there are situations in which having a public defender who is not familiar with juvenile processes and needs can be detrimental to the juvenile.

**09:53 AM**

Ms. Angela Brant, representing the Arapahoe County Office of the State Public Defender, indicated that more juveniles are arrested on warrants in Arapahoe County than are brought in via a summons. She explained that a juvenile who is arrested and brought into court must have a detention hearing within 48 hours of their detention, not including holidays and weekends. She said that while attorneys from the OSPD are not present at detention hearings, on-call attorneys on the Office of the Alternate Defense Counsel (OADC) and parental refusal lists are present. Ms. Brant noted that unlike adults, juveniles can be held without bail. Charges must be filed within 72 hours after a detention hearing.

**09:58 AM**

Ms. Brant spoke about the counsel-appointment process in Arapahoe County, noting that juveniles go through a number of assessments prior to the appointment of defense counsel. She said that defense counsel is generally appointed more quickly for children who are involved with social services. She spoke about the paperwork required to request a public defender. She then discussed speedy trial rights and the limited right for a juvenile to have a jury trial. She said that it is important for juveniles to know when they have a right to a jury trial, and when to ask for one.

**10:01 AM**

Ms. Brant referred to the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *In re Gault*. She listed the sentencing options available in a juvenile delinquency case. She spoke about the mandatory sentence offender classifier, explaining that if a child has three adjudications on his or her record, regardless of what the charge is, he or she faces a mandatory one year out-of-home placement, unless an alternate sentence is found. She also noted the sentencing requirements for a juvenile adjudicated of a crime of violence. Finally, she discussed repeat juvenile offenders and aggravated juvenile offenders. Aggravated juvenile offenders are entitled to a jury of 12, rather than to a jury of 6 like most juveniles.

**10:05 AM**

Ms. Kim Dvorchak, representing the Colorado Juvenile Defender Coalition, described the post-sentencing phases of a case. She spoke about a periodic review of probation, and noted that the statute specifically states that counsel is not required to be present for such hearings, although there is a right to counsel in a probation revocation hearing. She discussed review hearings for community placement and placement in the Division of Youth Corrections (DYC) in the Department of Human Services. She said that any juvenile sentenced to DYC has to serve at least six months of parole. She discussed a lack of statutory rights to counsel for parole hearings.

**10:09 AM**

Ms. Dvorchak stated that a juvenile has the same right to appeal as an adult, and explained where appeals must be filed. She distributed data concerning the number of juvenile delinquency appeals (Attachment C). She noted that there are very few juvenile appeals. She discussed how the lack of published cases affects case law, professionalism, and the decisions that judges and attorneys are able to make. Finally, Ms. Dvorchak discussed post-conviction rights, noting that in this situation the adult Rules of Criminal Procedure apply to juveniles.

"

**10:13 AM**

Ms. Dvorchak discussed rules pertaining to records expungement and registry on the Colorado sex offender registry. She said that a juvenile must affirmatively petition to remove him or herself from the sex offender registry. She discussed recent legislative changes to rules concerning expungement and the sex offender registry. She spoke about other states' rules concerning post-disposition access to counsel. She then discussed the costs of keeping juveniles in detention.

**10:16 AM**

Senator Ulibarri sought clarification that there is an advisement of rights but not an advisement of collateral consequences. Ms. Dvorchak responded to his questions, noting that only an attorney could be sure which potential consequences would apply to an individual child. Ms. Brinegar stated that juveniles in her jurisdiction are given a complete advisement of possible collateral consequences, although the advisement is not tailored to the individual juvenile.

**10:18 AM**

Senator Harvey asked why it is possible for children to be held without bail. Ms. Dvorchak indicated that the authority to hold children without bail was established in the 1990s. Representative Levy asked if there has been jurisprudence indicating that an adult's right to bail does not apply to juveniles. Ms. Dvorchak and Ms. Brinegar responded to her question. Ms. Brinegar stated that bonds are not issued for any child. She said that a juvenile will not be detained unless it is determined that the juvenile poses a threat to him or herself or to others. Ms. Brinegar indicated that juveniles are not held just because they cannot afford bail.

**10:23 AM**

Representative Levy asked for additional information concerning various practices across districts. Ms. Brinegar responded to her question, indicating that much of a jurisdiction's practices tend to follow earlier traditions. Judge Smith asked for information about when a summons is issued. Ms. Brinegar explained that an officer-written summons is sent to her office, and not to the court. Discussion continued between Judge Smith and Ms. Brinegar concerning whether it is possible to compare rates of informal adjustment in the 8th Judicial District compared to other jurisdictions. Ms. Ericson noted that not every jurisdiction offers diversion programs. Representative Levy spoke about recent legislation on this topic.

**10:29 AM**

Senator Marble asked Ms. Brinegar for further information concerning the use of pretrial services programs for juveniles. Ms. Brinegar responded to her remarks, noting that juveniles are generally released to Senate Bill 94 program supervision.

**10:33 AM**

Ms. Jessel asked about the percentage of children committed to DYC who actually go right to community placement, and how many children are denied parole. Ms. Weinerman addressed Ms. Brinegar's comments concerning GALs. She said that GALs cannot be defense attorneys and are required to represent the best interests of the child, not the child him or herself.

**10:36 AM**

Representative Levy asked Ms. Brant to discuss the use of OADC and parental refusal attorney lists. Ms. Ericson addressed questions concerning how attorneys are added to a list. Discussion continued on this point. Ms. Dvorchak commented that the public defender statute provides a broader representation than the advisement of counsel statute. She spoke about the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Rothgery v. Gillespie County*, 554 U.S. 191 (2008). Ms. Brinegar shared additional remarks.

**10:40 AM**

Senator Guzman asked for information regarding the timeline for determining eligibility for a public defender and parental refusal of counsel. Ms. Lilgerose spoke about her personal experience with parental refusal counsel. Ms. Ericson responded to Ms. Lilgerose's remarks. Senator Guzman asked for more detail concerning the application process for a public defender. Ms. Brant addressed her questions.

**10:45 AM**

The committee stood in a brief recess.

**10:56 AM -- Role of State Agencies in the Juvenile Justice Process**

The committee came back to order.

**10:57 AM**

Ms. Frances Brown, representing the Office of the State Public Defender (OSPD), described her office's role in juvenile defense. She discussed the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *In re Gault*. She referred to the specifics of the case related to the waiver of counsel. She discussed the provisions of the OSPD statute. She stated that attorneys must obey the rules of professional conduct. She also discussed the annual conferences that the OSPD attends, and discussed the number of complaints filed against the OSPD. She explained that OSPD attorneys are state employees, not contract employees.

**11:02 AM**

Ms. Brown spoke about mandatory training provided by the OSPD to its attorneys concerning juvenile counsel. She said that since 2007, there has been a separate juvenile agenda at the annual conference, and all attorneys involved in juvenile counsel must attend the items on this agenda. She then addressed whether public defenders can appear at juvenile detention hearings. She said that her office is not completely clear what the *Rothgery* case requires in juvenile counsel. She explained how the OSPD has interpreted the case. She stated that for some offices, it is possible for public defenders to appear at detention hearings. She noted that at this point, public defenders may not necessarily be assigned to the case. She spoke about the need to minimize the potential for conflicts of interest.

**11:10 AM**

Ms. Brown provided detail concerning the statute explaining when the OSPD is required to enter a case. She spoke about language within the most recent Chief Justice Directive concerning the right of the OSPD to elect to represent a defendant prior to appointment. She noted that juveniles are not considered to be "defendants." She said that there are three ways that a child can get the appointment of counsel: indigency; parental refusal; and if the court determines that it is in the best interests of the child. She indicated that in many cases, juveniles and their parents waive counsel because they are not adequately advised of potential collateral consequences to a conviction. She said that Fort Collins has put together a video for all juveniles going through the juvenile justice system, and one part of the video concerns collateral consequences.

**11:18 AM**

Ms. Brown concluded her remarks by stating that there were approximately 10,000 juvenile cases last year, and 75 percent of them took place in eight metro-area offices with public defenders who specialize in juvenile cases. She referred to earlier conversations concerning video conferencing.

**11:20 AM**

Ms. Lindy Frolich, executive director of the Office of the Alternate Defense Counsel (OADC), explained that her office provides attorneys in situations in which the OSPD has a conflict of interest. She stated that the OADC contracts with about 400 lawyers across the state. She spoke about her experience as a public defender and as an attorney in private practice prior to the creation of the OADC and the Office of the Child's Representative. She noted that juvenile cases are handled differently across the state. She said that OADC lawyers are generally not in court at detention hearings. She referred to earlier discussions concerning Arapahoe County, noting that lawyers who are present there are present on a voluntary basis. She said that except in Denver, public defenders and OADC are not regularly present for detention hearings.

**11:26 AM**

Ms. Frolich spoke about her work for the OADC and information concerning collateral consequences. She said that OADC cannot pick up any juvenile or criminal case until the OSPD has made a determination that the person qualifies for a public defender and that the OSPD has a conflict of interest. She then turned her attention to parental refusal cases. Finally, she spoke about the differences between a guardian ad litem (GAL) and a defense attorney. She also referred to earlier comments concerning whether the outcome is the same whether a defense attorney is present or not. Ms. Frolich said that her office is neither authorized to nor funded to be involved in post-disposition cases.

**11:32 AM**

Ms. Frolich spoke about petitions to remove a juvenile from the sex offender registry.

**11:33 AM**

Ms. Susan Colling, representing the Colorado Judicial Branch, explained how probation fits into the juvenile justice system. She noted that probation is a formal sentence from the courts. She stated that the Probation Division conducts a pre-sentence investigation (PSI) and is responsible for ongoing supervision within the community. A PSI report is not required by state law, and only some courts require it. She discussed the factors that help determine how a juvenile will be supervised in the community. She stated that filings, detentions, and other aspects of the juvenile justice system seem to be declining every year. She distributed two documents to the committee concerning the costs of various sentencing options for juveniles (Attachments D and E).



**11:41 AM**

Representative Levy sought information concerning how the process varies from judicial district to judicial district.

**11:42 AM**

Ms. Colling responded to questions from Senator Harvey concerning how the juvenile justice process has changed over the years. Ms. Brown remarked on the decline in juvenile filings. Ms. Lilgerose sought information concerning probation officers in Denver County. Discussion continued between Ms. Colling and Ms. Lilgerose concerning training for probation officers. In response to questions from Representative Levy, Ms. Colling explained that in some districts, probation officers may specialize in juvenile cases.

**11:46 AM**

Ms. Jessel sought information concerning a situation in which the client of a public defender becomes a victim in a separate case. Ms. Brown indicated that the roles are different depending on whether the client is a current or former client. She indicated that the situation is highly complex. Ms. Lilgerose sought additional information concerning the list of attorneys on the parental refusal list. Ms. Frolich indicated that the management of the list varies across jurisdictions. She said that in her practice, courts use the OADC list of attorneys who are qualified to practice in juvenile cases. Discussion then turned to whether parental refusal attorneys are held to the same standards as the public defenders. Ms. Frolich stated that OADC lawyers appearing in juvenile court are required to do five hours of juvenile-specific training each year.

**11:51 AM**

Ms. Brown responded to questions from Ms. Weinerman concerning whether it is possible to ensure that public defenders are present on certain days. Representative Levy asked for further information concerning detention hearings. Ms. Brown responded to her question.

**11:56 AM**

Representative Levy sought additional information concerning logistical and ethical issues that may arise if video conferences are used. She stressed that the cultures vary across jurisdictions. Ms. Frolich shared additional information concerning video conferences confidentiality issues related to such conferences.

**12:01 PM**

Judge Smith discussed his experience in the issue of video conferencing. He spoke about potential costs to counties for video conferencing. Representative Levy asked whether attorneys closer to detention facilities could represent juveniles being held there. Ms. Brown spoke about the potential conflicts of interest that such a situation may raise. She discussed transportation from detention facilities to courts. Ms. Jessel shared additional thoughts on the topic, as did Senator Marble.

**12:11 PM**

Representative Levy sought additional information concerning waivers of counsel. Ms. Brown spoke about case law concerning what is required for a valid waiver of counsel. Ms. Frolich commented on the issue of waivers of counsel. She said that the right to counsel attaches to the juvenile. She stated that the waiver of counsel is an informal process that does not work very well in its current form. Ms. Frolich expressed the view that a waiver should not be permitted until after an attorney consultation. Discussion between Representative Levy and Ms. Frolich continued, with Ms. Frolich expressing her personal belief that it is in the best interest of every person to be represented by an attorney in court. Ms. Brown commented that in some instances, a court will bring in a public defender to counsel a client who wants to waive counsel, with the requirement that that attorney not be later appointed to represent the client.

**12:20 PM**

Ms. Dvorchak spoke about the small number of juvenile cases handled by the OADC and the OSPD. She asked what impact the *Rothgery* case and legislation in response to that case may have on the allocation of resources devoted to adult and juvenile cases. Ms. Brown responded to her questions. Ms. Brown stated that the idea of a Chief Juvenile Defender has been discussed, but is not favored. She listed other topics that the OSPD has discussed due to changes in how public defenders are promoted. Representative Levy asked for further detail on these changes.

**12:26 PM**

Ms. Frolich spoke about her efforts to coordinate contract attorneys who specialize in juvenile cases.

**12:28 PM**

Senator Marble asked whether there are adequate resources for investigations in juvenile cases. Ms. Frolich responded to her question, as did Ms. Brown.

**12:31 PM**

The committee recessed for lunch.

**02:00 PM -- Professionalism Standards for Juvenile Defense Attorneys**

The committee reconvened and Representative Levy called the meeting back to order.

**02:03 PM**

Senator Harvey and Ms. Brown discussed the rates that are paid to attorneys contracting with the OADC. A book from the National Juvenile Defender Center, "National Juvenile Defense Standards," was distributed to the committee. A link to the book can be found on the Juvenile Defense Attorney Interim Committee [website](#).

**02:07 PM**

Mr. Mike Rafik, juvenile defense attorney with Collins, Rafik, and Johnson, Ms. Kim Dvorchak, executive director of the Colorado Juvenile Defender Center, and Robin Walker Sterling, assistant professor at the University of Denver Sturm College of Law, came to the table to discuss standards of professionalism for juvenile defense attorneys. Professor Walker Sterling told the committee a story illustrating why she wanted to be a juvenile defense attorney. She stated that the juvenile defense system is calibrated more towards punishment than rehabilitation. Professor Walker Sterling said that she wanted to discuss the scope of juvenile defense counsel and why that scope is important. She said that ethical rules are very clear that juvenile defense attorneys must represent the juvenile's stated interests, and that there are scenarios where there is confusion between stated interests and what attorneys and judges assume is the child's best interests. Professor Walker Sterling compared this to GALs, who serve a child's best interest.

**02:17 PM**

Professor Walker Sterling discussed the obligation of confidentiality between the attorney and the juvenile, and stated that the obligation is the same as it is with an adult client. She discussed recent United States Supreme Court cases concerning juvenile justice. Professor Walker Sterling noted that there is a trend of using the juvenile court system as the primary system for juvenile discipline as opposed to diversion programs.

**02:27 PM**

Mr. Rafik discussed his background in juvenile defense. He discussed the inherent differences in representation by a private attorney and a public defender. Mr. Rafik stated that juvenile justice is complex and should require specialization. He stated that some of the blame for failures that occur in juvenile representation are attributable to how public defenders advance in the system.

**02:36 PM**

Ms. Dvorchak stated that is important to approach juvenile defense through the eyes of the child. She noted that the National Juvenile Defense Standards are being implemented in numerous states. She responded to questions from the committee regarding who is promulgating these standards, and stated that the standards are more of a template. Ms. Dvorchak said that some states require certification in order to practice juvenile law.

**02:48 PM**

Professor Walker Sterling said that people should reject the notion of the juvenile system as an offshoot of the adult system. She stated that society should not widen the net in order to capture more children, and that the people in the system should be the ones who need to be there to access services. Professor Walker Sterling noted that justice should be rehabilitative and not punitive. Professor Walker Sterling responded to questions from Senator Harvey regarding what can be done legislatively.

**02:56 PM**

Representative Levy asked the panel to describe the role of GALs. Mr. Rafik stated that the GAL fills a specific purpose but expressed concerns about when the GAL acts as a second defense counsel. Ms. Dvorchak stated what she saw as struggles between the scope of representation of attorneys and GALs. Ms. Weinerman said that the GALs are not attorneys and are required to represent the assumed best interests of a child, not necessarily the stated interest. Senator Marble stated the misuse of GALs may lead to a lack of trust in the system by juveniles and parents.

**03:06 PM**

Ms. Dvorchak responded to questions from Senator Marble regarding what could be done to ensure adequate representation and stated that statutes should say that juveniles have a right to counsel at first contact, and she would also like the rules of juvenile procedure to be updated. Professor Walker Sterling stated juveniles should have easier access to community-based services. She also said that there is a tendency to overprosecute, and that there should be more reliance of other types of social control.

**03:11 PM**

Mr. Rafik stated that there should be an attorney at the first appearance, and that there needs to be accountability in schools. He said the counties should consider funding diversion programs. Professor Walker Sterling stated that she would like to see juveniles required to see counsel at least once before being allowed to waive counsel. She would like to see people not criminalize normal adolescent behavior.

**03:20 PM**

Ms. Dvorchak and Professor Walker Sterling discussed the impact of collateral consequences on immigration with Senator Ulibarri.

**03:22 PM -- Public Testimony**

Ms. Ginger V. Geissinger, a Weld County juvenile defense attorney, came to the table to discuss collateral consequences. She noted that the severity of collateral consequences should mandate that juveniles have adequate access to counsel at the detention hearing. She discussed a personal story about a client she represented who as an adult was unable to get guardianship of his disabled mother due to his breaking into a car when he was 15. Ms. Geissinger discussed the educational, vocational, and financial implications of misdemeanors and felonies. She said that often judges and district attorneys do not go far enough when explaining collateral consequence and leave it to the defense attorneys.

**03:33 PM**

Senator Ulibarri asked if Ms. Geissinger has a full list of collateral consequences. She noted that the most comprehensive list is maintained by the American Bar Association, which can be accessed [here](#). Ms. Geissinger discussed the difficulties of expunging records. Representative Levy stated that the OSPD maintains a state-specific collateral consequence list. Judge Smith discussed the consequence advisement video from Larimer County. Ms. Martin discussed pre- and post-adjudication and pre- and post-file diversion programs. Ms. Geissinger noted that while most consequences attach post-adjudication, there are some consequences that attach pre-adjudication. She stated that not every district has a juvenile diversion program.

**03:42 PM -- Other Business**

Representative Levy asked the committee for input on topics, resources, other ways to address the committee's charge. Senator Harvey noted that the afternoon panel addressed school codes and how zero-tolerance policies are clogging the criminal justice system. Representative Levy discussed legislation that came from the School Discipline Task Force established in 2011 and said it is a good idea to look into the implementation of the bills. She said she would look into having a presentation on school discipline. Ms. Lilgerose stated that she would like the committee to discuss restorative justice and diversion programs. Representative Levy referred to the adult diversion program legislation passed in the 2013 session. Ms. Dvorchak discussed what informal referring systems that the Juvenile Justice Task Force of the Colorado Committee on Criminal and Juvenile Justice is looking into. Ms. Weinerman said that she would like data regarding the variations in how different districts handle juvenile cases. Senator Guzman asked for fiscal analysis at some point regarding what the system costs now and the cost for suggestions that have arisen. Representative Wright stated that training and standards for law enforcement officers is important to look into.

**03:52 PM**

Ms. Brown stated that she would like to see data on differences in detention processes and to look into the implementation of Senate Bill 91-094.

**03:55 PM**

The committee adjourned.