



The Timothy Montoya Task Force To Prevent Children From Running Away From Out-Of-Home Placement | Meeting 14

Meeting Minutes -- Full Group Discussion

February 14th, 2024, 8:00 am-10:00 am Virtual Meeting (Zoom)
Facilitators: Keystone Policy Center (Trace Faust & Doris Tolliver)
Members: See Appendix A

	Wembers. See Appendix A
Welcome & Approval of Minutes	 Task force Chair Stephanie Villafuerte welcomed the task force and did a roll call. She moved to approval of the minutes. She asked for edits; there were no edits. Jenelle Goodrich motioned and Dennis Desparrois seconded. The minutes were approved. She moved to approval of the recap. She asked for edits; there were none. Jenna Coleman motioned and Beth NcNalley seconded. The recap was approved.
Introduction	 Trace Faust outlined the schedule for the day in subcommittee groups. They recapped the process of the subcommittee work; first starting in subcommittees and then volunteers work with Bryan Kelley to make recommendations to discuss as a large group at the next meeting. Bryan continued with a preview of the resources so members can be introduced to both topics; he started with the prevention subcommittee and hardware policies in 4 different states. Members have access to these resources. Bryan reminded the task force that CPO is not endorsing these policies by including them in the materials. He included that these state examples do not exactly match the context of the task force, for example some of the states discuss children with developmental disabilities explicitly. He explained CA in detail which included secured perimeters, delayed egress and age considerations. He explained KS in detail. KS has secured facilities for a specific type of youth with severe mental health concerns and diagnoses; children are housed there for 6 months and then they are reevaluated. KS also writes out the rights of the youth. WA has secure and semi secure facilities as well as staff secure facilities. There is also periodic review of facilities. WY has secure treatment centers described in statute with locking doors that must be accredited by a third party. He reminded people to discuss the examples that they like and dislike. Trace asked for questions from the members; there was none. Bryan moved to the intervention subcommittee and varied responses categories. The risk assessment dictates what response policy is required. AZ created a list of risk factors and if a child meets these factors then it requires specific elements of policy. DC is similar and they define absent children, missing children, abducted children and high risk children. These definitions prompt a specific response. NC is also similar by defining a high risk child. The idea is that children who meet a certain threshold prompt a sp







	the manufacture and a constitute about 1 and 1 and 1 and 1 and 2 and 2 and 3 a
	the prevention subcommittee should consider the Juvenile Justice Prevention Act, a federal act, that will not allow a secure locked fence. He also mentioned secure facilities will not be able to house committed youth and child welfare youth at the same time. Bryan thanked him for his comments. Doris Tolliver said that the note catcher will help tease out these specific pieces. Kelly Abbott said that the Division of Criminal Justice monitors Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act and she is happy to answer any questions people have about secure perimeters and delayed egress. Bryan said that the second part of the intervention subcommittee resources is specified response protocols. He provided the relevant CO regulations. He also explained that MI assigns deadlines to certain requirements and assigns responsibilities of employees. TN also portrays timelines. WA has robust language on these topics. Bryan asked for questions. There were none. • Trace provided the Zoom link for the subcommittee members to go to. Doris read the list of people that were in the subcommittee she facilitated. There was a conversation about what subcommittee members were in.
Prevention Subcommittee	• <u>Minutes</u>
Intervention Subcommittee	• <u>Minutes</u>
Conclusion	• Trace welcomed back the large group. They invited public comment. They, then invited Doris to share a bit about the subcommittee conversation. She said that the subcommittee was consistent in wanting characteristic driven distinctions of the children. This was a conversation about a high, moderate, low framework like Beth's. The children in the higher risk category are children who have suicide history, trafficking concerns, and medical concerns. There was less conversation around children that are below high risk. There was a conversation about the immediacy of the response and the existing tools to help determine risk. They named TN as a state to look at. Doris asked the subcommittee for anything that she missed; there was none. Trace provided the summary of their subcommittee. They said that the group discussed different categories: youth room, building, perimeter, and community. The youth room category included lasers. The building category included cameras and delayed locks. The perimeters category included fencing and ankle monitoring. The community category included cross walks. The idea was to explore tech more broadly. Trace asked for more comments; there were none.
Public Comment	No public comment.
Next Steps and Adjourn	Trace thanked the task force. Stephanie provided a gratitude closure; she is excited by these ideas. The task force adjourned at 10 AM.





POLICY COLLABORATIVE FOR CHILDREN & FAMILIES



Appendix A:

Stephanie Villafuerte

Karen Nielsen

Bryan Kelley

David Lee

Kelly Abbott

Dennis Desparrois

Kevin Lash

Becky Miller Updike

Jenna Coleman

Beth McNalley

Ashley Chase

Anna Cole

Elizabeth Montoya

Chelsea Hill

Jenelle Goodrich

Dr. Renee Marquardt

Brandon Miller

Norma Agular Dave

Brian Cotter