



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

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

Welcome & Approval of Minutes	Task force Chair Stephanie Villafuerte welcomed the task force and said that the task force will hold on approving the meeting materials from the last meeting to allow time for further review.
Discussion	 Trace Faust welcomed the task force and recapped a recent email that details the process of the upcoming meetings as well as edits to the draft recommendations. They asked for any questions. Jenelle Goodrich said that she will be out of town for the September meeting; she asked if she should have a proxy. Trace said that the final voting will happen via survey and email; the last meeting is a wrap up on where the recommendations landed. Jenelle thanked her. Trace asked for more questions; there were none. Doris Tolliver explained draft recommendation seven. Jordan Steffen also provided context on draft recommendation seven. Doris thanked her and provided the intention of the draft recommendation; she provided time for the task force to review the draft recommendation language. She asked for any questions; Jenelle asked which number they were starting with. Doris provided an answer. Doris brought the task force back. She asked for comments. Brian Cotter said that he has some concerns that the language is too broad. Doris asked him to say some more. Brian said that the information sharing topic is very broad. He said that it would be important to share information but not all information so he recommended a mandate for only specific information being shared. Doris thanked him. Jenelle said that she agrees; the information from an agency should be shared through the person on the team. Doris thanked her. Jordan said that they can narrow the language around the information shared; she brought up the other recommendations about information sharing and how the recommendations impact each other. Jenelle said that the information could be misused so it should be tightened up. Doris thanked everyone and said that they could include language about appropriate use of the information about a specific child to inform a response; he said that the yolo need the information sharing was de-identified data rather than a database with information about a specific child to info







- TRAILS and other databases so there are already ways to work through challenges. Doris thanked her.
- Lynette Overmeyer said that there should be an ability to share information about medical health concerns and mental health concerns. She recommended 'need to know' information. Doris thanked her and asked for more comments.
- Michelle Bradley said that she is wondering about people over 18 who are still involved with treatment. Jordan said that she can address this and asked for language to help the third party consultant address this. Doris asked a clarifying question. Michelle said these people have opted into treatment; people can be in the program until age 21. Doris said that there could be language for opting in. She also responded to electronic chats about typos in the draft recommendation language. She asked for any more comments.
- Brian said that he would oppose involving people over 18; this is beyond the scope of a unit. He said that the unit would focus on children who cannot self-protect and people over 18 can opt out. Stephanie said that this is a jurisdictional issue; the age 18 matters. She said that those who enter care after 18 do so voluntarily with agreements; there are custodial considerations. She said that, for today, there can be language about any plan making considerations for people over 18. Doris thanked her and asked for more comments.
- Lynette asked about recovering people with developmental disabilities. Brian said that they investigate any missing person case whether it was a purposeful run or not; it is more finicky for people with developmental disabilities. He said that they engage with people to see if there are safe places for them to go; if they are over age 18, they get to decide what happens and police cannot use force like they can with children. He said this is why he objects to this; it would be an intrusion of their rights. Doris thanked him. Lynette thanked him. Doris asked for more comments and said that there will be another opportunity to review the revised language and add comments before ultimately approving the recommendation or not; there were none.
- Trace electronically provided draft recommendation five. Jordan provided context for the draft recommendation. Trace provided time for review.
- Trace brought the task force back and asked for comments.
- Brian said that he struggled with this recommendation; he is not sure what the intent of the recommendation is. Trace thanked him. Jordan said that she agrees; she hopes this conversation can hone in the intention of the recommendation. Trace said that there can be a strawpoll to further hone in the recommendation. Ashley Chase said that there is recent legislation creating similar short term placements; the first focus could be if these efforts could be used by runaway children. She also said that education will be disrupted in a temporary placement so she struggles with the idea of temporary placement without a vision of benefit for the child. She also said that there should be a definition of temporary. Trace thanked her.
- Lynette said that a short-term stabilization placement is a better word for it.
 She said that the education part should be explored more since disrupting education leads to challenges for the child. She wants to avoid calling the placements temporary since the intention was to stabilize a child to get them







back to placement. She hopes that longer term placements would take a child back after a run since, when they refuse, it is a huge disruption. Trace thanked her.

- Norma Augilar Dave said that there should be more research done on what this looks like; people will like temporary placement since currently children are in precarious settings like DHS lobbies but there needs to be caution about moving this forward. She said that it should not be called a placement since children could linger there for long periods. She said that the intention is an assessment of a child's needs to figure out what needs to change in treatment. She also said that there are 21 day programs that take children to their schools; something similar can be built into a program like this. She said that the issue is children that are running from placement. Trace thanked her.
- Stephanie said that there needs to be a thorough post run assessment; there
 are already supports in place that do this work. She asked if the task force is
 recommending a robust post run assessment to determine if a child needs a
 new placement; if so, that recommendation exists. She said that this process
 can be even more robust rather than setting up shelters. She suggested
 placing this recommendation in another part of the recommendations. She
 also mentioned a continuum of care. Trace thanked her.
- Norma said that it is hard to determine what a child needs after a run. She said that the most inexperienced caseworkers often do the work and they do not always know what to do with a child. She said that there is a need for a more robust assessment after a child is not succeeding in their placement. She said assessments are more clinical work which is different from case management. Trace thanked her.
- Jenelle said that she agrees with Norma. She asked about out of state children. Lynette said that runaways from other states are put in detention for another state to come pick them up. Jenelle said that if there is not a run report, then the other state will not acknowledge the child. She suggested allowing Colorado to act since the out of state agreements are not always acknowledged. Lynette said that Mesa County takes custody of the out of state children and either plans for the family to come pick them up or pays for their travel home. Jenelle said that this is not standard practice. Trace thanked them.
- Elizabeth Montoya said that, in the subcommittee conversations, there was a list of needed aspects for the temporary placements but there were funding issues. Trace thanked her.
- Jordan asked if the recommendation should be to do research on short term stabilization units or to recommend funding for the short term stabilization units with specific components as well as research.
- Stephanie suggested taking a straw poll about making this topic a recommendation or having it live in other recommendations.
- Yes it should be a recommendation
 - o Lynette Overmeyer
 - Brian Cotter
 - Norma Aguilar Dave
 - Beth McNalley
 - Jenna Coleman







- Elizabeth Montoya
- Michelle Bradley
- o Anna Cole
- Jenelle Goodrich
- No it should not be a recommendation
 - Kelly Abbott
 - Stephanie Villafuerte
- Abstain
 - Dennis Desparrois
 - Renée Marquardt
 - o Ashley Chase
 - Chelsea Hill
- Trace said that they will ask the second part of the straw poll.
- Should the recommendation be more research on short term stabilization units
 - o Kelly Abbott
 - Ashley Chase
 - o Anna Cole
- Should the recommendation be research as well as funding for short term stabilization units
 - o Jenna Coleman
 - Michelle Bradley
 - Norma Aguilar Dave
 - Brian Cotter
 - Lynette Overmeyer
 - Beth McNalley
 - Elizabeth Montoya
 - o Chelsea Hill
 - Jenelle Goodrich
- Abstain
 - Dennis Desparrois
 - David Lee
- Trace thanked everyone and said that this was not a final vote but it is useful to inform recommendation writing.
- Stephanie said that she wants to avoid setting up recommendations that are
 in opposition. Trace said that the consultant would research the
 implementation and that the need is already established. Stephanie
 suggested an amendment that the consultant should research effective
 implementation.
- Jordan suggested language about investigating the components around effective implementation.
- Brian suggested doing the research to have the implementation done well.
 Trace thanked him.
- Stephanie suggested adding a robust discussion about the conversations around these topics in the final report.
- Lynette said that there used to be structures for a youth in mental health crisis. She said that medicaid would pay for it, sometimes. She said that the intent was to continue treatment plans. She said that her vision is that the







	short term stabilization units become a place for children to go when they are coming back from a run to get short term, intensive, and treatment focused assessment and planning to help them be more successful when they go back to their placement or change their placement; the team would then follow up with the child to check in and help address any worries or concerns. Stephanie thanked her and asked if there is anything that exists currently that mimics this. Lynette said that there is not. Stephanie asked how long ago these were available. Lynette said that it was the first decade of 2000. Stephanie thanked her. Jordan asked if the task force should investigate this or if the consultant should. Jenelle said that the task force should. She also asked if there is a duration that the task force is comfortable with. Beth McNalley said that it's important for children to know how long they are going to be at a placement. Dennis Desparrois said that 21 days is the law for time spent at a homeless youth shelter; he would like to try to hold to this. He said that children cannot come and continue to stay at the facility since it will fill up quickly; there needs to be a quick turn around. Trace asked if the timeline should be explicitly defined. Dennis said yes since they can fill quickly. Trace thanked him. Michelle said that the department can only pay for a bed that a child is not in for seven days. She brings this up since the department cannot pay for two beds at once. Jordan said that the third party consultant can develop language about the timeline that is within parameters of the law as well as within the intention of the task force. Trace said that they agree and asked for any objections to this. Dennis said that the agrees. Stephanie asked for task force members to provide a list of technical concerns around short term stabilization units; she asked task force members to put these concerns in the electronic chat.
Conclusion	 Trace asked for any last comments. Stephanie thanked the task force for their conversations. Trace thanked the task force for their survey engagement. Jenelle thanked the task force for everything, as she cannot attend the last meeting. Stephanie thanked the task force, as she cannot attend the last meeting. Norma thanked the task force, as she cannot attend the last meeting. Lynette thanked Elizabeth. Elizabeth thanked everyone. Trace thanked everyone and reminded them to watch their emails.
Public Comment	No public comment.
Next Steps and Adjourn	Trace dismissed the task force; the task force adjourned at 9:50 AM. The next and final meeting is September 4th at 8 AM.





Appendix A:

Beth McNalley

David Lee

Michelle Bradley

Elizabeth Montoya

Renée Marquardt

Jenelle Goodrich

Brandon Miller

Brian Cotter

Chelsea Hill

Anna Cole

Kelly Abbott

Dennis Desparrois

Jenna Coleman

Norma Aguilar Dave

Ashley Chase

Jana Zinzer

Lynette Overmeyer