

CCJJ COMMISSION MINUTES – APPROVED	
<b>Committee</b>	<b>Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice</b>
<b>Date</b>	Thursday, August 14th, 2025
<b>Time</b>	12 PM – 2 PM
<b>Location</b>	Hybrid Zoom Virtual meeting – CCJJ Large Conference
<b>Members Present</b>	<p><u>In-Person Attendance:</u> Commissioner Beau Mason, Stewart Young, Pam Vickrey, Richard Mauro, Ryan Robinson, Elizabeth Klc (for Tom Ross)</p> <p><u>Virtual Attendance:</u> Ron Gordon, Mike Schoenfeld (for Jared Garcia), Brent Kelsey (for Tracy Gruber), Chief Brian Gwilliam, Sheriff Chad Jensen, Blake Hills, Martin Munoz (JJOC), Alissa Black, Mark Moffat, Amanda Bollinger, April Graham, Judge Ryan Peters</p>
<b>Staff &amp; Visitors</b>	<p><u>Staff:</u> Danica Bodley, Dr. Michele Leslie, Dan Strong, Erica Wood, Adrienne Buhler, Van Nguyen (virtual), John Drnaey (virtual), Beatriz Herrera (virtual), Katie Fox (virtual), Mei Xue (virtual), Chyleen Richey (virtual), Angelo Perillo (virtual), Tess McCullough (virtual), Adam Trupp (virtual), Rachelle Hill (virtual), Richard Ziebarth (virtual), Marlesse Jones, Ben Peterson (virtual), Matthew Barraza, Ken Matthews (virtual), Sheena Yoon (virtual), Morgan Williams (virtual), Niyo Aimable (virtual)</p> <p><u>Visitors:</u> Brett Robinson, Angela Whitehead Pendlebury (virtual), Rep. Nelson Abbott, Moriah Pease (virtual), Paige Nelson, Robert Steed (virtual), Max Pierce (virtual), Tiffany Tran, Shannon Arrington (virtual), Leslie Howitt (virtual), Savannah Pike (virtual), Melissa Stirba (virtual), Erin Jemison (virtual), Jake Glenn (virtual), Jeff Buhman (virtual), Steve Burton, Albert Cramer (virtual), Raechel Lizon (virtual), Jennifer Campbell (virtual)</p>
<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Welcome and Approval of Meeting Minutes – <i>Elizabeth Klc, CJ Policy Director</i></b>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>Elizabeth Klc brings the commission meeting into session.</p> <p>The commission reviewed the previous meeting minutes from Thursday, June 5th, 2025.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Richard Mauro motions for the commission to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Beau Mason seconds the motion. The motion passes unanimously.</p>
<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>New Chair Selection Process – <i>Elizabeth Klc, CJ Policy Director</i></b>
<b>Notes</b>	The Commission has an open Chair position following the departure of Brett Peterson. A formal selection process will occur during the October 9, 2025, meeting. Commission members were invited to submit nominations for themselves or other members to Danica, Tom Ross, and Elizabeth Klc. Nominees will be contacted to confirm their willingness to serve before the vote.
<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>JAG 2023 Funding Recommendations – <i>Morgan Williams, Grant Program Manager</i></b>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>Morgan Williams, the JAG Program Manager at CCJJ, presented a slate of funding recommendations for the Commission's approval. The core issue addressed was a funding shortfall in the Title II juvenile justice grant, which left several delinquency prevention programs without awards. The recommendation proposed using JAG funds to support these initiatives.</p> <p>A contingent recommendation was also included for a Salt Lake County program that may not meet the guidelines for the state's SCIP crisis intervention program, with JAG funding serving as a potential alternative.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Richard Mauro motions for the commission to approve the funding recommendation as presented. Martin Munoz seconds the motion. The motion passes.</p> <p><b>Abstention(s):</b> One (1) Abstention; Pam Vickrey</p>

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Fines and Surcharges – <i>Rep. Nelson Abbott &amp;&amp; Jonathan Adams &amp;&amp; Paige Nelson</i></b>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>Representative Abbott presented a legislative concept aimed at reforming and simplifying the assessment of financial penalties in criminal cases.</p> <p>The current system, which imposes a base fine plus a significant percentage-based surcharge (e.g., 90% in district court, 35% in justice court), creates confusion for defendants. Plea forms stating a maximum fine "plus a 90% surcharge" require calculation and can obscure the true maximum financial exposure, which is a particular challenge for pro se defendants.</p> <p>The proposal is to legislatively eliminate the separate "surcharge" and roll its value into a single, higher fine amount. The intent is not to change the total amount paid by a defendant or the ultimate distribution of funds to various government entities, but to simplify the language and presentation of the penalty. This would require a significant redrafting of the code to preserve current fund distribution formulas.</p> <p>Ron Gordon, representing the courts, noted that a change of this magnitude would require a "one-time entire recalibration" of the courts' accounting software, which he described as a "big effort." The current system is designed to take a single payment amount and automatically break it out to the various statutory funds. The change would disrupt the statutory "order of operations" for how partial payments are allocated. Currently, restitution and specific fees are paid first, followed by the state surcharge, and finally the base fine. A new, clear priority order would need to be established for the single "fine." Under current law, judges have the discretion to waive fines but not surcharges. The proposed change would eliminate this distinction.</p> <p>Statutes with minimum mandatory fines (e.g., DUI offenses) would need to be identified and amended. Currently, a judge imposes a total amount that includes the statutory minimum fine (\$700 for a first DUI) plus all applicable surcharges.</p> <p>A suggestion was made to address the primary point of confusion—the plea form—by simply stating the total maximum financial penalty (e.g., "\$19,000") rather than overhauling the entire statutory framework for fines and surcharges.</p> <p>Representative Abbott acknowledged the feedback, framing the core issue as a policy decision for the legislature on "how we want to define fine."</p>
<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Prosecutor Conduct Commission – <i>Elizabeth Klc, Criminal Justice Policy Director</i></b>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>A new commission and director position are being established to address prosecutorial misconduct.</p> <p>Senator Todd Weiler's prosecutorial misconduct amendments bill was funded and it was signed by the governor. The director position is currently posted, with funding starting July 1st. The position is under the CCJJ umbrella, but the commission will operate outside of that with independent decision-making. The fiscal note for the operation of the commission and director/staff position is around \$375 thousand. The salary range for the director goes up to \$156,000 a year.</p>
<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Stalking and Protective Order System Review – <i>Marlesse Jones, VSC Director</i></b>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>Marlesse Jones, Director of the Victim Services Commission, initiated a discussion on the complexity of Utah's protective order system and proposed a path toward simplification.</p> <p>Utah has a large number of distinct protective and stalking-related orders (estimated at 13-15 types), which have been created over time to address specific needs. This has resulted in significant overlap in criteria and a complex legal landscape that is confusing for law enforcement</p>

	<p>officers responding to a scene that must interpret which of many different types of orders is in effect. The complexity makes it difficult for victims to navigate the system and understand the rules and parameters of an order, potentially leading to unintentional violations and reduced safety.</p> <p>The Commission endorsed the formation of a workgroup, to be facilitated by the Victim Services Commission, with the following objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analyze and Map: Create a comprehensive chart showing the similarities and differences between all existing order types.</li> <li>2. Strategize Simplification: Develop a plan to consolidate and streamline the orders, potentially into a few clear categories (e.g., civil orders, protective orders, stalking injunctions).</li> <li>3. Preserve Protections: Ensure the reform is focused on process simplification and clarity, with as little substantive change to existing protections as possible. The initiative would not be retroactive.</li> </ol> <p>It was noted that a separate workgroup has already been active for approximately 18 months to simplify the protective order application form. The Commission agreed that these two efforts should be merged to ensure efficiency and avoid contradictory outcomes. The workgroup will include voices from prosecution, defense, law enforcement, the Attorney General's Office, SWAP, and the courts.</p> <p>Ryan Robinson highlighted the lack of good data on protective order violations and expressed hope that a simpler, clearer system could help improve compliance and data collection.</p>
<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Governor's Executive Order and Criminal Justice Strategy – <i>Elizabeth Klc, Criminal Justice Policy Director</i></b>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>The Commission was updated on the progress of the Criminal Justice Strategy Task Force, which was created by a Governor's Executive Order and is tasked with presenting a strategic framework by October 1, 2025. The goal is to establish a more structured, data-driven, and holistic approach to criminal justice policy.</p> <p>The proposed framework is built on three pillars, informally branded as the "One-Pager," the "Three-Year Look-Back," and the "Deep Dive."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The One-Pager: Pre-Legislative Fact Sheet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose: To provide legislators with objective, data-rich information on a topic before a bill is drafted or debated.</li> <li>• Content: The one-page analysis from CCJJ would include current statutes, penalty ranges, sentencing guideline recommendations, actual sentencing outcomes (e.g., percentages sentenced to probation, jail, or prison), and, where possible, recidivism data and comparisons to other states.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The Three-Year Look-Back: Review of Enacted Legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose: To conduct a systematic review of significant criminal justice legislation on a three-year rolling basis.</li> <li>• Process: The review would analyze available data and gather stakeholder input to assess whether the legislation achieved its intended goals and identify any unintended consequences or impacts on system resources.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. The Deep Dive: Holistic Topic Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose: To conduct a comprehensive annual review of the entire criminal code, broken down by topic (e.g., domestic violence, drug offenses, property crimes).</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process: The task force aims to complete a full cycle through all major criminal code topics every four to five years. This "deep dive" would involve data analysis and stakeholder meetings to identify systemic issues and recommend policy changes to the legislature.</li> </ul> <p>A working group comprising defense attorneys, prosecutors, law enforcement (sheriffs and police chiefs), and corrections officials has been formed to refine this framework and advise the larger task force. The overarching goal is to shift policymaking from a reactive, "scattershot" approach to a more thoughtful, structured process that, if successful, could serve as a model for other states.</p>
<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Other Business</b>
Notes	No other business was addressed.
<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Public Comment</b>
Notes	Public comment time was given but none was addressed.
<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Adjourn</b>
Notes	<p><b>Motion:</b> Commissioner Beau Mason motions for the commission to adjourn. Ryan Robinson seconds the motion. The motion was unanimously agreed upon.</p> <p><b>The commission adjourns.</b></p> <p>The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 9th, 2025 from Noon-2 PM.</p> <p>Location: <u>Anchor Location: Capitol Board Room 240</u>  Zoom link:  <a href="https://utah-gov.zoom.us/j/88695952596?pwd=hMk2M7VttbQnUbWJnqufrZuniKeh7H.1">https://utah-gov.zoom.us/j/88695952596?pwd=hMk2M7VttbQnUbWJnqufrZuniKeh7H.1</a></p>
<b>DISCLAIMER</b>	<b>Please note that these meeting minutes have been primarily generated or assisted by an artificial intelligence (AI) tool. These notes have been edited by staff to ensure accuracy and completeness.</b>