

# Community Corrections Outcomes in Colorado Demonstrate Need for a New Approach

*Findings suggest deep structural changes are needed to reduce recidivism, promote public safety and improve the return on the state's significant annual investment in community corrections*

In fall 2020, the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) began leading stakeholder discussions around the idea of significantly restructuring community corrections to improve client outcomes and expand local communities' ability to design residential programs that better meet their unique needs.

The Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition (CCJRC) strongly supports this comprehensive reevaluation of community corrections and prepared this report to inform those discussions. It is primarily based on FY2020 data and focuses on two key outcome measures: (1) successful program completion, and (2) "combined outcome," which reports the recidivism rate of those who successfully completed a program but had a new criminal case filed within two years of completion.

While outcome data alone is not sufficient to determine which direction any restructuring of community corrections should take, several troubling findings demonstrate that the status quo is unacceptable and deep structural change is needed if the state hopes to substantially improve outcomes, reduce recidivism, promote public safety, and see a return on the sizeable investment that is made each year.

## Key Findings

- Statewide, 60% of diversion clients and 71% of transition clients successfully completed community corrections programs, but about one-third of the clients who completed programs had new criminal filings within two years.
- Less than half of diversion clients (41%) and transition clients (45%) completed programs and had no new filings within two years. Over the past five years, only about one-third of total clients have experienced successful combined outcomes.
- Program completion rates varied widely from program to program, ranging from 43%–78% for diversion clients and 58%–100% for transition clients. Although some variance is to be expected, there does not appear to be a minimum standard that programs must reach to continue receiving state funding.
- Although Colorado originally intended for its community corrections programs to be community-based, there has been significant ownership consolidation among just a handful of providers in recent years.

Many dynamics contribute to these outcomes, including not just the programs themselves, but also the role of the Office of Community Corrections within the DCJ, the local community corrections boards, the state's funding mechanism, and parole/probation supervision.

# Recommendations and Next Steps

CCJRC understands that a comprehensive restructuring of community corrections will require significant time and development, but there are interim steps the General Assembly can take during the 2021 legislative session.

## Interim Steps

- Create a formal mechanism either in the form of a task force or interim legislative committee to continue the discussion initiated by the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) with clear expectations that statutory changes needed would be developed for the 2022 legislative session.
- Rather than provide funding for performance-based contracting, DCJ should be authorized to utilize unexpended funding to create a competitive grant program to innovate strategies to reduce recidivism and provide greater transitional support for clients after they complete the program, especially in the first 12-24 months.
- Through the long bill or a foot note, DCJ should be given greater flexibility in the ways funding is provided to those local communities that are moving forward with new models for community corrections programs.
- DCJ should implement performance improvement measures for any program that has less than a 60% successful completion rate to include instituting a formal improvement plan or discontinue funding should a program consistently fail to reach the performance benchmark.
- DCJ should set up a formal ombudsman's office to investigate and respond to client concerns/complaints and suggestions for improvement.
- Providers should be required to provide the Joint Budget Committee with financial documents to ensure it has the information necessary to make informed funding decisions, especially when providers claim financial hardship.
- Researching other potential funding models rather than per-diem because it costs almost as much to operate a program that is at 70% capacity as it is at 100% capacity.

## A 21<sup>st</sup> Century Approach

CCJRC strongly supports restructuring Colorado's decades-old community corrections system. By placing greater emphases on flexibility, accountability, and innovation, the state can more effectively and efficiently achieve positive client outcomes and promote public health and safety. This new model for community corrections should include:

- programs provided by community-based organizations or partnerships between such organizations and local governments;
- smaller programs that are more responsive to the needs of clients at all risk-levels and are gender-specific, culturally competent, and trauma-informed.
- oversight that focuses more on program outcomes and provides a mechanism for defunding programs that fail to meet minimum standards;
- more support for clients following their completion of the program, especially in the first year; and
- more flexibility in funding so that local communities can implement a wider variety of residential programs, including shorter "stabilization" programs, more intensive residential treatment or co-occurring programs, and transitional programs.

## About This Report

This report includes a statewide overview of community corrections program outcomes for the diversion and transition client populations, as well as an overview of annual community corrections expenditures. It also includes a program-by-program overview and profiles of the 17 Colorado judicial districts in which community corrections programs are located. This analysis does not include Therapeutic Community programs funded by DCJ as part of the community corrections provider network. These specialty programs should, however, be included in discussions around restructuring.

## Sources

This report is based on data compiled by the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) Office of Community Corrections. It includes program outcomes from FY2020 and combined outcomes by risk level in 2018 (as reported in 2019), which were the most recent data available at the time of this report. Data from some community corrections facilities are not included because they either did not report data or did not have sufficient data to analyze. Some of the facilities with data included in this report have changed ownership or are no longer in operation.

The data used in this report was accessed March 30, 2021 through the Community Corrections Residential Programs Interactive Dashboard (<https://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ors/data/Comcor/Comcor.html>). Data that appears in the dashboard is regularly updated and may no longer reflect the exact figures that appear in this report.

*The DCJ Community Corrections dashboard is an extremely valuable resource. We recommend that its functionality be enhanced to allow the option of analyzing outcome and program data by ethnicity/race in addition to gender.*

## Definitions

*“Condition of Parole Clients”* are people on parole who are required to complete a community corrections program as a condition of their parole. There are a relatively low number of them in community corrections.

*“Diversion Clients”* are people sentenced directly to a community corrections program by the court.

*“Transition Clients”* are people under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections who have been accepted by a local community corrections board and program.

*“Risk Level”* (“Low Risk,” “Medium Risk,” “High Risk”) is determined by Level of Service Inventory (LSI) scores at the time of client intake. The LSI is a 54-item assessment tool used to measure a client’s risk of recidivism, as well as areas of need that may contribute to their level of risk. LSI risk scores of 1-18 are defined as “low,” while scores of 19-28 are defined as “medium” and 29-54 are defined as “high.”

*“In-program Failure”* represents a client who did not successfully complete a program because they committed a new crime or had a technical violation during their time in the program, or because they escaped/walked away.

*“Program Success and No New Filing Within [1 or 2] year(s)”* represents clients who successfully completed a program and received no new misdemeanor or felony charges/filings within one or two years.

*“New Filing Within 2 Years of Successful Completion”* represents clients who had either a new misdemeanor or felony court filing within two years of successfully completing a program.

# Statewide Community Corrections Outcomes, FY18, FY19 and FY20

## Diversion Programs

Of the 2,893 total diversion clients included in the FY2020 dataset, 38% were an in-program failure either for a technical violation or for escape, and 2% had a new criminal filing while in the program.


While 60% successfully completed the program, only 41% of total diversion clients successfully completed the program and had no new criminal filings after one year. Just 29% successfully completed the program and had no new filings after two years. See page 8 for a detailed breakdown of diversion program completion rates and combined outcome rates by judicial district and individual facility.

In FY2018, low-risk clients were the only sub-population in which the majority (59%) successfully completed the program and did not recidivate within two years of completion. Only about one-third of medium-risk clients (37%) and less than one-quarter of high-risk clients (23%) completed the program and did not recidivate within two years of completion.

Diversion Program Outcomes, FY2020\*



Diversion Program Combined Outcomes by Client Risk Level, FY2018\*



\* The pie chart and bar graph above represent data from two separate cohorts, which is why they reflect inconsistent in-program failure rates.



## Transition Programs

Of the 2,398 total transition clients included in the dataset, 28% were an in-program failure due to either a technical violation or escape, and 1% had a new criminal filing while in the program.


While 71% successfully completed the transition program, only 45% of total transition clients successfully completed the program and had no new criminal filings after one year. Just 32% successfully completed the program and had no new filings after two years. As with diversion programs, the majority of low-risk transition clients (63%) successfully completed the program and did not recidivate within two years of completion. See page 9 for a detailed breakdown of transition program completion rates and combined outcome rates by judicial district and individual facility.

In FY2018, low-risk clients were the only sub-population in which the majority (60%) successfully completed the program and did not recidivate within two years of completion. Only about two out of five medium-risk clients (38%) and less than one-quarter of high-risk clients (23%) completed the program and did not recidivate within two years of completion.

Transition Program Outcomes, FY2020\*



Transition Program Combined Outcomes by Client Risk Level, FY2018\*




\* The pie chart and bar graph above represent data from two separate cohorts, which is why they reflect inconsistent in-program failure rates.

The state's annual appropriation for community corrections increased 39% from 2012-2019. For the past five years, only about one-third of total clients have experienced successful combined outcomes (program completion and no criminal filings within two years of completion). While client risk rates have shifted, they do not appear to explain the consistently low rate of successful combined outcomes.


### State Community Corrections Budget (in Millions), FY2012–FY2019

Source: JBC Briefing Documents FY14-15 through FY20-21 – Annual Expenditures




### Community Corrections Program Outcomes, 2009-2018

All programs and clients statewide



### Client Risk Levels at Intake, 2009-2019

All programs and clients statewide



## Residential Community Corrections Programs by Judicial District, FY2020\*

JD	Program Name	Population Served	City
1	ICCS – Jefferson	Male	Lakewood
1	ICCS – West	Female	Lakewood
2	CoreCivic – Columbine <sup>1</sup>	Male	Denver
2	CoreCivic – Dahlia	Male	Denver
2	CoreCivic – Fox	Male	Denver
2	CoreCivic – Ulster	Male	Denver
2	Independence House – Pecos	Male	Denver
4	Com Cor, Inc.	Male / Female	Colorado Springs
4	GEO – Community Alternatives of El Paso County	Male / Female	Colorado Springs
6	Hilltop House	Male / Female	Durango
7	Advantage Treatment Center – Montrose	Male / Female	Montrose
8	Larimer County Residential Facility	Male / Female	Fort Collins
9	Garfield County Community Corrections	Male / Female	Rifle
10	ICCS – Pueblo	Male / Female	Pueblo
12	Advantage Treatment Center – Alamosa	Male / Female	Alamosa
13	Advantage Treatment Center – Sterling	Male	Sterling
14	GEO – Correctional Alternative Placement Services <sup>2</sup>	Male/Female	Craig
15	Advantage Treatment Center – Lamar	Male	Lamar
17	CoreCivic – Commerce City	Male	Commerce City
17	CoreCivic – Adams	Male	Denver
17	CoreCivic – Henderson Transitional Center (Female) <sup>3</sup>	Female	Henderson
17	CoreCivic – Henderson Transitional Center (Male) <sup>3</sup>	Male	Henderson
18	CoreCivic – Arapahoe Community Treatment Center	Male	Englewood
18	GEO – Arapahoe County Residential Center	Female	Littleton
18	CoreCivic – Centennial Community Transition Center	Male	Englewood
19	ICCS – Weld	Male / Female	Greeley
20	ICCS – Boulder	Male / Female	Boulder
20	CoreCivic – Longmont Community Transition Center	Male / Female	Longmont
21	Mesa County Community Corrections	Male / Female	Grand Junction

\* Includes facilities with FY2020 data included in the DCJ Residential Interactive Dashboard. Additional programs existed.

<sup>1</sup> In 2019, Denver City Council voted to end contracts with community corrections programs owned by CoreCivic and GEO; CoreCivic's Columbine facility has closed as part of this phase-out, and GEO closed its Tooley Hall and Williams Street facilities

<sup>2</sup> No longer operated as a Community Corrections program

<sup>3</sup> As of January 2021, is now ICCS – Adams and is a co-ed program

## Diversion Program Outcomes by Program, FY2020

The wide variation in outcomes among different programs highlights the need for DCJ to establish minimum performance standards and require programs to take corrective actions if they fail to meet those standards. Programs that continue to fall short of the minimum standards should become ineligible to receive continued funding.

JD	Program Name	# of Clients	Successful Completion	Completion – No New Filings 1 Year	Completion – No New Filings 2 Years
1	ICCS – Jefferson	195	63%	37%	36%
1	ICCS – West	63	54%	47%	34%
2	CoreCivic – Columbine	7	57%	38%	0%
2	CoreCivic – Dahlia	115	45%	35%	14%
2	CoreCivic – Fox	38	53%	40%	22%
2	CoreCivic – Ulster	20	70%	27%	0%
2	Independence House – Pecos	31	58%	48%	33%
4	Com Cor, Inc.	294	55%	42%	32%
4	GEO – Community Alternatives of El Paso County	95	47%	45%	36%
6	Hilltop House	51	69%	55%	24%
7	Advantage Treatment Center – Montrose	101	76%	51%	33%
8	Larimer County Residential Facility	379	70%	44%	34%
9	Garfield County Community Corrections	27	59%	37%	23%
10	ICCS – Pueblo	98	43%	31%	24%
12	Advantage Treatment Center – Alamosa	116	60%	35%	16%
13	Advantage Treatment Center – Sterling	59	68%	40%	31%
14	GEO – Correctional Alternative Placement Services	35	77%	28%	53%
15	Advantage Treatment Center - Lamar	37	54%	50%	N/A
17	CoreCivic – Commerce City	138	53%	36%	28%
17	CoreCivic – Adams	104	56%	42%	20%
17	CoreCivic – Henderson Transitional Center (Female)	91	47%	46%	13%
17	CoreCivic – Henderson Transitional Center (Male)	119	63%	38%	7%
18	CoreCivic – Arapahoe Community Treatment Center	96	65%	35%	38%
18	GEO – Arapahoe County Residential Center	62	66%	56%	50%
18	CoreCivic – Centennial Community Transition Center	84	67%	58%	38%
19	ICCS – Weld	173	50%	40%	21%
20	ICCS - Boulder	9	78%	N/A	N/A
20	CoreCivic – Longmont Community Transition Center	35	66%	50%	26%
21	Mesa County Community Corrections	173	71%	47%	35%


## Transition Program Outcomes by Program, FY2020

While transition clients have better rates of program completion than diversion clients, less than half successfully complete the program and have no new criminal filings within one year. Only about one-third have no new filings within two years. Like with diversion programs, there is wide variation in outcomes among different programs, highlighting the need for DCJ to establish minimum performance standards and require programs that fall short to take corrective actions.

JD	Program Name	# of Clients	Successful Completion	Completion – No New Filings 1 Year	Completion – No New Filings 2 Years
1	ICCS – Jefferson	55	60%	51%	33%
1	ICCS – West	19	74%	9%	38%
2	CoreCivic – Columbine	120	68%	48%	34%
2	CoreCivic – Dahlia	137	66%	42%	42%
2	CoreCivic – Fox	50	66%	31%	37%
2	CoreCivic – Ulster	152	70%	47%	28%
2	Independence House – Pecos	133	66%	51%	21%
4	Com Cor, Inc.	146	72%	49%	29%
4	GEO – Community Alternatives of El Paso County	327	71%	42%	39%
6	Hilltop House	28	96%	72%	36%
7	Advantage Treatment Center – Montrose	7	86%	60%	29%
8	Larimer County Residential Facility	49	65%	46%	61%
9	Garfield County Community Corrections	28	96%	63%	32%
10	ICCS – Pueblo	125	58%	33%	22%
12	Advantage Treatment Center – Alamosa	24	88%	24%	14%
13	Advantage Treatment Center – Sterling	24	63%	59%	36%
14	GEO – Correctional Alternative Placement Services	18	94%	43%	48%
15	Advantage Treatment Center – Lamar	6	100%	100%	N/A
17	CoreCivic – Commerce City	81	58%	40%	29%
17	CoreCivic – Adams	82	77%	36%	29%
17	CoreCivic – Henderson Transitional Center (Female)	42	62%	46%	41%
17	CoreCivic – Henderson Transitional Center (Male)	97	64%	34%	25%
18	CoreCivic – Arapahoe Community Treatment Center	126	80%	41%	31%
18	GEO – Arapahoe County Residential Center	151	76%	52%	43%
18	CoreCivic – Centennial Community Transition Center	105	73%	48%	39%
19	ICCS – Weld	85	76%	54%	27%
20	ICCS – Boulder	14	86%	N/A	N/A
20	CoreCivic – Longmont Community Transition Center	50	80%	45%	40%
21	Mesa County Community Corrections	40	80%	62%	28%

# 1st Judicial District

Counties: Gilpin, Jefferson




**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Correction Services (ICCS) – Jefferson

**Population:** 274 men

- 195 diversion, 55 transition and 24 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 14% low, 43% medium and 43% high

ICCS - JeffCo  
Diversion Program Outcomes



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 1st Judicial District

Counties: Gilpin, Jefferson





**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Correction Services (ICCS) – Jefferson

**Population:** 274 men


- 195 diversion, 55 transition and 24 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 14% low, 43% medium and 43% high



# 1st Judicial District

Counties: Gilpin, Jefferson




**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Correction Services (ICCS) – West  
**Population:** 97 women


- 63 diversion, 19 transition and 15 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 6% low, 19% medium and 76% high

ICCS - West  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk





# 1st Judicial District

Counties: Gilpin, Jefferson




**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Correction Services (ICCS) – West  
**Population:** 97 women

- 63 diversion, 19 transition and 15 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 6% low, 19% medium and 76% high

ICCS - West  
Transition Program Outcomes



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

## 2nd Judicial District

Counties: Denver




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Columbine

**Population:** 141 men


- 7 diversion, 120 transition and 14 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 9% low, 45% medium, and 46% high

**Core Civic - Columbine  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



- Program success and no filing within 2 years
- In-program failure
- New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

## 2nd Judicial District

Counties: Denver




### Community Corrections Program: CoreCivic – Columbine

**Population:** 141 men


- 7 diversion, 120 transition and 14 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 9% low, 45% medium, and 46% high

Core Civic - Columbine  
Transition Program Outcomes




Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



## 2nd Judicial District

Counties: Denver




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Dahlia

**Population:** 257 men


- 115 diversion, 137 transition and 5 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 9% low, 46% medium, and 46% high

Core Civic - Dahlia  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



## 2nd Judicial District

Counties: Denver




**Community Corrections Program: CoreCivic – Dahlia**

**Population:** 257 men


- 115 diversion, 137 transition and 5 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 9% low, 46% medium, and 46% high

**Core Civic - Dahlia  
Transition Program outcomes**




**Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



## 2nd Judicial District

Counties: Denver




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic - Fox

**Population:** 114 men


- 38 diversion, 50 transition and 26 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 7% low, 20% medium, 73% high

**Core Civic - Fox  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



## 2nd Judicial District

Counties: Denver




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic - Fox

**Population:** 114 men


- 38 diversion, 50 transition and 26 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 7% low, 20% medium, 73% high

Core Civic - Fox  
Transition Program Outcomes




Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



## 2nd Judicial District

Counties: Denver




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic - Ulster

**Population:** 187 men

- 20 diversion, 152 transition and 15 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 6% low, 46% medium and 48% high

**Core Civic - Ulster  
Diversion Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime

**Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**




■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion



## 2nd Judicial District

Counties: Denver




**Community Corrections Program: CoreCivic - Ulster**

**Population:** 187 men


- 20 diversion, 152 transition and 15 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 6% low, 46% medium and 48% high

**Core Civic - Ulster  
Transition Program Outcomes**




**Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



## 2nd Judicial District

Counties: Denver




**Community Corrections Program:** Independence House (IH) - Pecos

**Population:** 170 men


- 31 diversion, 133 transition and 6 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 2% low, 36% medium and 62% high

**IH - Pecos  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



## 2nd Judicial District

Counties: Denver




**Community Corrections Program:** Independence House (IH) - Pecos

**Population:** 170 men


- 31 diversion, 133 transition and 6 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 2% low, 36% medium and 62% high

IH - Pecos  
Transition Program Outcomes




Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 4th Judicial District

Counties: El Paso, Teller



**Community Corrections Program:** Com Cor, Inc. – 4th


**Total Population:** 459

**Female Population:** 88 women


- 62 diversion, 24 transition and 2 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 5% low, 34% medium & 61% high

**ComCor Inc. (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Female Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 4th Judicial District

Counties: El Paso, Teller



**Community Corrections Program:** Com Cor, Inc. – 4th


**Total Population:** 459

**Female Population:** 88 women


- 62 diversion, 24 transition and 2 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 5% low, 34% medium & 61% high

**ComCor, Inc. (female)  
Transition Program Outcomes**




**Female Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 4th Judicial District

Counties: El Paso, Teller



**Community Corrections Program:** Com Cor, Inc. – 4th


**Total Population:** 459

**Male Population:** 371 men


- 232 diversion, 122 transition and 17 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 13% low, 40% medium & 47% high

**ComCor, Inc. (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Male Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 4th Judicial District

Counties: El Paso, Teller



**Community Corrections Program:** Com Cor, Inc. – 4th


**Total Population:** 459

**Male Population:** 371 men


- 232 diversion, 122 transition and 17 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 13% low, 40% medium & 47% high

**ComCor, Inc. (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes**




**Male Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



## 4th Judicial District

Counties: El Paso, Teller



**Community Corrections Program:** GEO – Community Alternatives of El Paso County, Inc.


**Total Population:** 453

**Female Population:** 67 women

- 13 diversion, 51 transition and 3 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 9% low, 57% medium and 34% high

**GEO - El Paso (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime

**Female Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**




■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion



## 4th Judicial District

Counties: El Paso, Teller



**Community Corrections Program:** GEO – Community Alternatives of El Paso County, Inc.


**Total Population:** 453

**Female Population:** 67 women


- 13 diversion, 51 transition and 3 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 9% low, 57% medium and 34% high

**GEO - El Paso (female)  
Transition Program Outcomes**




**Female Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



## 4th Judicial District

Counties: El Paso, Teller



**Community Corrections Program:** GEO – Community Alternatives of El Paso County, Inc.


**Total Population:** 453

**Male Population:** 386 men


- 82 diversion, 276 transition and 28 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 10% low, 49% medium and 41% high

**GEO - El Paso (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Male Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



## 4th Judicial District

Counties: El Paso, Teller



**Community Corrections Program:** GEO – Community Alternatives of El Paso County, Inc.


**Total Population:** 453

**Male Population:** 386 men


- 82 diversion, 276 transition and 28 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 10% low, 49% medium and 41% high

**GEO - El Paso (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes**




**Male Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 6th Judicial District

Counties: Archuleta, La Plata, San Juan



**Community Corrections Program:** Hilltop House


**Total Population:** 80

**Female Population:** 15 women

- 12 diversion, 3 transition and 0 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 40% medium and 60% high

**Hilltop House (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


**Female Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 6th Judicial District

Counties: Archuleta, La Plata, San Juan



**Community Corrections Program:** Hilltop House


**Total Population:** 80

**Female Population:** 15 women

- 12 diversion, 3 transition and 0 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 40% medium and 60% high

Hilltop House (female)  
Transition Program Outcomes



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


Female Transition Client  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 6th Judicial District

Counties: Archuleta, La Plata, San Juan



## Community Corrections Program: Hilltop House


**Total Population:** 80

**Male Population:** 65 men

- 39 diversion, 25 transition and 1 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 15% low, 52% medium and 32% high

**Hilltop House (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


**Male Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 6th Judicial District

Counties: Archuleta, La Plata, San Juan



**Community Corrections Program: Hilltop House**


**Total Population: 80**

**Male Population: 65 men**


- 39 diversion, 25 transition and 1 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level: 15% low, 52% medium and 32% high**

**Hilltop House (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes**




**Male Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 7th Judicial District

Counties: Delta, Gunnison, Hinsdale,  
Montrose, Ouray, San Miguel



## Community Corrections Program: Advantage Treatment Center (ATC) - Montrose


**Total Population:** 119

**Female Population:** 13 women


- 12 diversion, 0 transition<sup>4</sup> and 1 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 8% low, 38% medium & 54% high

ATC - Montrose (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes



Female Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk




<sup>4</sup>There was no female transition client data for ATC – Montrose for FY20.



# 7th Judicial District

Counties: Delta, Gunnison, Hinsdale,  
Montrose, Ouray, San Miguel



## Community Corrections Program: Advantage Treatment Center (ATC) - Montrose


**Total Population:** 119

**Male Population:** 106 men


- 89 diversion, 7 transition and 10 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 7% low, 38% medium & 56% high

ATC - Montrose (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Male Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 7th Judicial District

Counties: Delta, Gunnison, Hinsdale,  
Montrose, Ouray, San Miguel



**Community Corrections Program:** Advantage Treatment Center (ATC) - Montrose


**Total Population:** 119

**Male Population:** 106 men


- 89 diversion, 7 transition and 10 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 7% low, 38% medium & 56% high

ATC - Montrose (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes




Male Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 8th Judicial District

Counties: Jackson, Larimer



**Community Corrections Program:** Larimer County Community Corrections


**Total Population:** 438

**Female Population:** 85 women

- 75 diversion, 7 transition and 3 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 4% low, 32% medium and 55% high

**Larimer County (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


**Female Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 8th Judicial District

Counties: Jackson, Larimer



**Community Corrections Program:** Larimer County Community Corrections


**Total Population:** 438

**Female Population:** 85 women


- 75 diversion, 7 transition and 3 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 4% low, 32% medium and 55% high

**Larimer County (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Female Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 8th Judicial District

Counties: Jackson, Larimer



## Community Corrections Program: Larimer County Residential Facility


**Total Population:** 438

**Male Population:** 353 men


- 304 diversion, 42 transition and 7 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 8% low, 33% medium and 59% high

Larimer County (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Male Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 8th Judicial District

Counties: Jackson, Larimer



## Community Corrections Program: Larimer County Residential Facility


**Total Population:** 438

**Male Population:** 353 men

- 304 diversion, 42 transition and 7 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 8% low, 33% medium and 59% high

Larimer County (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


Male Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 9th Judicial District

Counties: Garfield, Pitkin, Rio Blanco



**Community Corrections Program:** Garfield County Community Corrections


**Total Population:** 57

**Female Population:** 16 women

- 9 diversion, 5 transition and 2 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 13% medium and 87% high

Garfield County (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


Female Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 9th Judicial District

Counties: Garfield, Pitkin, Rio Blanco



**Community Corrections Program:** Garfield County Community Corrections


**Total Population:** 57

**Female Population:** 16 women

- 9 diversion, 5 transition and 2 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 13% medium and 87% high

## Garfield County (female) Transition Program Outcomes



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime

## Female Transition Clients Combined Outcomes by Risk




■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion



# 9th Judicial District

Counties: Garfield, Pitkin, Rio Blanco



**Community Corrections Program:** Garfield County Community Corrections


**Total Population:** 57

**Male Population:** 41 men

- 18 diversion, 23 transition and 0 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 5% medium and 95% high

**Garfield County (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


**Male Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 9th Judicial District

Counties: Garfield, Pitkin, Rio Blanco



**Community Corrections Program:** Garfield County Community Corrections


**Total Population:** 57

**Male Population:** 41 men


- 18 diversion, 23 transition and 0 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 5% medium and 95% high

Garfield County (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes




Male Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 10th Judicial District

Counties: Pueblo



**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Corrections Services (ICCS) – Pueblo


**Total Population:** 238

**Female Population:** 51 women


- 18 diversion, 26 transition and 7 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 38% medium and 62% high

ICCS - Pueblo (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Female Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 10th Judicial District

Counties: Pueblo



**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Corrections Services (ICCS) – Pueblo


**Total Population:** 238

**Female Population:** 51 women

- 18 diversion, 26 transition and 7 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 38% medium and 62% high

ICCS - Pueblo (female)  
Transition Program Outcomes



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


Female Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 10th Judicial District

Counties: Pueblo



**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Corrections Services (ICCS) – Pueblo


**Total Population:** 238

**Male Population:** 187 men


- 80 diversion, 99 transition and 8 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 8% low, 33% medium and 59% high

ICCS - Pueblo (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Male Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 10th Judicial District

Counties: Pueblo



**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Corrections Services (ICCS) – Pueblo


**Total Population:** 238

**Male Population:** 187 men


- 80 diversion, 99 transition and 8 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 8% low, 33% medium and 59% high

ICCS - Pueblo (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes




Male Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 12th Judicial District

**Counties:** Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla, Mineral, Rio Grande, Saguache



**Community Corrections Program:** Advantage Treatment Center (ATC) - Alamosa


**Total Population:** 160

**Female Population:** 56 women


- 41 diversion, 7 transition and 8 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 17% medium and 83% high

**ATC- Alamosa (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Female Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 12th Judicial District

**Counties:** Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla,  
Mineral, Rio Grande, Saguache



**Community Corrections Program:** Advantage Treatment Center (ATC) - Alamosa


**Total Population:** 160

**Female Population:** 56 women

- 41 diversion, 7 transition and 8 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 17% medium and 83% high

**ATC - Alamosa (female)  
Transition Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation

**Female Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**




■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion



# 12th Judicial District

**Counties:** Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla, Mineral, Rio Grande, Saguache



**Community Corrections Program:** Advantage Treatment Center (ATC) - Alamosa


**Total Population:** 160

**Male Population:** 104 men


- 75 diversion, 17 transition and 12 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 1% low, 15% medium and 84% high

**ATC - Alamosa (male)**  
**Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Male Diversion Clients**  
**Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 12th Judicial District

**Counties:** Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla, Mineral, Rio Grande, Saguache



**Community Corrections Program:** Advantage Treatment Center (ATC) - Alamosa


**Total Population:** 160

**Male Population:** 104 men

- 75 diversion, 17 transition and 12 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 1% low, 15% medium and 84% high

**ATC - Alamosa (male)**  
**Transition Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


**Male Transition Clients**  
**Combined Outcomes by Risk**



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 13th Judicial District

Counties: Kit Carson, Logan, Morgan, Phillips  
Sedgwick, Washington, Yuma




**Community Corrections Program:** Advantage Treatment Center (ATC) - Sterling

**Population:** 99 men


- 59 diversion, 24 transition and 16 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 6% low, 53% medium and 41% high

ATC - Sterling  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 13th Judicial District

**Counties:** Kit Carson, Logan, Morgan, Phillips  
Sedgwick, Washington, Yuma




**Community Corrections Program:** Advantage Treatment Center (ATC) - Sterling

**Population:** 99 men


- 59 diversion, 24 transition and 16 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 6% low, 53% medium and 41% high

**ATC - Sterling  
Transition Program Outcomes**




**Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 14th Judicial District

Counties: Grand, Moffat, Routt



**Community Corrections Program:** GEO – Community Alternative Placement Services (CAPS)


**Total Population:** 68

**Female Population:** 10 women

- 5 diversion, 2 transition and 3 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 10% low and 90% high

**GEO - CAPS (female)**  
**Diversion Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


**Female Diversion Clients**  
**Combined Outcomes by Risk**



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 14th Judicial District

Counties: Grand, Moffat, Routt



**Community Corrections Program:** GEO – Community Alternative Placement Services (CAPS)


**Total Population:** 68

**Female Population:** 10 women

- 5 diversion, 2 transition and 3 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 10% low and 90% high

**GEO - CAPS (female)  
Transition Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


**Female Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 14th Judicial District

Counties: Grand, Moffat, Routt



**Community Corrections Program: GEO – Community Alternative Placement Services (CAPS)**


**Total Population: 68**

**Male Population: 58 men**

- 30 diversion, 16 transition and 12 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level: 5% low, 30% medium and 64% high**

**GEO - CAPS (male)**  
**Diversion Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


**Male Diversion Clients**  
**Combined Outcomes by Risk**



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 14th Judicial District

Counties: Grand, Moffat, Routt



**Community Corrections Program: GEO – Community Alternative Placement Services (CAPS)**


**Total Population: 68**

**Male Population: 58 men**


- 30 diversion, 16 transition and 12 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level: 5% low, 30% medium and 64% high**

**GEO - CAPS (male)**  
**Transition Program Outcomes**




**Male Transition Clients**  
**Combined Outcomes by Risk**





# 15th Judicial District

Counties: Baca, Cheyenne, Kiowa, Prowers




## Community Corrections Program: Advantage Treatment Center - Lamar

**Population:** 46 men


- 37 diversion, 6 transition and 3 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 9% low, 56% medium and 35% high

**ATC- Lamar**  
**Diversion Program Outcomes**




**ATC - Lamar**  
**Transition Program Outcomes**



Advantage Treatment Center – Lamar opened in April 2019 and therefore does not have any 2-year Combined Outcomes data to analyze.

# 17th Judicial District

Counties: Adams, Broomfield




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Commerce City

**Population:** 223 men (1 woman) = 224 total

- 138 diversion, 81 transition and 5 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 10% low, 46 medium and 43% high

Core Civic - Commerce City  
Diversion Program Outcomes



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 17th Judicial District

Counties: Adams, Broomfield




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Commerce City

**Population:** 223 men (1 woman) = 224 total


- 138 diversion, 81 transition and 5 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 10% low, 46 medium and 43% high

Core Civic - Commerce City  
Transition Program Outcomes




Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 17th Judicial District

Counties: Adams, Broomfield




**Community Corrections Program: CoreCivic - Adams**

**Population:** 192 men


- 104 diversion, 82 transition and 6 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 9% low, 44% medium, and 47% high

**Core Civic - Adams  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 17th Judicial District

Counties: Adams, Broomfield




**Community Corrections Program: CoreCivic - Adams**

**Population:** 192 men


- 104 diversion, 82 transition and 6 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 9% low, 44% medium, and 47% high

**Core Civic - Adams  
Transition Program Outcomes**




**Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 17th Judicial District

Counties: Adams, Broomfield




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Henderson (Female)

**Population:** 134 women


- 91 diversion, 42 transition and 1 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 2% low, 18% medium, and 81% high

Core Civic - Henderson (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 17th Judicial District

Counties: Adams, Broomfield




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Henderson (Female)

**Population:** 134 women


- 91 diversion, 42 transition and 1 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 2% low, 18% medium, and 81% high

Core Civic - Henderson (female)  
Transition Program Outcomes




Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 17th Judicial District

Counties: Adams, Broomfield




**Community Corrections Program: CoreCivic – Henderson (Male)**

**Population:** 227 men


- 119 diversion, 97 transition and 11 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 10% low, 39% medium and 51% high

**Core Civic - Henderson (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**





# 17th Judicial District

Counties: Adams, Broomfield




**Community Corrections Program: CoreCivic – Henderson (Male)**

**Population:** 227 men


- 119 diversion, 97 transition and 11 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 10% low, 39% medium and 51% high

**Core Civic - Henderson (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes**




**Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 18th Judicial District

Counties: Arapahoe, Douglas, Elbert, Lincoln




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Arapahoe Community Treatment Center (ACTC)

**Population:** 228 men


- 96 diversion, 126 transition and 6 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 16% low, 54% medium and 30% high

Core Civic - ACTC  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 18th Judicial District

Counties: Arapahoe, Douglas, Elbert, Lincoln




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Arapahoe Community Treatment Center (ACTC)

**Population:** 228 men


- 96 diversion, 126 transition and 6 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 16% low, 54% medium and 30% high

Core Civic - ACTC  
Transition Program Outcomes




Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 18th Judicial District

Counties: Arapahoe, Douglas, Elbert, Lincoln




**Community Corrections Program:** GEO – Arapahoe County Residential Center (ACRC)

**Population:** 243 women


- 62 diversion, 151 transition and 30 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 10% low, 38% medium and 52% high

**GEO - ACRC  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 18th Judicial District

Counties: Arapahoe, Douglas, Elbert, Lincoln




**Community Corrections Program:** GEO – Arapahoe County Residential Center (ACRC)

**Population:** 243 women


- 62 diversion, 151 transition and 30 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 10% low, 38% medium and 52% high

**GEO - ACRC  
Transition Program Outcomes**




**Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 18th Judicial District

Counties: Arapahoe, Douglas, Elbert, Lincoln




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Centennial Community Transition Center

**Population:** 190 men (1 woman) = 191 total


- 83 diversion, 105 transition and 2 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 6% low, 39% medium and 55% high

Core Civic - Centennial  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 18th Judicial District

Counties: Arapahoe, Douglas, Elbert, Lincoln




**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Centennial Community Transition Center

**Population:** 190 men (1 woman) = 191 total


- 83 diversion, 105 transition and 2 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 6% low, 39% medium and 55% high

Core Civic - Centennial  
Transition Program Outcomes




Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 19th Judicial District

Counties: Weld



**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Corrections Services (ICCS) – Weld


**Total Population:** 262

**Female Population:** 60 women


- 52 diversion, 7 transition and 1 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 6% low, 20% medium and 74% high

ICCS - Weld (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Female Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk





# 19th Judicial District

Counties: Weld



**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Corrections Services (ICCS) – Weld


**Total Population:** 262

**Female Population:** 60 women


- 52 diversion, 7 transition and 1 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 6% low, 20% medium and 74% high

ICCS - Weld (female)  
Transition Program Outcomes




Female Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 19th Judicial District

Counties: Weld



**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Corrections Services (ICCS) – Weld


**Total Population:** 262

**Male Population:** 202 men


- 121 diversion, 78 transition and 3 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 4% low, 36% medium and 60% high

ICCS - Weld (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes




Male Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 19th Judicial District

Counties: Weld



**Community Corrections Program:** Intervention Community Corrections Services (ICCS) – Weld


**Total Population:** 262

**Male Population:** 202 men


- 121 diversion, 78 transition and 3 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 4% low, 36% medium and 60% high

ICCS - Weld (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes




Male Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



# 20th Judicial District

Counties: Boulder



## Community Corrections Program: ICCS – Boulder


**Total Population:** 27

**Male Population:** 21 men\*


- 5 diversion, 12 transition and 4 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 60% medium and 40% high

ICCS - Boulder (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes




ICCS - Boulder (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes



\*ICCS-Boulder began operations in January 2020 therefore there is no 2-year combined outcomes data to report. In addition, 6 women were reported in the program in FY20, though the data on the DCJ dashboard is incomplete.

# 20th Judicial District

Counties: Boulder



**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Longmont Community Treatment Center


**Total Population:** 94

**Female Population:** 17 women


- 9 diversion, 7 transition and 1 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 18% low, 35% medium and 47% high

**Core Civic - Longmont (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Female Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 20th Judicial District

Counties: Boulder



**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Longmont Community Treatment Center


**Total Population:** 94

**Female Population:** 17 women

- 9 diversion, 7 transition and 1 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 18% low, 35% medium and 47% high

Core Civic - Longmont (female)  
Transition Program Outcomes



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


Female Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 20th Judicial District

Counties: Boulder



**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Longmont Community Treatment Center


**Total Population:** 94

**Male Population:** 77 men

- 26 diversion, 43 transition and 8 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 27% low, 33% medium and 40% high

**Core Civic - Longmont (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


**Male Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 20th Judicial District

Counties: Boulder



**Community Corrections Program:** CoreCivic – Longmont Community Treatment Center


**Total Population:** 94

**Male Population:** 77 men


- 26 diversion, 43 transition and 8 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 27% low, 33% medium and 40% high

**Core Civic - Longmont (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes**




**Male Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**





# 21st Judicial District

Counties: Mesa



## Community Corrections Program: Mesa County Community Corrections


**Total Population:** 231

**Female Population:** 50 women


- 39 diversion, 3 transition and 8 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 4% medium and 96% high

**Mesa County (female)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Female Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 21st Judicial District

Counties: Mesa



**Community Corrections Program:** Mesa County Community Corrections


**Total Population:** 231

**Female Population:** 50 women

- 39 diversion, 3 transition and 8 condition of parole (COP)


**By Risk Level:** 4% medium and 96% high

## Mesa County (female) Transition Program Outcomes



■ Successful Completion ■ Technical Violation  
■ Escape ■ New Crime


## Female Transition Clients Combined Outcomes by Risk



■ Program success and no filing within 2 years  
■ In-program failure  
■ New Filing within 2 years of successful completion

# 21st Judicial District

Counties: Mesa



## Community Corrections Program: Mesa County Community Corrections


**Total Population:** 231

**Male Population:** 181 men


- 134 diversion, 37 transition and 10 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 1% low, 17% medium and 83% high

**Mesa County (male)  
Diversion Program Outcomes**




**Male Diversion Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



# 21st Judicial District

Counties: Mesa



## Community Corrections Program: Mesa County Community Corrections


**Total Population:** 231

**Male Population:** 181 men


- 134 diversion, 37 transition and 10 condition of parole (COP)

**By Risk Level:** 1% low, 17% medium and 83% high

**Mesa County (male)  
Transition Program Outcomes**



**Male Transition Clients  
Combined Outcomes by Risk**



## Authors

**Terri Hurst, Policy Coordinator**

Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition

**Christie Donner, Executive Director**

Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition

## Contact

Please direct all inquiries about this report and requests for additional information to Terri Hurst at [terri@ccjrc.org](mailto:terri@ccjrc.org) or (303) 825-0122.



1212 Mariposa St. #6, Denver, CO 80204  
(303) 825-0122, [info@ccjrc.org](mailto:info@ccjrc.org), [CCJRC.org](http://CCJRC.org)