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**About the Cover**

Built in 1927, the Wyandotte County Courthouse was designed in the neoclassical style by Wight & Wight of Kansas City, Mo., and constructed of Bedford stone and reinforced concrete.

The courthouse is located at:
710 N. 7th Street
Kansas City, KS 66101

**Photo by** Stephanie McFarland,
Wyandotte County
Roughly 95% of inmates sent to state prisons nationwide will be released back to their respective communities at some point.¹ That reality was brought home to me several years ago when both co-defendants in the first murder case I took part in 20 years ago were granted parole. At the time they were sentenced, I remember thinking the “fifteen to life” sentence (the penalty at that time for felony murder) felt significant. Over time, one comes to realize that all but a small percentage of even the very worst of the defendants we see each day will return at some point to our communities.

As we seek to enhance public safety and find justice for victims, we as prosecutors must strive to remind policy makers of this reality. Locking up the bad guys may sound good for a “tough on crime” election year door hanger, but if we truly want to positively affect community safety, be fiscally responsible and reduce the victimization of our citizens, we must acknowledge detrimental aspects of the current model; a system a colleague recently referred to with disdain as “catch and release.”

We have all heard the national—and increasingly bipartisan—calls for criminal justice “reform.” While we as prosecutors may not agree with all of the proponent’s arguments (or suppositions), the effort has brought to light issues that deserve our full attention. Many proposals are worthy of a full discussion—including “re-entry” programs for inmates returning to society from prison; expanded access to diversion; and sentencing reform—I have just enough space to scratch the surface of what I perceive to be the seminal issue facing the criminal justice system today: access to mental health & substance abuse treatment. In my experience, the need for expanded access to mental health and substance abuse treatment transcends socio-economics, race and region.

The lack of available treatment resources has a cost both to our communities and to the criminal justice system. Three quarters of inmates who return to prison “have a history of substance use disorders.”² Depending on the study and methodology,³ national estimates indicate 14% to 64% of inmates in jails and state prisons had suffered a “recent history” of at least one form of mental illness, including depression, manic-depression/bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, PTSD, an anxiety disorder or a personality disorder.⁴

In 2004, “53% of state prisoners met DSM

---

criteria for drug abuse or dependence.” Among inmates who fit this category, over half “had at least three prior sentences to probation or incarceration, compared to 32 percent of other inmates.” Those with mental illnesses are “overrepresented in probation and parole populations at estimated rates ranging from two to four times the general population.” A review of 40 studies considering the effect of a parent’s incarceration on children reveals a double digit increased risk for antisocial behavior for the child.

Not surprisingly, no study can establish a “proximal causative relationship between mental illness and criminal behavior.” Many people suffer from mental illness everyday without crossing the line into criminal behavior. However, mental illness is a threshold risk factor that, when coupled with other risk factors, including substance abuse, homelessness, and/or physical illness, plays a significant role in future dangerousness.

There are many factors that fuel criminal behavior. But mounting credible evidence suggests that investments in mental health and substance abuse treatment would afford our communities an excellent return on investment. Such investment has the potential to positively impact the time spent by our offices reviewing, charging, processing, trying, and sentencing defendants who committed crimes not because they had a propensity for criminality but because they were feeding a habit or were self-medicating to quiet a mental illness. The drain on prosecutors, public defenders, law enforcement, corrections and the court under the resource-scarce system currently in place is difficult to overstate.

As the legislature goes into session (with many new faces) next year, the inevitable calls for justice reform must include a pragmatic, clear response from our ranks. Expanding state dollars sent to Larned State Hospital and Osawatamie State Hospital; creating or enhancing community mental health crisis centers on the Bexar County, Texas model; or expanding the use of mental health courts are all viable points of discussion. But without a robust and honest discussion of these types of important mental health and substance treatment initiatives, no amount of criminal justice reform—however well-intended—will have the desired effect: keeping our communities safer.

Nationally, our profession faces difficult issues on a scale not seen in recent times. Our obligation is to engage and to speak clearly and honestly about ways our system may be improved. We owe it to the communities we represent.

6. Mumola, supra.
11. Johnson County’s Mental Health Court has served over 300 people since 2002, with a 49% successful completion rate. Their new “Veterans Court” currently has 14 participants.
Legislative Update
by Steve Kearney, President, Kearney & Associates

Attorneys in the Legislature

“Let’s kill all the lawyers.”

How many of you throughout the course of your lifetime at a family get-together, neighborhood barbecue or other events, when a discussion turned toward anything involving the law heard the inevitable quip, “let’s kill all the lawyers,” from one of the attendees oftentimes three cocktails past his or her limit? I suspect also that each of you on more than one occasion has borne witness to another muttering under their breath, “if it wasn’t for those damn lawyers,” when referring to legislation with which they disagreed. As tempting as it is, I won’t digress into the discussion about the fact that the individual commenting probably wasn’t registered to vote and, if so, never took the time to go to the polls. That is an entirely different conversation.

So I will take the last comment first regarding “those damn lawyers” in the legislature. During the time I have had the good fortune of working with and around the Kansas Legislature beginning in the late 1980s (no Def Leppard comments please) there have not been a sufficient number of attorneys in the legislature, practicing or not, to fill out the judiciary committee in either chamber. The seemingly far-flung belief by the voting public that the legislature is dominated by members of the bar continues to persist, and as most of you are aware, could not be further from the truth.

A quick review of our current state of affairs as it pertains to representation by the legal profession in the Kansas legislature shakes out like this: The 2013/16 lawyer legislators in the Senate number three of forty. Of those three, two will not be returning when the legislature convenes in January 2017. In the general election in November there are six non-incumbent attorney candidates in the mix. Three are running in open seats and three are running against incumbent Senators. That creates a range from one to seven attorneys in the Senate come January, with only one a certainty at this moment.

In the House of Representatives, fifteen of one hundred twenty-five members in the 2015/16 term are attorneys. Of those fifteen, five will not be returning either as a result of suffering a loss in the August primary, or not seeking reelection. Six of the remaining ten still have general elections in November in which to prevail to return in January. That leaves at this moment four of the fifteen incumbents and four non-incumbent members of the bar who have no general election opposition that will be sworn in for the 2017 Legislative Session. That brings the number of attorneys in the House that are sure to take their seats to eight. If all the incumbents prevail in November, it will bring the grand total of attorneys in the House to fourteen, a net loss of one.

The House also has two former lay magistrates serving in the 2015/16 term, one of which still has a general election opponent in November, and one that was unopposed who is certain to return in 2017. A third longtime lay magistrate was unopposed in an open seat this cycle and will also be sworn in as a new member of the House in January. Having experienced magistrates in the legislature has already paid dividends, and the addition of a third can only help broaden the understanding of those less exposed to the legal system.

Understanding that there is no plethora of attorneys serving or about to serve in the Kansas Legislature and hopefully debunking the belief that “those damn lawyers” are the cause of all problems legislative, let’s turn back to the opening comment, “first kill all the lawyers.” We should get the actual line correct before proceeding, the line from Shakespeare’s *Henry VI, Part 2* spoken by Dick the
Butcher is, “The first thing we do, let’s kill all the lawyers.” In context, the remark was made by the Butcher in response to his evil henchman boss Jack Cade’s proclamation that he would rise up and be king. While there is disagreement amongst scholars about what Dick the Butcher was trying to say, one well established line of thought, and the one that I employ here, is this: To create an environment in which a nefarious criminal like Jack Cade can usurp the throne and become king, those sworn to uphold and defend the rule of law must first be eliminated, hence, “kill all the lawyers.”

With Dick and Jack targeting lawyers as the first obstruction to the advancement of their reprehensible plan, one could extrapolate that the presence of attorneys in the legislative process as knowledgeable defenders of the rule of law, puts them directly on the front line in that role. While I am certain there is disagreement about the ideal number of lawyers serving in the legislature, without the necessary number of members of the bar in the legislature, haven’t Dick the Butcher and Jack Cade won that battle without so much as firing a shot?

Many thanks to all those members of the bar and all the rest of our citizen legislators that give so generously of their time and experience to make the state of Kansas a better place for all of us to live and raise our families. Godspeed in January!

**Babies**

**Jerome Gorman,** Wyandotte County District Attorney, is the proud papa to his third grandson, but Pete & Kristen’s first child. Grayson Royal Gorman was born on March 26. Grayson weighed 8 lbs. and 8 oz. and was 22 ½ in. long. Mom, dad and baby are doing well.

Douglas County Assistant District Attorney **Emily Haack** and her husband Pete welcomed their son, Isaac James Daniel on May 18, 2016. Isaac was 9 lbs. 1 oz. and 21 in. long. Isaac joins 1.5 year old brother Joseph at keeping Mom and Dad both extremely busy and very happy.

**Anniversary**

As of May 13, 2016, **Thomas R. Stanton** has been a prosecutor for 25 years. He was an Assistant County Attorney and First Assistant County Attorney in Saline County from May 13, 1991 to January 7, 2001, and has been the Deputy Reno County District Attorney from January 8, 2001 to the present.

**Retirement**

**Vicky Lyon,** Victim-Witness Coordinator, Lyon County Attorney’s Office, Emporia, retired June 30, 2016, after serving for 21 years with Lyon County.

**New Faces**

**Darrell Smith,** formerly in practice in Olathe, KS, joined the County Attorney’s staff as an assistant county attorney.
KCDAA Member Highlight

by Jeremy Crist, Assistant Riley County Attorney

The Importance of Giving Back

In preparing for our 2016 spring issue, and in an attempt to gather information for a member highlight story, we sent an e-mail in February asking members to complete a brief survey on their participation in collegiate sports or other community activities. This was an effort to get a glimpse into the ways our members contribute to their respective communities. One of our member’s responses to the survey necessitated a more in-depth interview, which led to the story that follows. It is with great pleasure that we introduce to you Assistant Attorney General, Lyndzie M. Carter, whose story about giving back to the community is both motivating and encouraging.

Understanding and appreciating the ways Lyndzie gives back to the community, requires a brief look at her past. She was raised in Arizona and born into a hard-working, blue collar family (her mother is a descendant of Irish immigrants and her father is a second generation Hispanic-American of Mexican immigrants). Always knowing she wanted to go to law school, she knew she would need to take a more nontraditional path to get there. At the age of 17, with the support and encouragement of her parents, she enlisted in the Air Force. She had tours in both Iraq and Honduras. With the help of the G.I. Bill, she obtained her undergraduate degree while on active duty, and graduated from Washburn University School of Law in 2012. She is currently in the Criminal Litigation Division at the Attorney General’s Office.

With a strong desire to give back and help those people with backgrounds similar to her own, Lyndzie became involved in two programs: Washburn Law School’s Mentor Program, and The Hermanitas Initiative. The law school’s mentor program pairs a first-year student with area alumni with similar interests and backgrounds. For Lyndzie, the commitment usually involves taking the student to lunch and being available to answer questions by phone or e-mail. She stresses the importance of internships and meeting people and being willing to work for free. Having a student invite her to his/her graduation, report back with the success of an internship or employment, or a kind note of appreciation help make for a satisfying and rewarding experience. Lyndzie says it’s her way of giving back. She had wonderful mentors and only hopes that she can be the same to someone else and help them achieve their goals. If you would like further information on the Washburn University School of Law Mentor Program, you can contact Tammy King, Director of Professional Development, or access the necessary registration forms online.

The second way Lyndzie gives back to the community is through her work locally with The Hermanitas Initiative. This local group is part of the broader MANA group, a National Latina Organization. They represent the interests of Latina women, youth, and families on issues impacting our communities. The Hermanitas Initiative is primarily for young Latina women ages 11-18, although no one is excluded. Through her work with this organization, Lyndzie strives to encourage minority girls to pursue professional careers and to expand their horizons, and help shatter the glass ceilings of cultural stereotypes. One way the group helps facilitate this initiative is through a conference on the Washburn campus in which the
girls, professionals, professors, and others, engage in a series of roundtable discussions set up like speed dating. The groups are engaged in timed discussions with approximately 8-10 young girls at a round table with a local professional before that professional moves on to the next group of girls. In this way, the girls are able to interact and get to know professional adults like them. For more information about The Hermanitas Initiative, you may contact Kim Morse, Ph.D, Professor of History, at Washburn University.

For Lyndzie, giving back is important, even if she doesn’t feel she has the time to spare. She believes it’s important to make the time for these activities. In the end, she believes wholeheartedly it’s worth the effort and makes our communities healthier. Having interviewed her personally, it was plain to see Lyndzie’s genuine excitement about these activities and that she derives much satisfaction from helping others like herself aspire, achieve, and overcome.

For L yndzie, giving back is important, even if she doesn’t feel she has the time to spare. She believes it’s important to make the time for these activities. In the end, she believes wholeheartedly it’s worth the effort and makes our communities healthier. Having interviewed her personally, it was plain to see Lyndzie’s genuine excitement about these activities and that she derives much satisfaction from helping others like herself aspire, achieve, and overcome.

**New Faces**

**TC Penland** was born and raised in Shawnee, Kansas. He graduated from Shawnee Mission Northwest and went on to earn his finance degree from Kansas State University. After working a few years in the financial industry, TC went on to attend law school at the University of Kansas. TC began his legal career as an associate at a small employment defense firm in Prairie Village, Kansas. TC looks forward to prosecuting adult felony cases at the Wyandotte County District Attorney’s Office.

**Jose Guerra** is from Quito, Ecuador, and graduated from Rockhurst High School in Kansas City, Missouri. He received his bachelor’s degree from Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska. After college, Jose returned to Kansas and earned his J.D. from the University of Kansas School of Law. During his third year in law school, he interned with the Johnson County District Attorney’s Office and prosecuted mainly domestic violence crimes as well as other misdemeanor level offenses. Jose came to the Wyandotte County District Attorney’s Office in May 2016, after serving as an Assistant District Attorney in Shawnee County for almost three years. He is currently prosecuting adult felony crimes.

**R. Lee McGowan** joined the Miami County Attorney’s Office as an Assistant County Attorney in Paola, KS on May 2, 2016. Most recently, Mr. McGowan was a prosecutor in the Shawnee County District Attorney’s Office for over ten years. He is a Washburn Law graduate.

**Christine Ladner** has joined the Office of the Saline County Attorney.

---

**County Courthouse Portraits**

**John D Morrison**
Prairie Vistas Gallery
151 N Rock Island, Suite 1D
Wichita, KS  67202
316-214-7566
www.prairievistas.com
Juvenile Justice Reform 2016: Senate Bill 367

by Donald W. Hymer, Johnson County Assistant District Attorney

Introduction to Juvenile Justice Reform in Kansas

Many have argued that juvenile justice in the United States has come “full circle.” Prior to 1900, no state had a separate court system for its juveniles. Juveniles were simply prosecuted in the criminal system, and received adult penalties, often with harsh consequences. In 1899, the first separate juvenile court system began in the state of Illinois. The first juvenile code in Kansas was enacted in 1906, and by 1920, all states followed suit. These early juvenile court models were generally based around rehabilitation, informality, and flexibility.

In the 1960s, the United States Supreme Court considered whether state juvenile justice systems provided sufficient due process during waiver (Kent v. United States, 383 U.S. 541, 1966)) and adjudication (In Re Gault, 387 U.S. 1, 1967)) proceedings. Although the Supreme Court understood and appreciated the system goals of rehabilitation and informality, the Court also mandated that basic due process concepts from the adult system must be added to the juvenile court process. A basic question analyzed in many Supreme Court cases from 1966 through 1985 was: Will the requirement of a specific adult due process right frustrate the juvenile justice system goals of rehabilitation and informality? Several specific rights, such as confrontation of witnesses in waiver and adjudication hearings (Kent, Gault), right to proof beyond a reasonable doubt (In Re Winship, 397 U.S. 358, 90 S.Ct. 1068, 25 L.Ed.2d 368, 1970)), or the right to trial by jury (McKeiver v. Pennsylvania, 403 U.S. 528, 91 S.Ct. 1976, 29 L.Ed.2d 647 (1971)), were analyzed by the Court. The rulings from Kent, Gault, and other cases required all states to change their juvenile justice systems to provide more “adult-like” due process rights.

During the 1980s and ’90s, many states, including Kansas, became concerned with juvenile crime issues. Increasing juvenile crime rates, along with several widely-reported juvenile crime incidents caused states to consider changing their juvenile systems. In Kansas, many such changes were enacted, and were referred to as “Juvenile Justice Reform,” in 1997 Kansas House Bill 2900.

As a result, the juvenile justice systems in Kansas and elsewhere at that time provided for more due process protections— and therefore “formality”— to juveniles, but also more punitive sanctions (including more waivers to adult status) as well. This is why many people now feel that the juvenile justice system has indeed come “full circle.” Justice and Juveniles in Kansas: Where We Have Been and Where We Are Headed, Carla J. Stovall, 47 K.L.R. 1021 (1999).

For the decade following the 1997 Juvenile Justice Reform, the offender code remained largely unchanged in terms of policy and procedure. The offender code did undergo many minor changes and the code was considered by the legislature to be difficult for the courts and practitioners to navigate. As a result, the legislature revised the entire Juvenile Justice Code in 2007, effective January 1, 2007, and those changes continue to be the most significant in recent years in the field of juvenile offender law. The code was completely re-written and relocated from K.S.A. 38-1600s to K.S.A. 38-2300s. Although the revision was sweeping in nature, it did not make many substantive changes, and the most controversial change, the granting of the right to a jury trial, was pulled from the bill prior to the final vote on the bill. On June 8, 2008, the Supreme Court of Kansas issued its opinion in In re L.M., 286 Kan. 460, 186 P.3d 164 (2008) granting juveniles the Constitutional right to a jury trial under the Sixth and 14th Amendments of the federal constitution, as well as having the right to a jury trial under the Kansas Constitution.

The evolution of the juvenile justice in Kansas did not escape the scrutiny of the Kansas Supreme Court and formed a portion of the rational for the decision of the L.M. Court.
Senate Bill 367 of the 2016 legislature is the latest installment of juvenile justice reform in Kansas. SB 367 is sweeping in its scope and touches almost every area of the Juvenile Justice Code, K.S.A. 38-2301 et. seq. SB 367 evolved as a result of a juvenile justice workgroup that had input from legislatures, judges and juvenile justice stakeholders from around the state. The resulting legislation seeks to reduce the number of youths in “out-of-home” placements and limit the case lengths for juveniles in the court system and also keep more in their communities. The bill is law effective July 1, 2016, however, many of the provisions of the law become effective over the course of the next several years.

This article will address the provisions that become effective July 1, 2016 or January 1, 2017. Additional articles will address the provisions that become effective at later dates. The changes also fall into two categories: “changes to the law” and “oversight and funding changes.”

July 1, 2016 – Changes to the Law

Waiver to adult status: Section 40 of SB 367 amends K.S.A. 38-2347 impacting waiver to adult status. For crimes committed by a juvenile on or after July 1, 2016, the minimum age for waiver is raised from 12 years of age to 14 years of age. Also, there is no longer a presumption of waiver to adult status and the state must prove by clear and convincing evidence the factors for waiver as contained in K.S.A. 38-2347. The factors did not change, only now for all offenders regardless of the offense, the burden is on the state to establish the juvenile should be waived to adult status.

Extended Jurisdiction Juvenile Prosecution (EJJP): Section 40 also amends the provisions of EJJP (contained in K.S.A. 38-2347). Effective July 1, 2016, any juvenile over the age of 10 can receive an EJJP dual sentence only if the juvenile is charged with, and eventually adjudicated of, an off-grid or level 1-4 person felony offense. Section 43 of SB 367 also amends K.S.A. 38-2364, which controls when the court may impose the adult sentence for a juvenile previously sentenced to a dual sentence. Under the provisions of EJJP, when the court sentences a juvenile, the adult sentence is stayed while the juvenile “serves” his or her juvenile sentence. Under the prior law, the execution of the adult sentence was stayed on the condition that the juvenile offender not violate the provisions of the juvenile sentence. The language now reads that the adult sentence shall be stayed on the condition that the juvenile offender substantially comply with the provisions of the juvenile sentence. [see K.S.A. 38-2364(a) (2)]. The committing of a new offense is still a basis upon which the court may impose the adult sentence. This section also cleans up the prior law and mandates the court conduct a hearing before imposing the adult sentence.

Juvenile Offender referral for Child in Need of Care petition: Section 44 of SB 367 amends K.S.A. 38-2367, which previously outlined the findings the court was to make prior to placing a child in the custody of the secretary of corrections. The statute is now amended to include a provision that enables the juvenile offender court to refer the case to the county or district attorney who shall file a Child in Need of Care (CINC) petition pursuant to K.S.A. 38-2234 and refer the family and juvenile to the Kansas Department for Children and Families (DCF) for services.

Changes to definitions section of Juvenile Justice Code: Section 29 of SB 367 amends K.S.A. 38-2302 and the definitions used in the juvenile justice system in Kansas. Detention Risk Assessment Tool is defined, although the use of such a tool is not required until January 1, 2107. The terms “evidence-based” and “graduated responses” are defined in K.S.A. 38-2302(h) and (i), respectively, although these provisions are not required to be utilized until January 1, 2017. Further, due to the emphasis in SB 367 to have juvenile offenders at home, the requirements of a reintegration plan are defined in K.S.A. 38-2203(x)(1)- (7). The use of a
reintegration plan is not mandated until July 1, 2017.

**Supervision Fee:** Section 22 of SB 367 continues the authority of the Kansas Supreme Court to establish a supervision fee in juvenile justice cases, but failure to pay the supervision will not prohibit the juvenile from being released early from supervision. As previously approved by statute, the fees and court costs may be waived.

### July 1, 2016 – Changes to funding and oversight

**Planning for the implementation of all phases of SB 367:** Although most of the legal provisions of SB 367 do not become effective until July 1, 2017, the bill contemplates that local planning committees such as local juvenile corrections advisory boards (JCABs) will begin the process of developing local alternatives to out-of-home placements. Part of this planning requires that each JCAB appoint a juvenile defense attorney to the board.

**Establishment of the Juvenile Justice Improvement Fund:** SB 367 mandates the establishment of the Juvenile Justice Improvement Fund for the purpose of developing evidence-based services and practices in communities statewide. The stated purpose of this fund is to help regions of the state that have high rates of out-of-home placements and fewer alternative to detention. The stated goal is to have very few juveniles in Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC) placements that are not at the correctional facility.

**Data Collection and Exchange:** SB 367 requires local and state level authorities and parties to develop a method to collect and exchange confidential data between all parties.

### September 1, 2016 – Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee

SB 367 requires the State of Kansas to create a Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee. The Oversight Committee will consist of 19 members appointed by various state officials to be appointed on or before September 1, 2016 and to meet no later than 60 days from that date. The committee is to evaluate performance and progress toward the goal of the improvement of the juvenile justice system and issue an annual report.

### January 1, 2017 – Changes to the Law

**Immediate Intervention:** Many counties and districts throughout the State of Kansas have for many years had pre-file programs to divert minor offenders from the formal court process. In many jurisdictions the adult criminal code language of diversion has also been used in juvenile court. SB 367, in sections 3, 39 and 63, amends K.S.A. 38-2346 and K.S.A. 75-7023 and mandates an immediate intervention program (IIP) in all counties in the State of Kansas.

- The IIP can be either before or after the filing of a complaint.
- Both first and second time offenders are eligible under the law.
- Prosecutors and local juvenile intake and assessment centers (JIAC) are to collaborate to decide the appropriate candidates for IIP.
- There is an 8 month maximum total time period for IIP, including all extensions for violation of the IIP agreement.
- Before an IIP may be revoked or reviewed for anything other than a new law violation, the violation must be brought before a multi-disciplinary team. Those invited to the MDT must include a representative of the juvenile’s school or school district, the juvenile, the juvenile’s parent(s).
- The bill also states that no juvenile can be denied an IIP based on the inability of the
juvenile to pay any fees associated with the IIP.

- The bill does not expressly state that juveniles are ineligible for IIP, or “diversion”, when charged with a felony filed of record with the court. SB 367 only operates to mandate the existence of an appropriate IIP system in every jurisdiction for misdemeanor offenses.

- The Office of Judicial Administration (OJA) and KDOC are to collaborate to develop standards for the state-wide immediate intervention programs and alternative means of adjudication in every jurisdiction in the State of Kansas.

- Effective January 1, 2017, KDOC is obligated to create a plan and provide funding for the state-wide immediate intervention programs that meet the standards of SB 367.

**Probation:** In keeping with the purpose of SB 367, numerous changes to probation and probation revocation sanctions are included in the new law. The bill requires KDOC to consult with the Kansas Supreme Court to promulgate regulations and rules by January 1, 2017, for a statewide system of community based graduated sanctions for technical violations of probation and conditional release violations. The new sanctions are not mandated to be implemented until July 1, 2017.

**Juvenile taken into custody:** SB 367 limits the circumstances under which a juvenile may be taken into custody.

- Effective January 1, 2017, a court service officer or community corrections officers may no longer take a juvenile into custody for violation of a condition of probation.

- The supervising officer may request a warrant by supplying the court with a written report and request for arrest if the violation is the third or subsequent violation and that the juvenile poses a risk of physical harm to another or to property.

- When law enforcement detains a juvenile and does not take the juvenile to JIAC, that juvenile shall be issued a notice to appear at JIAC at a certain date and time.

- Criteria for detention is amended to include that the juvenile scores for detention on the pending state-wide detention risk assessment tool, or that there are grounds to override the tool based on the written findings of the court that the juvenile will not appear at the next hearing or detention is necessary to protect the safety of another person or property.

Numerous additional changes to the juvenile justice code become effective on July 1, 2017 through July 1, 2018 and those provisions will be discussed in part II of this review of the Juvenile Justice Reform of 2016: Senate Bill 367.
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Photos from the KCDAA Golf Tournament
Do you have an article idea you would like to know more about? We can try to find a writer, if you have an idea.

Or would you like to submit an article?

Send your idea and/or submissions to Editor Nicole Van Velzen at nickiv@gmail.com.

WE WANT TO SHARE YOUR NEWS!

If you have something you would like to share with the KCDAA membership, please keep us informed.

We would like to publish baby announcements, new attorneys, anniversaries, retirements, awards, office moves, if you have been published, or anything else you would like to share!

Information submitted is subject to space availability and the editorial board reserves the right to edit material. Send your information and photos to:

Editor Nicole Van Velzen
nickiv@gmail.com

Next Deadline: Fall/Winter: October 26
With your help, we can conquer mountains and enhance public safety for the future.

Support our scholarships today!

Send your tax-deductible donation to:
Kansas Prosecutors Foundation
1200 SW 10th Ave.
Topeka, KS 66604

Learn more at www.kpfonline.org