

**SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD (SOMB)
MINUTES**

Friday, August 17, 2018

SOMB Members

Allison Boyd
Carl Blake
Jeff Jenks
Jeff Shay
Jesse Hansen
Jessica Meza
John Odenheimer
Kandy Moore
Korey Elger
Leonard Woodson
Marcelo Kopcow
Missy Gursky
Norma Aguilar-Dave
Richard Bednarski
Robin Singer
Sharon Holbrook
Steve Moreno
Taber Powers
Tom Lerversee

SOMB Guests

Amira Minzaai
Becki Hinton
Brandon Grund
Caryn Datz
Christian Gardner-Wood
Christine Rinke
Colton McNutt
David Nahum
Deb Baty
Dena McClung
Gary Reser
Jeffrey Jordan
Judith Kunze
Laurie Kepros
Layla Sadighi
Leslie Quitmeyer
Lindsay Sova
Lisa Mayer
Mable Banks
Mona Murch
Nicole Leon
Pat Harris
Roger Kincade
Selena Jameson
Shannon O'Connor
Tami Floyd
Tanya Tyrrell
Terri Pieros
Trent Bushner
Wendy Bieseemeier

Absent SOMB Members: Amanda Gall, Angel Weant, Brie Franklin, Mark Waller, Mary Baydarian, and Rick May

Staff: Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky, Raechel Alderete, Michelle Geng, Marina Borysov, Kelly Hume, and Jill Trowbridge

SOMB Meeting Begins: 9:01

Judge Kopcow reviewed the SOMB meeting rules and procedures for all in attendance.

INTRODUCTIONS:

Introductions were made by all SOMB Members and SOMB Staff, and audience members in attendance.

No Future Agenda Items

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Missy Gursky praised the Sex Offender Management Board (SOMB) for the quality of the presenters at the 2018 SOMB Conference.

Jessica Meza announced Megan Ring will replace Doug Wilson as the State of Colorado Public Defender.

Raechel Alderete announced that there is an open position on the Best Practices Committee due to the departure of Lee Oesterle from this committee. She indicated the Committee is looking for an adult treatment provider for this opening, and asked that any interested parties should contact her.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky announced on behalf of Bobbi Ponis, the Co-chair of the Family Engagement Committee, that a new chapter of the Family Resource Guide has been released, and asked all to review this material, and provide any feedback by September 15th.

Marina Borysov indicated the SOMB has received positive feedback regarding the presenters and sessions from the 2018 SOMB conference, and noted that next year's conference will again be at Beaver Run Resort. She mentioned that next year's conference will include both the SOMB and the Domestic Violence Offender Management Board (DVOMB), which will extend the conference to 4 days. Marina indicated that there will be more sessions, along with plenary sessions and keynote presenters. She asked all to also keep in mind those involved in the domestic violence field when submitting presentation proposals for next year's conference.

Marina Borysov asked all to contact her if they want to be a part of the training committee and planning of next year's conference.

Marina Borysov reviewed a number of the upcoming trainings scheduled through the Fall.

Laurie Kepros mentioned that the Legislative Oversight Committee for the Treatment of People with Mental Disorders in the Criminal Justice System are using the SOMB white paper to draft bills regarding juvenile registration.

APPROVAL OF MAY MINUTES:

Motion to approve the May minutes: Jeff Shay; 2nd (Question #1)

15	Approve	0	Oppose	2	Abstain	Motion Passes
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

APPROVAL OF JULY MINUTES:

Motion to approve the July minutes: Jeff Shay; 2nd (Question #2)

12	Approve	0	Oppose	5	Abstain	Motion Passes
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

APPROVE AGENDA:

Approved by consensus

VARIANCE BY TREATMENT AND EVALUATIONS SERVICES (Decision Item) – Carl Blake, Application Review Committee, and Michelle Geng, DCJ

Carl Blake reviewed a follow-up to a variance issued for Treatment and Evaluation Services (TES) which is at the end of the 3-year cycle. He noted that the Application Review Committee (ARC) is looking to see if the SOMB would like to make a revision to the Standards to incorporate the practice covered by this variance or deny the extension of it. Michelle Geng noted that this variance is for continued treatment of clients while under the appeal process.

Board Discussion:

There was extensive SOMB discussion regarding this variance and what the next steps are as indicated below:

- Tom Leverage asked how denial is addressed for those clients in this treatment group while in the appeal process.
- Michelle Geng noted that the client cannot discuss the crime of conviction while in treatment, but can still receive generalized treatment.
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that the issue is whether to continue the variance, which allows treatment for other behaviors while under appeal, or change the Standards to include those in this specific situation.
- Allison Boyd asked various questions regarding the number of clients in this program, if the appeals are being resolved, if the clients are moving into offense-specific treatment, how long they have been in this treatment group, and the type of data that TES collected.
- Carl Blake responded to Allison Boyd that most of this information was presented to the SOMB previously, and noted that TES was monitoring the level of engagement with most being compliant with all the conditions put upon them. He also mentioned that this can be a long process, with most of these cases still under appeal.
- Christian Gardner-Wood expressed concerns about who is monitoring the status of the appeals, and asked for further explanation of TES's findings.
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that the ARC currently monitors the appeal status, but noted that if the Standards change to include these situations, then the Community Supervision Teams (CST's) would then become the monitoring entity.
- Judge Kopcow asked what is the specific decision that needs to be made at this meeting.
- Carl Blake indicated that the variance policy is that after 3 years, a decision needs to be made to allow or deny the variance, and noted that it cannot be a perpetual variance. He mentioned the need to either revise the Standards to include this process or not renew this variance.
- Carl Blake discussed that all variances are monitored by the ARC, and noted they receive monthly and/or quarterly reports to make sure the client and treatment providers are following the terms of the variance.
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reiterated that this variance has reached the 3-year limit, and noted that the decision today only affects this specific variance.
- Allison Boyd expressed her desire that the ARC should continue to review and monitor this variance request for 1-2 more years, and noted that she does not support including this scenario in the Standards at this time until further monitoring of the variance is done.
- Tom Leverage noted he would like more ARC monitoring and treatment provider reporting before making a change to the Standards. He suggested supplying the current data to the Adult Standards Revision Committee to see if they support this change.
- John Odenheimer clarified that the clients are still being monitored by the CST while under appeal.
- Missy Gursky mentioned that supervising officers are supportive of the clients having some sort of treatment while their case is on appeal.
- Carl Blake suggested asking TES for specific information before the SOMB can make an informed decision. He mentioned that a decision needs to be made before the variance expires, and indicated that a temporary variance extension can be given.
- Judge Kopcow suggested that the SOMB ask for and receive specific client results from TES in order to make a decision by the next meeting in September.
- Jessica Meza made a motion to defer this and any questions to the Adult Standards Revisions Committee for review. There was no second to the motion.
- Tom Leverage asked what specific Standards would be affected.
- Christian Gardner-Wood asked what benefit the client would have with non-sex offense specific treatment, and if there is any benefit after 3 years.
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that Rick May had previously offered to answer any questions if asked regarding more specific outcomes of this treatment.

- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded to Tom Leverage that it will be a lot of work for the Adult Standards Revisions Committee to do without specific recommendations from the SOMB considering the strict Legislative timeframes currently in place. He suggested filtering these questions through the Best Practice Committee for review and compilation of a specific recommendation to (1) change the variance policy, (2) include this scenario in the Adult Standards, or (3) cancel this variance completely.
- Jessica Meza amended the pending motion to have the Best Practices Committee look at this variance, review any pending questions, and decide whether to send this to the Adult Standards Revisions Committee for drafting of the language and insertion into the Standards. Richard Bednarski 2nd the motion.
- Allison Boyd asked if a variance would have to be submitted for each individual under appeal to join a treatment group like TES offers. Carl responded that this variance is for TES to operate a group that includes clients whose cases are under appeal.
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky asked if this motion would allow TES to be in a deferred status until this issue is resolved. Jessica Meza agreed to include that in her motion.

Audience Discussion:

Terry Pieros asked if this variance or scenario includes those incarcerated who are in Sex Offender Treatment Monitoring Program (SOTMP). Carl Blake responded that this variance is for a specific private treatment group.

Motion to refer issue to Best Practices Committee for review: Jessica Meza; Richard Bednarski 2nd (Question #3)

18	Approve	0	Oppose	0	Abstain	Motion Passes
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

Judge Kopcow asked what would be the timeline for Best Practices to bring back recommendations to the SOMB. Tom Leverage and Carl Blake responded that this issue will be prioritized, and indicated that this review could be done, and recommendations brought back to the SOMB within 90 days. Carl Blake indicated that this variance will be extended through this period.

It was noted that this variance will be included as a future agenda item for the November SOMB meeting.

BREAK: 10:07 – 10:25

ADULT STANDARDS SECTION 3.170 (Action Item) – Michelle Geng, DCJ (Handout Provided)

Michelle gave a brief overview of the proposed Adult Standards Section 3.170, and noted that this section was previously approved by the SOMB with the removal of the Low Risk Protocol. She noted that research and best practices shows that mixing low risk and high risk clients together increases the risk for low risk clients. Michelle indicated that separating these groups is not always a viable option for the rural areas of Colorado. She mentioned that this section was vetted through the Best Practices Committee, and the Adult Standards Revisions Committee, and then sent back to the Best Practices Committee. Michelle indicated that it is suggested that treatment providers look at both the static and dynamic risk assessments when placing clients into groups, and mentioned that it is not recommended moving clients between low and high risk groups each time their dynamic risk level change.

Board Discussion:

Allison Boyd questioned the sentence that states "Risk score shall be determined by the combined score derived from the static and dynamic risk assessment." Michelle Geng responded that the treatment providers can use more than these, but to use at least these when assessing client risk.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that best practice is to consider at least these instruments, and not to rely on clinical judgement only when assessing risk. He also mentioned that this language helps make sure the correct instrument or assessment is used when placing a client into a specific group. Chris encouraged all to

send comments and feedback to Michelle Geng for dissemination to stakeholders for next month's ratification vote on this topic.

Missy Gursky indicated that the Best Practices Committee and the Adult Standards Revisions Committee have come to agreement of this language.

Carl Blake noted that this language has been revised due to specific tasks as requested by the SOMB, and indicated his desire to expedite and make a decision on this revised language today. Carl Blake made a motion to accept this document and take a vote on it at this meeting. Missy Gursky 2nd this motion.

Allison Boyd expressed concern about the use of the two tools stated that may not vet out the true risk in some cases. Carl Blake responded that the behavior will still be monitored based on the dynamics of the group, and noted that the score is determined by the results of both static and dynamic risk assessments.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky suggested changing the sentence to "risk score shall, at a minimum, be determined by the combined score derived from the static and dynamic risk assessment."

Missy Gursky responded that she is not in favor of the change due the fact that it opens the door for treatment providers to do whatever they want when assessing risk, and to heed the research and best practice on this issue.

Jesse Hansen agreed with Missy Gursky to keep the language as is.

Audience Discussion:

Laurie Kepros reiterated that best practices and research indicate that these two assessments are the most current, validated risk assessment tools.

Motion to approve the document as is: Carl Blake; Missy Gursky 2nd (Question #4)

18	Approve	0	Oppose	0	Abstain	Motion Passes
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

CHILD CONTACT SCREENING PROCESS (Action Item) – Missy Gursky, Adult Standards Revisions Committee, and Michelle Geng, DCJ (Handout Provided)

Missy Gursky gave an overview of this proposed language and process regarding the new Child Contact Screening. She indicated that these revisions include a more narrowed focus of the factors regarding child contact. Missy noted that this is a more efficient process that is economically affordable. She asked all to review and supply feedback or suggested revisions, and indicated the desire to bring this back to the SOMB as a decision item next month. She mentioned that the Child Contact Screening Handbook will be revised as well.

Michelle Geng mentioned that this new screening process is the same as the Child Contact Assessment (CCA) screening process in an abbreviated form to include the following revisions:

Pre-Screen Factors

- If *2 or more factors* indicated, ineligible for CCA and must meet the criteria in Section 5.740 to have minor child contact;
 - Adult history of illegal sexual behavior with child(ren) age 12 or younger;
 - Three or more unlawful sexual behaviors;
 - Sexual interest or arousal to prepubescent children, including conviction related to the viewing, creating or distributing of child sexual abuse images;
 - Unresolved CCA polygraph

- Removed level 3 denial from the Pre-Screen Factors

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that the changes made were mandated by the Legislature and supported by research. He noted that the 2014 external evaluation also raised questions regarding the CCA's appropriateness. Chris mentioned that the revisions change the focus of the CCA process, and noted that includes factors that had not been addressed previously. He indicated that the CCA is not an instrument, but uses research supported factors.

Board Discussion:

Christian Gardner-Wood expressed support of this document and the changes made. He questioned if sexual sadism is included in the exclusionary criteria for any form of child contact in Section 5.725, and if so, would it be included in Section 5.732 also. Christian also asked why Section 5.732 B. was changed from SVP Criteria to psychopathy or personality disorder. Kelly Hume responded that psychopathy or personality disorder is terminology that is much more supported in the field, and did not know why sexual sadism was not included in Section 5.732. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky clarified the difference between exclusionary versus disqualifying criteria indicating that exclusionary means that a client may never have contact with own minor child, while disqualifying may mean that at this time, the client is not eligible for a CCS.

Christian Gardner-Wood asked if sexual sadism is in Section 5.725, then why it is not in Section 5.732. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that if a client meets the exclusionary criteria, then they do not go any farther with the CCA, and indicated that it is irrelevant to have psychopathy in Section 5.732. He suggested removing psychopathy from Section 5.732 B.

Koey Elger noted the need to include legal guardian wishes and desires for child contact in this section. Michelle Geng noted that this is in the beginning of this section, but will include it in this area also.

Allison Boyd agreed that the parent's wishes should be included, but noted that they do not have veto power over contact.

Carl Blake indicated that this section is for non-Burns scenarios that give the offender contact with own non-victim child who they have a relationship with. He agreed that the legal guardian's wishes should be a factor in allowing or disallowing contact.

Missy Gursky noted that the CCA handbook addresses the wishes of the other parent or legal guardian regarding contact with own child. Gary Reser indicated that many times the other parent uses this as leverage against the offender having contact.

It was discussed how the evaluator knows who the legal guardian is, and it was indicated that the evaluator follows-up with those indicated as the parent and/or legal guardian before the CCA or CCS is completed and before contact is allowed if the guardian wishes. Korey Elger noted that the client needs to request from the Department of Human Services who the legal guardian is, and the client should ask the court for updated guardianship information. Missy Gursky indicated that Social Services records are required as indicated on page 4 of 5 of this document.

Gary Reser noted that at times, the CCA/CCS is done without the other parent information. Missy Gursky reiterated that the CCA/CCS is a recommendation for the CST who makes the final decision regarding own child contact.

Audience Discussion:

Laurie Kepros noted that this scenario is only an issue when the judge has restricted contact with own non-victim minor children (under Burns). She mentioned that all other court restrictions supersede this scenario.

Judge Kopcow asked all to review this language with their stakeholders, submit feedback to the SOMB staff, and indicated this item will be a Decision Item at the September SOMB meeting.

LEGISLATIVE REPORT UPDATE (Action Item) – Kelly Hume, DCJ

Kelly Hume reviewed the literature review and the policy section of the Legislative Report as follows:

Policy Section - She indicated that there is only one policy at this time, and asked for other policies from the SOMB. She mentioned that the SVP designation will again be addressed in the Legislative Report, and noted the need to move toward a 3-tiered system as indicated by research.

Literature Review – Kelly indicated the literature review will include the use of pornography in juveniles and adults, and the LGBTQ community and addressing their needs. Kelly indicated that the use of the victim representative and their role on the CST will also be included.

Kelly Hume mentioned that there will be a shift in the term “Sexual Deviance” in the Legislative Report, and noted this will be clarified, and why the change in language is necessary. She asked all present to let her know of any further issues regarding policy or literature to be included.

Board Discussion:

Jessica Meza suggested including research regarding lifetime supervision for juveniles tried in adult court, and the implications of juveniles being incarcerated in the Department of Corrections. She also asked if there are treatment groups they can attend, and how they are affected. Kelly Hume responded that she will research this topic further.

SEX OFFENDER SURCHARGE ALLOCATION (Decision Item) – Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky, DCJ

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed the Sex Offender Surcharge fund process for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 and the parameters around this. He indicated that the funds are used by four agencies in numerous ways (the Department of Public Safety - CDPS, the Department of Corrections - DOC, the Department of Human Services - DHS, and the Judicial Department). Chris noted that the amount that is budgeted for each agency is according to their needs, and is based on a predetermined formula. He noted that this is a decision item to allocate up to the full spending amounts as indicated by each agency. Chris mentioned that DCJ will use some of this fund for the data collection requirement, which does not affect the general spending for Fiscal Year 2019-2020.

Board Discussion:

Carl Blake indicated that these are not funds that the SOMB is generating, but noted these are funds that the SOMB is tasked with disseminating.

John Odenheimer clarified that this is not taxpayer dollar spending.

Motion to approve the sex offender surcharge allocation: Richard Bednarski; Norma Aguilar-Dave
2nd (Question #5)

17 Approve 0 Oppose 0 Abstain Motion Passes

LUNCH: 11:30 – 12:22

DEFINITION OF RISK RELATED SEXUAL INTERESTS AND BEHAVIOR PATTERNS (Action Item) – Tom Leverage, Best Practices Committee, and Kelly Hume, DCJ (Handout Provided)

Tom Leverage gave an overview of the reason for the change of the definition of risk related sexual interests and behavior patterns which replaces the use of the term "deviant sexual interests". He indicated that the research on normative sexual behavior in the field is evolving regarding offense related sexual interests. Tom noted that the Best Practices Committee decided on alternate terminology to "deviant or deviancy" which includes alternative sexual behavioral terminology. As a result, the Committee decided on the term "risk related sexual interests and behavior patterns".

Kelly Hume reiterated the move away from sexual deviance labeling due to various reasons. She indicated that the research indicated the use of problematic or unhealthy sexual behaviors, and noted that the Committee did not feel that these terms captured the target population areas with which the SOMB is concerned. Kelly indicated that the Committee was looking for terminology that encompasses both the risk related sexual interests and sexual behavior patterns. She reviewed the risk related sexual interest and behavior patterns as indicated on the definition of risk related sexual interests and behavior patterns handout.

Board Discussion:

Carl Blake indicated that the Juvenile Standards will be reviewed to see how this change in terminology will affect various sections. He indicated that in the evaluation section, this new definition will work well in the Standards. Carl noted that in Section 3.130 of the Juvenile Standards (the treatment section) where it addresses deviant behaviors, the terminology will be changed to "increasing abusive and harmful behaviors". He indicated that there are some places where this new terminology will be used, and some instances it is not appropriate, such as in the Penile Plethysmograph (PPG) results appendix.

Judge Kopcow asked if this terminology is new to the field, and if it is appropriate for the Standards. Carl responded that the field is moving away from "deviant", and noted that this new terminology makes sense and further clarifies the term "deviant". Judge Kopcow asked if it makes sense to add a footnote to clarify the intent of the SOMB of using this new terminology.

Kelly Hume indicated that recent research is moving toward "problematic" and "more harmful behaviors" terminology.

Tom Leverage indicated that this new terminology clarifies the transition for treatment providers and evaluators. He agreed to insert a footnote in the Standards to clarify the intent of the SOMB to move toward this new terminology.

Christian Gardner-Wood asked why the SOMB is not using the research terminology of "problematic", and asked if there is anything that relates to non-consensual sexual behavior as being a risk factor. He expressed the need to identify the deviant sexual fantasies as they relate to that specific sexual risk behavior.

Carl Blake responded to Judge Kopcow that a footnote might be good for clarity, but noted that the definition further clarifies what deviant encompasses. He responded to Christian Gardner-Wood's concern of not using "problematic" behaviors in the definition. Carl noted that in the Juvenile Standards where it discusses the interruption of deviant fantasies, that this has been changed to interrupting illegal, abusive, and harmful behaviors. He noted that "problematic" is too broad and indicated the need to narrow the scope to cover those behaviors that the treatment providers deal with. Carl indicated that the concept of this new definition is flexible enough to be able to alter it to fit a specific section. He mentioned that the Adult Revisions Standards Committee may find the need to clarify each section as needed.

Judge Kopcow noted that the footnote will clarify the SOMB position for those not in the therapeutic field.

Tom Leverage suggested adding "coercive sexual behavior" in the definition as this is used regularly in the field. He indicated that Marie Crabbe noted that pornography is moving toward more aggressive sexual encounters.

Dr. Colton McNutt noted that the bullet points are direct from research, and indicated that non-consensual sexual behavior was not indicated in the research. He mentioned that this point could be clarified in the body of the definition.

Judge Kopcow mentioned that all in attendance take this new definition back to their stakeholders for review and feedback.

Audience Discussion:

Gary Reser noted that from a therapist's point of view, there is a big difference between sexual interests and sexual abusive behaviors. He indicated that this new terminology helps define the specifics of non-deviant sexual interests.

STAFF UPDATES RELATED TO UPCOMING STRATEGIC PLANNING INITIATIVES – Marina Borysov, DCJ, and Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky, DCJ

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky and Marina Borysov updated the SOMB on the upcoming strategic planning initiatives. Chris discussed the work done to date, while Marina updated all on what is planned for the future strategic planning initiatives.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky highlighted the past work done:

- An external evaluation was done in 2014 with 28 resulting recommended action items;
- Of the 9 recommendations prioritized by the SOMB, all have been addressed or are underway;
- There were 19 remaining recommendations, with 17 being completed;
- The Last 2 recommendations are the Child Contact Assessment (CCA) and contact with children in Section 5.700, which is currently being revised and near completion, and;
- The Clarification, Contact, and Reunification Section which is being worked on now with Allison Boyd and the Victims Advocacy Committee. It was noted that the work will be sent to the Adult Standards Revisions Committee by the end of the year, with revisions being presented to the SOMB early in 2019.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky discussed what happened this past legislative session:

- There was a request by Representatives Herod and Willet for an audit of the SOMB, and indicated that it will have a focus on:
 - How the SOMB establishes and communicates the Standards and Guidelines;
 - How the SOMB determines the qualifications of the providers;
 - How the SOMB monitors providers;
 - How the SOMB manages and allocates funding;
 - General transparency in all operations
- The Legislature requested the need for data collection from treatment providers as to the efficacy of the SOMB Standards. Chris noted that the Legislature approved the use of the Sex Offender Surcharge fund for this data collection system, which is currently in the process of being created through the Office of Information Technology (OIT). He indicated that the SOMB will hire a new statistical analyst for support regarding data entry, training, and analysis for the SOMB and the Legislature. Chris noted that some preliminary data should be available before the next Sunset review in 2020.
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky highlighted that HB1427 was vetoed by the Governor which defined a conflict of interest when a SOMB member has a contract with any state entity. He noted that the SOMB has committed to do an independent review of the SOMB decision-making processes, and indicated that the

SOMB will work with an outside reviewer to look at ways to modify any SOMB administrative policies. This announced and introduced Commissioner Trent Bushner, who will be doing the independent review.

Commissioner Trent Bushner gave an overview of his past and present qualifications in the field of parliamentary procedures. He indicated that he is looking forward to finding out what the SOMB does, and going deeper into the business of the SOMB.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that this review will be about how the SOMB policies are created and not the policies themselves. He referenced HB 1198 which requires each state agency on behalf of their boards and commissions to identify specific procedures for training of policies, bylaws, and procedures.

Marina Borysov highlighted what the Executive Committee has planned for the SOMB strategic planning session:

- The SOMB strategic planning initiative session will be held on October 26, 2018 during the regularly scheduled SOMB meeting;
- She indicated that this all-day planning session will be held offsite in order to encourage new perspectives, insights, and fresh ideas;
- The SOMB will be using an outside facilitator, Diane Zile of Jera Partnerships, who will contact each SOMB member to find out more about the SOMB, what they do on the Board, and how they do it;
- The findings of these interviews will be presented at the September 21st SOMB meeting, and it was asked that all SOMB members please participate and give feedback;
- After the retreat, Diane will present an overview of the outcomes and a road map of what is to come;
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the public will get a copy of the outcomes of this planning in November, and indicated the SOMB's goal of transparency with this process and the outcomes. He noted that the public will have an opportunity for comments and feedback after the process is completed.
- It was noted that this strategic planning initiative will be for short-term goals (1-2 year goals).

Board Discussion:

Carl Blake commented that it is important to have an outside facilitator, as this keeps the SOMB more open and transparent regarding public concerns.

LIVING BEYOND THE TRAUMA OF TRAFFICKING (Presentation) – Jessa Dillow Crisp, Survivor Leader and Executive Director of BridgeHope (Handout Provided)

Kelly Hume introduced Jessa Dillow Crisp, and gave a brief background of her story in surviving the human sex trafficking life.

Jessa Dillow Crisp presented her life story and the effects of the trauma of human trafficking. Some of the highlights of this presentation are as follows:

1. Engaging the battle of sexual human trafficking:
 - Many prostitutes are victims of sexual human trafficking
 - Force = Physical restraint or serious physical harm; Fraud = wrongful or criminal deception; Coercion = the plan and pattern intended to cause a person to believe that failure to perform an act could result in harm or restraint
 - There are various kinds of human trafficking: familial, survival, sex, labor, rural, urban, foreign, domestic, gang controlled, and pimp controlled
 - Trafficking exploits the vulnerable – ages 12-14 females are high risk for trafficking, ages 11-13 males, $\frac{3}{4}$ of runaways are approached within 48 hours, 100,00-300,000 youth are at risk for exploitation per year, foster youth, single mothers, and anyone vulnerable are at high risk
 - Not just women are trafficked, but boys, girls and men are also trafficked – 50% of commercially sexually exploited children in the USA are boys

- There are many control tactics used by traffickers
 - This is a \$39.9-million-dollar industry in Denver, and a \$240-million-dollar industry in Atlanta
2. The Battle for Restoration:
- Trafficking impacts a person physically, spiritually, mentally, psychologically, emotionally, relationally, with self-image, and developmentally
 - Resilience increases a person's resistance to stress and lowers their chance of developing PTSD
 - Being a survivor leader
3. Helping Victims Thrive and embrace their inner warrior
- Freedom is a huge requirement of every human being – with freedom comes responsibility
 - There are many gaps in services for victims such as the lack of training, using technology to foster hope for the vulnerable, and the need to help them thrive by collaborating with communities worldwide
 - Tangible needs victims have are basic necessities, emergency supplies, housing, job training, and education opportunities
 - Mentorship programs really work

Board Discussion:

Jeff Jenks asked what the difference is between the punishments or sanctions issued by the courts in Canada versus the United States. Jessa responded she is not sure, and indicated that she has not been back. She noted that each jurisdiction in the United States is different, mentioned that there is room for growth, and indicated that change happens slowly.

Tom Leversee thanked Jessa for sharing her story.

Jessica Meza asked if lengthy sentencing affects the outcome of a person leaving human trafficking for good, and if it reduces vulnerability. Jessa responded that she is still working on her own trauma, and expressed the need to trust the system. She indicated that much help is needed with those trying to leave human trafficking.

Steve Moreno asked if society as a whole has accepted this way of life, and asked what her perspective is. Jessa responded that yes society does play a big role in human trafficking, and noted that culture approves sexualization and encourages "pimping".

Carl Blake asked if Jessa works with the Human Trafficking Council in Colorado. Jessa replied that she has partnered with them in various ways. Carl described a high-risk victimization tool that is used for juvenile offenders and victims that the Department of Human Services uses that might be helpful for attorney's. He indicated that this tool is used to identify risk factors up front, it can help keep juveniles out of the juvenile criminal system and enter a diversion program. Jessa noted that she is also involved with juvenile diversion programs.

SOMB Meeting Adjourned: 2:37pm

Session Name: New Session 8-17-2018 10-12 AM

Date Created: 8/17/2018 8:34:54 AM **Active Participants:** 18 of 24

Average Score: 0.00%

Questions: 5

Results By Question

1.) Motion to approve May minutes (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	88%	15
No	0%	0
Abstain	12%	2
Totals	100%	17

2.) Motion to approve July minutes (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	71%	12
No	0%	0
Abstain	29%	5
Totals	100%	17

3.) Motion to refer variance issue to BP Committee for review (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	100%	18
No	0%	0
Abstain	0%	0
Totals	100%	18

4.) Motion to approve the document (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	100%	18
No	0%	0
Abstain	0%	0
Totals	100%	18

5.) Motion to approve sex offender surcharge allocation (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	100%	17
No	0%	0
Abstain	0%	0
Totals	100%	17

Session Name: New Session 8-17-2018 10-12 AM

Date Created: 8/17/2018 8:34:54 AM Active Participants: 18 of 24

Average Score: 0.00%

Questions: 5

Results Detail

Name	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total Points	Score
Answer Key	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	-
Aguilar-Dave, Norma	-	-	1	1	1	0.00	-
Bednarski, Rick	1	3	1	1	1	0.00	-
Blake, Carl	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Boyd, Allison	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Elger, Korey	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Gusky, Missy	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Hansen, Jesse	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Holbrook, Sharon	1	3	1	1	1	0.00	-
Jenks, Jeff	3	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Leversee, Tom	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Meza, Jessica	1	3	1	1	1	0.00	-
Moore, Kandy	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Moreno, Steve	1	3	1	1	1	0.00	-
Odenheimer, John	1	3	1	1	1	0.00	-
Powers, Taber	3	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Shay, Jeff	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Singer, Robin	1	1	1	1	-	0.00	-
Woodson III, Lenny	1	1	1	1	1	0.00	-
Participant List Averages	-	-	-	-	-	0.00	-