

# SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD (SOMB) MINUTES

**Friday, April 21, 2017**

## SOMB Members

Allison Boyd  
Amy Fitch  
Angel Weant  
Carl Blake  
Jeff Shay  
Jessica Curtis  
Jessica Meza  
John Odenheimer  
Kim English  
Korey Elger  
Leonard Woodson III  
Marcello Kopcow  
Mary Baydarian  
Missy Gursky  
Norma Aguilar-Dave  
Richard Bednarski  
Rick May  
Tom Leversee

## Visitors

Alfonso Cappa-Melendez	Kathy Livornese
Ali Mooney	Kevin Bishop
Alison Mooney	Kipp A. Scott
Alison Talley	Kristen Wiest
Angela Bryan	Kristi Foss
Anne Gates	Kurt Runge
Annie L. Sepulveda	Laurie Kepros
Barbara Mills	Lori J. Seitz
Becki Hinton	Maria Moreno
Bob Bowers	Michael Conroy
Brandon Mathews	Michelle Kovacevic
Carey Boelter	Michelle Wesolowski
Chere Cheney	Mona Murch
Ciera Botzheim	Morrisa VanDyke
Colton McNutt	Nedra Barnes-Larrieu
Daniel Martin	Rebecca Lowe
Debbie Baty	Ronald Newman
Ellen Holcomb	Scott Simpson
Gale Page	Susan Walker
Gary D. Bradford	Theresa Hernandez
Glenn Gates	Tim Martinez
Heather Irwin	Timothy L. Johnson
Joanie Vigil	Todd Hanenberg
Josh Keehne	Tracy Senter
Karoline Kern	Yvette Cousins

**Absent SOMB Members:** Alli Watt, Brie Franklin, Jeff Jenks, Kandy Moore, Mary Baydarian, and Merve Davies

## **Staff:**

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky	Raechel Alderete	Michelle Geng
Kelli Reynolds	Marina Borysov	Jill Trowbridge

**SOMB Meeting Begins: 9:03**

## **INTRODUCTIONS:**

Extended introductions were made by all Sex Offender Management Board (SOMB) members and visitors present.

## **APPROVAL OF MARCH MINUTES:**

**Motion to approve the March Minutes:** Jessica Meza; Carl Blake 2<sup>nd</sup> (Show of Hands)

<b>14</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Raechel Alderete announced that the Trauma Informed Care training that is being given by Dr. Jill Levinson on May 18<sup>th</sup> is full, and noted that Dr. Levinson will speak at the May 19<sup>th</sup> SOMB meeting. Raechel also mentioned that the 11<sup>th</sup> annual SOMB Conference registration has opened, and indicated that the number of attendees will be limited to 400 people. She mentioned that Marina Borysov

will be emailing information regarding the conference, and urged all to please register quickly. Raechel also noted that SOMB members' registration is free.

Raechel mentioned that the requirement of polygraph examiners to have a bachelor's degree from an accredited 4-year college/university, which was inadvertently omitted from the most recent version of the Juvenile Standards, will be included in Section 4.100, 4.102, 4.110, and 4.111.

Marina Borysov announced that sponsorship tables at the conference will be \$50 and that there are a limited number of tables available. She also noted that sponsorships are available.

Michelle Geng announced that there was no public comment for the Lifetime Supervision criteria, and that this section is now ratified. She also mentioned that all of the artwork on the walls and art pieces were created by survivors of domestic violence.

Allison Boyd mentioned the Colorado Advocacy in Action conference will be held in Vail on June 12<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup>, and noted it is being sponsored by the Colorado Coalition against Sexual Assault and the Colorado Coalition against Domestic Violence.

Korey Elger noted that April is Child Abuse Prevention Awareness month, and reminded all that the Rockies game on Sunday, April 23<sup>rd</sup> is recognizing child abuse awareness.

#### **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

Jessica Curtis indicated that in the Juvenile Standards, Section 5.000 that some of the language that references guardians ad litem in juvenile cases is not statutorily supported due to a change in statute, and noted she will create and send amended language.

#### **Approval of Agenda**

Approved by consensus

#### **YOUNG ADULT MODIFICATION PROTOCOL SURVEY RESULTS AND TRAINING (PRESENTATION)- Kelli Reynolds, Raechel Alderete, Missy Gursky (Handout Provided)**

Raechel Alderete outlined the background of the Young Adult Modification Protocol and presented criteria as to the implementation and usage. She indicated this protocol was created to assist evaluators and treatment providers in the proper handling of offenders in the 18-25 age group as they do not specifically fall into the juvenile or adult risk assessment categories. Raechel also noted that neurobiological research indicates that full brain development in males does not take place until the age of 25-29, which makes them prone to impulsive behavior. She went on to discuss how the protocol helps respond to this population's specific needs.

Kelli Reynolds indicated that the Young Adult Protocol was added to the Standards as an appendix in 2014. She mentioned that a survey was created to gauge provider information and usage of the protocol. Kelli reviewed the survey goals and results, and noted this survey was sent to 345 treatment providers with 55 responses (a 16% response rate). She continued to present the various survey results for the SOMB, and offered to send these results to the members.

Missy Gursky discussed how the Young Adult Modification Protocol is being applied in practice, and indicated the confusion of this protocol being used as a "Program." She noted the fact that not every offender ages 18-25 will fit into this protocol. Missy went on to mention that this population was not being assessed properly before the creation and implementation of the Young Adult Protocol tool, and also indicated that this tool is helpful in assessing risk, which may eliminate the need to apply for a variance for Standards exceptions.

#### **Board Comments:**

Jessica Meza asked if there is a timeframe as to when to start utilizing the protocol and what the success rate is using this protocol. Missy Gursky responded that the timeframe is for the Low Risk Protocol. She noted that the Young Adult Protocol starts immediately, and if the individual meets the criteria, they can be treated right away. Missy also responded that she did not have statistical results, but that success is being seen as this population is engaging in the program sooner. She also noted that these individuals typically have a better peer and home support system. Jessica Meza asked how the court can identify these individuals to be recommended for this protocol. Missy responded that the evaluators and treatment providers should make that determination and not the court.

Magistrate Curtis mentioned that this information is helpful, and noted that the court should order offense specific treatment that leaves the treatment program up to the treatment providers.

Kelli Reynolds responded to Jessica Meza that there is no current data regarding the success rate of this protocol, but that it will be included in the data collection plan as a factor.

Rick May supported Magistrate Curtis regarding less treatment planning done in court.

Tom Leversee noted that the protocol allows the teams to respond to the emotional, social, and risk and needs of this population.

Allison Boyd questioned if the protocol is staying victim-centered, and noted that there is no difference in victim impact with this age group.

Judge Kopcow expressed concern that only 16% responded to the survey, and he asked if the 84% that did not respond was due to a lack of training in this protocol. He also asked if the survey could be given at the 2017 SOMB Conference to encourage a high response rate. Raechel Alderete responded that there are booster trainings and all day-trainings which include the young adult protocol. She also suggested adding additional questions to the training surveys that specifically ask about recent changes to the Standards. Kelli Reynolds also responded that this response rate is typical as with other surveys, and research is looking for other ways to boost survey participation.

Angel Weant mentioned that this presentation has covered some of inquiries she has received from Probation regarding the Young Adult vs. Low Risk protocols. She also indicated that she has access to the successful termination data if needed.

Carl Blake noted that his response to this survey covers the 40 treatment providers for his agency, so this can skew the data. He suggested adding questions to the survey regarding whether the response is for the entire agency or how many treatment providers the response represents.

Missy responded to Allison Boyd and clarified that the Young Adult Protocol still holds the clients accountable, is more individualized, and addresses how the treatment providers respond to individual needs. She noted that the victim component is not left out.

Kelli Reynolds responded to Carl Blake that it would be great to know if a response is for an entire agency or just an individual treatment provider, and noted that these responses would affect the results.

Tom Leversee asked Carl Blake if it is appropriate for one person to complete the survey for the entire agency and if specific data would be missed. Carl responded that it depends upon the survey, and noted the need to be cognizant of the information requested before responding for an entire agency.

Jessica Meza asked if the age limit can be raised to age 29 due to full male brain development being closer to this age, and asked if the SOMB should work on clarifying and training of the Young Adult Protocol to reduce Multi-Disciplinary Team/Community Supervision Team (MDT/CST) conflicts. Raechel Alderete responded that some conflicts are being taken back to court for resolution regarding the use of the Young Adult Protocol, and noted that there are mixed messages coming from judicial regarding the use of certain risk assessments that are not appropriate for this age group. She reiterated that continued training and technical assistance are key to eliminating confusion between the courts and treatment providers.

Missy Gursky suggested keeping the age cap at 25, and noted the fact that as the Adult Standards continue to be more individualized, they will clear up some of these conflicts.

Judge Kopcow confirmed the decision to keep the age cap at age 25, and to let the treatment provider make the age determination as to when to use the protocol.

**BREAK: 10:47 – 10:58**

### **SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH AND NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS RIGHTS WEEK – Victim Advocacy Committee**

Allison Boyd, the Chair of the Victim Advocacy Committee, presented the issue of sexual assault and the armed forces. She introduced Josh Keehne from the Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CCASA) and SherryLynn Boyles of TESSA to speak on sexual assault in the armed forces and victim impact and services generally. Allison mentioned a future SOMB agenda item that would include a number of military representatives to speak about sexual assault in the military.

Josh Keehne a Marine Corp. veteran presented the context of the video that was played regarding a Facebook scandal (Marine Corp. United) which included illicit photos of female marines without their consent, and discussed the sexually aggressive culture that is

prevalent in the military. After the video, Josh gave a presentation on what creates the sexual aggression found in the military and what the culture is that encourages that behavior. He indicated that much of this culture is spurred by the N.C.O.'s encouraging younger men into situations that encourage this sexual aggression.

#### **Board Comments:**

Amy Fitch noted that progress has been made and it was encouraging to hear that the higher echelon is addressing this issue, but that there is still much to be done to change this culture.

Josh Kehne noted that the changes that have been made are due to civilian intervention to spur change.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that this issue has been going on for a while, and noted the need for follow-up. He indicated that the military has previously addressed this through the chain of command, and now there are other avenues for victims to come forward (i.e. chaplain, victim counsel, etc.).

Allison Boyd noted that when an individual is prosecuted for a sex crime in the military, they get discharged without treatment, and the crime is not reported to local authorities. Amy Fitch responded to Allison and indicated that they are prosecuted, face prison time, and are subject to whatever sanctions are federally mandated.

Tom Leversee indicated that peers need to start confronting this behavior, and indicated the need to be encouraged by the chain of command to do so.

SherryLynn Boyles, the Executive Director of TESSA, gave a presentation on what programs TESSA offers. She noted that TESSA serves domestic violence and sexual assault victims with counseling, advocacy programs, court programs, hospital on-call programs, rural programs (5 satellite offices), a safe-house, a 24-hour crisis line, children's programs, a legal program, and addresses the impact on sexual assault victims, and victim awareness. She mentioned that 1 in 5 women are sexually assaulted, and that the largest group of sexual assault victims is in the age group of 16-24. SherryLynn also noted that many of these crimes are not reported, and is considered the "silent" crime, due to intimidation of victim blaming, media attention, death threats, the legal process, etc. SherryLynn also discussed the use of trauma informed practice for the victims in helping them cope with the after effects of the sexual assault. She went on to speak about the victim's memory after facing trauma and the oddities, emotional reactions, and physical reactions that happen when recounting the incident. SherryLynn noted that the greatest amount of recovery happens with victims of "stranger" rape due to a better support system and trust.

**LUNCH: 12:02- 1:01**

#### **LOCAL PROVIDER PRESENTATIONS AND QUESTION AND ANSWER**

Maria Moreno, a victim representative of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program (SAPR), located at the Air Force Academy, noted that this program is 11 years old, and was created to provide advocacy for cadet victims, provide attorneys for victims, and mentioned that this program works closely with TESSA in the Colorado Springs area. Allison Boyd asked how many staff are involved in this program, and Maria responded that there are 4 victim advocates (which include 1 male advocate) and 16 volunteer advocates (both civilian & military). Allison also asked if this program works with a victim through the entire process when a case is prosecuted through the military and what kind of sanctions are given for convictions. Maria responded that SAPR does work with the victim through its entirety, and also responded that there are times when the accused is court-marshalled, but noted that if there is insufficient evidence, a cadet will be discharged from the Academy. There was continued discussion as to the discharge or court-marshal sanctions.

Kurt Runge of the Colorado Springs Probation Department described a task force, which includes treatment providers, evaluators, probation officers, polygraph examiners, and others as needed, which was created out of necessity to collaborate and communicate better within the Community Supervision Team (CST). He noted that this task force meets monthly to review SOMB Standards and changes, how to communicate better, to develop policy, improve polygraph scheduling, and indicated this task force is involved in the education of the changes in technology, how to collaborate with all agencies, adaptations to changes in legislation, and to treat and supervise offenders better. Tom Leversee noted that this program should help improve the individual CST. Angel Weant commented that this task force has enhanced collaboration between professionals and continuity of care, is very beneficial for this community, and noted that Colorado Springs has the highest per capita of individuals on probation in the state. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky asked how the task force is getting and implementing the SOMB changes. Kurt responded that this information and changes are received via Angel Weant through Judicial and from Michelle Geng through treatment provider updates.

Mona Murch, a polygraph examiner with RAI Services in Colorado Springs indicated that she and Tracy Senter will be presenting the task force concept that Kurt Runge described previously at the SOMB Conference in July. She indicated that there will be a short survey sent out requesting feedback and asking about questions and concerns regarding the use of polygraph. Mona noted that she and Tracy will also be presenting on polygraph question formulation, and how to help people disclose without fear of prosecution at the conference.

Sue Wich of the Family Center located in Colorado Springs discussed the programs that the Center offers and gave some background information regarding the Center. She discussed how the sex offender treatment programs work, and indicated that offenders have to be open and honest, they are in lockdown living, and are encouraged to take accountability for their actions and become stakeholders of their own lives. She also described the aftercare program following successful completion of the sex offense specific program. Clients who have completed the program gave powerful personal testimonies. Kim English asked if they had to take a polygraph during treatment and aftercare. They replied yes, and that it was very difficult to be open and honest.

Kristy Foss, the ComCor Program Director indicated the differences in the Comcor program from other programs. She mentioned that the offenders live in residence style housing which incorporates comprehensive treatment. Kristy noted that there are four phases of living arrangements within the ComCor program before moving to community living, and noted they are given help in re-integrating in community living. She mentioned the residential accommodations are at capacity, and indicated that there are currently 18 offenders living in residence and 24 living in non-residence. A client who has completed the ComCor program, gave his personal testimony. John Odenheimer asked Kristy if all residents are sex offenders. Kristy and Kevin, another staff member from the program, responded that there are all types of offenders, and noted that the sex offenders are separated from the other offenders. Allison Boyd asked if the treatment program is on site and if there are transition clients. Kevin responded that yes it is on-site, and noted that the ComCor program is different than other programs in that it brings structured case management, UA/VA monitoring, and GPS monitoring. He also indicated that there are clients from both the DOC and from Probation.

Rick Bednarski asked what the timeframe is for a client to get to the treatment phase four. Kristy and Kevin responded that it depends upon the client's sentence, and that the client progresses at an individual pace, but is usually from 18 - 24 months before moving into non-residential living. Michelle Geng commented that what the victim needs and what the offender needs are very similar. Kristy noted that ComCor is ramping up the victim and clarification components.

James Meyer, owner and therapist at Bijou Treatment and Testing Institute (BTI), discussed the treatment programs and indicated the treatment focus is to encourage clients to live healthier lives for both themselves and those around them. He also indicated that there has been some success working with Developmentally Disabled/Intellectually Disabled (DD/ID) clients, and described the Victim Identification Process program (VIP).

Lori Seitz from the Cheyenne Mountain Re-entry program discussed that the offenders live in a dormitory style setting, and indicated that they work with various community agencies and resources available in the Colorado Springs area. She also noted that individuals hold each other accountable and focus on healthy relationships and healthy lifestyles. Lori mentioned that the program helps the clients through some of the community-life situations they will face, such as shopping, costs, technology (cell phones, social media), etc. before being released from the program. The individuals are also helped in creating safety plans.

John Odenheimer asked if there is a sex offender treatment program at Cheyenne Mountain. Lori responded that there is a sex offender maintenance treatment program, and indicated they must have successfully completed Phase I & II of the SOTMP to be enrolled in this program.

Debbie Baty of the Blue Bench mentioned a pilot program in Jefferson County, and noted that she is a post-conviction victim advocate for victims whose offenders are on probation in Jefferson County. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated she will also be providing victim representation on the community supervision teams.

Amy Fitch of the Colorado Springs District Attorney's office indicated that the treatment providers do a great job in Colorado Springs. She also described the Juvenile Diversion and Sexting program which covers all kinds of cyber safety. Amy mentioned that instead of prosecuting juveniles and young adults, they are sent to the juvenile diversion program to educate them on cyber security, which can include parents and kids.

Magistrate Curtis noted that the juvenile providers and MDT's do great work, and is appreciative of the local representation this meeting.

**BREAK: 2:25 – 2:40**

**SOMB STANDARDS REGARDING BURNS CASE – SIBLINGS – (Decision Item) – Executive Committee** (Handout Provided)

Michelle Geng framed the Burns case issue and discussions regarding contact between offenders and minor siblings (applies to juvenile and adult offenders). She also indicated that there will be no revisiting of the previous discussions.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the purpose of today's meeting is to vote to include language in the Standards regarding automatic sibling contact or not, and to consider a possible variance process.

**Board Comments:**

Korey Elger asked how many options are available for today's vote. Judge Kopcow responded that there are four options.

Magistrate Curtis expressed her concern about the proposed language in that it will put treatment providers in conflict with the Court and Probation, which can possibly put treatment providers in contempt. She noted that when the judge signs the court order without additional conditions, it indicates that sibling contact is allowed.

Amy Fitch also agreed with Magistrate Curtis and noted that in reality, sibling contact will be granted. While she agreed that child safety is paramount, she suggested leaving the existing language in place, and to use the variance process to restrict or allow contact.

Angel Weant also echoed Magistrate Curtis' position and mentioned that the MDT's/CST's cannot keep going back to court seeking clarification. She noted that if there are issues, they need to be litigated at the time of sentencing. Angel reminded all that Burns does allow the probation officer to go back to court for modification of the existing terms and conditions if there is new information found after sentencing.

Allison Boyd questioned what to do about contact if a sibling is born or due to a relationship or marriage when other siblings come into the family. Angel Weant responded that this is "new information" and Probation can go back to the courts for modification of the terms and conditions. Allison also asked for clarification of the second sentence of the second paragraph on page 2 of the Variance Policy document. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that no sibling contact is allowed is what is currently in the Standards and this is when the variance process is used to allow the treatment provider to treat an offender when contact is allowed.

Korey Elger asked the juvenile treatment providers how often a variance would have to be done to allow treatment providers to treat under these circumstances. Carl Blake responded that the Juvenile Standards have already clarified this issue, contact is at the discretion of the MDT, and noted that there would be no need for a variance.

Norma Aguilar-Dave remarked that this is confusing the system by having two sets of standards; one for juveniles and one for adults. Raechel Alderete responded that yes there is confusion between the two Standards and all are looking to the SOMB for clarification and consistency.

Amy Fitch presented a motion to leave the Standard as is (to not include siblings in the Burns exception Standards language) and use the variance process for treatment providers to offer treatment for offenders who are allowed sibling contact. Allison Boyd and Tom Leverage seconded the motion.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky suggested waiting to see if there are many variance applications before changing the current language.

Norma Aguilar-Dave indicated that the SOMB is not moving forward during this challenge, and inspired the board to not be fearful, but use the knowledge and research they have available.

Carl Blake mentioned that if this language is kept, that there needs to be guidance for treatment providers in the Standards.

Kim English asked if the polygraph examiner can ask specific questions to help determine if sibling contact would be appropriate for juvenile offenders.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded to Carl Blake and indicated this is the same dilemma as the original Burns case, and noted that this variance form is used to give direction and clarification for treatment providers to provide treatment or not.

There was continued SOMB discussion regarding sibling contact and the treatment providers' position.

Jessica Meza responded to Kim English and stated that the polygraph is not conclusive in court and asked if there are there other ways to extract self-reporting.

Carl Blake suggested modifying the variance form to include clarification as to when to use this document. Amy Fitch agreed to amend her motion to include policy information on the variance form. Allison Boyd seconded the amended motion.

Michelle Geng asked if "Juvenile Standards" should be removed from the variance form as the Juvenile Standards already give discretion to the MDT for these cases. Carl Blake and Raechel Alderete responded that it is good to have the Juvenile Standards referenced so that treatment providers would still have a process and extra information, if needed.

There was additional discussion from the SOMB regarding the revisions to the language on the variance form.

Kim English indicated that this issue deserves a white paper and agreed to help create this.

#### **Audience Comments:**

Tim Johnson from the Boulder County District Attorney's Office described a case where the court manually "modified" the terms and conditions of probation. He indicated that Probation received this order electronically which did not include the manual terms and modifications, and subsequently the offender signed the unamended copy of the court orders. Tim agreed with the use of the variance, but indicated it must be clear with the contact with the siblings' piece, and suggested more guidance and clarification that indicates that the Burns ruling does not apply to offender siblings.

Laurie Kepros objected to Tim Johnson's comment that sibling contact is not a Burns case. She noted case law nationally covers various Constitutional cases which address familial relationships. She suggested the SOMB not address case law on this issue.

**Motion to keep existing language and use the variance process with policy information:** Amy Fitch; Allison Boyd 2<sup>nd</sup>  
**(Question #1)**

<b>14</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

#### **STANDARDS SECTION 4.000 REVISION REGARDING CREDENTIALING (Decision Item) – Application Review Committee** (Handout Provided)

Carl Blake framed the changes to the alternate qualifications for those without a Master's degree and license wishing to move to Full Operating Level. Michelle Geng also clarified these changes for the audience.

Richard Bednarski made a motion to include the changes made to the Full Operating Level credentialing. Missy Gursky seconded the motion.

#### **Board Comments:**

Tom Leversee clarified that these individuals have been under clinical supervision for 10 years by an approved SOMB clinical supervisor, and noted the application would be reviewed by ARC before being fully approved.

#### **Audience Comments:**

Susan Walker questioned the credibility of the treatment provider being at full operating level without an advanced degree. Rick May responded that he understands her position, and indicated he is very comfortable that this shows their competency and is in favor of this change. Susan noted that families are concerned when they see only a bachelor's degree for treatment providers with Full Operating Level designations. Missy Gursky responded that DORA only requires a Bachelor's degree.

Magistrate Curtis mentioned that Probation is so backlogged with cases that she is in favor for anything that can be done to attract new people to this field without losing the quality of treatment. Carl Blake reminded Magistrate Curtis that this change is for already practicing providers who are under supervision for at least 10 years.

**Motion to:** Jessica Meza; Norma Aguilar-Dave 2<sup>nd</sup> **(Question #2)**

<b>16</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

**SOMB Meeting Adjourned: 3:48**

**Session Name**

New Session 4-21-2017 3-45 PM

**Date Created**

4/21/2017 9:35:33 AM

**Active Participants**

16

**Total Participants**

24

**Average Score**

0.00%

**Questions**

2

---

**Results Detail**

Last Name	First Name	Q1	Q2	Total Points	Score
<b>Answer Key</b>		-	-	0.00	-
Aguilar-Dave	Norma	2	1	0.00	-
Bednarski	Rick	1	1	0.00	-
Blake	Carl	1	1	0.00	-
Boyd	Allison	1	1	0.00	-
Curtis	Jessica	1	1	0.00	-
Elger	Korey	1	1	0.00	-
English	Kim	1	1	0.00	-
Fitch	Amy	1	1	0.00	-
Gursky	Missy	1	1	0.00	-
Leversee	Tom	1	1	0.00	-
May	Rick	1	1	0.00	-
Meza	Jessica	2	1	0.00	-
Odenheimer	John	1	1	0.00	-
Shay	Jeff	1	1	0.00	-
Weant	Angel	1	1	0.00	-
Woodson III	Lenny	1	1	0.00	-
<b>Participant List Averages</b>		-	-	0.00	-



**Session Name**

New Session 4-21-2017 3-45 PM

**Date Created**

4/21/2017 9:35:33 AM

**Active Participants**

16

**Total Participants**

24

**Average Score**

0.00%

**Questions**2

---

**Results by Question****1. Motion to approve the variance process (Multiple Choice)**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes	87.50%	14
No	12.50%	2
Abstain	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>16</b>

**2. Motion to approve Standard Credential modification (Multiple Choice)**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes	100.00%	16
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	0.00%	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>16</b>