

SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD MINUTES

Friday, May 15th, 2015

Board Members

Alli Watt
Amy Fitch
Bill Hildenbrand
Carl Blake
Jeff Geist
Jeff Jenks
Jeff Shay
Kandy Moore
Kim English
Marcelo Kopcow
Mary Baydarian
Merve Davies
Mimi Scheuermann
Missy Gursky
Pam Bricker
Richard Bednarski
Rick May
Tom Leversee

Visitors

Jerry Frey
Roger Kincade
Carrie Woofter
Taralyn Clark
Pat Martin
Linda Martin
James Solano
Zachary Dibilio
Mark Olson
Susan Walker
Cynthia Lockwood
K. Eisentraut
Bryan Jameson
Carolyn Turner
Natasha Shafer

Visitors

Joe Gerber
Steve Parker
Jodie Goter
Leslie Harris
Cheryl Davis
Amberly Chalberg
Jamie Gibbs
Debbie Baty
Brenda Kay
Laurie Kepros
Laura Saurini
Mathias Antony
Chrystal Owin
Valerie Estrada

Absent Board Members

Allison Boyd Angel Weant Brie Akins Jessica Curtis Jessica Meza John Odenheimer

Staff

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky Harmony Fox Roxanne Hotchkiss
Cathy Rodriguez Jesse Hansen Raechel Alderete

Board Meeting Begins:

Introductions –

Future Agenda Items – No future agenda items.

March Minutes –

APPROVAL OF MARCH MINUTES (with correction to SOIP): motion to approve Merve Davies; 2nd Mimi Scheuermann.

13 Approve 0 Oppose 3 Abstain Motion Passes

April Minutes –

APPROVAL OF APRIL MINUTES: motion to approve Merve Davies; 2nd Rick May.

13 Approve 0 Oppose 3 Abstain Motion Passes

Announcements – Marcelo Kopcow noted information about the Circuit Court case U.S. versus Burns, and he explained how it relates to the work of the Sex Offender Management Board (SOMB).

Jeff Geist indicated that a Committee is being formed to start in June 2015 to discuss how the SOMB will respond.

Carl Blake commented that the Continuity of Care Committee will be addressing multi-disciplinary collaboration and information sharing issues identified by the recent panel discussions. He indicated the Committee has the proper representation of stakeholders to engage with this topic and provide the SOMB with further guidance.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky announced that the June Board meeting is being canceled due to lack of a significant agenda, and reminded SOMB members that there will be a short board meeting on Wednesday July 8th in Breckenridge, Colorado during the conference.

Cathy Rodriguez announced that the Human Trafficking Committee is considering creating Standards and Guidelines, as well as an approval process for their providers.

Jesse Hanson asked if board members had any legislative issues that need addressing in the 2016 Legislative Report.

Jeff Shay commented that law enforcement has had challenges with the legislation created in HB 11-1278. He commented that law enforcement would like to see the deregistration component of this legislation repealed, as they have found it creates a loophole for offenders to move and be out of compliance with the registration requirements.

He also commented that law enforcement would also like to see a petition process to remove incapacitated elderly and severely disabled offenders from the registry. As this population grows in size he finds that they often do not have the support systems to help them register. This then either causes law enforcement significant extra effort or places the offender out of compliance.

Tom Leverage commented that research is not showing that requiring juveniles to register is aiding in lowering recidivism and he would like to see the SOMB address this requirement.

Merve Davies asked if the U.S. versus Burns case might require the SOMB to make legislative recommendations.

Raechel Alderete noted the registration for the conference is open. Also, those interested in exhibit or tables or sponsorship need to contact her immediately. Additionally, the SOMB does give 5 scholarships to attend the conference and a drawing will be done on June 5th, 2015. Lastly, the nominations for awards have been extended until June 5th, 2015.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky acknowledged Merve Davies on his work developing a Visual Reaction Time (VRT) instrument.

Approve Agenda – Agenda is approved.

Community Corrections Progression Matrix (Action Item) – Courtney Kramer, Glenn Tapia, and Chrystal Owin, Office of Community Corrections – Handout Provided.

Mimi Scheuermann asked when and for what reasons would someone be dropped a level in this Matrix.

Glenn Tapia commented that they are still working out some of the data, but that dropping a level is currently so rare that there isn't enough data just yet to have specifics.

Marcelo Kopcow asked if a LSI would be taken with each move up on the Matrix.

Glenn Tapia commented that the LSI has some challenges with being used every 8 weeks because certain areas of the LSI require a 2 year time lapse.

Susan Walker commented that many of the people with whom she has worked have already had intensive treatment with the SOTMP. She would like to see those leaving DOC continue their work, but also without repeating the treatment already provided. Additionally, she commented that housing remains a significant challenge for many offenders and there are times when an offender cannot find housing and therefore end up back in DOC.

Jeff Geist commented that if an offender is placed back in DOC because of housing reasons they are placed on a condition of parole (COP) bed and are typically in for 180 days. These offenders would likely not be under the requirements of this Matrix.

Jeff Geist commented that in general the approach of the SOMB is team decision-making. He asked if the forms per level of the Matrix would be filled out as a team effort or just the case manager.

Glenn Tapia commented that it currently would be the case manager, but that bringing in additional team members comments could be reviewed.

Laurie Kepros asked who is considered a sex offender. Is it someone who has a sex crime in the background or is currently in DOC on a sex offense?

Chrystal Owin agreed having an inclusionary list of requirements should be drafted to help identify only those who fit the program to be included in the Progression Matrix

Laurie Kepros asked if passing all polygraphs is a requirement for progressing from levels; some offenders may have physical or mental impairments that do not allow this progression. Additionally, she commented that someone on appeal may be considered for deniers groups, but if this person is on an appeal they are not admitting anything related to their criminal case and therefore this person should not be placed in a group until their appeal is finished, though this could take a significant period of time.

Merve Davies asked about level 3 requirements and offered his assistance to reword this requirement to better reflect the needs of sex offenders.

Jeff Geist asked to have this re-presented to the SOMB in the future in order to have time to accommodate the SOMB's concerns and recommendations.

Break

Juvenile Standards Section 9.000 Informed Supervision Protocol (Action Item) – Juvenile Standards Revisions Committee – Handout Provided.

Mimi Scheuermann asked if the MDT is approving the training or the person trying to become an Informed Supervisor.

Carl Blake commented that the MDT is making sure that the person did complete the training and furthermore is able to successfully display the required material.

APPROVAL OF JUVENILE STANDARDS SECTION 9.000: motion to approve William Hildebrand; 2nd Mimi Sheuermann.

18 Approve

0 Oppose

0 Abstain

Motion Passed

Adult Standards Revisions Committee Review of Changes to the Introduction and Committee Update (Presentation) – Handout Provided.

Marcelo Kopcow commented that the new Guiding Principle 10 is consistent with the U.S. versus Burns case.

Jeff Geist explained that the SOMB will be able to vote on these changes at an upcoming meeting, but the Committee is currently only looking to share their current progress and make sure overall the SOMB agrees with the direction of focus.

Lunch

Therapist Ethical Requirements Input (Action Item) – Application – Carl Blake explained the current Standards and Guidelines regarding therapist code of ethics.

Jeff Jenks commented that polygraph has had difficulties with cases of ethics also and would like to see changes made to directly address some of these cases.

Nancy Jackson commented that because she sees the SOMB as the experts with the sex offender population, the SOMB should address the concerns of ethical issues when it comes to treatment providers.

Marcelo Kopcow commented that DORA should be informed in these cases and they should address the concern as a licensing concern.

Jeff Geist asked ARC to consult with DORA if and when these kinds of challenges are presented in the future and follow that guidance.

PREA Background Information (Action Item) – Natasha Shafer, Division of Youth Corrections (DYC); Karen Moldavan, CCASA, and Jerri Worm, DOC – Handouts provided.

Natasha Shafer commented that the DYC screening process is similar to PREA's. She added that they have added more screening for LBGYQ members, and they do not isolate but rather make sure housing and general needs for safety are met. Since PREA has released its Standards in 2012, training within the Division of Youth Corrections has enhanced their work. Additionally, she commented that they have greatly increased their awareness of inappropriate sexual behavior even beyond just issues between juveniles but also with staff.

Laurie Kepros commented that she would like to see the SOMB continue this discussion beyond this presentation.

Carl Blake commented that DYC also does an annual and anonymous report asking within their facilities about these grievances. He noted that even though this does not result in an actual reporting of crimes if the victim is unwilling to come forward, it does give the facility information about their policies and if they need more attention.

Kim English commented that she and Peggy Heil did a report some years ago that looked at individuals who committed a sex crime in the community and individuals who committed a sex crime while incarcerated and found much higher recidivism rates for those who committed this crime while incarcerated.

Tom Leversee asked what were some of the key findings from the DYC surveys.

Natasha Shafer commented that the information is limited, but has been helpful to them.

Amy Fitch commented that she was surprised at the statistics. She adding that it was especially surprising because reporting rates are much lower than the actual rate of the crime.

Break

Variance Request (Decision Items) – Application Review Committee –

Jeff Geist asked if the treatment goals document had been presented to the client and what the response was.

Chelsea Beck commented that the goals have been presented and the client has already started to work on them.

Rick May asked about the treatment provider’s experience was with the client and his investment in treatment.

Chelsea Beck commented that the client has shown increasing investment in regular treatment, but that the client is not accepting that he is a sex offender and therefore they are not doing any sex offender specific treatment.

Merve Davies asked if there were additional goals.

Chelsea Beck commented that some of the goals may be more simplistic, but treatment is going well but moving slowly. Therefore, reaching these goals is taking much longer than expected.

Jeff Geist asked if there were any cognitive disabilities

Chelsea Beck commented that personal responsibility is a major focus as well as victim empathy.

Amy Fitch commented that she does have concerns, but that it is ultimately up to parole or probation to decide if he is no longer safe in the community due to his lack of participation.

Mimi Scheuermann asked for clarification from a polygraph perspective if there is a better balance to taking some of the polygraphs, but not all of them.

Rick May responded that the provider could speak with a polygrapher and this may help determine which polygraphs are most necessary and helpful.

APPROVAL OF THE VARIANCE FOR 90 DAYS: motion to approve Tom Leversee; 2nd Rick May.

11 Approve

3 Oppose

0 Abstain

Motion Passed

MEETING ADJOURNED at 2:20 pm.

Device ID	Remote No.	First Name	Last Name	1) Motion to Approve March Minutes	2) Motion to Approve April Minutes	3) Motion to approve Section 9.0 of the Juvenile Standards	4) Motion to approve variance for 90 days
2B201	1	Pam	Bricker	-	-	1	1
2B212	2	Mary	Baydarian	1	1	1	1
2B213	3	Richard	Bednarski	3	3	1	-
2B216	4	Carl	Blake III	1	1	1	1
2B226	5	Allison	Boyd	-	-	-	-
2B22D	6	Jessica	Curtis	-	-	-	-
2B237	7	Merve	Davies	1	1	1	1
2B23B	8	Kim	English	3	1	1	1
2B246	9	Amy	Fitch	-	-	1	2
2B25B	10	Jeff	Geist	-	-	-	-
2B261	11	Missy	Gursky	1	1	1	1
5EE64	12	Rick	May	1	1	1	1
2B26A	13	Bill	Hildenbrand	-	1	1	-
2B26E	14	Nancy	Jackson	1	1	1	-
2B281	15	Jeff	Jenks	1	3	1	-
2B291	16	Marcelo	Kopcow	1	1	1	1
2B295	17	Allison	Watt	1	1	1	2
2B2A8	18	Tom	Leversee	1	1	1	1
2B2D6	19	Jessica	Meza	-	-	-	-
2B2F5	20	Kandy	Moore	1	1	1	1
2B2FF	21	John	Odenheimer	-	-	-	-
2B302	22	Mimi	Scheuermann	1	3	1	1
2B32A	23	Jeff	Shay	1	1	1	2
2B32C	24	Angel	Weant	-	-	-	-
2B32F	25	Brie	Akins	-	-	-	-