

# SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD (SOMB) MINUTES

Friday, March 18, 2022

## SOMB Members

Allison Boyd  
Carl Blake  
Christina Ortiz-Marquez  
Gary Kramer  
Gregg Kildow  
Jeff Shay  
Jesse Hansen  
Jessica Dotter  
Joshua Nowak  
Kathy Heffron  
Katie Abeyta  
Kent Vance  
Kimberly Kline  
Lisa Mayer  
Michelle Simmons  
Nicole Feltz  
Rick May  
Scott James  
Sharon Holbrook  
Taber Powers  
Theresa Weiss  
Tony Carochi

## SOMB Guests

Alicia McNamara	Maria Estrada
Alison Talley	Martha Lugo
Angel Weant	Matthew Smith
Brenda Kay	Michelle Neergaard
Brian Tobias	Missy Gursky
Brianna Gonzalez	Pamela Richarson
Casey Ballinger	Pat Harris
Christy McKinley	Laurie Kepros
Dana Montoya	Rachelle Boespflug
David Nahum	Rick Anglund
Debra Baty	Rick Ostring
Gary Bradford	Sara Raisley
Jason Talley	Sarah Marlow
Jenna Harper	Sera Bennett
Jeremy Tafoya	Tami Floyd
Jessica Meza	Tanya Ahamed
Katie Mancinelli	Tasha Dobbs
Kris Gibson	Wendy Bieseimeier
Kristin Kubacki	Maria Estrada
Kristy Stansell	Martha Lugo
Kyle Jones	Matthew Smith

**Absent SOMB Members:** Glenn Knipscheer and Norma Aguilar-Dave

**Staff:** Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky, Erin Austin, Raechel Alderete, Rachael Collie, and Jill Trowbridge

**SOMB Meeting Begins: 9:09 am**

This meeting was recorded.

## **ORIENTATION TO THE MEETING:**

Kimberly Kline (SOMB Chair) introduced herself, and welcomed the SOMB members in attendance along with the members of the public.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) introduced himself.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) introduced herself, reviewed the various aspects of this WebEx meeting, and indicated how the meeting will be conducted. Erin Austin noted she will be the contact for technical support, and mentioned that she will monitor any questions or comments in the chat and in the question and answer functions.

**INTRODUCTIONS/ATTENDANCE:**

The SOMB members in person introduced themselves individually and indicated how long they have been on the SOMB. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky introduced the Board members who were attending online, and reviewed the open positions on the SOMB.

SOMB Staff introduced themselves.

In person guests introduced themselves.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) introduced the guests attending virtually.

**NEW FUTURE AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS:**

**Board Members:**

None

**Audience:**

Laurie Kepros (Audience Member) indicated that there is a holistic model that evaluates sexual offending at four levels which includes individual risk, housing, community interface, healthy community relationships, and asked if the SOMB could take a look at this new model in identifying possible points of intervention. She indicated that she will send the resource information for this.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**Staff Announcements:**

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) announced the following:

- Erin Austin noted that the Application Review Committee (ARC) position update – Erin Austin announced that Dr. Rick May will be leaving the SOMB and ARC due to term limitations. She asked all to think about nominations to replace Dr. May in both these positions.
- Erin Austin indicated that there will be two separate appeals at the May SOMB meeting.
- Erin Austin noted that March is Women’s History Month, and she gave a short presentation of a number of famous women of color in history.
  - Dorothy Vaughan, Kathryn Johnson, and Mary Jackson (mathematicians who worked for NASA)
  - Marie Curie two-time Nobel Prize recipient (physics and chemistry)
  - Maya Angelou, Poet (civil rights activist)
  - Patsy Mink (first woman of color in the U.S. House of Representatives)
  - Amanda Gorman, National Youth Poet Laureate (published her first book in 2015 at age 13)
  - Oriini Kaipara, Newscaster (first anchor newscaster in New Zealand to broadcast with the traditional moko kauae face tattoo)
  - Deepa Narayan, Author and Social Scientist (who fight for women’s rights in India) - A video from Deepa Narayan was shown regarding the seven beliefs that can silence women.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky announced the following:

- Upcoming Training:
  - Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed the training held on March 17<sup>th</sup> by Dr. Alex Rodrigues on the use of digital media with youth.
  - Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed the Lunch and Learn trainings for this year. He indicated the first training was on Continuity of Care given by Christina Ortiz-Marquez, Amanda Retting, and Tanya Ahamed. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the past lunch and learn trainings are available on demand.
  - Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed that the Victim Clarification Lunch and Learn training will be held on April 7<sup>th</sup> which will be given by Raechel Alderete and Theresa Weiss. He asked all to watch for this training announcement and registration information
  - Future training – Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky announced that there is an upcoming Lunch and Learn training on the Standards Booster in June.
  - Future training – Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky announced that the use of Polygraph for Adults and How It Can Be Individualized training is being planned soon.
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that Senate Bill 22-089 (SOMB Sunset Renewal bill) sponsored by Senator Bob Gardner has been postponed indefinitely. He indicated that the SOMB is currently under a Sunset review (by Brian Tobias,) and noted that a bill for that Sunset review will be coming out in the 2023 Legislative session. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky asked that any feedback can be given through a link on the SOMB website.
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted all to review the pending Legislative bills that are currently in process that are included in the handouts.
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that training on Evaluating Individuals Charged with Child Pornography Possession which will be given by Dr. Alex Rodrigues, and noted that it is scheduled on May 18, 2022 from 8:30 am – 12:30 pm at the Lakewood Police Department. He mentioned that the announcement and registration information will be released within the next two weeks. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that SOMB members can attend this meeting at no charge and can contact the SOMB staff for the discount code.
- 2022 ODVSOM Conference update –
  - Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the conference will be held in person, and indicated the selection of the Keynote Speakers is being finalized, the sessions have been chosen, and mentioned that registration will be open in mid-April.
  - Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that this conference will be held on July 12<sup>th</sup> – July 15<sup>th</sup> at the Beaver Run Resort in Breckenridge, and noted that there will be a recorded option along with the in-person option.
  - Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky mentioned that all sessions will be recorded for personal consumption. He indicated that the conference will be a 4-day conference which will be intermixed with Domestic Violence (DV) and Sex Offender (SO) specific sessions, and noted that there will be a Networking/30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary event on Wednesday evening, July 13<sup>th</sup>.
  - Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that there will be a conjoint DVOMB/SOMB Board meeting on Wednesday 7/13 at the conference which will be two hours in length. He also mentioned that Board members can attend the conference for free, and that transportation costs are covered by DCJ, but noted that food and hotel accommodations are on your own
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky mentioned that the new SOMB Member Orientation will be held on April 15<sup>th</sup> immediately after the SOMB meeting.

Update of Previous Future agenda Items:

- Victims of diverse backgrounds – Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that the Executive Committee will continue to prioritize those issues for future Board and Committee presentations.
- Living arrangements for those who have committed a sexual offense – Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that a housing panel discussion will be formed, and noted that Rachael Collie (SOMB Staff) has pulled all research regarding this. He mentioned that this information will be available for future presentations by the SOMB Staff or other stakeholders, and this information will be made available for those who request it.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the Appeal previously scheduled for this meeting has been delayed until next month's meeting.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed some fun facts of the SOMB for their 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary.

**Board Announcements:**

None

**Audience Announcements:**

Laurie Kepros (Audience Member) highlighted the following three days of recognition in March:

- 3/15 – World Social Work Day
- 3/22 – National Day of Empathy (for those incarcerated)
- 3/18 – National Public Defender Day – Laurie Kepros gave some information and statistics of the Office of State Public Defenders

Lisa Mayer (SOMB Member) thanked Laurie Kepros.

Casey Ballinger (Audience member) put a link in the chat about the Inside Wire radio station that is now broadcasting in prison.

**APPROVAL OF February MINUTES (Decision Item) – (Attachment #1)**

***Carl Blake (SOMB Member) moved to approve the February Minutes as presented.***

***Jeff Shay (SOMB Member) 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.***

Kimberly Kline (SOMB Chair) reminded the audience to not participate in the vote, and asked the SOMB members to click "submit" to ensure their vote is recorded.

**Motion to approve the February Minutes as presented: Carl Blake; Jeff Shay 2<sup>nd</sup> (Question #1)**

<b>18</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

- 12 Yes – online
- 1 Abstention – online
- 6 Yes – in person
- 2 Abstention – in person

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

The Agenda was then approved by consensus.

**SEX OFFENSE SPECIFIC TREATMENT WITH CLIENTS OF DIVERSE ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS (Presentation) – (No Attachment) – (One Hour Training Credit Provided to All Attendees) – Rachael Collie, DCJ**

Rachael Collie introduced herself, indicated that she will present on the research of this topic, and noted that Taber Powers will present from personal experience working with individuals of diverse ethnic backgrounds. She highlighted the following information:

RNR Model (Bonta & Andrews, 2017)

General Psychotherapy (Lau, Chang, Okazaki & Bernal, 2016)

Salient Questions

- Do standard sex offense-specific EBTs work for ethnic-racial minorities?
- Do standard sex offense-specific EBTs work as well for ethnic-racial minorities?
- Do sex offense-specific A-EBTs and/or CSTs work better than EBTs?
- What are the mechanisms of change within A-EBTs/CSTs with ethnic minorities?

Treatment Meta-analyses

- Gannon et al. (2019)
- Losel & Schmucker (2005)
- Schmucker & Losel (2015)
- Hanson et al. (2009)

Attrition Meta-Analysis (Olver et al., 2011)

- No relationships between ethnic-minority status and sex offense-specific program drop-out

Schaff, Jeglic, Calkin, Raymaekers, & Leguizamo, 2019, p. 1698

Usher; A.M. & Stewart, L.A. (2014)

- Effectiveness of correctional programs with ethnically diverse offenders: A meta-analytic study. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology.*, 58(2), 209-230.

Sexual Offending Programs only

- Methodological Limitations
  - Small sample sizes
  - Broad recidivism measure
  - FU 3 years only
  - Single, large, 2009 study
  - Canadian only

Some of the criticisms of standard rehabilitation programs for ethnic-racial minority offenders (Usher & Stewart, 2014)

Do culturally-adapted treatments work better than standard treatments?

- Gutierrez, Chadwick, & Wanamaker, (2018). Culturally relevant programming versus the status quo: A meta-analytic review of the effectiveness of treatment of indigenous offenders. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 60(3), 321-353.

Therapeutic Relationship & Group Cohesion

Emerging Research on Offense pathways and Treatment Needs – Lees, Hanson, Calkins & Jeglic (2020a). Paraphilia and antisociality: Motivations for sexual offending may differ for American Whites and Blacks. *Sexual Abuse*, 32(3), 335-365.

Schaff, Jeglic, Calkin, Raymaekers, & Leguizamo (2019). Examining the ethno-racial related differences in child molester typology: An MTC:CM3 approach. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34(8), 1683-1702.

Lee, Hanson, & Blais, (2020b). Predictive accuracy of the Static-99R and Static-2002R risk tools for identifying Indigenous and White Individuals at high risk for sexual recidivism in Canada. *Canadian Psychology*, 61(1), 42-57.

### Summary & Conclusions:

- Evidence suggests that sex-offense specific EBTs can work for ethnic-racial minority offenders.
- The degree standard EBTs work as well is unclear as evaluations have not examined the specific question in sufficient detail. From the currently available research there is some suggestion of a lack of parity of effectiveness.
- Evidence favors culturally-adapted sex-offense specific EBTs achieving, at least a similar, or better result than standard EBTs. Examples of culturally sensitive treatment is emerging.
- Mechanisms: treatment responsivity, therapeutic alliance, group cohesion, protective factors, culturally-relevant pathways to desistance.
- Recent research suggests there are potential ethnic-racial differences in the development of sexual offending and the type of patterns established, and noted that further replication and exploration is desirable.
- Opportunity to consider keeping pace with these developments:
  - Increase focus on general criminality;
  - Treatment responsivity strived to comprehensively consider cultural values, importance of connection systemic influences and the attendant sociodemographic challenges;
  - Cognizant that potential culturally-specific risk factors and needs may exist that are not clearly reflected in our existing risk and classification systems or etiological theories.

### Summary of Research Limitations:

- Review of studies was necessarily limited – review highlights rather than a comprehensive review
- Methodological issues particularly in treatment outcome evaluation studies include:
  - Not disaggregating treatment effects by ethnic-racial groups
  - Ethnic-racial group treated as a single variable when in reality is multifaceted
  - Small sample sizes in individual program evaluations
  - Broad measure of recidivism
  - Different recidivism measures across studies
  - Lack of information about whether ethnic-racial treatment responsivity addressed in standard programs, if so how
  - Lack of reporting on therapeutic alliance and group cohesion factors
- Small number of studies

### **Audience Discussion:**

Laurie Kepros (Audience Member) asked if other formal research is underway. Rachael Collie (SOMB Staff) responded that there is some research from the past, but noted it is not well developed. She indicated that we should see more research coming in the next few years.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) read a comment from the chat that indicated this research and information is important for CSTs to better understand the needs of diverse ethnicities and cultures.

Taber Powers (SOMB Member) gave a presentation on treatment with Native American clients and noted that in his area of Colorado, there is a very high number of Native Americans. He indicated that he reached out to his Native American clients for their input and questions.

Taber Powers then highlighted the following information:

Demographics

Important Concepts

- Tribe vs. Clan
- Family construct
- Native American Church (combine native American ceremonies/culture with Christianity)
- Traditional vs. Non-Traditional
- Language

#### His First Experience

- Native American vs. Hispanic
- Not another f\*\*\*ing white boy! (be aware of your own biases)

#### I know enough to know I don't know enough

- Interviewed 5 clients
- Asked the clients the following questions:
  - Brief history of tribe/clan
  - What is your tribe's belief in the white man system?
  - What is your tribe's belief on sex offenses?
  - What has been your experience in sex offense treatment at a Native American?
  - How has sex offender treatment taken into consideration your Native American Culture?
  - How has sex offender treatment not taken into consideration your Native American Culture?
  - How could sex offender treatment improve to best work with your Native American Culture?

Taber Powers then reviewed the clients' cultural background and answers to the above questions:

Client #1: 41-year old male  
Ute Maintain Ute Tribal Member  
Engaged in treatment for 42 months

Client #2: 25-year old male  
Navajo Tribal Member  
Engage in treatment for 12 months

Client #3: 27-year old male  
Navajo Tribal Member / Onid Tribal Member  
Engage in treatment for 4 months

Client #4: 26-year old male  
Navajo Tribal member  
Engaged in treatment for 30 months

Client #5: 25-year old male  
Navajo Tribal Member  
Engaged in treatment for 16 months

#### Take Away:

- The Native American culture is often not trusting of the system
- Native American culture is very diverse and does not fit in a box
  - Teachings and value are different within tribes
- Understand the fundamentals of Native American Language to help better communicate with clients.
- Ask questions – Clients are the best educators on their culture
- Respect their traditional healing practices and incorporate them in treatment as often as possible

Taber Powers indicated that he continues to learn more about Native Americans.

Allison Boyd (SOMB Member) asked if any clients are treated through the Federal system and/or the Colorado system. Taber Powers responded that there is a mix within his clientele. She then asked if the victims are primarily Native American. Taber Powers responded that the majority are Native Americans.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) read a question from the chat box that asked if it would be relevant to inquire as to the race/ethnicity of the victims of Taber Powers' clients regarding child sexually explicit materials (CSEM) offenses. Taber Powers responded that he has one client that had a CSEM offense, and noted that most of the client's offenses have been contact rather than non-contact offenses.

Rachael Collie (SOMB Staff) thanked Taber Powers for his presentation on treatment with this population and mentioned the need to address the cultural differences when working with indigenous clients. She also noted that it is helpful to hear that treatment providers are trying learn and understand these cultural differences.

**BREAK: 11:20 – 11:35 am**

**TELE-HEALTH CRITERIA AND STANDARDS (Review Public Comment and Ratification) – (Attachment #2) – Carl Blake, SOMB Member; and Raechel Alderete, DCJ**

Raechel Alderete (SOMB Staff) clarified that the new Tele-health Standard will be inserted in Section 3.140 in the Juvenile Standards, and Section 3.160 in the Adult Standards. She noted that the specific criteria will be found in Appendix P of the Juvenile Standards, and Appendix U of the Adult Standards.

Suggested New Standard:

*"In-person therapy is the preferred and expected modality in which sex offense specific treatment should occur. In some cases, teletherapy may be an appropriate modality to meet the individual needs of the client. If using teletherapy, providers shall follow the criteria outlined in appendix XXX."*

Raechel Alderete indicated that the new Tele-health Standard language was on the website for a period for public comment, and noted that the Tele-health criteria was also included in that document. She reviewed how the teletherapy treatment modality evolved, and noted that the teletherapy variance process was created for teletherapy during the onset of the pandemic in July 2020. Raechel Alderete indicated that since that time, there has been robust discussion with various committees, with the field, and with the SOMB. She noted that it was decided that teletherapy could be a permanent viable modality in limited use situations.

Raechel Alderete (SOMB Staff) paraphrased the public comments received which do not necessarily support this standard (comments provided.)

- Public Comment #1 – Does not support the proposed language in that this language arbitrarily is restrictive of provider discretion and flexibility.
- Public Comment #2 – Does not support the proposed language in that it does not address equity, diversity, inclusion, and that many of the criteria for the use of teletherapy is in direct contradiction of the Department of Regulatory Agencies (DORA) rules.
- Public Comment #3 – Does support the Standard language, but is concerned with the criteria in the Appendix, specifically Item IV that indicates that both the client and the treatment provider reside in the same state.
- Public Comment #4 – Does not support the current proposed Standard language and the appendix criteria in that this response indicates that teletherapy should not be an option, but an equal treatment modality. They also feel that this Standard and criteria is too prescriptive and restrictive.



- Public Comment #5 – This individual does not support the current proposed Standard language and criteria as follows:
  - The SOMB’s guidelines on teletherapy goes against DORA recommendations
  - Feels that the decision to use teletherapy should be given by the therapist alone
  - Expressed the need to trust the therapists in doing what is best for their clients and not what is best for themselves
  - Teletherapy does not increase risk
- Public Comment #6 – Does not support the proposed Telehealth Standard language and appendix criteria as follows:
  - This language is in direct opposition to Colorado Revised Statute – C.R.S. Section 10-16-123 which states that “it is the intent of the General Assembly to recognize the practice of telehealth as a legitimate means by which an individual may receive health-care services from a provider without in-person contact with the provider.”
  - This language is in direct opposition to DORA allowed guidelines
  - Expressed that the decision to use teletherapy should be determined by the therapist and not the CST
  - Express concerned with messaging that might cause therapists to leave this field

Raechel Alderete (SOMB Staff) reiterated that this Standard is being added as a modality, to be used when it is best for the client. She noted the need for more training and technical assistance from the SOMB which might be necessary when introducing major changes to the Standards. Raechel Alderete indicated that if ratified, a longer implementation period might be needed to fully understand the changes.

Carl Blake (SOMB Member) clarified that there appears to be some misunderstandings with the proposed standard and appendices, and he noted that the position of the Board is to allow teletherapy. He clarified the following:

- Public Comment #1 – Carl Blake noted that the language as modeled according to C.R.S. 16-11.7-103 4A (I), and mentioned that the CST has the option to modify the criteria to follow the risk-needs-responsivity model according to the Colorado Revised Statutes.
- Public Comment #2 – Carl Blake indicated that when crafting the SOMB criteria, multiple guidelines were used including DORA criteria as a guideline.
- Public Comment #3 – Carl Blake agreed that the out-of-state sentence is not clear, and noted that there may be circumstances where the client may be out-of-state. He recommended correcting the first sentence. He also highlighted that providers should be aware of not being able to assess body language when using teletherapy.
- Public Comment #4 – Carl Blake reiterated that tele-therapy is only an option if in the client’s best interest, and noted that if the client wants to meet in person, then the treatment provider should provide that service.
- Public Comment #5 – Carl Blake responded to the comment that the treatment provider should make the decision to use teletherapy, and indicated that this has been addressed in Standard 5.055 that states that professionals and the team work collaboratively regarding matters of treatment. He noted that the use of teletherapy is already aligned with a number of other Standards.
- Public Comment #5 regarding not using tele-therapy appropriately – Carl Blake also indicated that if the Standards do not outline the parameters of using teletherapy, then the Board cannot take action against anyone who does not follow those parameters.
- Carl Blake clarified the “working on the beach” statement which addresses when teletherapy is not meeting the needs of the client. He noted that the only reason to use teletherapy is to meet the best needs of the client and not the needs of the provider.

- Public Comment #6 – Overstepping the SOMB authority – Carl Blake indicated that Statute requires the SOMB to create and develop standards of practice for this population, so the SOMB is within its statutory requirement to create these standards.
- Public Comment #6 – Carl Blake responded to the concern that other organizations and associations have authorized the use of teletherapy as a modality. He noted that those organizations have “allowed” the use of teletherapy, but have not “mandated” their use, just as the proposed Standard 3.140/3.160 has.
- Public Comment #6 – Carl Blake noted that the proposed standard emphasizes the needs of the client, and indicated that the Application Review Committee (ARC) have reviewed numerous complaints on the use of teletherapy from both the treatment providers and the clients. He mentioned that due to this, there is a need for criteria and this Standard.

Carl Blake (SOMB Member) recommended that the SOMB approve the proposed Telehealth Standard and the proposed criteria with the change to Criteria IV to read “must be residing in Colorado except in extenuating circumstances.”

Raechel Alderete (SOMB Staff) noted that the roman numerals will be changed to regular numbers for consistency with the other appendices.

### **Board Discussion:**

Allison Boyd (SOMB Member) responded to the public comment directed to her regarding the victim’s voice in teletherapy, and noted that all stakeholders are to work together collaboratively, as they all have a voice, and should work as a team. She indicated that there is respect for the different roles and perspectives. Allison Boyd expressed her concern with the comment that indicated that being victim-centered is “rhetoric,” and noted that being victim-centered is a key component to all treatment.

Allison Boyd (SOMB Member) also expressed concern with Criteria #15 in the Appendix in that she struggles that #15 negates the other criteria.

Carl Blake (SOMB Member) clarified that the public comments state that the Board goes against Colorado law or agencies. He noted that the SOMB is not going against State law or other agencies and that this Standard and criteria are in line with those.

Theresa Weiss (SOMB Member) indicated that telehealth is helpful, but noted the necessity to see most clients in person. She noted that while clients are restricted to which providers they can go to (2-3 choices), she supports the telehealth standard and criteria when deemed absolutely necessary for the client.

Lisa Mayer (SOMB Member) asked why the SOMB should have telehealth standards if DORA already allows this. She noted that the treatment providers are already obligated under DORA and their own profession to follow certain standards, and asked why the SOMB is getting involved. Lisa Mayer asked if this should be discussed further. Rachael Alderete (SOMB Staff) responded that the criteria is in an appendix rather than as a standard in order to make changes more easily when best practice in the field changes.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) indicated that procedurally Standards are up for public comment, appendices are not up for public comment as they are administrative policies of the Board.

Kim Kline (SOMB Chair) noted that respective boards already have standards on teletherapy (LCSW, APA, etc.) and mentioned that their number one rule is to do no harm to the clients. She mentioned that they should consider the needs of the clients first. Carl Blake (SOMB Member) also responded the criteria was based on the

specific problems that have been encountered specific to this population, and indicated that this Standard and criteria give clarity to the operationalization for use for treatment providers. He noted that this Standard is needed if telehealth is not being done in an appropriate manner, so the Board would have the ability to regulate the treatment providers.

Jessica Dotter (SOMB Member) indicated that according to Statute, it is the SOMB's duty to create standards to treat, evaluate, manage, and monitor individuals who have committed sexual offenses. She mentioned that victim voices are also statutorily required to be heard, and noted this Board hears their concerns. Jessica Dotter mentioned that in general, collaboration between the various stakeholders is key to reducing sexual victimization. She expressed her appreciation of the public comment and noted that it is a vital part of this Board's process.

Allison Boyd (SOMB Member) responded to Lisa Mayer and noted that the purpose of this Board is to create standards, and mentioned that licensing agencies are the minimum requirements. She noted that the SOMB Standards are created to give a higher level of guidance. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) mentioned that specific conditions are prescribed in the Standards which are more stringent than DORA. He noted that it is the SOMB's responsibility to focus on the best research-based practices available.

**Audience Discussion:**

None

Jesse Hansen (SOMB Member) noted that due to the public comment, the "why" for this standard and appendix was not clear enough. He suggested a longer implementation period of six months for all stakeholders to understand and transition.

Judge Gary Kramer (SOMB Member) commented that he is satisfied that this recommendation is within the purview of the SOMB. After reading the comments, he asked if the new recommendations are evidence-based, and if this research has been provided to all stakeholders. Carl Blake (SOMB Member) responded that the criteria was shared with the stakeholder groups numerous times and through numerous committees. He noted that the Board was asked if they supported moving in the direction of creating this standard with specific criteria. Carl Blake described the process that was used to present this to the public. He responded Judge Kramer's question regarding if this is evidence-based. Carl Blake indicated that the proposed Standard is evidence-based, noted that the criteria (appendix) is based on already existing guidance, some criteria is a legal requirement (i.e., HIPPA where research is irrelevant), and some criteria is based on the best interest of the population that is worked on (sex offense specific). Raechel Alderete (SOMB Staff) noted that Yuanting Zhang has previously presented the available research to both the Best Practices Committee and to the SOMB.

***Carl Blake (SOMB Member) moved to ratify the Standard and modify Criteria #4 as amended and set an implementation date of 4 months.***

***Rick May (SOMB Member) 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.***

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) suggested that the SOMB Staff will do implementation and outreach during the 4-month period, and take feedback during that time for additional considerations. He indicated that any additional considerations can be brought back to the SOMB for their review and approval.

Carl Blake (SOMB Member) also noted that if a treatment provider has any client needs, that they can always submit a variance until the full implementation of the new standard and criteria has been completed.

Laurie Kepros (Audience Member) asked if the treatment providers are operating under the current pandemic variance, and then asked when implementation would begin for the new Standard and criteria. Carl Blake (SOMB Member) responded that once adopted, the COVID variance would end after the 4 months of implementation has been completed.

Lauren Rivas (Audience Member) questioned whether this Standard and criteria is evidence-based, and asked how this proposed change was shared with providers. She indicated that teletherapy does work. Carl Blake (SOMB Member) responded that this information has been shared with providers in numerous platforms, and noted that teletherapy has worked successfully with a number of clients, which reduces a number of barriers for clients to have treatment. He noted that each specific criterion is modeled after the various mental health agencies, state law, and field parameters. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) indicated that part of the implementation process should clarify the evidence-based research, the various agency recommendations (i.e., DORA), and will let providers know, understand, and operationalize this modality. He also indicated that the research is evolving.

Kimberly Kline (SOMB Chair) reminded the audience to not participate in the vote, and asked the SOMB members to click "submit" to ensure their vote is recorded.

**Motion to ratify the Standard and criteria #4 as amended and set an implementation date of 4 months: Carl Blake; Rick May 2<sup>nd</sup> (Question #2)**

<b>16</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>03</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>02</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	-----------	---------------	-----------	----------------	----------------------

- 7 Yes – In person
- 1 No – In person
- 9 Yes – Online
- 2 No – Online
- 2 Abstention – Online

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) announced that Allison Boyd is leaving the SOMB due to term limitations and discussed her years of service on the Victim’s Advocacy Committee. He expressed his appreciation for her firm stance for the victim perspective, and that she always spoke her truth, even when it is not the most popular. He thanked her for her service and dedication to victims and to the SOMB.

Kimberly Kline (SOMB Chair) also indicated that Allison Boyd is the “gold standard” of victim representation, and noted that she will be truly missed.

There were a number of praises and comments given by Katie Abeyta (SOMB Member), Raechel Alderete (SOMB Staff), and Erin Austin (SOMB Member.)

Allison Boyd (SOMB Member) responded that this Board has worked on some really hard stuff and expressed appreciation for all the perspectives represented. She noted her passion for helping victims and her desire to help people live happy, productive, and safe lives.

**Meeting Adjourned: 1:00 pm**

Respectfully,

---

Jill Trowbridge  
Program Assistant

Date



---

Kimberly Kline  
Chair of the SOMB

4/19/2022

Date

Event Name	Event Start Date	Event Start Time	FirstName	LastName	Leave Time	Approval of February 2022 minutes(10:16 am / 10:17 am)	Ratify the Board's previous decision to modify the telehealth Standard with addition to criteria 4 of "Except in extenuating circumstances", and set an implementation timeframe of 4 months.(12:47 pm / 12:48 pm)
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Allison	Boyd	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes - In-Person	No - In-Person
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Carl	Blake	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Christina	Marquez	1:00 pm Denver Time	Abstain	Abstain
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Gary	Kramer	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes	Yes
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Gregg	Kildow	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes	Yes
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Jeff	Shay	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes - In-Person	Yes - In-Person
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Jesse	Hansen	1:03 pm Denver Time	Yes	Yes
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Jessica	Dotter	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes	Yes
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Joshua	Nowak	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes	No
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Kathryn	Heffron	1:01 pm Denver Time	N/A	No
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Katie	Abeyta	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes	Yes
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Kent	Vance	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes	Yes
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Kimberly	Kline	1:00 pm Denver Time	Abstain	Yes - In-Person
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Lisa	Mayer	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes	Abstain
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Michelle	Simmons	9:06 am Denver Time	Yes	N/A
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Nicole	Feltz	9:12 am Denver Time	Abstain	Yes - In-Person
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Rick	May	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes - In-Person	Yes - In-Person
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Scott	James	12:48 pm Denver Time	Yes	Yes
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Sharon	Holbrook	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes	Yes
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Taber	Powers	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes - In-Person	Yes - In-Person
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Theresa	Weiss	1:00 pm Denver Time	Yes - In-Person	Yes - In-Person
SOMB Meeting	March 18, 2022	9:00 am De	Tony	Carochi	9:09 am Denver Time	Yes	Yes
						<b>18 Yes</b>	<b>16 Yes</b>
						<b>0 No</b>	<b>3 No</b>
						<b>3 Abstain</b>	<b>2 Abstain</b>
<i>Kathy Heffron joined the meeting at 10:47</i>							
<i>Michelle Simmons left the meeting at 12:27 pm</i>							